



Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
March 11, 2011 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.

Policy Committee: Jack Baker (Bloomington Plan Commission), Michelle Allen (FHWA), Lynn Coyne (IU Real Estate), Susie Johnson (City Public Works), Richard Martin (Monroe County Plan Commission), Kent McDaniel (Bloomington Public Transportation Corp.), Tom Micuda (proxy for the Mayor—City of Bloomington), Patrick Murray (CAC Chair), Andy Ruff (Bloomington City Council), Jim Ude (INDOT), Dan Swafford (Town of Ellettsville), Julie Thomas (Monroe County Council), and Bill Williams (Monroe County Highway Department).

Others: Adrian Reid (City Engineer), Lew May (BT), Connie Griffin (Town of Ellettsville), Steve Walls (INDOT), Tom Tokarski (citizen), Sean Beachy (Wendel), Kirk Burzyski (Wendel), Laird Pylkas (Wendel),

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

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes:
 - A. January 14, 2011—Mr. Micuda moved for approval. Mr. Martin seconded. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.
- III. Communications from the Chair—Mr. McDaniel said there is an effort to reduce spending for public transportation going on at the State House. The bill would cut 17.8% of the public mass transportation fund. That would mean a loss of over \$400,000/year for Bloomington Transit. That would result in significant service cuts. An amendment has been filed to restore that funding. He said that Parking Operations at IU was contacted by someone at Bernardin Lochmueller who is working on an INDOT traffic study. They were asking for information about parking permit sales, parking lot locations, etc. Mr. Ude did not know about this study. Mr. Murray said that he had heard that RPS wanted a traffic study. Mr. McDaniel thought that study was being done by Walker Engineering.
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - A. Citizens Advisory Committee—Mr. Murray said the CAC had passed all 3 items on their agenda. They are working on a draft policy statement for accessibility and universal design policy.
 - B. Technical Advisory Committee—No report
- V. Reports from the MPO Staff
 - A. Bloomington Transit’s Grimes Lane Operations Facility Study—Mr. May said that BT is working on a plan to expand their Grimes Lane Operations Facility. That facility was constructed in 1997 and it is shared with IU. Since the facility was built, BT has experienced tremendous growth and is outgrowing the facility. Mr. May provided details on the conditions at the facility. Wendel Architects studied the facility and presented an overview of their draft

final report. They presented 3 design options and the associated costs. A new site would be the best but the most expensive option. Mr. May said they are leaning toward Option 3 with the price tag of about \$10 million because it's more affordable than the other options. It should suffice for the next 10-20 years. Mr. Martin said that the consultants said Option 3 would be a 10-year solution, not a 20-year solution. What could we do on this site after Option 3 is nearing capacity? Ms. Pylkas made some suggestions. Mr. May added that he used a 60% growth rate in figuring how long the facility would be sufficient to meet BT's needs. That may be too optimistic especially with public transportation funds in jeopardy. It is hard to imagine that \$58 million could be procured for the preferred plan. Mr. Martin if we decide to abandon the site, we should probably do it sooner rather than later. Mr. Micuda noted that the current structures have to allow water to flow through them since part of this is in a floodway. Ms. Pylkas consulted with their engineers and they thought it would be possible to design the facility with enclosures. Any additional water coming into the site would have to have a detention system and the parking lots could serve this function. Mr. McDaniel asked about possible site contamination on the junkyard. The junkyard owner would have to test the site and remediation would probably be part of the sales negotiation. Mr. Baker noted that Mr. May was going to have a neighborhood meeting about this. He didn't expect opposition. He suggested that the trail and the bicycle boulevard be integrated into the site design. Mr. May said the next steps will be to begin raising the revenue. The project will need to be programmed in future TIPs. We should talk to our congressional delegation about securing some federal money.

Mr. Desmond introduced Vince Caristo, the Planning Department's new Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator.

Mr. Desmond said that the Policy Committee has to do a Work Program Amendment at the next meeting. The amendment will be going to the other 2 MPO committees in March and to the Policy Committee in April. We want to make sure we use our money rather than lose it.

