



POLICY COMMITTEE

June 14, 2019

1:30 - 3:00 p.m.

Council Chambers (#115)*

Policy Committee in Attendance: Jim Ude, Lisa Ridge, Sarah Ryterband, Margaret Clements, Jason Banach, Kate Wiltz, Julie Thomas, Adam Wason (proxy), Nate Nickel (proxy), Lew May (proxy), Pamela Samples

Staff: Pat Martin, Ryan Clemens

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of the Minutes*
 - a. May 10, 2019
 - *Ryterband moved to approve the May 10 minutes. May seconded. Passes unanimously by voice vote.
- III. Communications from the Chair
 - a. None
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - a. Citizens Advisory Committee
 - (1) Ryterband reported on the CAC meeting and recommended the approval of amending the TIP to include the INDOT project DES# 1901448
 - (2) Ryterband discussed SR45 condition and concerns
 - b. Technical Advisory Committee
 - (1) May reported on the TAC meeting and also recommended approval of the TIP amendment
- V. Reports from the MPO Staff
 - a. FY 2020 Unified Planning Work Program
 - (1) Martin reported that the UPWP has a few final processes needing to be completed before the new Fiscal Year begins in July.
 - b. FY 2020 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program
 - (1) Martin reported that he expects the TIP to be approved by INDOT by the beginning of the new (2020) Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2019.
 - c. SR45 Corridor – SR45 Bypass to Russell Road – Status Update
 - (1) Martin reported that the MPO sent the Monroe County Board of Commissioners’ letter to INDOT and further MPO correspondence echoed the concerns expressed in the Commissioners’ letter. INDOT responded meticulously to all issues raised in the letter which was sent back to Martin and Thomas and immediately sent to the Policy Committee. Additionally, BMCMPPO staff further researched conditions of the corridor with regard to traffic volumes, crash history, turning movements, and overall condition.
 - (a) Thomas expressed disappointment with the response from INDOT with regard to the Monroe County Board of Commissioners’ and BMCMPPO letter and is wondering

what a potential time frame might look like for potential projects. Ude mentioned that it is hard to know as of right now based on state funding and project scoring.

- (2) Ude mentioned that the potential for an INDOT project concerning the SR45 Corridor has been submitted to INDOT, and it is possible we could find out by the end of summer if this project has been selected by INDOT's Asset Committee. If it is selected, the project will come to the BMCMPPO, along with all budgets, phases, and production schedules to be included within the TIP. Discussion ensued.

VI. Old Business

- a. None

VII. New Business

- a. FY 2018 – 2021 & FY 2020 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments*
 - (1) DES# 1901448 – District-Wide Bridge Terminal Joints Asphalt Patching
*Ryterband moved approval of the amendment. Thomas seconded. Passes unanimously by voice vote.
- b. Monroe County - Southwest Corridor Study Findings & Update
 - (1) Presentation by Tom Vanderbergh of American Structurepoint. Discussion ensued after the presentation.
 - (2) Ridge mentioned that next steps will include a public meeting after estimates and other feedback are received.
- c. Area 10 Rural Transit - Transit Route Optimization Findings & Final Recommendations
 - (1) Presentation by Chris Myers. Discussion ensued after the presentation.
- d. Bloomington Transit - Route Optimization Study Findings & Final Recommendations
 - (1) Presentation by Boris Palchik of Foursquare ITP. Discussion ensued after the presentation.
 - (2) May discusses next steps including a plan for a series of public meetings.
- e. Bloomington Transit - Maintenance/Operations Facility Condition Assessment Study Findings & Final Recommendations
 - (1) Presentation by Andrew Hupp of EMG Corp.
 - (2) May discusses next steps, discussion ensued.

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

- a. Public comment by Scott Faris about SR 45 corridor. Faris was wondering why past project ideas for this corridor fell through due to local opposition. Wason clarified the reasons why a similar project from seven years ago did not move along further through the transportation planning process by noting that it had a lot to do with the historical nature of properties along this corridor and concern from local opposition groups. Martin confirmed this assessment. *Five minute public comment limit exceeded, but discussion ensued.*

