



Policy Committee Meeting Minutes March 6, 2015 Council Chambers Room 115, City Hall

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

Attendance

Policy Committee: Jason Banach, Tom Micuda, Jim Ude, Jack Baker, Kent McDaniel, Richard Martin, Julie Thomas, Sarah Ryterband, Scott Thomas, Geoff McKim, Susie Johnson, Andy Ruff, Bill Williams

Others: Sandra Flum, INDOT Section 5; Michael Reschke, Herald Times

MPO Staff: Josh Desmond, Anna Dragovich, Emily Avers, Scott Robinson

I. Call to Order

Members of the Committee introduced themselves as there are some new members.

II. Approval of Minutes

1. January 9, 2015:

Kent McDaniel made a correction to the shuttle pricing listed in the minutes from January 9. He also reported he heard the seats were starting to fill up. One rider emailed McDaniel to say they would start reserving seats. McDaniel didn't know the service was becoming so popular. Maybe the service will start running more often than the current 4 trips per day.

**Jack Baker moved to approve the amendment minutes. Micuda seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

III. Communications from the Chair:

McDaniel provided a brief overview of two bills recently brought forward regarding funding for public transportation. One of the bills is Senate Bill 379, which would create a county economic development income tax opportunity specific to Monroe County to fund public transportation services. The tax would be a minimum of 1/10th of 1% and a maximum of ¼ of 1% and would raise between 2.8 million and 6.9 million dollars. There has been some concern about the impact this would have on rural transit. Kerry Conway from Rural Transit and Lew May from Bloomington Transit have been working together to discuss distributing services. They are discussing a plan about what kind of services to provide and what those services will cost. That plan will need to be worked out before the Monroe County Council makes a decision on how much they want to spend and where they want the resources to go. McDaniel thinks the bill is a win-win for both Rural Transit and Bloomington Transit. The bill passed the Senate 41:9 and is now going to the House.

Bill 1215 would have increased statewide funding through the Public Mass Transportation Fund (PMTF), from 42.5 million statewide to 60 million statewide. That seems like a big increase, but

when you look at the fact that funding has not increased for the last 7 years and look at the traditional rate of growth, the funding would be up to about 59 million dollars now. The bill did not get a hearing. The House Ways and Means Committee gave a minimal increase from 42.5 million to 46 million in the first year and 49 million in the second year. Of that increase in funding, INDOT is required to take \$3 million each year and give it to AMTRACK. When you consider that, it's really an increase of \$418,000 statewide for 65 systems. That's less than a 1% increase. The second year goes up to 8% but that does not nearly make up for the loss in PMTF revenue over the last 7 years. On Tuesday, March 10, there will be a Public Transit Day at the Statehouse to try to get that amount increased in the Senate, particularly the first year. There will be a rally with some speeches. One of the guest speakers will be Randy Truett, the sponsor of the bill.

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees:

1. Citizens Advisory Committee-

Sarah Ryterband is new to the MPO Policy Committee. She reported the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met and approved the TIP amendment and the grants on the agenda for today. There was some concern about the Rogers Rd. project and the fact this has not been discussed at all with the Prospect Hill neighborhood and City staff has not communicated with the neighborhood association.

B. Technical Advisory Committee-

Tom Micuda said the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met and had the same agenda the CAC had for their meeting. They had no issues with the INDOT TIP amendment. The TAC was comfortable with all the grant award projects that were submitted. Micuda has spoken with at least one person in Prospect Hill about the 4th and Rogers Rd. proposal. What he told that individual is while the project is up for consideration for funding, the actual project would not be designed and built until much later and the City of Bloomington would involve the neighborhood in discussions about what the design might look like and how it might affect the neighborhood at that time.

C. Report from I69:

Sandra Flum gave an update on I69 Section 5. The operation and maintenance of 37 transferred to the developer on December 1, 2014. They have been managing the road with good success. The design is progressing. It is not finished yet. They have also started construction. The piers for the Rockport Rd bridge are forming. Once the Rockport Rd bridge is constructed, reconstruction on Tapp Rd. will begin. They will start main line median work, where they will be widening the road and adding the third lane that will go through Bloomington, up to St Rd 46. That should start in the next 60 to 90 days. They also plan to do some work on grading up north, towards the Monroe County line. They expect to start sometime in May. You will start to see traffic restrictions in this area. They are trying to make sure those are publicized to the media when restrictions are starting. There are currently lane closures for the tree removal and other things that are safety related just to make sure that the operation in the area is safe.

