



**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
April 22, 2009 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall**

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

Attendance

Technical Advisory Committee: John Carter (Monroe Co. Community School Corp.), John Collisson (County Highway), Jane Fleig (CBU), Connie Griffin (Ellettsville Planning), Laura Haley (Bloomington GIS), Perry Maull (IU Campus Bus), Lew May (Bloomington Transit), Doug Norton (Rural Transit), Adrian Reid (Bloomington Engineering), Andrea Roberts (Bloomington Public Works), Mike Trexler (Bloomington Controller), Jim Ude (INDOT), and Dave Williams (Bloomington Parks) and Gregg Zody (Monroe Co. Planning).

Others: Josh Desmond (MPO Staff), Raymond Hess (MPO Staff), Jane Weiser (MPO Staff), and Joyce Williams (Bloomington Engineering), Kathy Catlin Davis (O.R. Colan).

- I. Call to Order--**Adrian Reid called the meeting to order
- II. Approval of Minutes:**
 - A. March 25, 2009--**Tom Micuda moved approval. Jane Fleig seconded. The minutes were approved by a unanimous voice vote.
- III. Communications from the Chair—**There were no reports.
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committee**
 - A. Updates on BMCMPPO funded projects—**Lew May reported that Bloomington Transit (BT) has awarded their contract for final design of their Downtown Transfer Facility to Parsons Brinkerhoff. They hope to break ground by the end of the year. Adrian Reid said the bid letting for the West Third Street project was last month. It came in about \$2 million under the engineers' estimates. Construction will begin this summer. The Henderson St. project will be let in 2 weeks.
- V. Reports from the MPO Staff**
 - A. 10th Street Campus Mobility Study—**Raymond Hess said this project was kicked off last Thursday with a series of public workshops. The area of study is 10th St. to 17th St. and from the bypass to Dunn St. The consultant, Gorove Slade and Associates, is in the data collection stage including input from the public workshops. Staff has handouts, a Facebook page and an online survey. We are trying to get input from the students as well. Mr. Reid noted that through their traffic counts, they discovered that there are some sections of 10th St. that compare in volume with the bypass.
 - B. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Development—**Mr. Hess reported that we are very behind schedule on developing our TIP. Last year we started that process in December. Other MPOs and INDOT seem to be behind as well. The ARRA money has been a contributing factor. We are expected to issue a call for projects today or tomorrow. Staff developed a streamlined submittal form which Mr. Hess then explained. It will be released very

soon. The completed forms need to be submitted within a couple of weeks. We will want to take this to the Policy Committee at their June 8 meeting. We have projects that carry over from year to year. The only new year we are looking is 2013. There might be some changes to existing projects however. Mr. Reid asked if staff expects submittals (for the Complete Streets part of the form) for existing projects. Mr. Hess said he would like to start a record for all projects currently in the TIP. Any project that hasn't cleared the 30% completed threshold would need to be submitted for the Complete Streets part of the form. Mr. Micuda asked if it would apply to a project like 17th/Arlington/Monroe that is not that far along. Mr. Hess said yes. Staff is even asking for Transit projects to complete the first page for standardized collection of data. Complete Streets only applies to roadway projects. Mr. Micuda asked if there was any information regarding the funding allocation for 2013 or are we going to assume carryover at this point with our normal funding stream. Mr. Hess said no. We don't really know what we have to spend until near the end of the fiscal year. What we get in the beginning is pretty much just an estimate. Mr. Desmond added that the other complication is the re-authorization of SAFETEA-LU.