[Faris continues to speak on matters of the SR45 corridor. Ude mentions that there were separate projects along this corridor but none were able to move forward because of numerous issues and public opposition. Ryterband tells Faris that the previous project also did not move forward because the project itself was inadequate and did not contain many aspects of a safe roadway and the project did not consider all users of the thoroughfare. Ryterband eludes to the BMCMPPO Complete Streets Policy adopted by the Policy Committee in 2009 as a reason why these potential projects did not have merit to proceed. Faris requests the Policy Committee send a letter back to the INDOT Commissioners asking why a previous project on this corridor was removed due to local opposition. Faris says, "Send out a letter at a very senior level, this group, back up to the INDOT Commissioner making the case, and if in fact, and I'd even make the reference back to this case study because obviously there was something there on

why they stopped, and if they did stop because of inadequate planning, or your assessment of inadequate planning, because there weren't sidewalks, pathways, bicycles, et cetera, then you should take and elaborate on that." Clements *motioned* "to approve and enact Faris' recommendation as stated." "Seconded" by Wiltz. Ridge paraphrases the "motion" to be "A letter to be sent back to Mr. McGuinness, INDOT Commissioner, from the MPO board concerning the case study that's represented in their letter." *Motion* "passes" 4 (Y), 1 (N), 6 (A). *Based on the BMCMPO Bylaws, the motion failed to pass because it did not receive a majority vote. This will be discussed at the Policy Committee meeting on 9/13/2019 for further review.*

Faris offers his perceptions on ambulance routes to the future IU Health Bloomington facility. Faris goes on to recommend "that you take an action to have IU Health come explain those things." Clements *motioned* to "approve Mr. Faris' recommendation that we have IU Health come and make a presentation to the MPO 'planning committee' about traffic issues involving the hospital development." "Seconded" by Wiltz. Due to Faris' very long recommendation, Ridge is unsure what Clements' "motion" is at this point and paraphrases the "motion" to be: "recommend IU Health representative attend the next MPO Policy Committee meeting to discuss the emergency routes to new hospital." *Motion* "passes" 5 (Y), 0 (N), 6 (A). *Based on the BMCMPO Bylaws, the motion failed to pass because it did not receive a majority vote. This will be discussed at the Policy Committee meeting on 9/13/2019 for further review.*

Faris goes on to discuss how we can address additional safety concerns. Ryterband explains to Faris that SR45 and the other roads going by the hospital are not within the jurisdiction of the BMCMPO and that the role of an MPO is to be a granting organization to local public agencies, not one that creates projects. Ridge confirms that the Policy Committee takes safety very seriously; however, it cannot plan INDOT's projects for them as they plan for projects decades in the future. Ridge says that we cannot require IU Health to come speak to the Policy Committee. Faris goes on to further discuss INDOT roadways that do not lie within the BMCMPO Metropolitan Planning Area or its jurisdiction. Thomas mentions that the Policy Committee has done as much as it can with regard to this issue, and that all we can do is ask, and that we have already asked, and that the concerns about this corridor have been received. Clements thanks Thomas and Martin for their involvement and initiative in contacting INDOT.]

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – June 26, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – June 26, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – August 9, 2019 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

**Action Requested / Public comment prior to vote (limited to five minutes per speaker).*

Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call [812-349-3429](tel:812-349-3429) or e-mail human.rights@bloomington.in.gov.

Meeting Transcript and Notes

A complete transcription of the BMCMPPO 6-14-2019 Policy Committee meeting is available through the following “[VIEW>](#)” permanent link:

Title: MPO Policy Committee 6/14/2019

Date: Fri, June 14, 2019

Meeting Type: City

[VIEW >](#)

<https://catstv.net/government.php?issearch=banner&webquery=policy+committee>

As voted on by the Policy Committee on 10-11-2019, a written version provided by Policy Committee Member Margaret Clements of a self-selected portion of the meeting was approved to be amended to the end of the 6-14-2019 Policy Committee Meeting Minutes. See the Addendum on the following pages for this document. First, please note that portions of what transpired are inaudible and are therefore not able to be perfectly transcribed from this video, nor has everything which transpired is noted in this document. Second, this provided document was never proofread for accuracy by MPO staff before it was amended to be added as an addendum to these Minutes, so the document is here exactly as written by the author. Third, public comments in this section contain many opinions which should be reviewed by the jurisdiction who manages the infrastructure discussed. It should also be noted that the “Communications from Committee Members” portion of the agenda is only meant for Committee Member announcements and items they would like to address that do not occur on the agenda for that particular meeting, and that members of the public may speak on all voting items for “Old Business” and “New Business” prior to committee member votes. As described in the Minutes above, please further note that votes which occurred within the “Communications from Committee Members” portion of the meeting are non-agenda and non-voting items, therefore, what transpired does not comply with the BMCMPPO Operational Bylaws. Additionally, also based on the BMCMPPO Operational Bylaws, each “motion” which occurred within this portion of the agenda failed to “pass” because it did not receive an affirmative vote from a majority of committee members present. The “passing” of these “motions” were inaccurately announced at the time and will be made clear at a subsequent Policy Committee meeting. Policy Committee Members may reference an 8-16-19 memo from MPO staff which describes the use of the Bylaws in depth. For a complete transcription of the BMCMPPO 6-14-2019 Policy Committee meeting, please follow the links above.

