



2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Task Force

August 19, 2013; 12:00 – 1:30 p.m.

City Hall, Hooker Room (245)

- I. Welcome
- II. TDM Update
- III. 2030 Goals & Policies Evaluation
- IV. Vision Statement Examples Comparison
- V. Draft 2040 Vision Statement Discussion
- VI. 2040 Goals & Policies Discussion
- VII. Next Meeting: September 23

Adjournment

2030 LRTP Goals & Policies Evaluation

The 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), adopted in 2006, provided a timeline to implement various transportation projects over a twenty five year time horizon. The LRTP also provided a vision statement and policy guidance regarding the region's transportation network. Evaluating the 2030 LRTP can provide insight to consider in the development of the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). This document provides an evaluation of project implementation, an assessment of achievement of the goals of the Vision Statement, and some conclusions and lessons learned.

The first section provides an evaluation of the projects identified within the 2030 LRTP and the status of their implementation. This review does not examine the design or other project attributes (costs, scope, etc.) to avoid a subjective or over-complicated review. Rather it identifies only whether or not a project was completed. The 2030 LRTP established two time horizons: short-term (2009 to 2019) and long-term horizon (2020 to 2030). Currently, we are in the mid-point of the short-term time horizon or year eight of the twenty five year plan. In other words, it would imply that approximately 30% of the projects should be completed at this point in time. This 30% value will be used as a performance measure for projects completed.

The second section provides an evaluation of the Vision Statement. It is more subjective in nature due to the difficulty of establishing objective performance measures for each goal. The Citizens Advisory Committee once used the Vision Statement to evaluate sample projects and found it a useful exercise, but concluded it was very subjective and highly dependent upon the context of each project. This evaluation collectively considered the scope of the projects completed and used a general level of satisfaction (using a scale of fail, neutral, pass) to evaluate each goal for the projects completed.

Finally, some general conclusions have been outlined based upon the two evaluations. These conclusions provide a basis for discussion on areas the 2040 MTP can improve upon, emulate, or even avoid all together.

Projects

The 2030 LRTP identifies numerous capital improvement projects, including roadways and multi-use trails. The estimated costs and timeframes for each project are identified on pages 14-18 of the 2030 LRTP. Additionally, Appendix F (pp. 169-178) outlines the general scope and preliminary design of each project. Two other project lists from the 2030 LRTP also need to be considered. One is the list of "Committed" projects (pp. 7-8; Figure 1-1, p. 11). These are projects that at the time of developing the LRTP were considered to be close enough to implementation that they could be marked as complete for the purposes of planning for future projects. It is generally expected that the committed projects would be completed before projects identified within the LRTP are implemented. The other list is of "Transit" projects

identified in Chapter 3 (pp. 62-63). These projects are included in the overall 2030 LRTP project list mostly due to the nature of funding for transit capital projects and their respective operations and maintenance programs. These projects typically utilize separate sources of Federal funds from infrastructure projects. Below is a summary of each project list and their completion status.

Committed Projects

A total of 12 projects are identified. Of these, seven have been completed. The remaining five are not anticipated to be completed at any time in the near future. **Completion rate = 58%** (100% benchmark)

- West 3rd Street Phase II - from Landmark Avenue to SR 37 (complete)
- Curry Pike - from SR 45 to Constitution Avenue
- Vernal Pike Phase I and II - from SR 37 to Hartstrait Road (complete)
- Country Club Drive/Rogers Street Intersection - intersection reconstruction (complete)
- Rogers Road/Smith Road Intersection - intersection reconstruction (complete)
- 3rd Street/Atwater Avenue - from Mitchell Street to High Street
- Basswood Drive - from end of Basswood Drive to West 3rd Street
- Weimer Road - from Tapp Road to Wapahani Road
- State Road 45/46 Bypass - from Walnut Street to 3rd Street (complete)
- State Road 48 - from Curry Pike to Hartstrait Road (complete)
- State Road 45 - from SR 45/46 Bypass to Russell Road
- Sare Road Phase I and II - from Rogers Road to David Drive and from McCartney Lane to Moores Pike (complete)

Capital Improvement Projects

A total of 24 projects are identified, several of which have been divided into phases over the time period of the 2030 LRTP. Of these, three projects have been completed (or will be in the very near future), and three have had small improvements completed within the larger identified corridor or a small segment of the project has been completed (for purposes of evaluation they will be counted as completed). All but two of these completed projects are identified as short-term projects (again, for purposes of evaluation they will be counted as completed in the short-term). **Completion rate = 25%** (30% benchmark)

