



## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 25, 2013

6:30 – 8:00 p.m.

McCloskey Room (#135)

*Suggested  
Time:*

*6:30pm*

- I. Call to Order and Introductions
- II. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. August 28, 2013
- III. Communications from the Chair
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
  - a. Project Updates
  - b. MTP Task Force
- V. Reports from MPO Staff
- VI. Old Business

*6:45 pm*

- VII. New Business
  - a. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments
    - 1. INDOT – Bridge Inspections – Quality Assurance/Quality Control on Statewide Bridge Inspection Data\*
    - 2. INDOT – Bridge Inspections – Statewide Bridge Rehabilitation and Emergency Inspections\*
    - 3. MCCSC – Safe Routes to Schools Non-Infrastructure\*
  - b. HSIP Selection Process \*
  - c. TAP Selection Process\*
  - d. CAC Chair and Vice-Chair Roles and Responsibilities Discussion

*7:30 pm*

- VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)
  - a. Topic suggestions for future agendas
- IX. Upcoming Meetings
  - a. Policy Committee – September 13, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)
  - b. Technical Advisory Committee – October 23, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
  - c. Citizens Advisory Committee – October 23, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

*8:00 pm*

- X. Topic Suggestions Under Consideration for Future Discussion  
Communication & Public Coordination Improvements, Bike/Pedestrian Set Aside Money

Adjournment

*(\*Recommendations Requested / \*Public comment prior to vote – limited to five minutes per speaker)*

**Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

**August 28, 2013 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): David Sabbagh, David Walter, Elizabeth Cox-Ash, James Reed, Ken Campanella, Larry Jacobs, Patrick Murray, Glenn Carter, Sarah Ryterband, Sarah Clevenger, Anita Douglas, Mary Jane Hall, Ted Miller, Paul Ash, Laurel Cornell, Jack Baker,

Others in Attendance (including Non-Voting CAC Members): Jim Ude (INDOT), Sandra Flum (INDOT), Josh Desmond (MPO Staff), Anna Dragovich (MPO Staff), Chaim Julian (City Environmental Commission), Lisa Hutchcraft, Dona Parham, Kathy Schick, Nicholas Toth, Ayman Ashwaiheen, Amy Hamilton, Andy Hamilton, Ross Dybvu

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

**II. Approval of Minutes** – The June 26, 2013 minutes were accepted by the Committee.

**III. Communications from the Chair** – Mr. Sabbagh said that he attended the I-69 Local Collaboration meeting hosted by the Chamber of Commerce. Items that were discussed at the meeting included: aesthetics along the I-69 corridor and zoning ordinances being discussed by the county planning commission with regard to truck stops/travel plazas.

**IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees**

**A. MTP Task Force** – Mr. Desmond reported that the consultant continues to work on the traffic demand model. The model is expected to be finished by the end of September. The Task Force met on August 19 and discussed the vision statement along with goals and policies for the plan.

**B. Project Updates** – Ms. Flum reported that the Record of Decision and the Final Environmental Impact Statement has been issued for I-69. Next, INDOT will begin appraising approximately 400 properties for land acquisition. The clearing of trees along the right of way will begin during the Fall/Winter to avoid disturbing the Indiana Bat.

**V. Reports from MPO Staff** – Ms. Dragovich presented the 2014 meeting calendar for the committees' review. Ms. Dragovich also discussed the annual completion report for 2013. This report outlines the work that staff has done such as conference attendance, traffic counting, ADA Transition Plan development, etc. One thing to note is that the funding for these activities is at 60% in to a two year budget. She explained that typically we would be at about 50% spent and 50% unspent, however, the traffic demand model and the MPO conference used up a good amount of the money. She also explained that, though only 40% of the funding remains, staff will still be able to meet their obligations. Ms. Dragovich also discussed the quarterly project tracking report. This is a report that will be sent to the committee on a quarterly basis to update them on the status of projects in the TIP.

**VI. Old Business - None**

## VII. New Business

**A. TIP Amendment – INDOT Raised Pavement Markings for SR 37\*** – Ms. Dragovich explained that INDOT is requesting a TIP amendment for a project that would include raised pavement markings along SR 37. Mr. Ude explained that the project is for refurbishment of the reflectors. **\*\*\*Jack Baker motion to approve the amendment, Paul Ash seconded. Amendment was approved\*\*\***

### **B. HSIP Selection Process**

Mr. Desmond explained the proposed HSIP selection process and suggested that the CAC delay approval until October to allow further review by the LPAs. Mr. Desmond explained the selection process is meant to rank projects that should receive HSIP funds. The CAC provided their feedback and comments.

### **C. TA Selection Process**

Mr. Desmond presented the proposed TA selection process. He mentioned that there are still some tweaks to be made with regard to the scoring system. A refined version will be available by the next meeting. Mr. Desmond mentioned that he is still unsure when the MPO will receive a TA allocation from INDOT. He is waiting FHWA guidance on this issue.

## VIII. Communications from Committee Members

### **A. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas**

Ms. Ryterband requested a discussion to talk about the roles of the CAC chair on the Policy Committee. She suggested that the chairman be required to vote the same way as the CAC does at all Policy Committee meetings.

## IX. Upcoming Meetings

**A. Policy Committee – September 25, 2013 (Council Chambers)**

**B. Technical Advisory Committee – September 25, 2013 at 10:00am (McCloskey Room)**

**C. Citizens Advisory Committee – September 13, 2013 at 6:30pm (McCloskey Room)**

## X. Topic Suggestions under Consideration for Future Discussion

Communication & public coordination improvements, bike/pedestrian set aside money, changes to bylaws as they pertain to the roles of the CAC chair

**Adjournment (~8:00 PM)**

*These minutes were \_\_\_\_\_ by the CAC at their regular meeting held on September 25, 2013.  
(date, initials)*



**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** MPO Technical Advisory and Citizens Advisory Committee Members  
**From:** Anna Dragovich, Senior Transportation Planner  
**Date:** September 25, 2013  
**Re:** Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

The Indiana Department of Transportation has requested a TIP amendment to include two bridge inspection projects. One project includes a total of \$50,000 for fiscal year 2014 for emergency rehabilitation and inspection. This funding is in place and would be used for an emergency situation where a bridge inspection would need to take place. For example, if a truck ran off the road and into a bridge which resulted in damage to the bridge. This funding would be used for immediate inspection of the damaged bridge and any rehabilitation that would need to occur.

State of Indiana Projects		Funding Source	Fiscal year			
			2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Bridge Inspections</b>	BR	\$ 40,000			
<b>Location:</b>	Various Statewide	Local	\$ 10,000			
<b>Description:</b>	Statewide bridge rehabilitation and emergency inspection	RW				
<b>DES#</b>	1297613	CN				
<b>Support:</b>						
<b>Allied Projects:</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ 50,000			

The second project that INDOT has requested a TIP amendment for is a project that entails quality control inspections of bridge inspection data. Quality control for bridge inspection data is done at random and insures that paperwork has been filled out completely and that bridge inspections have been done with integrity.

State of Indiana Projects		Funding Source	Fiscal year			
			2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Bridge Inspections</b>	BR	\$ 200,000			
<b>Location:</b>	Various Statewide	Local	\$ 50,000			
<b>Description:</b>	Quality Assurance/Quality Control program on both State and County bridge inspection data.	RW				
<b>DES#</b>	1382761	CN				
<b>Support:</b>						
<b>Allied Projects:</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ 250,000			

**Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization**

**Monroe County School Corporation**

The following is a project that was previously in the 2012 – 2015 TIP. Since spending is on-going and MCCSC has not exhausted the funding, the project needs to be reflected in the current TIP. The funding is used for outreach projects such as bicycle rodeos, purchase of helmets, and promotion of safe biking and walking.