Mr. Desmond said that Mr. Ruff had requested staff to do a report on some legislation which may affect MPOs (HB 1367). It was originated by a representative from Valparaiso who is the chair of the Transportation Committee in the House. It has written in reaction to his frustration with NIRPC, the MPO in his area. The representative wants to make MPOs more accountable. He wants to create some performance standards and review mechanism for all MPOs in the state. If any MPO didn't meet the standards there would be some penalties. MPO directors wanted to hold a meeting with this representative to see what could be done. The first cut of the bill was written in a way that showed he really didn't understand how MPOs already function. The representative wanted to restrict by law the size of Policy Boards since NIRPC has over 50 voting members. After their initial discussion with him, it was clear that he was not going to withdraw the bill. The MPO Council made a lot of suggestions to improve the bill and the representative accepted a lot of them. It won't affect our MPO much if the bill gets passed. The bill passed in the House but was tabled in the Senate Committee. It remains to be seen what ultimately happens to this bill but the MPOs are keeping a close eye on it. Mr. Desmond related some of the changes that could come about with this bill. Most of the requirements are things that we do anyway. The review panel called for has become more balanced. The penalty would be withholding any funds that the State gives us through our TIP. Mr. Ruff asked if staff

knows of any other states that have comparable legislation. Mr. Desmond said he wasn't aware of any. Ms. Allen said that FHWA is looking at the bill for conflicts with federal language or policies. Mr. Ruff asked staff to send him the list of qualifications for board members. Mr. Tokarski said he was concerned that the bill attempts to concentrate authority for transportation planning with the governor and INDOT. The review panel is weighted very heavily with getting the governor's opinion across. It weakens local control while the federal government is trying to give local areas more control. It appears to exclude average citizens from the decision-making Policy Committee because only professionals are allowed on the PC. He wondered if this was an attempt to make legal what was illegally done with the MPO last November in which they used extortion to further a specific project that was desired by the governor and INDOT. It may well conflict with federal law. If people have concerns they should communicate that with the MPO Council because they seem to be somewhat neutral on this. Mr. McDaniel said that they are all concerned to Mr. Tokarski.

VI. Old Business

A. Public Participation Plan Amendment (*Action Requested*)—Scott Robinson briefly presented the Plan Amendment and noted that it had been recommended for approval by the CAC and TAC. He asked if anyone had any questions about the Public Participation Plan Amendment. Mr. Martin asked for clarification on the administrative approval process as it relates to illustrative projects. Mr. Micuda suggested changing the word "other" in the last sentence to "new." Mr. Hess said he thinks that captures the point staff was trying to make. Mr. Martin said in the paragraph above that there is "and/or" which should just be "and." Mr. Micuda agreed. Mr. Martin suggested getting rid of a single quotation mark in the last paragraph. He suggested changing the word "by" to "from" in the last sentence.

*****Mr. Micuda moved approval of the Public Participation Plan Amendment with the wording changes as proposed by Richard Martin. Mr. Coyne seconded.**

There was no public comment.

*****The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

VII. New Business

A. FY2010 -2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

1. Parking Lot Resurfacing (Rural Transit) (*Action Requested*)—Mr. Hess reported that Rural Transit had received ARRA funding. They will apply that funding to resurfacing their parking lot. This needs to be amended into the TIP. The amendment has been recommended for approval by both the CAC and TAC.

*****Mr. Micuda moved to approve Rural Transit's proposed TIP amendment. Mr. Martin seconded.**

There was no public comment.

*****The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

B. Transportation Enhancement (TE) Award Determination (*Action Requested*)—Mr. Robinson explained the BMCMPPO received 2 applications for TE funds. The Committee recommended awarding the funding to the Ellettsville Phase II Heritage Trail project. The Committee had some concerns about the local matching funds which has subsequently been addressed. Mr. Baker noted that it was a very difficult decision to make since both projects were so worthy. The Committee wanted to make clear that they would like to see the project

which was not funded to be resubmitted next time. Mr. Martin asked if there was leftover funding. Ms. Johnson said she would be interested in using any remaining money for brick street restoration in University Courts. Mr. Robinson said staff is determining whether the remaining funds could be used for another project or rolled-over to future years.

*****Mr. Micuda moved approval of the Transportation Enhancement Award determination as outlined in the report. Mr. Martin seconded the motion.**

There was no public comment.

*****The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.**

C. Draft FY2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program—Mr. Hess presented an overview of the document. To meet the State’s April 30th deadline for final TIP submittal, the Policy Committee will have a special meeting on April 8th. He explained the process to develop the TIP. He compared the existing adopted TIP to the proposed draft TIP to illustrate the changes. No action is necessary today. Staff considers the projects in the new TIP to be fiscally constrained. Mr. Ruff pointed out an error on page 3. He also wanted to go on the record again stating that I-69 is not fiscally constrained.

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

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas—Mr. McDaniel asked Mr. Ude to look into that study that is being done by BLA. Mr. Martin asked staff to report to the PC next time about the progress of the Long Range Transportation Plan. Ms. Thomas asked staff to keep them updated on the MPO legislation.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Technical Advisory Committee – March 23, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- B. Citizens Advisory Committee – March 23, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- C. Policy Committee – **April 8, 2011** at 1:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

The meeting was adjourned.

These minutes were approved by the Policy Committee at their meeting held on 4/8/11 (rch)