Addendum

Friday June 14, 2019

MPO Policy Committee Meeting

Minutes transcribed beginning at 1:11 from Cats TV by Margaret Clements

Lisa Ridge: Moving on the next topic is communications from committee members and/or the public for non agenda items

SCOTT FARIS: I am going to re-engage on the 10th street state road 45 safety concerns. I just got a copy of the response to the Commissioners letter that was sent just before the meeting so I just read it briefly while I was sitting here.

Do you all have a copy of this [Commissioner Thomas/Patrick Martin letter to INDOT]? Do you have a copy of this electronically that you can put on the screen?

Ryan Clemens: no I do not

Scott Faris: You do not. Okay. I just want to comment on a couple of bullets. If you happen to have in front of you, if you go to page 2, I am going to the last two bullets on the page and for those who do not have it in front of them, I will read it out loud.

“There is merit in improving service to bicyclists and pedestrians from Grandview Drive to Smith Road. To address that need we are creating a candidate project for our next capital improvement cycle. The cycle concludes Early Spring, with selection of funded projects.

Now I know you talked about that previously, I would like the MPO staff or I would request that MPO staff or INDOT Seymour take the action to report back to this body on the result of that group when they in fact consider capital improvement projects to see whether or not this is actually going to make the list.

Saying that you are going to just take a wait and see without doing a follow up to see if it actually makes the list doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

The second thing, is the last bullet item on the page, and there is some real concern here, and it should be real concern for this body here:

“There is potential value in the wholesale modernization and reconstruction of State Road 45 or the 1.3 mile stretch of State Road 45 from the bypass to Russell Road .”

Okay, we are now acknowledging a fact there is a requirement here, the state is...

They go on to say

“As recently as 2012”

That's five years ago...no seven years ago...

"INDOT was designing a fully funded capital project to completely rebuild state road 45 in this area specifically from Range road/Pete Ellis drive to Russell road."

And they give a case number.

"This project was eliminated due to local opposition to the scope of work and its impacts."

Who was that? Does anybody know?

Margaret Clements: I was not on this committee at that time.

Adam Wason: I could probably provide a little historical perspective there and this is in consultation with MPO staff with Mr. Martin. I think it has to do with the Daisy Garten Homestead there. It is an historical property on the south side of the road there. And I think the impacts to that property had a lot to do with the local opposition. Correct me, Pat, if I misspeak here. It had to do with the historical nature of the property and the impacts it would have had to the property, I think. Whether it was Bloomington Restorations, Inc., or other local groups, that is where a majority of opposition came from, is that a fair statement Pat?

Scott Faris: It says here, specifically from range road/Pete Ellis Drive that is the intersection past the farm to Russell road.

Adam Wason: that property goes all the way to Pete Ellis from just west of Pete Ellis and that property does adjoin Pete Ellis there

Scott Faris: Sir, I am talking about East of there

Adam Wason: I understand that

Scott Faris: so you didn't address...Pat maybe you have the answer to my question

Adam Wason: What I am saying, Mr. Faris, is that the Daisy Garten property goes all the way from the west of the intersection to Pete Ellis

Scott Faris: Got it. I understand that part of it. The part I don't understand is from Pete Ellis Drive all the way to Russell Road

Adam Wason: Sure

Scott Faris: Part of the concern I brought up the last time we had this meeting is that we have an infrastructure that is not meeting the needs of the community. That

is a country road. With all the new apartments, new school, a post office, a church, and iu busses, and city busses and school busses, and with kids walking across the streets not at the crosswalks, and with scooters and with bicycles and we all know we had a fatality out there

Margaret Clements: And soon there will be emergency vehicles

Scott Faris: I am going to get to that in a second. What I am getting at here, folks, is that at one point INDOT was going to take it on and because of the community, it stopped. It would be interesting to know why it stopped because now we are paying the price and now it is seven years later and it is only going to get worse.