Geoff McKim thanked Flum for the update. He asked how INDOT monitored contractor performance for operations and maintenance.

Flum said last summer they did project management funding. The contractors had documents they were required to complete by contract to show how they planned to operate and how they planned to do design. INDOT had to approve the plans and monitor how they adhere to the plans. There are auditors in the field making sure what is in the plan is also what the contractors are building. INDOT also monitors the inspectors through inspections in the field.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

1. MTP Update-

Desmond emailed committee members earlier in the week to provide a summary of an issue he is bringing up in the meeting today. Because our MPO is in attainment for air quality standards, we have a 5 year update cycle. Our last air quality plan was adopted on May 14, 2010. We readopted our previous plan and reaffirmed the assumptions that were made during that planning process because not a whole lot had changed at that time. Our previous plan went to 2030. May 2015 is our absolute deadline for adopting a replacement plan and we have to have adopted a plan that has a 20 year time horizon. Our goal is for the new plan to go through 2040 so when we adopt it in 2015, we'll have 25 years and will be well within our 5 year cycle as well as our 20 year time horizon.

We've been working for some time on developing the new 2040 plan with some significant assistance from a consultant who has been building a brand new travel demand model. The model is a very significant component of the planning process for this new plan. It would allow us to test future development and growth scenarios and future project implementation scenarios, put it all together in a way we think is a best fit scenario for the future of our MPO planning area and guide us along a path that we think is appropriate for us to implement the vision we have for transportation in our area. That being said, we have been inundated with set backs over the last several months that prevent us from having the model complete which prevents us from completing scenario testing to figure out where we want to go in the future with all of our different options. It is very hard to develop a plan without the model because you can't test the scenarios, share the outcomes and get feedback about if we're going in the direction we want to go. The bottom line is we are not going to make that May 2015 deadline.

The last time we had to adopt a plan we had the option of readopting the current plan in its existing form, because when we did it in 2010 the plan went out to 2030 and that was still a 20 year plan. Now, we don't have the ability to readopt our existing plan because it would only be a 15 year time horizon. When you don't have a valid plan, you have a lapsed plan. If you have a lapsed plan, your TIP is frozen. That means whatever the form the TIP is in at the time it is frozen, you're stuck with how it is. You can't add new projects and you can't make changes to existing projects. For example, if you have a project that needs an increase in funding, you either can't fund the project or you have to find the funding on the local side from another funding source in order to keep the project moving forward. It really ties your hands as far as being able to manage money in your TIP, not just for local projects, but also for INDOT, for transit, or for anyone else who has federal money in the TIP. Our state and federal friends are every bit as eager as us to not have a lapsed plan. The strategy we've been discussing with Federal

Highway and INDOT, which they are supportive of, is to take in our 2030 plan and make some minor modifications to it to create an interim 2035 plan. We would do some simple analysis, change some things in the current plan, to create a bridge plan. A bridge plan would get us up to another 5 years to approve a new plan. We only really want 5 or 6 months to get the model and get a final plan drafted to bring before the Policy Committee before the last meeting in November. To avoid having a lapsed plan, the only real option right now is to do a 2035 plan to bridge the gap temporarily for the next several months.

It is especially important because we are also in the process of developing a new 4 year TIP. If our plan lapses, we would not be able to adopt a new 4 year TIP. Obviously, we want to do some significant changes to the last 2 years of the existing TIP as they roll over into the new TIP. We don't want to be stuck with the old information and the old funding numbers, we want to get all the new funding information and numbers right so we don't have a period in time when we can't do the projects we want to do.