- 2nd Street/Bloomfield Road - from Walnut Street to SR 37
- 10th Street/14th Street - from SR 45/46 Bypass to Dunn Street
- 17th Street - from SR 45/46 Bypass to SR 37 (two intersection reconstruction projects)
- Adams Street - from Allen Street to Rockport
- Dunn Street - from 17th Street to 10th Street
- Moores Pike - from SR 446 to College Mall Road/Sare Road
- Smith Road - from SR 46 to Rogers Road
- Sudbury Drive - from College Avenue to Weimer Road
- Tapp Road/Country Club Drive/Winslow Road/Rogers Road (two intersection reconstruction projects and one road reconstruction project)
- Weimer Road - from Bloomfield Road to Wapehani Road

- CSX Corridor Trail - from Adams Street to Country Club Drive (complete)
- Jackson Creek Trail - from Moores Pike to That Road (two trail projects)
- Airport Road/Tapp Road - from SR 37 to Hartstrait Road
- Fullerton Pike/Gordon Pike/Rhorer Road - from Snoddy Road to SR 37
- Kirby Road/Hartstrait Road - from SR 46 to SR 45
- Leonard Springs Road/Fullerton Pike - from SR 37 to SR 45
- Maple Grove Road/Bottom Road - from SR 37 to SR46
- SR 37 West Frontage Road - from SR 46 to 3rd Street/SR 48
- Union Valley Road - from Maple Grove Road to SR 46
- Karst Farm Trail - from Ellettsville Trail to Karst Farm Park (complete)
- Stinesville-Ellettsville Greenway - from Owen County Line to SR 37
- Interstate 69 - from Green County line to Morgan County line (complete)
- State Road 45 - from Bethel Lane to Russell Road and from Green County Line to Curry Pike
- State Road 46 - from Friendship Road to SR 446 and Owen County Line to Red Hill Road

Transit Projects

A total of 26 projects are identified, most of which fall under operations and maintenance. Of these, 14 have been completed to some extent while some are on-going over the life of the plan (e.g. fleet replacement). The remainder are not anticipated to be completed at any time in the near future (e.g. route expansion). **Completion rate = 54%** (30% benchmark)

- Sunday Service - most routes
- Major Holiday Service - most routes
- Weeknight Service to 11 p.m. - all routes (completed)
- Weekday Early Morning Service 6 a.m. - all routes (completed)
- Weekday 30 Minute Frequency - all routes
- Saturday Early Morning Service 7 a.m. - most routes (completed)
- Saturday 30 Minute Frequency - most routes
- Saturday Service to 10 p.m. - most routes (completed)
- Expanded Geographic Coverage - new service in 10 corridors
- Crosstown Service - new service in 3 corridors
- Downtown Shuttle Service - new circulator route
- Park and Ride Shuttle Service - new park and ride route
- BT Access Ridership Growth - double current demand
- 50 Additional Passenger Shuttles
- Existing Fixed Route Fleet Replacement Schedule with Diesel Propulsion (completed)
- Existing Fixed Route Fleet Replacement Schedule with Electric Hybrid Propulsion (completed)
- New/Expanded Downtown Transfer Facility (completed)
- Expanded Grimes Lane Operations Facility
- Security and Surveillance Systems (completed)
- Automatic Vehicle Locator and Radio Communications System with Next Bus

- Information (completed)
- Paratransit Scheduling Systems (completed)
 - Rare Collection Technology (completed)
 - BT Access Vehicle Replacement (completed)
 - BT Access Vehicle Expansion
 - Support Vehicle Replacement (completed)
 - Engine/Transmission Replacement (completed)

Vision Statement Goals

The 2030 LRTP Vision Statement lists 12 goals, each with several objectives identified. For purposes of this evaluation only the overall goals were evaluated. The evaluation considers the projects completed and their collective scopes for an overall performance rating of each goal on a pass, fail, or neutral scale.

