



**Policy Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**September 10, 2010 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall**

*Policy Committee minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Audio recordings are on file with the City of Bloomington Planning Department.*

**Attendance**

**Policy Committee:** Jack Baker (Bloomington Plan Commission), Lynn Coyne (IU Real Estate), Mike Farmer (Ellettsville Town Council), Susie Johnson (Bloomington Public Works), Richard Martin (Monroe County Plan Commission), Kent McDaniel (Bloomington Public Transportation Corp.), Mark Kruzan (Mayor—City of Bloomington), Patrick Murray (CAC Chair), Andy Ruff (Bloomington City Council), Jim Stark (INDOT), Mark Stoops (County Commissioners), Julie Thomas (Monroe County Council), Bill Williams (Monroe County Highway Department),

**Others:** Jay DuMontelle (FHWA), Connie Griffin (Town of Ellettsville), Veda Stanfield (CARR), Steve Hendricks, Clark Sorensen (Indian Creek), Thomas Tokarski (CARR), Larry Jacobs (Chamber of Commerce), Jim Rosenbarger (citizen), Bev Ohneck-Holly (CARR), Sandra Flum (INDOT).

**MPO Staff:** Josh Desmond, Raymond Hess, Scott Robinson and Jane Weiser.

- I. **Call to Order**—Mr. McDaniel called the meeting to order. He told the public how the meeting would proceed. Mr. Martin moved that item VII A. 4 be considered before item VI. Mr. Stoops seconded. There was no discussion and the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**
  - A. **June 11, 2010**—Mr. Coyne moved approval. Mr. Martin seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.
- III. **Communications from the Chair**—None
- IV. **Reports from Officers and/or Committees**
  - A. **Citizens Advisory Committee**—Mr. Murray reported. The CAC passed all items except for the one calling for including I-69 in the TIP.
  - B. **Technical Advisory Committee**—Mr. Reid reported that the TAC unanimously passed all items on the agenda, including the I-69 TIP amendment.
- V. **Reports from the MPO Staff** --None
- VII. **A. 4. I-69 Section 4 (INDOT)** –Mr. Stark made a motion on behalf of INDOT to postpone the request to amend the TIP to the November Policy Committee meeting. Mr. Stoops seconded. The motion was approved by voice vote with Mr. Martin voting no.
- VI. **Old Business**
  - A. **Public Participation Plan Amendment (Action Requested)** – Mr. Robinson reviewed changes to the Public Participation Plan (PPP). The changes have been presented and passed by the TAC and CAC. Ms. Thomas asked which projects have been adversely

affected by the absence of an administrative approval process. Mr. Robinson said that in the past year, especially with the ARRA funding, there were minor changes to projects already in the TIP, such as changes from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year. Another example is the Batchelor Middle School project which needed funds shifted from construction to engineering design. If the changes to the PPP are approved, they would allow the simple administrative changes TIP amendments to be approved without going through the whole process. Administrative amendments would have to be approved both by the MPO director and the Policy Committee chair. Staff would be required to notify all committees and update the TIP when items have been approved administratively. Ms. Thomas asked if a Policy Committee member could respond via email to say that they want to bring it to the Policy Committee. Mr. Robinson said the director and the chair could decide that an amendment should not be a fast track decision. There are very few circumstances where an administrative modification would be considered. Mr. Ruff asked how this relates to minor amendments which don't have to go to the TAC or the CAC. Is staff comfortable that the spirit of the public participation policy would still be met even in the situation where there is an administrative approval dealing with cost changes of between 20% and 100%? Mr. Robinson said any change would have to have qualifying funding and "be fiscally constrained." Mr. Stoops said he didn't see the part about changes between 20% and 100%. Mr. Hess explained that there are 3 levels of approvals. The first is a Major Amendment which is a project cost change > 100% or any new project which adds capacity or requires the acquisition of right-of-way. Such amendments would go through the entire process. The next is a Minor Amendment which would be anything with a cost change between 20% and 100%. Minor amendments only need to be approved by the Policy Committee, though staff tries to take minor amendments to the CAC and TAC if time permits. The third level is an Administrative Amendment where the project cost change is under 20% and there is concurrence between the Policy Committee chair and the MPO director. In that case, we could administratively approve the change. Staff is just trying to streamline some very minor changes to existing projects which have already been reviewed and approved by MPO Committees. Ms. Johnson asked if a particular portion of a project were stripped out of a project that might have some very significant impacts to the community but not have any significant impact to the MPO budget—How would that be handled? Mr. Robinson said that changing the scope of the project significantly would not be handled by an administrative approval. Mr. Martin asked if staff had identified issues that could be dealt with administratively. Mr. Robinson gave some examples. Mr. Martin asked why staff didn't add a monetary threshold. Mr. Stoops asked if as part of the administrative procedure and minor amendments policy could include some kind of notification of the committee members and some time for comments from them. Mr. Robinson said that could possibly be added but staff felt that the MPO director and Policy Committee chair could be relied upon. Mr. Stoops said that he would like notification added. Mr. McDaniel asked if the Committee wanted to take action on this today. Ms. Thomas wanted to postpone until more language is included. Mr. McDaniel asked for comments to be directed to staff. Mr. Martin said he would like to add language about a monetary cap for administrative changes. Also, staff should consider the notification issue. **\*\*\*Ms. Thomas moved to postpone action on this issue until the issues listed by Mr. Martin are addressed. Mr. Martin seconded the motion and it was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

## VII. New Business

### A. FY2010 -2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments (*Action Requested*)

**1. 2010 project carryover to 2011 (Bloomington, Monroe County, Ellettsville, School Corporations, Transit)**—Mr. Hess introduced this amendment. He explained that in the absence of developing a new TIP, some project schedules have become outdated. The amendment was presented to and approved by both the TAC and CAC. There was no public comment. **\*\*\*Mr. Stark moved approval. Mr. Baker seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

**2. Heritage Trail (Ellettsville)**—Mr. Hess introduced the amendment and explained that Ellettsville would like to move forward with the Heritage Trail. In order to do so, the cost for project's phases needed to be updated in the TIP. It was taken to the CAC and TAC and both recommended approval. There was no public comment. **\*\*\*Mr. Williams moved approval. Mr. Martin seconded.**

**3. SR 446 Resurfacing (INDOT)**—Mr. Hess introduced the amendment and explained INDOT has requested to add a new project to the TIP for the resurfacing of SR 446 from SR 46 to Pine Grove Rd. There was no public comment. It was taken to the CAC and TAC and both recommended approval. Mr. Martin wanted to make sure that the road and the shoulders will be repaved due to heavy bicycle traffic. There was no public comment. **\*\*\*Mr. Coyne moved approval. Mr. Martin seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

## VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)

Mr. McDaniel discussed a report called "More Transit = More Jobs." One of the conclusions is that investing in transit results in more jobs than investing the same amount of money in more highways. The authors evaluated TIPs to gather their information. He complimented staff for their TIP reporting. The report can be found at [www.transportationequity.org](http://www.transportationequity.org).

## IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Technical Advisory Committee – September 22, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- B. Citizens Advisory Committee – September 22, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- C. Policy Committee – November 5, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

## Adjournment

*These minutes were adopted by the Policy Committee at their meeting held on 11/5/10. (JFW)*