



**Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2011 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall**

*Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner.
Audio recordings of the meeting are available in the Planning Department for reference.*

Attendance

Citizens Advisory Committee (Voting Members): Chair Patrick Murray (Prospect Hill NA), Laurel Cornell (Tree Commission), Joanne Henriot (Bryan Park NA), Bill Milroy (Old Northeast NA), Ted Miller (citizen), Jack Baker (McDoel Gardens NA), Paul Ash (McDoel Gardens NA), Elizabeth Cox-Ash (McDoel Gardens NA), Ted Miller (citizen), Barbara Salisbury (S. IN Center for Independent Living), Sarah Ryterband (Prospect Hill NA), David Walter (6th & Ritter NA), and Larry Jacobs (Chamber of Commerce).

Others In Attendance (including Non-Voting CAC Members): Andy Davis (Bloomington Commission on Sustainable), Buff Brown (citizen), Josh Desmond (BMCMPPO staff), Scott Robinson (BMCMPPO staff), Raymond Hess (BMCMPPO staff), Susie Johnson (Bloomington Public Works), Sandra Flum (INDOT), Reggie Arkell (Federal Transit Administration), Jay Mitchell (INDOT), Jay DuMontelle (Federal Highway Administration), and Michelle Allen (FHWA).

I. Call to Order and Introductions (~6:30 PM)

II. Election of Officers - Mr. Hess reviewed the duties of the Chair and Vice-Chair as detailed in the Bylaws. Ms. Cornell nominated Mr. Murray as Chair and Ms. Henriot seconded. Ms. Cox-Ash nominated Ms. Cornell as Vice-Chair and Ms. Henriot seconded. Larry Jacobs motioned to elect Patrick Murray as Chair and Laurel Cornell as Vice-Chair by acclamation. The motioned was seconded by Ms. Henriot and passed unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes - The October 27, 2010 minutes were accepted.

IV. Communications from the Chair – Mr. Murray and Mr. Hess described the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments approved by the Policy Committee on January 14th. All four TIP amendments were for Bloomington Transit: change to purchase of hybrid buses; change to operational budget; change to purchase of BT Access vehicles; and addition of fare collection software upgrade. Mr. Murray also stated that Bloomington Transit carried 3.265 million passenger trips in 2010 and IU Campus bus carried 3.631 million.

V. Reports from Officers and/or Committees – There were no reports.

VI. Reports from MPO Staff

A. FY 2010-2013 TIP Amendments – Mr. Murray covered this under Communications from Chair.

B. FY 2012-2015 TIP Development – Mr. Hess explained the MPO has begun the process to develop the next TIP: issued a call for projects on 1/14/11; held a meeting with local public agencies 1/20/11; held another meeting with local public agencies on 1/31/11; project submittals due 2/14/11; last meeting with local public agencies on



2/16/11; CAC & TAC project review on 2/23/11; public comment period begins 3/1/11; Policy Committee project review on 3/11/11; CAC & TAC review and recommendation on TIP on 3/23/11; Policy Committee adoption on 4/9/11; transmittal to State by 4/30/11. Mr. Baker asked about how projects originate and if they come out of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Mr. Hess replied that projects are expected to originate in the LRTP, with the exception of non-capacity adding projects. Mr. Hess reminded the CAC that projects must be sponsored by a local public agency willing to provide the local match.

VII. Old Business

A. Public Participation Plan (PPP) Amendment – Mr. Robinson reviewed the changes to the PPP. The major change from the last time the CAC reviewed the PPP is that the Policy Committee members have three days to object to administrative approvals. The CAC will be asked to make a final recommendation on the PPP at the February meeting.

VIII. New Business

A. Transportation Enhancement Selection Review Committee - Mr. Desmond explained the MPO received \$280,000 in Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds from INDOT for fiscal year 2014. The MPO expects two applications: the City of Bloomington's Allen Street Bicycle Boulevard project; and the Town of Ellettsville's Heritage Trail project. Pursuant to the MPO's TE guidelines, a TE selection committee must be formed made up of at least one but no more than two representatives from each of the MPO Committees. The TE Selection Committee will review the TE applications and meet in mid-February to give a recommendation on how the TE funds should be awarded. The recommendation from the TE Selection Committee will be reviewed by the Citizens Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee before it is ultimately decided by the Policy Committee. The Policy Committee chose Jack Baker and Bill Williams and the Technical Advisory Committee chose Jane Fleig. Sarah Ryterband and Paul Ash volunteered to represent the CAC on the TE Selection Committee.

B. Certification Review by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) – Mr. Desmond explained FHWA reviews MPOs every four years to make sure they are compliant with federal and state regulations. It also provides the MPO an opportunity to discuss its concerns. Mr. DuMontelle further explained the review process is also meant to identify the effectiveness of the planning process. A public comment opportunity is also part of the certification review and this CAC meeting serves that purpose. FHWA would like feedback from the CAC on how things are going with the MPO. He mentioned best practices in quarterly project tracking and development and implementation of ADA Transition Plans. There is an interest from FHWA to clarify the linkage between the planning processes and environmental processes and how stakeholders are engaged.