MCCSC Projects		Funding Source	Fiscal Year			
			2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure</b>	SRTS	\$ 20,000	\$ 55,000		
<b>Location:</b>	Various	PE				
<b>Description:</b>	Comprehensive education, encouragement & outreach activities aimed at increasing walking, biking & safety at 7 elementary schools	RW				
<b>DES#:</b>	1173691	CN				
<b>Support:</b>						
<b>Allied Projects:</b>		<b>TOTAL:</b>	\$ 20,000	\$ 55,000		

**Requested Action**

The Technical Advisory and Citizens Advisory Committees are requested to make recommendations to the Policy Committee on the proposed TIP amendments.



# Transportation Improvement Program Project Request Form

**NOTE:** This form must be completed in its entirety in order for a new project to be considered for inclusion into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) *OR* to make changes to an existing project already programmed in the TIP.

Please complete all parts, including signature verification, and attach all support materials before returning to BMCMPPO staff at the address listed below.

Mail: Bloomington/Monroe County MPO  
401 N. Morton Street Suite 160  
PO Box 100  
Bloomington, IN 47402

**-OR-** email: [mpo@bloomington.in.gov](mailto:mpo@bloomington.in.gov)  
fax: (812) 349-3535

## 1. Public Agency Information (Fill in all applicable fields):

- Monroe County       City of Bloomington       Town of Ellettsville       INDOT
- Rural Transit       Indiana University       Bloomington Transit       \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Name (ERC): Kate Francis Phone: 317-234-5289 Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: Indiana Department of Transportation, Indianapolis, IN

Email: kfrancis@indot.in.gov

## 2. Project Information (Fill in all applicable fields):

- Project Name: Bridge Inspections      DES Number: # 1382761
- Is this project already in the TIP?       Yes       No
- Project Location (detailed description of project termini or attach an illustration): Quality Assurance/Quality Control on both the State and County Bridge Inspection Data throughout the State
- Brief Project Description: Same as Location Description
- Support for the Project (e.g. Local plans, LRTP, TDP, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_
- Allied Projects (other projects related to this one): \_\_\_\_\_
- ITS Components: Does the project have an Intelligent Transportation Systems component? \_\_\_\_\_  
If so, is the project included in the [MPO's ITS architecture](#)? \_\_\_\_\_

### 3. Financial Plan

Identify *ALL* anticipated project costs for all phases, including total anticipated project costs beyond the four years to be programmed in the TIP (i.e. outlying years). Please identify any illustrative phases or costs in *italics*.

*Note: Fiscal Years run from July 1 to June 30 (For example, FY 2014 starts 7/1/13 and ends 6/30/14).*

Phase	Funding Source	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	Outlying Years
PE	Bridge	\$ 200,000	\$	\$	\$	\$
	State	\$ 50000	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
	<b>Totals:</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

- **Construction Engineering/Inspection:**

Does the project include an acceptable percentage of construction costs set aside for construction engineering or inspections?  Yes  No  N/A

- **Year of Implementation Cost:**

Has a four percent (4%) inflation factor been applied to all future costs?  Yes  No

### 4. Complete Streets

- **New Projects:** If this is a new project to be included in the TIP and the Complete Streets policy is applicable, then Section 4 **MUST** be completed.
- **Existing Projects:** If this project is already included in the currently adopted TIP (compliant or exempt) and changes have occurred or will occur to the project which would have bearing on the Complete Streets Policy information on file, then all of Section 4 must be updated and resubmitted for consideration.
- **Not Applicable:** If this project is not subject to the Complete Streets Policy, check the **Not Applicable** box and proceed to Section 5.

**Complete Streets Applicability and Compliance** – Check one of the following:

**Not Applicable – If Complete Streets Policy is Not Applicable, please skip to Section 5.** The project is not subject to the Complete Streets Policy because it is a transit project, a non-road project, a resurfacing activity that does not alter the current/existing geometric designs of the roadway, a ‘grandfathered’ local roadway project included in the TIP before the adoption of the policy, or is a project that uses federal funds which the BMCMPPO does NOT have programming authority. *No Additional Information items (below) have to be provided for projects to which the Complete Streets Policy does not apply.*

**Compliant** - The project will accommodate all users of the corridor. The project is new construction or reconstruction of local roadways that will use federal funds through the BMCMPPO for **any** phase of project implementation. *Additional Information items 1-8 (below) must be submitted for compliant projects.*

**Exempt** - The project is unable to accommodate all users of the corridor due to certain circumstances or special constraints, as detailed in Section IV of the CS Policy. *Additional Information items 1, 4-8 (below) must be submitted for exempt projects.* Reason for exemption: \_\_\_\_\_

**Additional Information** – Attach to this application form the following information as required by the Complete Streets Policy. If any fields are unknown at the time of application, the applicant may indicate that “specific information has not yet been determined.” For any sections marked as unknown, information should be submitted as soon as it is available.

- 1) **Detailed Scope of Work** – Provide relevant details about the project that would be sufficient to use when seeking consulting services (detailed project description, vehicular elements, non-vehicular elements, new construction/reconstruction).
- 2) **Performance Standards** – List specific performance standards for multimodal transportation, including, but not limited to: transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile users, ADA and Universal Design, environmental, utilities, land use, right of way, historic preservation, maintenance of services plan, and any other pertinent design components in relation to current conditions, during implementation/construction, and upon project completion.
- 3) **Measurable Outcomes** – Identify measurable outcomes the project is seeking to attain (e.g. safety, congestion and/or access management, level-of-service, capacity expansion, utility services, etc.)
- 4) **Project Timeline** – Identify anticipated timelines for consultant selection, public participation, design, right-of-way acquisition, construction period, and completion date.
- 5) **Key Milestones** – Identify key milestones (approvals, permits, agreements, design status, etc.)
- 6) **Project Cost** – Identify any anticipated cost limitations, additional funding sources, project timing, and other important cost considerations not included in the table above.
- 7) **Public Participation Process** – Describe the public participation process (types of outreach, number and type of meetings, etc.), and the benchmark goals for the project (participation rates, levels of outreach, levels of accountability and corresponding response methods to input received, etc.).
- 8) **Stakeholder List** – Identify the key parties/agencies/stakeholders/interest groups anticipated to be engaged during project development and their respective purpose and roll for being on the list.

## 5. Signature Verification

I hereby certify that the information submitted as part of this form is accurate. Furthermore, if applicable, I certify the project follows the Complete Streets Policy.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

09042013  
Date



# Transportation Improvement Program Project Request Form

**NOTE:** This form must be completed in its entirety in order for a new project to be considered for inclusion into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) *OR* to make changes to an existing project already programmed in the TIP.

Please complete all parts, including signature verification, and attach all support materials before returning to BMCMPPO staff at the address listed below.

Mail: Bloomington/Monroe County MPO  
401 N. Morton Street Suite 160  
PO Box 100  
Bloomington, IN 47402

**-OR-** email: [mpo@bloomington.in.gov](mailto:mpo@bloomington.in.gov)  
fax: (812) 349-3535

## 1. Public Agency Information (Fill in all applicable fields):

- Monroe County       City of Bloomington       Town of Ellettsville       INDOT
- Rural Transit       Indiana University       Bloomington Transit       \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Name (ERC): Kate Francis Phone: 317-234-5289 Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: Indiana Department of Transportation, Indianapolis, IN

Email: kfrancis@indot.in.gov

## 2. Project Information (Fill in all applicable fields):

- Project Name: Bridge Inspections      DES Number: # 1387613
- Is this project already in the TIP?       Yes       No
- Project Location (detailed description of project termini or attach an illustration): Statewide Bridge Rehabilitation and Emergency Inspection
- Brief Project Description: State Bridge Inspections as required by Federal Highway and Safety
- Support for the Project (e.g. Local plans, LRTP, TDP, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_
- Allied Projects (other projects related to this one): \_\_\_\_\_
- ITS Components: Does the project have an Intelligent Transportation Systems component? \_\_\_\_\_  
If so, is the project included in the [MPO's ITS architecture](#)? \_\_\_\_\_

### 3. Financial Plan

Identify *ALL* anticipated project costs for all phases, including total anticipated project costs beyond the four years to be programmed in the TIP (i.e. outlying years). Please identify any illustrative phases or costs in *italics*.