1. Develop a well-integrated, multi-modal transportation system for the efficient and economic movement of people and goods while supporting the land use policies of the respective communities Comprehensive Plans.
 - **Fail:** “Well-integrated and multi-modal” is sporadic, but moving in the right direction.
2. Create a network of multi-use pathways, bicycle routes, greenways and sidewalks that traverses the community, connects activity centers, and links recreation opportunities.
 - **Pass:** Majority of trail projects are completed.
3. Reduce the number, length, and frequency of automobile trips on a per capita basis.
 - **Fail:** Prominent completed projects are capacity adding, but transit and trail projects are noteworthy.
4. Optimize the flow of traffic and the relationship between land uses to reduce traffic congestion, trip length, and trip frequencies.
 - **Pass:** Several projects were safety oriented and targeting intersections and not whole corridors.
5. Develop the widest possible range of transportation alternatives to automobile trip-making by residents.
 - **Pass:** All projects have options for non-motorized users.
6. Make transportation infrastructure investments that support the development policies of the City of Bloomington Growth Policies Plan, the Monroe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the Town of Ellettsville Comprehensive Plan and the Indiana University Master Plan.

- **Neutral** Plans lack specificity on corridor priorities and investments, but policy direction is provided for non-motorized transportation.
7. Make transportation infrastructure investments in a manner that protects and enhances the environment, promotes energy conservation, and improves quality of life.
 - **Fail:** Prominent completed projects are capacity adding, but transit and trail projects are noteworthy.
 8. Increase the safety and security of the motorized and non-motorized surface transportation systems.
 - **Pass:** Safety improvements, transit projects, and trail projects.
 9. Support economic vitality of the metropolitan area through transportation investments that enhance competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
 - **Fail:** Most projects do not directly benefit employment or manufacturing areas, but most boast indirect economic benefits.
 10. Improve the movement of goods through the transportation system as a means to enhance the region's economic competitiveness.
 - **Neutral:** Capacity adding projects have improved conditions, but most projects are not based upon the movement of goods.
 11. Develop transportation plans and improvement programs on the basis of an integrated and comprehensive viewpoint of transportation expenditures and revenues for the maintenance, operation, and capital investment in all surface transportation modes.
 - **Neutral:** Expenses are detailed, but outside transit lack operations and maintenance for other modes.
 12. Preserve the investment in existing surface transportation systems and promote efficient system management and operation.
 - **Fail:** Most projects do not focus on preservation and operations

Total: Pass (4), Neutral (3), Fail (5)

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from the above analysis. For instance, the assumptions used to designate “committed” projects for the 2030 LRTP were inadequate. In reality only 58% of those projects have actually been completed since plan adoption, while the remainder are not expected to be implemented in the foreseeable future. With a “committed” designation the expectation from the 2030 Plan is these projects would be completed in the very near future and were modeled as such in the transportation model.

The completion rate of proposed future projects in the 2030 LRTP is satisfactory with 25% for capital projects and 62% for transit projects (30% benchmark). However, two of the projects (I-69 Section 4 and Karst Farm Trail) are rated completed and several smaller-scaled variants of larger projects were also rated as completed (Tapp Rd, Jackson Creek Trail, 17th Street) and may skew the completion rating favorably. If considering only whole projects completed, the B-line Trail is the only project completed at this point in time resulting in an overall completion rating of 5%. The completion rate for transit projects was treated differently because most are on-going maintenance and operations projects, making it difficult to determine a completeness status. For this purpose if the project commenced then the project was considered completed.

Consistency between the Vision Statement Goals and completed projects is mostly fair (pass) to poor (fail). This rating is not indicative of either projects or goals, but a reflection on the consistency between projects and Vision Statement Goals.

Based on these findings the following are points of discussion to consider:

- What threshold should be used for identifying committed projects? Programmed in the TIP? Under construction? Completed?
- What kinds of projects should be included in the master list of future projects?
- How stringent or flexible should the timing, funding, and project scope in the MTP be? How ambitious or conservative should the projects list be?
- To what extent should project cost estimates be used to determine the completion or project delivery date? Is there a substantial difference between fiscal constraint and project delivery? What measure would be more effective for project delivery?
- How should the Vision Statement Goals be used? For project completion evaluation? For plan implementation evaluation? For project scoping and identification? All of the above?
- What role does the LRTP currently play in the development of the TIP? What role should it play?
- What policies, directives, or other actions should be considered as part of the MTP and/or stand alone initiatives with direction?

Vision Statement Comparison

The goals and vision statement of the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan were compared to three other MPO plans previously discussed at the July MTP Task Force meeting. This analysis was done to determine how the 2030 Plan measured up and to shed some light on its weaknesses. That analysis has been outlined in the table below.

