



Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
May 14, 2010 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall

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

Attendance

Policy Committee: Jack Baker (Bloomington Plan Commission), Mike Bivens (proxy for Lynn Coyne IU Real Estate), Mike Farmer (proxy for Ellettsville Town Council), Susie Johnson (City Public Works), Iris Kiesling (Monroe County Commissioner), Mark Kruzan (Mayor COB), Richard Martin (Monroe County Plan Commission), Kent McDaniel (Bloomington Public Transportation Corp.), Andy Ruff (Bloomington City Council), Julie Thomas (Monroe County Council), Jim Stark (INDOT), and Bill Williams (Monroe County Highway Department).

Others: Kurt Babcock (County GIS), Adrian Reid (City Engineer), Larry Jacobs (Chamber of Commerce).

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

- I. Call to Order**—Mr. McDaniel called the meeting to order at 1:35pm
- II. Approval of Minutes:**
 - A. March 12, 2010**—Ms. Johnson moved approval. Mr. Williams seconded and the minutes passed unanimously.
- III. Communications from the Chair**—There was no report.
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees**
 - A. Citizens Advisory Committee**—There was no report
 - B. Technical Advisory Committee**—There was no report.
- V. Reports from the MPO Staff**
 - A. 2008 Crash Report**—Mr. Hess presented the report. The total number of crashes has been slightly increasing. In the report, crashes are broken down by location, time of day, fatalities, and the number/type of vehicles and/or bicycle/pedestrians involved. Mr. Martin noted a discrepancy in numbers between the table and text. Mr. Hess made the distinction that fatalities may be a different number than fatal crashes if there were more than one fatality in a crash. Mr. McDaniel said that a permanent committee has been formed to address bicycle and pedestrian safety on campus. Mrs. Kiesling suggested putting an article in the paper about bicycle safety. There was some discussion about mid-block crashes. Also included in the report was the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Eligibility List. This list excludes State facilities. Mr. Martin said it would be helpful if they knew which of these problem areas we are addressing with the funding that we have already programmed. Mr. Hess concurred and explained that recent safety improvement projects are too new to compare the data 3 years before and 3 years after the project.

Mr. Desmond noted that the BMCMPPO was given the 2009 Outstanding Project award from the American Planning Association Indiana Chapter for the Complete Streets Policy.

VI. Old Business

A. Readoption of the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (*Action Requested)**—Mr. Desmond reviewed staff's reasons to readopt the existing 2030 LRTP. Those reasons were discussed in detail during the last Policy Committee meeting. Basically, the BMCMPPO is short on time, short on funding and short on data. A vote to readopt the 2030 plan without any changes would reaffirm the goals and objectives that are the foundation of the plan and reaffirm the plan itself including the group of projects. There was a 30-day public comment period and no comments were received.

Mr. Hess said there is a lot of interest to develop a travel demand model that it is more dynamic, captures more multimodalism, and is more useful. He presented the time-line proposed by staff to develop a new travel demand model and long range transportation plan. The first step is to form a Task Force or Steering Committee made up of representatives of all 3 MPO Committees. Staff wants to research existing and possible federal requirements and network with other progressive MPOs with dynamic models. Then a gap analysis would be performed to determine what deficiencies there are locally and how to fill those gaps. He pointed out significant areas on the time line. This was presented to the TAC and the CAC. The TAC recommended readoption of the LRTP unanimously. The CAC recommended readoption by a vote of 11:2. Any feedback on the timeline or what has been presented here would be appreciated by staff.

Ms. Thomas asked if a blanket acceptance of the LRTP has happened before. Mr. Hess said that he didn't think it has been done before. The federal regulations state that the MPO has to update its LRTP 5 years. The LRTP was adopted originally in 2006 and would lapse by 2011. Staff believes that extra time would result in a better updated plan. Ms. Thomas was not comfortable doing this. Ms. Kiesling asked what the other two committees' comments were. Mr. Baker said the 2 people on CAC who voted against readoption felt that we have enough data and should move forward. The other members supported the readoption. Mr. Reid said that the TAC voted unanimously in support of readoption. Ms. Johnson said she supports giving the MPO the time needed to develop a good model. She didn't think the MPO could develop the kind of model and do the kind of public participation necessary between now and March. Mr. Desmond said that while the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) has programmed funds for this project, 100% of that money must be spent up front. We don't have the money budgeted locally to develop the plan. Mr. Martin asked if the money is included in the next budget. Mr. Desmond said yes. Mr. Martin said this is a 30-month project that we would have to do in 9 months. That is an impossible compression. He had tried to use the model for some work that he was doing for the County and found that that the whole concept of the model is wrong. There was more discussion about the pros and cons of readopting the LRTP with the existing travel demand model. Ms. Thomas wondered if there was a way to do an abbreviated timeline/process to use in the immediate future and then start this process moving forward to the next 5-year update. Mr. Martin said that accurate census numbers gives us population statistics for much smaller areas than the entire county. Mr. Ruff said that population numbers are constantly changing.