Mr. Murray expressed interest in linking land use plans, like the City's Growth Policies Plan (GPP), to transportation plans, like the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan. Ms. Cornell stated this could augment public involvement because the GPP has a very public update process and is a high profile document that many people in the community

understand and follow.

Mr. Milroy stated it would be helpful to receive notification in the local paper as opposed to electronic distribution. He also suggested more commitment to public involvement whereby public workshops and meetings should be held all day long to maximize the opportunity for public comment. Ms. Johnson stated local projects go through significant public processes but there are not the same opportunities to comment on State projects. This leads to local frustration surrounding State projects. Ms. Cornell stated it would also be helpful to understand what a project will look like when completed through the use of visual images. Mr. DuMontelle offered the suggestion it would also be helpful to understand how public comment was considered in the final design of the project.

Ms. Salisbury stated there is a disconnect between a project's planning and development and the concerns of the disability community. Improved coordination would help. Ms. Ryterband added there is also a disconnect between those designing the road and the community's priorities. Things change over time and if the design was done a long time ago or by someone not familiar with the community, then the changes aren't taken into consideration. Ms. Salisbury also expressed concern that project offices are not accessible by transit. Mr. DuMontelle asked how often communication should occur concerning projects. Ms. Salisbury stated it depends on how close the project is to implementation and that it would be helpful if citizens could track a project's progress, maybe on a website.

Ms. Henriot asked how the State programs and prioritizes projects. Ms. Allen stated the INDOT districts identify needs and purposes of the project. Mr. Mitchell added that "big-ticket" projects go through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Federally funded projects which go through the NEPA process must identify a problem, determine the impacts (environmental, social, historic) of different alternatives, identify a best alternative, solicit public input, and then settle on the preferred alternative. Mr. Mitchell stated public input can influence aspects of the project and that ADA consideration is part of the NEPA process. Opposing public viewpoints are weighed against the original needs that justified the project. Commitments that are finalized during the NEPA process are binding. Mr. Baker stated the public receives no assurance that public comment was taken into consideration and suggested the need for improvement especially on big controversial projects. Ms. Allen stated the Final Environmental Impact Statement for big projects which go through the NEPA process must document responses to public comments received.

Mr. Baker motioned to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes. Ms. Cornell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Ryterband asked if Depts. of Transportation consider peak oil and its influence on project selection. Mr. DuMontelle said there is uncertainty about the Highway Trust Fund and emerging technologies. FHWA's role is to bring some of these issues to light and promote best practices rather than prescribe specific solutions. He suggested that [Long Range] Metropolitan Transportation Plans can plan for transit, bike/ped infrastructure, preservation of existing facilities, road diets, and other innovative ideas.



MPOs are more apt to incorporate these initiatives than states because they are more nimble. Ms. Cornell suggested the State promote pilot programs for transportation projects to see if things work which then can be applied elsewhere. Mr. Arkell stated the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is currently looking for MPOs to come up with innovative and sustainable demonstration projects that would promote livability by combining funds and the program goals of the Dept. of Transportation, Housing & Urban Development, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Ms. Salisbury expressed frustration over deplorable designs of projects that lack adequate pedestrian accommodations. Ms. Ryterband stated she has been dismayed that public information meetings concerning State projects have been ineffective since INDOT personnel were unwilling to provide meaningful answers. Ms. Cornell stated the State often brings a large “battalion” of staff to meetings which may feel intimidating, especially if the audience is smaller than the number of INDOT representatives. It is more important to have someone willing to follow-up with the committee on questions to which the answer was unknown at the time. The configuration of the room of a public meeting can also make things friendlier to the public. Mr. Milroy suggested State Representatives be present at public meetings as well. Mr. Baker asked how State projects take our local Complete Streets Policy into account in their development. Mr. DuMontelle replied State projects should be developed in concert with the needs of the local community.

The CAC expressed their appreciation to FHWA staff for presenting and listening at the meeting. Mr. DuMontelle thanked the Committee for their input and stated the meeting was very informative for him as well. Mr. Desmond stated the Certification Review process will result in a report that will be shared with the MPO Committees.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas – There were no suggestions.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Technical Advisory Committee – February 23, 2011 at 10:00am (McCloskey Room)
- B. Citizens Advisory Committee – February 23, 2011 at 6:30pm (McCloskey Room)
- C. Policy Committee – March 11, 2011 at 1:30pm (Council Chambers)

Adjournment (~8:20 PM)

*These minutes were accepted by the CAC at their regular meeting held on February 23, 2011.
(RCH: 2/23/2011)*