*Note: Fiscal Years run from July 1 to June 30 (For example, FY 2014 starts 7/1/13 and ends 6/30/14).*

Phase	Funding Source	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	Outlying Years
PE	Bridge	\$ 40,000	\$	\$	\$	\$
	State	\$ 10,000	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
	<b>Totals:</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

- Construction Engineering/Inspection:**

Does the project include an acceptable percentage of construction costs set aside for construction engineering or inspections?  Yes  No  N/A

- Year of Implementation Cost:**

Has a four percent (4%) inflation factor been applied to all future costs?  Yes  No

### 4. Complete Streets

- New Projects:** If this is a new project to be included in the TIP and the Complete Streets policy is applicable, then Section 4 **MUST** be completed.
- Existing Projects:** If this project is already included in the currently adopted TIP (compliant or exempt) and changes have occurred or will occur to the project which would have bearing on the Complete Streets Policy information on file, then all of Section 4 must be updated and resubmitted for consideration.
- Not Applicable:** If this project is not subject to the Complete Streets Policy, check the **Not Applicable** box and proceed to Section 5.

**Complete Streets Applicability and Compliance** – Check one of the following:

**Not Applicable – If Complete Streets Policy is Not Applicable, please skip to Section 5.** The project is not subject to the Complete Streets Policy because it is a transit project, a non-road project, a resurfacing activity that does not alter the current/existing geometric designs of the roadway, a ‘grandfathered’ local roadway project included in the TIP before the adoption of the policy, or is a project that uses federal funds which the BMCMPPO does NOT have programming authority. *No Additional Information items (below) have to be provided for projects to which the Complete Streets Policy does not apply.*

**Compliant** - The project will accommodate all users of the corridor. The project is new construction or reconstruction of local roadways that will use federal funds through the BMCMPPO for **any** phase of project implementation. *Additional Information items 1-8 (below) must be submitted for compliant projects.*

**Exempt** - The project is unable to accommodate all users of the corridor due to certain circumstances or special constraints, as detailed in Section IV of the CS Policy. *Additional Information items 1, 4-8 (below) must be submitted for exempt projects.* Reason for exemption: \_\_\_\_\_

**Additional Information** – Attach to this application form the following information as required by the Complete Streets Policy. If any fields are unknown at the time of application, the applicant may indicate that “specific information has not yet been determined.” For any sections marked as unknown, information should be submitted as soon as it is available.

- 1) **Detailed Scope of Work** – Provide relevant details about the project that would be sufficient to use when seeking consulting services (detailed project description, vehicular elements, non-vehicular elements, new construction/reconstruction).
- 2) **Performance Standards** – List specific performance standards for multimodal transportation, including, but not limited to: transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile users, ADA and Universal Design, environmental, utilities, land use, right of way, historic preservation, maintenance of services plan, and any other pertinent design components in relation to current conditions, during implementation/construction, and upon project completion.
- 3) **Measurable Outcomes** – Identify measurable outcomes the project is seeking to attain (e.g. safety, congestion and/or access management, level-of-service, capacity expansion, utility services, etc.)
- 4) **Project Timeline** – Identify anticipated timelines for consultant selection, public participation, design, right-of-way acquisition, construction period, and completion date.
- 5) **Key Milestones** – Identify key milestones (approvals, permits, agreements, design status, etc.)
- 6) **Project Cost** – Identify any anticipated cost limitations, additional funding sources, project timing, and other important cost considerations not included in the table above.
- 7) **Public Participation Process** – Describe the public participation process (types of outreach, number and type of meetings, etc.), and the benchmark goals for the project (participation rates, levels of outreach, levels of accountability and corresponding response methods to input received, etc.).
- 8) **Stakeholder List** – Identify the key parties/agencies/stakeholders/interest groups anticipated to be engaged during project development and their respective purpose and roll for being on the list.

## 5. Signature Verification

I hereby certify that the information submitted as part of this form is accurate. Furthermore, if applicable, I certify the project follows the Complete Streets Policy.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

09042013  
Date



## Transportation Improvement Program Project Request Form

**NOTE:** This form must be completed in its entirety in order for a new project to be considered for inclusion into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) **OR** to make changes to an existing project already programmed in the TIP.

Please complete all parts, including signature verification, and attach all support materials before returning to BMCMPPO staff at the address listed below.

Mail: Bloomington/Monroe County MPO  
401 N. Morton Street Suite 160  
PO Box 100  
Bloomington, IN 47402

**-OR-** email: [mpo@bloomington.in.gov](mailto:mpo@bloomington.in.gov)  
fax: (812) 349-3535

### 1. Public Agency Information (Fill in all applicable fields):

- Monroe County   
  City of Bloomington   
  Town of Ellettsville   
  INDOT  
 Rural Transit   
  Indiana University   
  Bloomington Transit   
  MCCSC

Contact Name (ERC): John Carter Phone: 812-330-7720 Fax: 812-330-7791

Address: 560 E. Miller Dr. Bloomington, IN 47401

Email: jcarter@mccsc.edu

### 2. Project Information (Fill in all applicable fields):

- Project Name: Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure      DES Number: # 1173691
- Is this project already in the TIP?     Yes       No
- Project Location (detailed description of project termini or attach an illustration): N/A
- Brief Project Description: The main focus is comprehensive education, encouragement and outreach activities aimed at increasing walking and biking and safety at seven (7) city elementary schools: Arlington Elementary, Childs Elementary, Fairview Elementary, Project School, Summit Elementary, Templeton Elementary and University Elementary. The grant was applied for by MCCSC in conjunction with the City of Bloomington Planning Department and Bloomington Hospital/IU Health. We will be partnering with Bloomington Hospital/IU Health again to provide the majority of these services.
- Support for the Project (e.g. Local plans, LRTP, TDP, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_
- Allied Projects (other projects related to this one): \_\_\_\_\_
- ITS Components: Does the project have an Intelligent Transportation Systems component? no  
If so, is the project included in the MPO's ITS architecture? \_\_\_\_\_

### 3. Financial Plan

Identify *ALL* anticipated project costs for all phases, including total anticipated project costs beyond the four years to be programmed in the TIP (i.e. outlying years). Please identify any illustrative phases or costs in *italics*.

Note: Fiscal Years run from July 1 to June 30 (For example, FY 2014 starts 7/1/13 and ends 6/30/14).

Phase	Funding Source	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	Outlying Years
PE	SRTS	\$ 20000.00	\$ 55000.00	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>Totals:</b>		<b>\$ 20000.00</b>	<b>\$ 55,000.00</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>

- Construction Engineering/Inspection:**

Does the project include an acceptable percentage of construction costs set aside for construction engineering or inspections?  Yes  No  N/A

- Year of Implementation Cost:**

Has a four percent (4%) inflation factor been applied to all future costs?  Yes  No

### 4. Complete Streets

- New Projects:** If this is a new project to be included in the TIP and the Complete Streets policy is applicable, then Section 4 **MUST** be completed.
- Existing Projects:** If this project is already included in the currently adopted TIP (compliant or exempt) and changes have occurred or will occur to the project which would have bearing on the Complete Streets Policy information on file, then all of Section 4 must be updated and resubmitted for consideration.
- Not Applicable:** If this project is not subject to the Complete Streets Policy, check the **Not Applicable** box and proceed to Section 5.