Jim Ude: I am kind of going from memory here, because it has been awhile. We had a separate project years ago for just the intersection and it has been a number of years ago. Like the gentleman said, there were issues with the Garten Farm and several trees that the public did not want to have removed or cut down. There were several issues with the project that led to the project being stopped at the time. I don't know who made that decision, but that is what happened.

Then the other project went from Pete Ellis/Range Road out to Russell Road and there was some opposition to that project and I cannot remember what all of the issues were

Scott Faris: It would be very interesting. There is a case number here. In my experience with the indot customer service folks, they pretty much document every single thing you talk about. I would be interested to see this case number here to see why you all stopped this or recommended it be stopped.

Sarah Ryterband: At the last meeting where you spoke and I said that there was a project and I said that part of the issue was that the project that the project that was being proposed was not adequate it did not include sidewalks, it was leaving the little goat paths for all of those 10,000 students who are riding the bus per day it wasn't just the folks from BRI who had objected, there was more objection to the way it was being designed. And it was only going to be roadway and it was not going to include ALL users for this roadway and that was a big part of the opposition as well.

Scott Faris: Yes Ma'am. I would make the argument or make the recommendation even though you all have said and INDOT has said here at the end that you all have enough justification enough requirements on the table not only for Pete Ellis Drive or the sidewalk or the Entire roadway, I would make the argument that this body, signed out by the members of this body send a letter back to the commissioners stating the requirement. It is nice that the board of commissioners from Monroe County sent a letter forward, but nothing came out of this body. I thought that was what was agreed to at the last meeting: that in fact the MPO staff was directed to

take and put together a memorandum. Now I may have heard that wrong, but I believe that is what I heard.

Now I used to be in the requirements business when I was in the military. You have to be the squeaky wheel. And I would recommend that you send a very senior letter from this body, including the mayor, referencing this case study, because it is clear that there was something there that caused it to stop. And take and elaborate on your assessment of inadequate planning, whether it was sidewalks, bike paths, etc. then you should take and elaborate on that. You lose nothing by doing that. It brings more legitimacy to the requirement by bringing it to a more senior level.

Margaret Clements: I would like to move that we approve and enact Mr. Faris' recommendation as stated.

Lisa Ridge: We have a motion, do we have a second?

Kate Wiltz: I'll second

Lisa Ridge: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor of the motion for a letter to be sent back to Mr. McGinnis, INDOT commissioner from the MPO board concerning case study represented in their letter. All those in favor indicate by saying ay.

Vote called: Unison, ays have it with Sarah Ryterbrand nay.

Lisa Ridge: Motion Carries

Scott Farris: I want to thank the Board of Commissioners I think they did a pretty good job of capturing the essence of what the concerns have been and what they continue to be. I do think the response is pretty adequate to what the issues were.

Two things have come up recently and I read it in the paper and I have also been communicating with the chief of staff at the hospital. It deals with the entrances that they plan to use at the hospital and the ambulance routes that they intend to use. And I did not see it in this letter here. Those two items still need to be addressed.

People out in our area, the East side, and out in the area where I live off of Range Road are concerned about the ambulance routes because in fact if the ambulances are stopped on 46 as they go up toward the hospital when the train is stopped on the tracks, they will go up the road to Smith Road go under the underpass, they will go down state road 45/10th street and they are going to come down and take a right and go right on range road. If in fact it is Fall, and we have the students, and all the complicated traffic patterns that we have and all the pedestrian traffic and the road being so impassable in areas because there is no place to pass...what are you going to do with the ambulances when they come down? I would recommend that one of you or the MPO staff contact Miss Wendy Hernandez who is the chief of staff of IU

Health here locally and ask her the question: what are the ambulance routes going to be here with respect to that hospital. People are asking what is going to happen during the football games, the basketball games and so forth. I do not know anywhere that is being discussed.

Margaret Clements: We had asked Mayor Hamilton, at our last meeting, to bring someone from IU Health to our committee to make a presentation to the committee. To my disappointment, it hasn't occurred and I have been asking for a year and a half.

Scott Faris: I have a recommendation that you take an action to have IU health come and explain those things.

Margaret Clements: I move that we approve Mr. Faris's recommendation that we have IU health come and make a presentation to the MPO Policy committee about traffic issues involving the hospital development.

Lisa Ridge: We have a motion on the floor. Do we have a second?

Kate Wiltz: I'll second

Lisa Ridge: All those in favor to have an IU health representative make a presentation to the next MPO policy meeting to discuss emergency routes to the new hospital please indicate by saying ay

Vote: Ays unanimous
All those opposed (no nays recorded)

Lisa Ridge: Motion Carries. We will send a recommendation to have IU health make a presentation to the MPO. We do not meet in July so the next meeting would not be until August.