C. Unified Planning Work Program Development—Mr. Desmond said that everybody in the state is behind with this like they are with their TIPs. We are still finalizing what our budget numbers are. Our fiscal year '08 unspent money will carry over into 2010. We already have a 2-year Work Program for '09-10. Any unspent money there will carry over, too. We will get a new fiscal year allocation for FY 2010. We should have money to do what we need to do. This is actually an amendment to our existing FY 2010 Work Program. Every year when we do a Work Program the FHWA folks send to the MPOs Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs). These are things that we need to address as part of our Work Program and MPO operations that year. FHWA has added 3 new points of emphasis that they wish us to implement. 1.) Quarterly project tracking reports—South Bend has come up with a local MPO report that supersedes the State report. We would like to consider that option. 2.) Annual listing of obligated projects—we do this already. 3.) Americans with disabilities transition plans—This is to make sure that all government facilities are ADA-compliant. While we are distributing money to our LPAs, they want us to make sure that they have a plan in place or are already compliant for ADA accessibility. This would apply to LPAs that consist of over 50 persons. Mr. Desmond said that we have some special projects that will carry over and a couple of new ones to add. We need to do an interim update on the Long Range Transportation Plan. We will do a major update after the new census data is reported back to us in a couple of years. The CAC is planning to do a couple of projects with Ball State University. BT has asked about doing a study concerning expansion of their maintenance and storage facility. We will have to decide if we want to do the west 2nd Street study. April 2010 is the date of the census. He reminded the MPO partners to turn in their billings through 3rd quarter. Staff would like to have an estimate of any anticipated spending through the 4th quarter.

VI. Old Business—There was none.

VII. New Business

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

1. INDOT – SR 48 Pavement Preservation from SR37 to Curry Pike (*Recommendation Requested*)

Mr. Hess said that INDOT has contacted the MPO to amend the TIP to add this project. It will be in FY 2009 at a cost of \$534,251 (ARRA funding). Staff is asking for recommendations from the advisory committees in order to take this amendment to the Policy Committee on May 8.

Jane Fleig asked about the paving starting 800 feet from the intersection. Joyce Williams said INDOT said that they are starting basically where the City project ends.

2. INDOT – SR 45/46 from Kinser Pike to Pete Ellis Dr. (*Recommendation Requested*)

Mr. Hess said this project cost has increased to \$36 million. The State wants to use ARRA funds now. Since we are amending the cost and the funding source the TIP needs to be amended. Mr. Desmond spoke to INDOT about design issues. IU was trying to reach an agreement to have a more heavily landscaped median that IU would maintain. No final agreement has been reached on this issue. IU had talked to INDOT about changes to the sidepath configuration. Staff and IU would like a sidepath on the west side of the road that would meander into campus territory following the general path of the bypass but would not necessarily be contained within the bypass right-of-way. At this point INDOT is going ahead with the standard sidepath design. The only place that there will be no sidepath is along the outside north/east portion between Dunn & 14th. INDOT was approached about making the 3rd and 10th St. intersections more pedestrian-friendly. They will only add pork chop pedestrian refuges in the northwest quadrant of both of those intersections. Staff doesn't know about a specific letting date.

Mr. Ude said that the consultant told him that there will be some coordination with IU on some key busy weekends so that the contractor won't have any lane closures during that time. He would have a penalty to pay if he does. Mr. Micuda asked if Mr. Ude had the sense that the design part of this project is 100% complete. Mr. Ude thought it was close. Ms. Fleig said they are still working on the storm sewer design. Mr. Hess asked if the ARRA money was going to help take care of some of the added Utilities costs. Fleig said they are working on that.

Mr. Micuda asked Mr. Reid if he had seen the refuge islands on the plans. Mr. Reid said yes. At 10th St., they got the pork chop islands put in for Little 5. When they took into account medians, they were getting out of the right-of-way footprint.