**Complete Streets Applicability and Compliance** – Check one of the following:

**Not Applicable** – If **Complete Streets Policy is Not Applicable, please skip to Section 5.** The project is not subject to the Complete Streets Policy because it is a transit project, a non-road project, a resurfacing activity that does not alter the current/existing geometric designs of the roadway, a ‘grandfathered’ local roadway project included in the TIP before the adoption of the policy, or is a project that uses federal funds which the BMCMPPO does NOT have programming authority. *No Additional Information items (below) have to be provided for projects to which the Complete Streets Policy does not apply.*

**Compliant** - The project will accommodate all users of the corridor. The project is new construction or reconstruction of local roadways that will use federal funds through the BMCMPPO for **any** phase of project implementation. *Additional Information items 1-8 (below) must be submitted for compliant projects.*

**Exempt** - The project is unable to accommodate all users of the corridor due to certain circumstances or special constraints, as detailed in Section IV of the CS Policy. *Additional Information items 1, 4-8 (below) must be submitted for exempt projects.* Reason for exemption: \_\_\_\_\_

**Additional Information** – Attach to this application form the following information as required by the Complete Streets Policy. If any fields are unknown at the time of application, the applicant may indicate that “specific information has not yet been determined.” For any sections marked as unknown, information should be submitted as soon as it is available.

- 1) **Detailed Scope of Work** – Provide relevant details about the project that would be sufficient to use when seeking consulting services (detailed project description, vehicular elements, non-vehicular elements, new construction/reconstruction).
- 2) **Performance Standards** – List specific performance standards for multimodal transportation, including, but not limited to: transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile users, ADA and Universal Design, environmental, utilities, land use, right of way, historic preservation, maintenance of services plan, and any other pertinent design components in relation to current conditions, during implementation/construction, and upon project completion.
- 3) **Measurable Outcomes** – Identify measurable outcomes the project is seeking to attain (e.g. safety, congestion and/or access management, level-of-service, capacity expansion, utility services, etc.)
- 4) **Project Timeline** – Identify anticipated timelines for consultant selection, public participation, design, right-of-way acquisition, construction period, and completion date.
- 5) **Key Milestones** – Identify key milestones (approvals, permits, agreements, design status, etc.)
- 6) **Project Cost** – Identify any anticipated cost limitations, additional funding sources, project timing, and other important cost considerations not included in the table above.
- 7) **Public Participation Process** – Describe the public participation process (types of outreach, number and type of meetings, etc.), and the benchmark goals for the project (participation rates, levels of outreach, levels of accountability and corresponding response methods to input received, etc.).
- 8) **Stakeholder List** – Identify the key parties/agencies/stakeholders/interest groups anticipated to be engaged during project development and their respective purpose and roll for being on the list.

## 5. Signature Verification

I hereby certify that the information submitted as part of this form is accurate. Furthermore, if applicable, I certify the project follows the Complete Streets Policy.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

8/27/13  
Date

## MEMORANDUM



**To:** Technical Advisory & Citizens Advisory Committees

**From:** Joshua Desmond, AICP  
BMCMPPO Director

**Date:** September 18, 2013

**Re:** Highway Safety Improvement Program Guidelines Update

---

### Background

The BMCMPPO adopted its Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Guidelines in 2010, establishing procedures for awarding Federal HSIP funding to local projects. The INDOT Office of Traffic Safety recently reviewed the BMCMPPO HSIP Guidelines and made several recommendations for updates to bring the Guidelines into compliance with INDOT's latest procedures and areas of emphasis. BMCMPPO Staff have proposed minor revisions to the Guidelines that reflect INDOT's recommendations as well as some clarifications that Staff found useful. The proposed revised Guidelines, which include both the strikethrough edits and new material, are provided after this memo. Since the TAC and CAC meetings on August 28, Staff has made some minor editorial revisions as well as a significant update to the scoring system on Page 5. All other revisions to the Guidelines remain as outlined below. Staff anticipates presenting the revised guidelines to the Policy Committee for adoption at the October 11 meeting.

### Recommended Changes

The core focus of the BMCMPPO HSIP Guidelines – fatal and severe crash reduction – remains unchanged. The procedures detailed within the Guidelines have been updated to ensure the local program meets state and Federal requirements. Changes to the BMCMPPO HSIP Guidelines are relatively minor in nature and are as follows:

- Updated references to the current emphasis areas in the most recently approved Indiana Strategic Highway Safety Plan (dated October 1, 2010). (Page 2)
- Changed references to “Low-Cost Programmatic Improvements” to “Low-Cost Systematic Improvements”. (Throughout)
- Identified the requirement for LPAs to perform Benefit/Cost analysis no later than the design phase of the project and maintain that analysis in the project file. (Page 3)
- Identified that Road Safety Audits (RSA) are required for all HSIP projects. (Page 3)
- Included guidance for coordination with railroads on the placement of traffic control devices at railroad crossings. (Page 4)
- Identified that an LPA may utilize a LTAP Helpers Engineer to assist in locating the RSA team for “High-Cost Site Specific Projects”. (Page 4)
- Identified that all LPAs within the BMCMPPO Planning Area Boundary are eligible for HSIP funding. (Page 4)
- Clarified the safety data driven methods used to prioritize proposed projects for selection. (Page 5)
- Added requirement of a signature from the highest financial official of the LPA on the project application cover letter as well as the name and title of the LPA employee who is the primary contact for the project. (Page 5)
- Clarified the project submittal process after CAC and TAC review. (Page 6)
- Various minor editorial and formatting changes that did not affect the content of the Guidelines (Throughout)

### Recommendation Requested

The TAC and CAC are requested to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on the proposed changes to the BMCMPPO HSIP Guidelines.



# HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Deleted: ¶  
Bloomington/Monroe County  
Metropolitan Planning Organization¶  
Highway Safety Improvement  
Program Guidelines¶

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Font: Bold

Last Revised: TBD

## Overview

The Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMCMPO) is responsible for administering the local Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) process within the urbanized area, including establishing project selection procedures, soliciting projects from Local Public Agencies (LPAs), evaluating project applications, and awarding funding to projects. The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) retains final authority regarding which projects are funded.

There are six general provisions guiding the Indiana State Highway Safety Improvement Program.<sup>1</sup>

- 1) *The candidate project shall demonstrate that it will address one of the infrastructure emphasis areas outlined in the Indiana Strategic Highway Safety Plan:*<sup>2</sup>
  - a. Roadway Departure Crashes
  - b. Intersection Crashes
  - c. Large Vehicle Conflict Crashes
  - d. Roadway Restriction Related Crashes
  - e. Vulnerable User Crashes
  - f. Human Factors Contribution to Crashes
- 2) *The candidate project must demonstrate a workable plan to address the identified safety problem.*
- 3) *The candidate project must demonstrate a financially sound design concept.* For site-specific projects, a benefit/cost ratio at or above 2.0 is the minimum standard for eligibility. Low-cost systematic countermeasures may be better suited to a program-based benefit/cost analysis.
- 4) *All project documentation is subject to review and eligibility determination by the multi-agency Highway Safety Advisory Committee.* INDOT and FHWA retain the right to refuse Federal safety funding for projects that can not document eligibility (justification of need) and cost effectiveness.
- 5) *Where new devices are installed, the owner agency agrees to fund all future maintenance.*
- 6) *Post-construction analysis is a requirement for all completed projects.* For site-specific projects, the normal standard is comparison of crash history for three continuous years before the start and end of project construction. Other low-cost systematic improvements not based on crash history may have post-construction reporting periods of different length.

All phases of project implementation (Preliminary Engineering, Right-of-Way, Construction, and Construction Engineering/Inspection) are eligible under the HSIP program; however, HSIP funds may not be used as a component of a larger project. Local Public Agencies will be required to provide a minimum local match in the amount of 10% of the project cost.