One of the steps we need to take is to come back in April with some TIP amendments. We're very close to having a final 2016-2019 TIP draft, so we have a really good idea of what we want those projects to be and how we want them funded for 2016 and 2017. We would need to bring back a TIP amendment for the 2014 through 2017 TIP to take the existing 2016 and 2017 funding away from the 2014-2017 TIP and replace them with what we expect 2016 and 2017 to be in the new TIP so the last 2 years of the existing TIP would match what we expect to see in the new TIP when it gets adopted. This would cover us if for some reason our air quality standards plan lapses and our TIP is frozen. We would at least have the most up-to-date funding for last two years of our current TIP. Fiscal Year 2016 starts this July 1st, so there is no time to waste in terms of making sure we have 2016 and 2017 aligned properly.

Right now, staff is figuring out what changes are required to make a 2035 plan out of our current 2030 plan. We had hoped to have the model done late last year so we could create the draft plan this winter and spring for you to look at and hopefully adopt by the deadline. The strategy staff would like to pursue- and will pursue unless they hear something different today- is to get the 2035 plan in place and in the mean time keep moving on the 2040 plan. It is obviously not an ideal situation. We don't want to spend too much time on the 2035 version, because that's not our ultimate goal; we want to do just enough to get in the good graces of our federal and state friends and at the same time push forward on the 2040 plan so we can hopefully get that one started in just a few months. The other option is just to let things lapse until we get the 2040 plan in place. That's a bigger risk because we don't know exactly when the plan would be ready to bring to the Policy Committee. Staff can commit to presenting a plan by the end of the year but we don't know if it would be 1 month, 3 months or 6 months- and we don't know what amendments to a project we might need to deal with while the TIP is frozen. It's a riskier strategy to just let things lie until we get the main plan done as opposed to trying to patch it temporarily. Adopting a 2035 plan in May will also allow us to adopt our new 4 year TIP at that same meeting, so we would be able to move

forward on that as well. Desmond wants to hear the Policy Committee's guidance and comments on which strategy we want to go forward with.

McDaniel asked if Desmond was reasonably certain this could be finished by the end of the calendar year if we decide to take the temporary bridge.

Desmond said yes.

McDaniel asked how long they could bridge if they have to go that route.

Desmond said in a technical sense if we adopt a valid plan, it would be a 5-year window for us. Nobody wants to take another 5 years to get a plan done.

McDaniel said it seems pretty clear to him doing the bridge is the way to go. What would be the downside to that? Why would we want to let the TIP lapse?

Desmond said the only downside is just time spent on something other than the 2040 plan. It takes some of the focus away from getting the main plan done. He thinks we can minimize the amount of work we really need to do by having some staff work on the bridge plan and some staff work on the 2040 plan. He's trying to do this in a way that hopefully won't distract staff from the greater goal of getting the main plan done.

McDaniel asked if Desmond had talked to the FHWA, FTA and INDOT. Is this acceptable to them?

Desmond said this is acceptable to them. He thinks he can say they will be comfortable with us not making radical changes, but doing just enough to get it to 2035. They would be very happy for us to not go to a lapse.

Richard Martin said he has been out of the loop for a year and is trying to play catch-up. The last time he was involved in this, the MTP was on schedule. He doesn't know what happened in the meantime. He does have some concerns about making the assumption that advancing and reauthorizing what we've been doing is a reasonable strategy even for the short term. If you're going to go back and prepare for April an update to the TIP which includes all the work you want to be doing in the 2015-2017 time frame it would be the same as what we would adopt with a new plan. He doesn't see a realizable difference in what can happen if we already have all the TIP changes we would plan on making anyway in place so they become part of the frozen TIP. They would stay in the TIP. They wouldn't change. So we've got the authorization we need to go ahead and do the work. If it's a very short interval of time- 5 or 6 months- the probability of needing to do significant changes in that period of time is fairly small, given that we've been planning these in the first place. There are also the issues then of the kind of changes the new MTP is going to be asking us to make that we're not taking into account because we're just taking what we've got and advancing it forward. Anything we would do would be justified in terms of the old plan rather than the new plan and we really want to be looking at these projects in the context of the new plan. He doesn't see the urgency to have a non-lapsed TIP. He thinks the pressure and

emphasis needs to be on finishing up the new MTP and that's where the energy should be expended at this point in time. Get the TIP projects there, let us do those in April, and freeze it at that point in time. It also should be true that we could adopt the old plan at any point in time as the new plan going forward, even if we extended. That's all there. He would like to focus on moving forward, not playing catch-up. He wants the effort put into getting this thing done and done right and behind us.