	BMCMPPO	Nashville MPO	Lawrence & Douglas County KS, MPO	DVRPC
Mobility & Accessibility	✓	✓	✓	✓
Traffic Mitigation/ Congestion Reduction	✓	✓	✓	✓
Land Use/ Quality of Life/Growth Management	✓	✓	✓	✓
Safety & Security	✓	✓	✓	✓
Economic Vitality	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maintain & Preserve	✓	✓	✓	✓
Financial Stewardship	✓	✓	✓	✓
Multi-Modal System	✓	✓	✓	✓
Environment	✓	✓	✓	✓

BMCMPPO = Bloomington Monroe County MPO, DVRPC = Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission

As the table shows, the 2030 Plan does a great job of addressing the topics and intentions of the other plans that were reviewed. However, what varies between the plans is the degree to which they choose to address these intentions or goals. For example, some plans address the goal of maintaining and preserving existing infrastructure very prominently by stating it as a stand-alone goal. Others have addressed this as an objective under a higher goal of Financial Stewardship, for example.

Additionally, it should be noted that the Nashville MPO has a transit-specific vision. Though our 2030 vision statement does not address transit directly, it is addressed throughout the Plan's goals and objectives.

In short, it looks like we shape up fairly well when compared to the three other plans. What differs is the level of priority we choose to place upon our goals. If, for example, maintaining and preserving our existing infrastructure is a major priority/goal of this MPO, we ought to plainly, clearly and prominently say so. We must then ensure that the MPO implements this goal by putting in place a policy, an evaluation process, a mandatory reporting process, or other measure. Though our vision statement compares well to the other plans that were reviewed, we can go further to make a plan that is distinctively our own. That will ultimately be determined by how we choose to establish a process for carrying out the new vision for 2040.

2040 MTP DRAFT VISION STATEMENT

Our regional transportation system will provide high-quality movement of people and goods in support of a sustainable economy, a healthy environment, and livable, safe and diverse communities. The following principles will guide the future development of the transportation system:

Safe: Improve the safety of all transportation system users regardless of mode.

Efficient: Move people and goods in the most effective way using the least amount of resources.

Multimodal: Provide all users with a choice of mode type and improve intermodal connections.

Appropriate: Make transportation investments that improve quality of life and are sensitive to their context.

Responsible: Preserve existing transportation investments and limit environmental, social and financial impacts of new investments.

Healthy: Recognize and mitigate the public health impacts of transportation investment choices.

2040 MTP DRAFT GOALS & POLICIES

Goals and Objectives

- Practice Thoughtful, Sound Financial Stewardship by Ensuring that Transportation Investments Reflect Regional Goals
 - Improve intergovernmental coordination and request guidance on transportation project selection and land use development through incentives and/or policies
- Preserve and Maintain the Efficiency of the Region's Existing Transportation Infrastructure
 - Adopt a fix-it-first mentality that directs transportation funding and project selection.
 - Support "soft projects" such as, signal timing software and public outreach campaigns as viable transportation investments while recognizing that it is appropriate to use federal funding for such projects.
- Protect the Health of the Public and the Integrity of the Environment of Our Region
 - Recognize and consider how transportation investments affect air quality, physical activity, biodiversity, water quality and natural resources.
- Encourage Quality Growth and Land Use Development Practices
 - Utilize context sensitive solutions to ensure that project choices and scope are in line with community values both within and beyond the project right-of-way.
- Offer Purposeful Transportation Choices for a Diverse Population
 - Provide safe pedestrian crossings of major streets every 1/8 mile
 - Invest in mass transit to offer citizens the ability to access residences, jobs, retail, recreation and various other parts of the community. Recognize that it is acceptable to use several types of transportation funding pots to do this.

Policies

- Fund transportation projects and facilities that protect the integrity of the natural environment, the character of our community, as well as, our health and safety
- Optimize existing infrastructure before adding more
- Integrate transportation planning with local and regional long range land use goals
- Maximize personal mobility by creating balanced modal choices through transit, walking, driving and biking
- Create a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that reflects the visions, policies, goals, and expectations of this Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

- The BMCMPPO and its Local Public Agencies shall, at a minimum, evaluate the implementation success of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) prior to the start of next MTP development process. This evaluation shall include, at a minimum, vehicle miles traveled, land use density, number of single occupant vehicles, total miles of bike lanes, linear feet of new pedestrian accommodation, number of new curb ramps installed, crosswalk and intersection improvements, percentage of transit stops accessible via sidewalks and curb ramps, rate of crashes, injuries and fatalities by mode, rate of children walking or biking to school.