## Project Selection

There are two project categories for HSIP funding: low-cost systematic improvements (e.g., sign replacement, backing plates on signal heads, pedestrian countdown signals, etc.), and site-specific improvements (e.g., roadway realignment/reconfiguration, new signals, etc.). In keeping with statewide and federal goals, low-cost systematic strategies are preferred strategies. Some large scale site-specific projects, such as intersection reconstruction, would rapidly expend the funds and could tie up multiple years of funding. In addition, such projects would likely involve right-of-way acquisition, which would cause a significant lag in project implementation. Low-cost systematic and smaller scale site-specific projects can be implemented more quickly and are preferred.

<sup>1</sup> Indiana Department of Transportation. Local Highway Safety Improvement Program Project Selection Guidance. July 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Indiana Department of Transportation. Strategic Highway Safety Plan. October 1, 2010.

**Deleted:** <sp>

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Deleted:** Program

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Formatted:** Right

**Deleted:**  
Amended 6/11/10

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Deleted:** of Procedures/Requirements

**Formatted:** Left

**Deleted:** HSIP program

**Deleted:** <#>Emphasis Area 4: Improve motorcycle safety ¶  
<#>Emphasis Area 5: Reduce large truck crashes ¶  
<#>Emphasis Area 6: Reduce bicycle and pedestrian crashes ¶  
<#>Emphasis Area 7: Reduce "High Risk" rural road crashes ¶  
<#>Emphasis Area 8: Minimize the possibility and consequences of leaving the roadway ¶  
<#>Emphasis Area 9: Improve safety at intersections ¶  
<#>Emphasis Area 10: Reduce crashes at highway railroad crossings¶

**Deleted:** Other low

**Deleted:** , programmatic

**Deleted:** federal

**Deleted:** programmatic

**Deleted:**

**Formatted:** Left

**Deleted:**

**Deleted:** ¶  
¶  
¶

**Formatted:** Left

**Deleted:** programmatic

**Deleted:** high-cost

**Deleted:** over high-cost

**Deleted:** High-cost

**Deleted:** Smaller

**Deleted:** September 2006

**Formatted:** Font: 10 pt

Project selection procedures differ for low-cost systematic and site-specific projects. Generally, site-specific projects require a greater burden of proof on the applicant to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the proposed strategy. A Road Safety Audit (RSA) must be performed for all proposed HSIP projects, regardless of type. The specific project selection procedures are detailed below.

### Low-Cost Systematic Improvements

The low-cost systematic improvement project types listed below are eligible for BMCMPO HSIP funding. LPAs should prioritize improvements based on the greatest anticipated safety benefit. The project application requires the LPA to discuss its prioritization method. LPAs are required to perform the benefit/cost analysis and Road Safety Audit (RSA) reports no later than the design phase of the project. It is not necessary to demonstrate a particular cost/benefit ratio for these types of projects.

- 1) *Conduct replacement of outdated regulatory, warning and guide signs to meet Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) retroreflectivity requirements.* The basis for this project type is to assist LPAs in meeting the Federally mandated requirements to upgrade warning, regulatory, and guide signs to current standards of the MUTCD.<sup>3</sup> Regulatory and warning signs are eligible for replacement based on the following criteria:
  - a. Signs that are known to be in place longer than 10 years
  - b. Signs that do not have prismatic sheeting
  - c. Signs that are damaged to the extent that their nighttime retroreflectivity is inadequate.
  - d. Signs that fail to meet minimum retroreflectivity requirements
  - e. If the cost estimate exceeds available funding, replacement of signs will be prioritized on the basis that warning and stop signs are highest priority followed by other regulatory and guide signs.
- 2) *Upgrade traffic signals to a minimum of one signal head per travel lane.* The basis for this project type is a well established crash reduction factor associated with this countermeasure. Proposed locations can be prioritized based on crash history and traffic volume.
- 3) *Install black backing plates on all signal heads at a traffic signal.* The basis for this project type is a well established crash reduction factor associated with this countermeasure. Proposed locations should be prioritized based on crash history and traffic volume.
- 4) *Install pedestrian push button and countdown heads at traffic signals.* This countermeasure is described in INDOT Design Standards and is eligible at public road crosswalks. Prioritization of locations should be made according to crash history, pedestrian volume, traffic volume, and pedestrian conflicts.
- 5) *Install new pedestrian crosswalk warning signs, flashing beacons, special pavement markings and refuge areas.* Justification of locations should be according to a documented pedestrian plan that identifies corridors serving pedestrian traffic generators such as multimodal trails, schools, libraries, retail and Central Business District (CBD). Proposed locations should be prioritized based on traffic volume, and pedestrian conflicts.
- 6) *Make changes to signal timing to improve safety.* The basis for this project type is a well established crash reduction factor associated with this countermeasure. Proposed locations can be prioritized based on crash history and traffic volume.
- 7) *Install new lighting at intersections and at trail crossings.* The basis for this project type is a well established crash reduction factor associated with this countermeasure. Proposed locations should be prioritized based on crash history, traffic volume, and pedestrian conflicts.
- 8) *Install new guardrail end sections upgraded to current standards.* This activity is considered preventative maintenance under HSIP guidance that allows for the replacement of substandard

<sup>3</sup> [http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway\\_dept/night\\_visib/policy\\_guide/](http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway_dept/night_visib/policy_guide/)

**Deleted:** <sp>

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Deleted:** Program

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Formatted:** Right

**Deleted:**  
Amended 6/11/10

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Deleted:** programmatic

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt, Underline

**Deleted:** Programmatic

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt, Underline

**Formatted:** Left

**Deleted:** It is not necessary to demonstrate a particular cost/benefit ratio for these types of projects; however,

**Deleted:** federally

**Formatted:** Font: 10 pt

guardrail end sections (such as buried ends) with current guardrail end sections contained in INDOT Standards and Specifications. In order to provide the proper transition to existing guardrail, not more than 100 feet of the existing guardrail may also be replaced at each end section. Proposed locations should be prioritized based on crash history and traffic volume.

- 9) *Install new guardrail at approved locations where none existed before.* New runs of guardrail may be placed according to INDOT Standards and Specifications where the need is determined, according to Chapter 49 of the INDOT Design Manual. Proposed locations should be prioritized based on crash history and traffic volume.
- 10) *Install new stop signs at railroad crossings that lack active warning devices.* The basis for this project type is a well established crash reduction factor associated with this countermeasure. The LPA may install new stop signs at any public road crossing of an active railroad line that currently lacks active warning devices such as railroad activated lights and gates. If existing stop signs are present but are in poor condition they may be replaced under the basis of item 1 above. Proposed locations should be prioritized based on crash history and traffic volume. The LPA should coordinate the placement of traffic control devices at railroad crossings with the railroad.
- 11) Other improvements as authorized by INDOT/FHWA. Certain systematic improvements may be authorized on a temporary basis by INDOT and FHWA in order to allow MPOs additional flexibility in spending HSIP funds. These supplemental authorizations, when applicable, will be conveyed to the LPAs during the annual HSIP call for projects.

**Deleted:** <sp>

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Deleted:** Program

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Formatted:** Right

**Deleted:**  
Amended 6/11/10

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

### Site-Specific Improvement Projects

The selection process for site-specific improvement projects entails a greater level of analysis than is required for low-cost systematic improvements. In particular, a benefit/cost ratio greater than 2.0 is required for all site-specific projects. Additionally, projects must be located at one of the top 50 crash locations in the County, or another location formally approved by the Policy Committee. Road Safety Audits (RSA) are also required for site-specific projects. The RSA report should define the safety issues and identify alternatives and recommended crash countermeasures.<sup>4</sup> The RSA team must consist of independent un-biased experts. The LPA application must include a formal written response to the findings of the RSA team. The LTAP HELPERS Engineer can assist the LPA in locating qualified team members for the RSA.