Ryterband said she understands we've had problems with getting the model accomplished in the way we would like so we can move forward with this new plan.

What she doesn't understand is we need to bring these TIP amendments forward if the bridge plan would cover them. Isn't that also duplicating your work load?

Desmond said it would be duplicating the work load a little bit. He just wants to be careful if for some reason the bridge plan doesn't get adopted in May or we find out later we aren't able to use a bridge plan, we at least have a back up for those projects. It is a little duplicative, but it's more of a safety measure than anything.

Ryterband said it's a back up.

Baker said this is confusing. It sounds easy to basically rename the TIP and adopt it as a new TIP. What he is wondering is what kind of projects we're talking about or what minimum changes are required before this bridge plan is adopted as a valid bridge.

Desmond said we are still working out exactly what that means. What we've heard from Federal Highway is we still need to demonstrate that it's financially feasible.

We'll have to do some additional financial predictions based on how we predicted finances for the existing plan. We'll continue that out to 2035. He doesn't think it involves conjuring up any new projects because there are so many projects in the plan that are undone right now. We do need to recognize Map 21 as a new guiding federal legislation. The previous plan was written under SafetyLou as well as it's previous legislation, so we do need to put some language in that recognizes Map 21 is now in effect as the guiding force for our planning regulations and rules and document that we know it's out there. We have to work on performance measures and we intend to do so more fully with our 2040 plan. And also just document that we are still comfortable with the assumptions made in this plan until we get to a 2040 plan that is going to replace all of this with some new ideas.

Baker asked if these are items that would be put into the 2040 plan anyhow that would be brought forward in the interim.

Desmond said they would be fully developed in the 2040 plan so they would be in compliance. So we will be much more in depth on those issues in that plan.

Baker said there's the chance of where something could come along and we wouldn't be able to apply it to the TIP because it was frozen. We just want to avoid that.

Desmond said if there was an emergency repair on a road, they wouldn't be able to come in and put money in our TIP and say we need to repair this road.

McDaniel said Desmond understands this a lot better than he does and probably better than most of the other Committee members. What would your preference be?

Desmond said his preference would be to do the bridge plan. He doesn't want to put us in a situation where we're putting ourselves at risk. We may let things lapse and nothing happens, but he doesn't know what could come from INDOT in that period of time, since they do frequently come to us for amendments. He doesn't know what could happen with city or county projects that are going forward right now that may or may not need amendments. It's hard to predict. He would feel more comfortable doing the bridge plan and allowing us to move forward with a new TIP so that we can keep fully functioning as an MPO and doing those responsibilities while we put together the new 2040 plan.

McDaniel asked what Desmond wanted from them today. This isn't listed in the agenda as an action item.

Desmond said he doesn't really need a vote, he's just looking for the consensus of the group. If the committee is comfortable moving forward with the bridge plan, that is what he'll do, but if there are enough people opposed to the bridge plan he would like to know now so staff can get guidance on how to go.

McDaniel asked if anyone other than Martin had a strong preference against the bridge plan. No other committee members expressed a preference to let the plan lapse.

McDaniel said it looks like they are in agreement for now and to take the path of working on the bridge plan.

Desmond said he would keep the Committee updated as things develop.

B. Quarterly Project Tracking Report-

Anna Dragovich presented the Quarterly Tracking Report. She explained what the report is for the new Committee members. The tracking report is a combined effort between the MPO, INDOT project managers and consultants, and project managers from each of the LPAs. This is done on a quarterly basis, in July, October, January and April. The goal is to coordinate and talk about the projects to make sure they are on time and the estimates are correct. It's a great way for everyone to stay on top of projects. After each meeting, she writes up the report. The last meeting was January 28th. When they have a meeting, each of the LPA project managers submits a report to her and she summarizes it in the Quarterly Tracking Report. Two of the big things they report on is project estimates and project timeline. She doesn't want to go through it in too much detail because it's in the packet, but the first graph shows project time lines.