Mr. Hess said that the reason that staff wants to build a good model at one time is that staff doesn't have the capabilities in-house to tinker with the model. This is a consultant developed model. Anytime new information should be entered into the model we would have to hire a consultant again. Mr. Hess said that the Federal Highway Administration suggested this approach of readoption to another MPO in Indiana. Mr. Ruff said that he was uncomfortable with the wording of some of the justifications such as under the heading of Financial Forecasts. He asked Mr. Stark if there had been any changes since 2005 in funding plans or projections considering cost increases for I-69. Mr. Stark said that their most recent STIP shows the illustrative dollars that INDOT plans on spending in the next 3 years. Mr. Ruff said he was concerned that the STIP didn't have to be fiscally constrained like our local TIP has to be. In readopting the present LRTP we could be making assumptions that are no longer valid at the local level more than they would at the state level. Mr. Ruff asked if Mr. Stark had anything new to report from the STIP regarding I-69. Mr. Stark said that there is a lot happening from Crane down to Evansville. The State intends that by the end of this year the majority of the projects will have been let and construction underway by 2011. If something changes, he will bring that information to this committee. INDOT agrees with the proposed readoption of the LRTP. INDOT is interested in the MPO's strategy to develop a progressive model and the inclusion of multimodal planning. *****Ms. Kiesling moved readoption of the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan. Ms. Johnson seconded.**

Mr. Martin asked to amend the motion **to indicate that the Policy Committee endorses and would like to pursue the outlined project plan for the creation of a new 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan.** The amendment was accepted. Mr. Hess wanted to clarify that the **assumption as part of the motion is that it reaffirms the goals and objectives and acknowledges that the planning assumptions are still valid.** That was accepted by Ms. Kiesling and Ms. Johnson. Mr. Ruff asked if the goals and objectives are consistent with Secretary LaHood's new direction for the Department of Transportation. Mr. Hess said yes and reviewed the goals and objectives from the LRTP.

There was no public comment.

*****The motion was approved by a vote of 11:1.**

VII. New Business

A. FY2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment

1. Update County-wide Aerial and Elevation GIS Layers (*Action Requested**)—

Mr. Hess said that this issue did not arise until after the readoption of the LRTP had been discussed. The UPWP had \$100,000 programmed to update the LRTP. However, the MPO will now hold off on the update at this time. There was also other money programmed in the UPWP that will likely not be spent by June 30th, the end of the fiscal year. Consequently, the bulk of this money goes back to the State. Staff has become aware of a statewide effort to do statewide aerial flyovers and update to the GIS for elevations and aerials. The State would like the MPOs to help fund that in the future. The County had issued a request for proposals earlier this year for consulting agencies do these updates to the GIS layers. The bids came in about \$100,000 higher than expected. The MPO could help fund this update. It would require adding an eligible



expense into the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to update county-wide aerial and elevation GIS layers. The MPO would draw down some of the surplus funding from the 2035 LRTP and put that toward the county-wide area elevation GIS layers. The total funding would be \$130,625. Both the CAC and TAC recommended approval of this amendment. Mr. Williams and Mr. Babcock reported on the progress to date. Ms. Kiesling thanked the City.
*****Mr. Williams moved to approve the amendment. Ms. Johnson seconded.**

There was no public comment.

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

B. FY2011-2012 Unified Planning Work Program—Mr. Desmond presented the report. A 2-year Work Program seems to be working well. There will not be any funding carryover with this new program. The budget will likely be 30% smaller for the next two years. This will be presented to the TAC and CAC in May and then back to the Policy Committee in June. Mr. Martin asked about future funding. Mr. Desmond explained.

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

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas—Mr. McDaniel asked if the LRTP Task Force would be on the June agenda. Mr. Hess said yes. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Williams volunteered.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Technical Advisory Committee – May 26, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- B. Citizens Advisory Committee – May 26, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- C. Policy Committee – June 11, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)**

Adjournment

These minutes were adopted by the Policy Committee at their meeting held on 6/11/10 (JFW).