**Deleted:** ¶ High-Cost

**Formatted:** Left

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt, Underline

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt, Underline

**Formatted:** Left

**Deleted:** high-cost

**Deleted:** projects.

**Deleted:** high-cost

The benefit/cost ratio is based on the relationship of the type and number of crashes to the specific countermeasures proposed. Therefore, the proposed treatment must be capable of reducing the types of crashes associated with the site. In order to facilitate benefit/cost analysis, the BMCMPO will provide a benefit/cost spreadsheet to the Local Public Agencies (LPAs). To complete the worksheet, it will be necessary for the LPAs to consult the police reports for the crashes under consideration. At the request of the LPA, the BMCMPO can provide a list of the crash record numbers for any particular location so that the crash reports can be more easily obtained. Relationships between crash type and countermeasures are detailed in FHWA's "Desktop Reference for Crash Reduction Factors."

In order to be eligible for BMCMPO HSIP funding, the following must be satisfied:

- 1. The LPA must be within the BMCMPO Planning Area Boundary; and
- 2. The proposed site-specific improvement project location must be exclusive of INDOT facilities, including intersections where a non-INDOT facility intersects or adjoins an INDOT facility; and
- 3. The proposed site-specific improvement project location must be identified in the list of the top 50 fatal/incapacitating injury crash locations in the most recent BMCMPO Crash Report, as included in the HSIP Call for Projects. LPAs may appeal to the Policy Committee to allow a

**Deleted:** proposed high-cost project locations

**Deleted:** Within

**Deleted:** urbanized area

**Deleted:** Exclusive

**Deleted:** Identified

**Deleted:** Applications.

<sup>4</sup> Information regarding the RSA process can be found at: <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/rsa>

**Formatted:** Font: 10 pt

project location that is not on the list of eligible project locations. Such appeals may be made concurrent to or prior to applying for HSIP funding. If the appeal is successful, the proposed location will be added to the list of eligible project locations.

Applications for site-specific improvement projects at eligible locations will be prioritized based on the following criteria (total of 100 points possible):

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Safety</b>	More than 2.5 Crashes per MEV	<b>30</b>
	More than 2.0 Crashes per MEV	20
	More than 1.5 Crashes per MEV	15
	More than 1.0 Crashes per MEV	10
	More than 0.5 Crashes per MEV	5
<b>Benefit/Cost</b>	Greater than 10	<b>30</b>
	Greater than 5	20
	Greater than 2	10
	Greater than 1	5
	Less than (or equal to) 1	0
<b>Status of Project</b>	Construction & ROW plans complete	<b>25</b>
	PE & Environmental complete	20
	Initial request for construction funding only	15
	Initial request for construction and ROW funding	10
<b>Local Share</b>	25% or more additional	<b>15</b>
<b>OVER Amount</b>	20% or more additional	<b>12</b>
<b>Required</b>	15% or more additional	9
	10% or more additional	6
	5% or more additional	3
	Required local amount	0

- Deleted: <sp>
- Deleted: Program
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic
- Formatted: Right
- Deleted: Amended 6/11/10
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic

**Project Application Requirements**

LPAs must include the following materials in their applications:

- 1) A cover letter signed by the highest elected official of the LPA that owns or maintains the public road(s) where the proposed infrastructure project will be constructed and a signature by the LPA's highest financial official. The letter shall address all of the following:
  - a) Project intent, including the project location and type of work.
  - b) Explanation of how it was determined that this is one of the worst problems in the area.
  - c) Discussion of the relationship between the type and number of crashes and the treatments proposed.
  - d) Discussion of other treatments that were considered and why were they rejected.
  - e) Name and title of the LPA employee that is the primary contact for the project and who is responsible for sign off on project reports and other project milestones.
- 2) A completed Benefit/Cost worksheet or, in the case of systematic improvements, discussion of the prioritization method used.

- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline
- Formatted: Left
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt
- Formatted: Left
- Deleted: will be required to
- Deleted: local public agency

Formatted: Left

- Formatted: Left
- Deleted: low-cost programmatic projects
- Formatted: Font: 10 pt

- 3) A map of the location(s) to be improved. For some low-cost systematic improvements, involving multiple locations (e.g., sign replacement), a simple dot map is sufficient.
- 4) A data collection plan for pre/post treatment comparison (some low-cost systematic improvements may not be amenable to evaluation). The data collection plan should clearly indicate the LPA's ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the project, using three years of pre-treatment data and three years of post-treatment data. The analysis should include a breakdown of the type and number of crashes in each of the six years, and the estimated benefits of the project, based on the number of crashes reduced in the three year post-treatment period. Standard crash cost estimates are incorporated into the Benefit/Cost worksheet. Crash data collection and analysis will be the responsibility of the LPA.
- 5) Preliminary cost estimates for each phase of the proposed project (e.g. PE, ROW, Construction, and Inspection Services).
- 6) A proposed timeline for completion of each phase of the project.
- 7) For site-specific projects only:
  - a) Road Safety Audit report, including RSA team member list, description of safety problems, and recommended crash countermeasures.
  - b) LPA response to RSA recommendations.

**Deleted:** <sp>  
**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic  
**Deleted:** Program  
**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic  
**Formatted:** Right  
**Deleted:** Amended 6/11/10  
**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 9 pt, Not Italic  
**Deleted:** programmatic projects  
**Deleted:** programmatic

**Formatted:** Font: Not Italic

### HSIP Project Selection Process

The process for awarding BMCMPO HSIP funds to LPA projects shall be as follows:

1. The BMCMPO will issue a Call for Projects.
2. LPAs will submit completed project applications with appropriate supporting materials to the BMCMPO by the Call for Projects deadline.
3. BMCMPO staff will review submitted project applications and, if necessary, work with LPAs to refine or clarify their applications.
4. BMCMPO Staff and LPAs will present project applications to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The CAC and TAC will prioritize the project applications and make recommendations as to which project(s) should be awarded HSIP funding. These recommendations will be forwarded to the Policy Committee.
5. The Policy Committee will approve the local HSIP funding awards.
6. BMCMPO Staff will submit the approved funding awards to INDOT for evaluation by the Highway Safety Advisory Council (HSAC).
7. The HSAC will make a final determination regarding the BMCMPO HSIP funding awards.
8. Approved projects will be added to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in accordance with BMCMPO TIP amendment procedures.

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt  
**Deleted:** Fund Distribution  
**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt  
**Deleted:** allocating and distributing  
**Formatted:** Left  
**Deleted:** issues  
**Deleted:** call  
**Deleted:** projects.  
**Deleted:** .  
**Deleted:** evaluates  
**Deleted:** works  
**Deleted:** , if necessary  
**Deleted:** ) for feedback.  
**Deleted:** whether the  
**Deleted:** receive  
**Deleted:** recommends  
**Deleted:** submits  
**Deleted:** recommendations  
**Deleted:** makes  
**Deleted:** are  
**Formatted:** Left, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Tab after: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.5"  
**Deleted:** ), following public notice requirements. ¶

**Formatted:** Font: 10 pt

# MEMORANDUM



**To:** BMCMPO Technical & Citizens Advisory Committees  
**From:** Joshua Desmond, AICP  
BMCMPO Director  
**Date:** September 19, 2013  
**Re:** Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Guidelines Update

---

---

## Background

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21), the transportation bill that went into effect in 2012, authorized a new funding program called the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The TAP program is a consolidation of three Federal programs that existed independently under previous transportation bills - Transportation Enhancements (TE), Safe Routes to School (SRTS), and the Recreational Trails Program (RTP). In FY 2011-2012, TE, SRTS, and RTP projects in the BMCMPO totaled \$981,588. MPO staff estimates the local TAP allocation for FY 2013-14 to be \$302,373 (a final allocation amount will be specified during the TAP Call for Projects).