These are all the projects in our TIP using federal funds. The biggest take home message from the graph is the dotted vertical line at the 48 month mark. INDOT suggests a project life from preliminary engineering to construction letting be about 4 years. That's not really absolutely true, more of a suggestion and a base line idea of

how long a project should be programmed. Some of the projects have gone a little beyond that, which is not really red flag raising worthy, but it is definitely something to monitor for the future.

Baker asked what she would say is the warning or what we can do to avoid having projects go way over the 4 year goal. What should we really take away from this?

Dragovich said she tries to treat all the projects the same in the graph. Some of the projects only had local funds which makes them look, in the graph, like they have taken longer than they have. That is why she doesn't think this is red flag worthy. Also, as the committee knows, INDOT is encouraging them to spend their funding fully each year it is allocated, so that will encourage project to stay on their time line. If we don't use the money we will lose it.

Desmond added in some cases there's just no way to avoid delays, whether it's on INDOT's end or the LPA's end. Sometimes you think you're done with a step, like the environmental review, and then something pops up that adds 8-12 more months on because it's a special condition you have to explore and deal with before you can move on with the project. Sometimes, like with Tapp and Rockport Rd, that project was just put on hold for a while because there was no money and there was a difference in opinion about what the design should be. It sat around for quite some time not moving forward in the process because no one was pushing the design forward because there was no money for it. Two years later, now we have money for it, so we can move on. That puts it out of whack with the 4 year project scope you would hope for, but there wasn't much else you could do if you didn't have the money and you couldn't figure out what sort of design you wanted to do. There are so many different factors to making a project get through the process in a reasonable amount of time. It's hard to predict.

Dragovich said we've been doing this for maybe about a year. There are only about 5 quarters worth of data. A lot of the projects are new and we don't have the most accurate data yet. The ones she is particularly interested in tracking because we have been monitoring them for the last 5 quarters are the Black Lumber Trails project and the Downtown Curb ramps project. From the graph, it looks like they are going pretty well. Those are her litmus test moving forward because they are the newest projects in the TIP at this point.

Baker said the reason he asked is because he's wondering if all the delays are from unforeseen circumstances or if we should look at some sort of supervision over the sites or procedures that could act as warning bells for projects that might go beyond the 4 years. He just wanted to see if staff had anything they thought we could do to keep the projects. One of them is almost doubled in the time line. He just wonders if there is any way of getting control.

Desmond said the Quarterly Tracking process is that tool. In years past, we would put the money in the TIP and we'd never hear from the project managers again until we saw them building their projects. There is no way staff could help the project managers

along with way if they ran into a road block somewhere at the state or federal level or if they ran out of money or needed more money. Getting together on a quarterly basis, everyone is all on the same page about what the issues are on a project and we can all help each other keep it moving forward.

Dragovich moved to the budgeting side of the Quarterly Tracking Report. Her graph showed the history of the project funding amounts since each project was put into the TIP. The graph shows the percent changes through the life of the project. There are no red flags to raise at this moment. She was looking for the Committee members to ask her questions instead of going through each item on the graph.

There were no questions.

VI. Old Business- None at this time

VII. New Business

1. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

1. DES# 1383223 Surface Treatment on SR 446; SR46 to Moores Pike*

Dragovich presented the TIP amendment. It was brought from INDOT for a project that is in the TIP right now. It is a resurfacing project on SR 446 between SR46 and Moores Pike. What INDOT is asking for is an increase in funding for Fiscal Year 2015. They are requesting an increase from \$146,742 federal funds to \$227,200 federal funds. The amendment was approved in both the CAC and TAC. There was a 30 day public comment period. During that time, we received no comment. Staff is asking the Policy Committee to vote on the above amendment.

Martin asked why the project is costing \$100,000 more?

Jim Ude said two things happened. When the project was first proposed, the estimate was not a good estimate. It was proposed to be a certain type of asphalt but in the payment design, the engineer decided to change it to regular asphalt, so the cost was different.

Martin said this will be a more substantial road way?