Jane Fleig moved approval of both amendments. Gregg Zody seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

B. Safe Routes to Schools applications (*Recommendation Requested*)

Mr. Hess said the only candidate for this year would be from Monroe County to apply for a Lakeview Elementary School infrastructure project. This is a resubmittal of an application that was done in 2006. The project would probably cost around \$100,000. Applications are due at the end of May. The project would be for additional sidewalks along Strain Ridge Rd. connecting the school to some of the adjacent neighborhoods to the northwest. It was not clear if MCCSC or Monroe County is the applicant. There will be more details when this is presented to the Policy Committee in May. Tom Micuda moved approval of TAC endorsement of this project. Lew May seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

C. Transportation Enhancement Process (*Recommendation Requested*)

Mr. Hess said that MPOs have been delegated responsibility and a portion of funding for TE projects. We will have a designated pot of TE funds (~\$280,000 annually) within the MPO that we can award at our discretion however we receive less money in this pot than we have procured in the past. We need to figure out how to administer this program and allocate the funds. We have largely deferred to the State's process, criteria and timetable. Annually, we will form a TE Selection Committee made up of a minimum of 1 member of the CAC, TAC and PC—selected by those committees. People serving on the committee should not have a conflict of interest and attend meetings regularly. 3 additional members may be selected by the MPO from organizations such as Downtown Bloomington Inc., IDNR, Bloomington Bicycle Club, etc. Projects would be selected based on a 100 point system as prescribed by INDOT's methodology. The TAC and CAC would review the recommendations from the Selection Review Committee and the PC will have the final authority to award the funding and amend the TIP accordingly. The projects would have a 20% local match. We can bank our money from year to year if we choose however no award will exceed \$1 million. We will have to submit any information received by the MPO to INDOT for their review regarding the project's eligibility for TE funds. The call for projects will come this summer. Staff would like to move on this today since the upcoming meeting will be very busy.

Mr. Micuda asked if a person working for one department in the City government would be considered to have a conflict of interest if a different department from the City applied for funds. Mr. Hess said that could be seen either way. Mr. Micuda thought that people working for the City of Bloomington, Monroe County or Ellettsville should probably not serve on this sub-committee. Mr. Reid said that if this is the case, the committee may have problems with its level of expertise. Mr. Micuda noted that the project would still go through the TAC giving them the opportunity to screen the recommendation. There was more discussion concerning how the representatives of groups might unduly influence the ranking of projects. Mr. Hess said that the criteria is set by federal legislation and administered by INDOT. Mr. Micuda said it might be useful to narrow the definition of conflict of interest. For example, Mr. Williams could not review a Parks project but Mr. Reid could. Mr. Desmond suggested a staggered rotation of new members for the Selection Committee. Mr. Zody asked if this has to go through CAC. Mr. Hess said it could be considered an administrative document that would not need official approval or policy action until we work out all the kinks. Mr. Reid pointed out that they are not in a real hurry since the call for projects would be projects happening for 3 years. He disagreed with requiring a detailed budget at application. Mr. Micuda suggested striking the at-large members and went with two members of each committee. Any member of the committee

whose organization had submitted an application would not be able to rate the application. Committee members from within the same organization could rate the applications as long as their department was not the applying entity. _____ said they are only talking about \$280,000 per year. Why not bring the proposals to the 3 committees and skip the selection subcommittee? Mr. Williams suggested allocating a year per group so that there is no competition. If the entity is not prepared to submit an application, they can pass. Mr. Hess said that Williams' scenario would prevent bankrolling. They reviewed the scoring criteria that INDOT uses for all projects. The general consensus was that this needs more thought.

Mr. Hess asked how the TAC would like to proceed. Mr. Williams suggested talking to other MPOs and see how they are working it out. Mr. Hess said that staff would find out. Mr. Micuda said that he thinks that they are making it more difficult than it needs to be since it isn't a large pot of money and the competition probably won't be severe. Any decision made by the subcommittee will be vetted in the other MPO committees. He would be willing to support it in its current form but they can get more input. *****Tom Micuda moved to table the issue. Perry Maull seconded.** It was suggested to have a subcommittee in the meantime to come up with a system. **The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

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

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas

IX. Upcoming Meetings

A. Policy Committee – May 8, 2009 at 1:30pm (McCloskey Room)

B. Technical Advisory Committee – May 27, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)

C. Citizens Advisory Committee – May 27, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

Adjournment

These minutes were adopted by the Technical Advisory Committee at their regular meeting held on May 27, 2009 (RCH 04/22/2009)