The BMCMPO must establish a local competitive process to review and award local TAP grants. MAP-21 does not establish minimum standards or procedures for competitive TAP processes at the MPO level. MPOs are given discretion to establish project priorities and to determine whether to fund (or not fund) eligible project categories.

Under MAP-21, eligible activities under the TAP program fall into four categories:

1. Transportation Alternatives:
  - A. On-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other nonmotorized forms of transportation, such as sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure.
  - B. Infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs.
  - C. Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other nonmotorized transportation users.
  - D. Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.
  - E. Community improvement activities, which include but are not limited to:
    - i. inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising;
    - ii. historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities;
    - iii. vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control; and
    - iv. archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under title 23.
  - F. Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to-
    - i. address stormwater management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff, including activities described in sections 133(b)(11), 328(a), and 329 of title 23; or
    - ii. reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats.
2. The Recreational Trails program under section 206 of title 23.
3. The Safe Routes to School program eligible projects and activities under SAFETEA-LU.

4. Planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

In general, projects that were previously eligible through TE, SRTS, or RTP are now eligible under the new TAP umbrella. However, there are several important differences under TAP that are important to consider:

- Some project eligibilities have been eliminated while others have been created
- There is no dedicated allocation for Safe Routes to School (SRTS).
- Non-profits can no longer apply directly for SRTS funding.
- SRTS projects now require a local match of at least 20%, whereas previously it was a 100% federally funded program.
- TAP funds can be used at any location inside an MPO's Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)
- Some TE project types are no longer expressly described as eligible activities under TAP:
  - Safety, educational activities, and promotional activities, except as permitted under the SRTS.
  - Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites (including historic battlefields), and scenic or historic highway programs (including tourist and welcome center facilities).
  - Landscaping and other scenic beautification.
  - Historic preservation, and rehabilitation and operation of historic buildings, structures, or facilities (including historic railroad facilities and canals).
  - Archaeological planning and research.
  - Establishment of transportation museums.

Attached to this memo are draft BMCMPPO TAP Guidelines. The major elements of the BMCMPPO TE selection process have been retained, with the following significant changes:

- Project eligibilities have been selected in order to focus on projects that improve active transportation (walking and bicycling) choices. This will help the BMCMPPO meet goals that have been established in the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Complete Streets Policy.
- Project application guidelines and selection criteria have been simplified. These changes are intended to reduce the administrative burden on local public agencies, BMCMPPO staff, and committee members throughout the application and selection process.
- The TAP Selection Committee is not restricted from recommending partial awards. This change is intended to allow for more flexibility in granting awards, and to facilitate coordination that may enable smaller projects to move forward (i.e. many SRTS projects).
- The application, project selection, review, and award processes will be reviewed after each funding round. This will allow the process to be refined over time in order to meet the needs of the BMCMPPO.

A revised project application form, including more details regarding project scoring for prioritization purposes, will be developed for use in the TAP call for projects.

### **Requested Action**

The TAC and CAC are asked to make a formal recommendation regarding the proposed TAP Guidelines. Staff hopes to bring a final version of the Guidelines to the Policy Committee for adoption at the October 11 meeting.

**BLOOMINGTON • MONROE COUNTY**



# TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM GUIDELINES

## **INTRODUCTION**

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21), the transportation bill that went into effect in 2012, authorized a new funding program called the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). In broad terms, TAP is a consolidation of three previously existing federal programs which were not independently authorized in MAP-21: Transportation Enhancements (TE), Safe Routes to School (SRTS), and the Recreational Trails Program (RTP). This packet contains general information about the process used to award TAP grants to eligible projects within the Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMCMPO).

The Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMCMPO) is responsible for reviewing and awarding eligible Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant applications that fall within the BMCMPO Urbanized Area. MAP-21 does not establish minimum standards or procedures for competitive TAP processes. MPOs are given discretion to establish project priorities and to decide whether to fund (or not fund) eligible project categories.

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) will provide technical assistance and review to ensure that any submitted TAP application meets federal eligibility requirements. INDOT will also administer TAP funds and all subsequent project management aspects (e.g. engineering design reviews, contract bids, contract awards, etc.) once the BMCMPO has awarded TAP funds to a Local Public Agency (LPA) project.

## **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES**

Eligible activities to be considered for TAP awards in the BMCMPO are described as follows:

- Sidewalks
- On-street or off-street bicycle infrastructure
- Pedestrian and bicycle signals
- Maintenance or construction of recreational trail or trailhead facilities
- Traffic calming techniques
- Lighting and other infrastructure that improves bicycle and pedestrian safety
- Infrastructure projects that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs
- Safe Routes to School programming (Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Evaluation)

## **LIMITATIONS**

TAP grant awards are based upon a grant formula where no more than 80% of the eligible costs will be reimbursed; which in turn requires a minimum of a 20% local match to be paid by the applicant. The BMCMPO will get estimated amounts to award annually for the local TAP program. The BMCMPO will have the ability to rollover or bank any previous TAP funds allocated to the local TAP program that were not awarded. These funds can be used any subsequent year or TAP grant award cycle in addition to the annual allocation. For the most current estimate available for the local TAP Program, contact the BMCMPO staff. The following are guidelines and limitations to the TAP Program:

- No limitation on the number of applications an LPA can submit for consideration;
- New projects, components of existing projects, and multiple phased projects are eligible;
- Application requests cannot exceed the estimated amount of TAP funds available, and are capped at \$1,000,000 under any scenario.

## **SELECTION COMMITTEE**

A TAP Selection Committee will review and score all applications received during the TAP call for projects and will provide their recommendation to the BMCMPO committees. At a minimum, the TAP Selection Committee shall be comprised of at least one, but not more than two, member(s) from each of the BMCMPO committees: the Policy Committee (PC), the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Members that are chosen to serve on the TAP Selection Committee may do so provided the following conditions are met:

- The member is in good standing with the BMCMPO;
- The member is nominated by their respective BMCMPO committee to serve on the TAP Selection Committee; and
- The member understands that, in a good faith pledge, their role is to serve in the best interest of the BMCMPO and not to any subordinate agency, group, or association where a perceived or real advantage may come to being through their association by serving this committee.

In addition to the BMCMPO members serving on the TAP Selection Committee, up to three at-large members may also be selected to serve on the TAP Selection Committee if the MPO staff finds that the composition of the committee could benefit from additional expertise outside of the BMCMPO committee membership. These at-large members may be asked to serve by the MPO staff provided the following conditions are met:

- The individual resides within the BMCMPO Urbanized Area, with the exception of representatives of the Indiana Department of Transportation, Indiana Department of Environmental Management, and other pertinent state agencies; and
- At least one of the at large members is directly associated with one of the following: Bloomington and Monroe County Visitors Bureau, Downtown Bloomington Inc., Bloomington Bicycle Club; Indiana Department of Natural Resource; Council of Neighborhood Associations, a local bicycle or pedestrian advocacy or safety group, a local historic preservation group (HPC, Monroe County Historical Society), a licensed engineer, architect, landscape architect, or planner, Indiana Department of Environmental Management, or Indiana Department of Transportation.

## PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA, REVIEW, AND AWARD PROCESS

The TAP Selection Committee shall review all applications and score them on a 100 point system as prescribed in these guidelines. This scoring system evaluates the level of community support, overall utility, safety, and project readiness, based on the following criteria:

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>MAXIMUM POINTS</b>
<b>Community Support</b>	<b>20 points</b>
Is the project supported by local planning documents?	10
Has the project received letters of support from community organizations?	5
Has the project been presented at public meetings?	5
<b>Safety</b>	<b>25 points</b>
Does the project location occur on any of the lists in the MPO's crash reports from the previous 3 years?	10
How many total crashes occurred within ¼ mile of the proposed project in the previous 3 years?	5
How many fatal or incapacitating injury crashes occurred within ¼ mile of the proposed project in the previous 3 years?	5
Does the proposed project improve safety for multiple user groups?	5
<b>Utility</b>	<b>25 points</b>
Does the project connect to destinations such as parks, schools, libraries, retail centers, employment centers?	10
Does the project enhance bicycle and pedestrian access for traditionally underserved populations, as identified in the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan?	5
How many transit routes and transit stops are located within the proposed project, or are located within ¼ mile of the proposed project?	5
Does the project connect to existing bicycling and walking networks?	5
<b>Project Readiness</b>	<b>30 points</b>
What percentage of design work is currently completed for the project?	10
What percentage of the project right-of-way is owned by the project sponsor at the time of this application?	10
Is this project eligible for a categorical exclusion from NEPA reviews?	5
With the funds requested, will the project be fully funded, or a phase of the project fully funded?	5
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>100 points</b>

Each application shall be scored as described above by each TAP Selection Committee member. Once the applications have been scored by each member, the average of their respective scores will determine the rank order of the applications. The TAP Selection Committee members will make funding recommendations based upon the estimated amount of available TAP funds, the project rank scores, and the funding requests for each application/project.

The results of the TAP Selection Committee review process will be a recommendation for which application(s) to award and how much TAP funding the application(s) should receive. Their recommendations will be sent to the CAC and TAC for consideration and subsequent recommendation. The PC will consider all of these recommendations and make the final award determination.

## **APPLICATION**

All TAP project applications must be submitted by a Local Public Agency (a unit of government with authority to levy taxes) and by the deadline established by the call for projects. Generally, the following conditions apply:

- Limit each application's scope to one single project;
- A complete BMCMPO TAP application form must be submitted;
- Limit each application to a total of 35 pages in length;
- Include additional information pages, maps, pictures, letters of commitment/public support etc.;
- Include a detailed project budget for your total project with itemized cost estimates;
- Indicate whether some of the project could be completed if only part of the requested funds are awarded;
- Include a cover letter signed by the highest local elected official;
- Provide an electronic copy of the application to the BMCMPO; and
- Re-submissions for future cycles will be accepted; however, the application must be updated and meet any new guidance or requirements.

## **PROGRAM EVALUATION**

The TAP program requirements will be reviewed by BMCMPO staff and Committees after each funding cycle.

## **RESOURCES**

The following list provides pertinent information related to various aspects of the TAP program and materials needed to submit an application to the BMCMPO:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Final TAP Guidance  
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidetap.cfm>
- TAP project evaluation form, score sheets and other BMCMPO information [website location to be determined following approval]

## CHAPTER 4: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### 4.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is to serve as the formal means through which active citizen participation provides the Policy Committee with public input on official decision making for transportation planning matters.

### 4.2 Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be:

- A. To foster and develop citizen awareness and understanding regarding transportation policy and planning;
- B. To promote necessary interaction between citizens and the Policy Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, and the Metropolitan Planning Organization staff; and
- C. To keep the Policy Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, and the Metropolitan Planning Organization staff apprised of current and emerging citizen concerns in relation to transportation issues within the urban area.

### 4.3 Membership

- A. **Members:** The membership of the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be comprised of citizens of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County and the Town of Ellettsville. Key stakeholder groups, agencies and organizations from each community should also be represented. The following groups, as well as others that may not be listed, are strongly encouraged to send a representative to participate in the Citizens Advisory Committee.
  - 1. Bloomington Traffic Commission
  - 2. Monroe County Traffic Commission
  - 3. Indiana University Student Association
  - 4. Bloomington Commission on Sustainability
  - 5. Bloomington Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Commission
  - 6. Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
  - 7. Ellettsville Chamber of Commerce
  - 8. Bloomington Environmental Commission
  - 9. League of Women Voters
  - 10. Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission
  - 11. Bloomington Council of Neighborhood Associations
  - 12. Bloomington Bicycle Club
  - 13. Bloomington Board of Realtors
  - 14. Bloomington Council for Community Accessibility

15. Downtown Bloomington, Inc.
  16. Area 10 Agency on Aging
  17. Bloomington Urban Enterprise Association
  18. Monroe County Soil & Water Conservation District
  19. INDOT, Seymour District (Non-voting)
  20. FHWA, Indiana Division (Non-Voting)
- B. **Eligibility:** All citizens and organization representatives that attend Citizens Advisory Committee meetings shall be considered Committee Members.
- C. **Registration:** Anyone wishing to become a member of the Committee shall register using a form provided by the MPO Staff. Such registration shall include contact information (mailing address, phone number, email address, etc.) as well as indicate whether the member has been designated as an official representative of a community organization or agency.
- D. **Voting Privileges:** Citizens Advisory Committee members shall attend three (3) consecutive Committee meetings before they are eligible to vote on Committee business. Members may vote on Committee business as of the third consecutive meeting they attend.
- E. **Revocation of Voting Privileges:** Citizens Advisory Committee members who miss three consecutive meetings may have their voting privileges revoked with concurrence from the Chair and Vice-Chair. Exceptions may be made if the Committee member can demonstrate extenuating circumstances. A Committee member whose voting privileges have been revoked shall be required to follow the process outlined in 4.3(D) to regain voting status.

#### 4.4 Officers

- A. **Officers:** The Citizens Advisory Committee shall elect the following officers:
1. Chair
  2. Vice-Chair
- B. **Eligibility:** Officers of the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be chosen from the voting members of the Citizens Advisory Committee.
- C. **Elections:** Election of officers shall occur in January of each year. Officers shall be elected by a secret ballot of the voting members of the Committee. Elections for all officers shall be by majority vote.
- D. **Duties:** The duties of the elected officers of the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be as follows:
1. Chair
    - a. Preside over the meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

- b. Set the Agenda for Citizens Advisory Committee meetings, in consultation with the Vice-Chair and the MPO Staff.
  - c. Attend meetings of the Policy Committee as a voting member.
2. Vice-Chair
- a. In the absence of the Committee Chair, to preside over the meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee.
  - b. Set the Agenda for Citizens Advisory Committee meetings, in consultation with the Chair and the MPO Staff.
  - c. Attend meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee as a voting member.

#### 4.5 Meeting Procedure

- A. **Quorum:** A quorum shall consist of a simple majority of Citizens Advisory Committee members eligible to vote. At an absolute minimum, quorum shall consist of four (4) voting-eligible Committee members.
1. Committee Action: No action shall be taken by the Citizens Advisory Committee without a quorum.
  2. Rescheduling: If a quorum is not present, those present may tentatively reschedule the meeting to another day when a quorum can be obtained. The members present may also conduct the meeting as an informational session, but shall not take any official action on business items.
- B. **Schedule:** Meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be open to the public and be held on a monthly basis or as needed for special business.
- C. **Special Votes:** The Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee may request a mail, fax, or e-mail vote on issues already presented at previous meetings.
1. **Limitations:** This practice will be used only if Federal and/or State imposed deadlines are an issue or if the vote is necessitated due to the urgency of a local, State, or Federal project.
  2. **Committee Report:** A mail, fax, or e-mail vote will be presented at the next scheduled Citizens Advisory Committee meeting as part of the previous meeting minutes.
- D. **Agenda Items:** Members of the CAC may suggest agenda items at least seven (7) days prior to the next scheduled meeting.

#### 4.6 Order of Business

The business of the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be taken up for consideration and disposition in the following order, unless order is suspended by unanimous consent.

1. Call to order by the Chair
2. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting
3. Communications from the Chair
4. Reports from officers and/or committees
5. Reports from the MPO staff

6. Old Business  
*Public comment prior to vote (limited at the discretion of the Chair)*
7. New Business  
*Public comment prior to vote (limited at the discretion of the Chair)*
8. Communications from Committee members on matters not included in the agenda
9. Adjournment