Scott Faris: And your point of contact is Chief of Staff Wendy Hernandez. The last thing I would like to bring up is kind of like the elephant in the room. We have talked about infrastructure, we have talked about roadways, and all the other things listed in this letter. What we have not talked about is how do we address the safety concerns. Assuming that none of the work is done in the near future, how are we going to address the safety concerns along that corridor from the bypass all the way out almost to lake lemon. Whose responsibility is it?

Sarah Ryterband: It is not our job. We cannot address it. It is not our highway. We do not own it. We do not own either one of the highways that passes by the hospital. The fact that the IU hospital design and plan through iu health without consideration of any of these things is not the role of the MPO. That is not our jurisdiction. If you want to address it, address it with IU Health.

Scott Faris: I refer you to the website which says: MPO council. I'm going to read you something. It lists the MPO transportation planner which is Pat Martin and it talks about a description of the MPO it says:

"The MPO is comprised of a partnership of local governments and transportation service providers MPO members including the city of Bloomington, Monroe county, the town of Ellettsville, Indiana University, and the Bloomington Public Transportation Corporation." And the mission of this group is "the MPO coordinates regional transportation planning efforts among these groups. I would argue that it all falls under the auspices of this group including the safety aspect of it. If the safety aspect of it doesn't want to be addressed by this group, that what group would do it? Is it public works?"

Sarah Ryterband: Those are INDOT's roads.

Scott Faris: They are not all INDOT roads, are they?

Sarah Ryterband: Those are INDOT's roads.

Scott Faris: They are not all INDOT's roads. If you look at the street signs all the way out to Smith Road, it says Smith Road and 10th Street. That is the intersection. Up on Deckard Drive, that is where it changes to State Road 45.

Margaret Clements: I would also articulate that as a citizen appointee to this committee, I take very strongly how important our role is in terms of promoting citizen safety, automobile safety, ridership safety, safety for all users. It is not sufficient to have access for all users, but safety has to be of paramount concern. We state that that is one of our metrics and we have declined in our safety. And I think we have to really take to heart Mr. Faris's recommendations.

Scott Faris: At the police department there is a sign that says that we are a safe and civil society. Safety is an important element of it. We have bicycles, pedestrians, scooters, people who are not familiar with driving in this country on that road and it is a very dangerous road. Something is going to happen there. Is there an action that you can take? Who is responsible for public safety on that road there? I'm hearing INDOT.

Lisa Ridge: We cannot make INDOT or a state agency we cannot dictate their projects. We cannot plan out there 5 year plan.

Scott Faris: If INDOT is responsible for that safety corridor there, then I would recommend that INDOT Seymour take the action to address it. What are we doing about the safety aspect of it?

Lisa Ridge: To my knowledge, INDOT has worked with IU Health

Scott Faris: They have not talked with each other.

Lisa Ridge: It is not this board's responsibility to make them talk. It is a state route it is a IU health building and that is not what the MPO board is here for.

Scott Faris: Yes, Ma'am. I am talking about is the bypass all the way out to Russell Road. I'm not talking about Pete Ellis/Range Road or the access road to the hospital. So I am specifically talking about East 10th Street/State Road 45 from the bypass all the way out to Lake Lemon. If INDOT is the organization that is responsible for that roadway, then I would suggest that INDOT Seymour address those safety concerns.

Julie Thomas: I appreciate what you are saying, but our proposal that has been acknowledge as having been received is the limit of what we can do as a board and that's it. In a way, it is really frustrating because I see it and the board of commissioners as a whole agrees. And on the other hand, we have a very limited scope of what we are responsible for and that is already quite a bit. Sometimes, not being responsible for things is sometimes a good thing. All we can do is ask

Sarah Ryterband. INDOT is independent and IU is independent we cannot force them to do anything

Margaret Clements: I would like to thank Commissioner Thomas and Mr. Martin for taking the initiative to contact INDOT and to also initiate the request and hear their response. It was our understanding that we would have a presentation here today by IU Health. But unfortunately neither the Mayor nor IU Health representatives are here. And I agree with Mr. Faris that these are important issues such that no action is not an adequate answer because lives have been lost and more lives stand to be lost and I do believe that with all of the players at this table including INDOT, Indiana University, the transportation committee, me, that it is not adequate to just look the other way.