Ude said it will be.

**Micuda moved in favor of the proposed TIP amendment. Baker seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

B. TAP Grant Awards*-

The grant awards are related to the development of the 2016-2019 TIP which will be coming to the PC in the next few months. The process we go through to award these particular funds is to do grant awards first, submit them to INDOT for their final eligibility stamp of approval, and then put the projects in the TIP as officially funded

projects with these sources of money. This is the first step in getting those projects through so they can be in the new TIP.

The TAP award is a funding source that pertains to bicycle and pedestrian transportation infrastructure. We have funding available for all four years of the TIP so we are trying to award money for all the years. You want to make sure you have the money out there so if you start a project now, the funding will be ready when it is time for the construction letting to happen or for preliminary engineering or right-of-way.

We did receive several applications which were reviewed by the TAP selection committee and staff. Then the applications go to the CAC and TAC before coming to the PC. The applications include completing the County's Karst Farm Trail Phase 3 project, the side path project around the roundabout at Rogers and High St to connect from the Stands around to Child's school, the side path that would go along Henderson St to the soon to be built Black Lumber Trail spur down to Winslow Rd, the trail extension to both the north and the south of the Jackson Creek Trail, and the side path connect along Winslow Rd from Walnut St. to Highland to connect to the B-line or further west down Tapp Rd. Those projects were presented to the TAP committee.

They were scored based on the scoring system that is set up for the TAP process. All the projects received good scores. At the time, when we were looking at the funding, we thought we had enough funding to pay for all those projects out of the TAP funding we had assigned for each year and our extra balances. Our allocation each year is \$154,049. What we found out after we went through the TAP selection process is we are locked in to the years we said we would spend our extra balances in the old TIP plan. We can't just take the balance and use it where we want it over the next 4 years.

We do have an additional balance of TAP available in 2016 (\$68,000) and 2019 (\$245,000) but in 2017 and 2018 we have just the annual allocation. With those parameters, we are not able to fully fund all the projects that came forward. We proposed to fund a couple of projects with STP funding instead, so they will all be fully funded, just not with TAP funds.

What we're proposing is for Fiscal Year 2016 to give the full annual allocation plus the extra balance for a total amount of \$203,127 to the Karst Farm Phase 3 project which will allow them to do their final design and construction during that fiscal year. For Fiscal Year 2017, we would give the entire \$154,000 to the design phase of the South Henderson side path. For Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019, we would give the full amount to Jackson Creek Trail because there is going to be some extensive design for both of those segments. For both of those years, they would get their design phase funded.

That means we do have right of way and construction to phase in in future years, beyond the life of the TIP that we're working on now. These projects will be able to get started with their design and then future years of the TIP will have to find ways to continue those on with Right-of-Way and construction funding. Jackson Creek Trail would actually get a full \$200,000 for Fiscal Year 2019. Desmond pointed out with those proposed awards there would be in Fiscal Year 2019 a remaining balance of \$198,000 or \$199,000 that is not yet assigned to a project. We will still have the ability to assign that money to a project. Desmond recommends that we do that along with

some extra funds for HSIP by doing a new call for projects as soon as we get this new TIP adopted. We'll program as much as we can under this new TIP for the next four years and then whatever is left we'll do a new call for projects to our LPAs in Ellettsville, City of Bloomington and Monroe County so we can program the money and not lose it. We're in a use it or lose it situation in regards to money now; if we don't use the money we're allocated for a given year, it doesn't come back to us the next year. It's incumbent upon us to make sure we're maximizing the use of all of our funds. We're going to try to write a TIP that does that in the best way possible. Those are our recommendations right now as far as awarding the TAP funds. If they're adopted here, they'll go to INDOT for a final review and unless they raise any red flags, those will all be included in our TIP proposal in a couple of months here.

The two projects that are proposed for STP funding instead of TAP funding this cycle are the Rogers Rd side path and the Winslow Rd side path. That would allow them to start their design process as well. Ultimately, all the projects that applied for TAP funding under this scenario get some funding, it's just not all going to be TAP funding. Both the advisory committees did recommend approval of these proposals.

McDaniel asked if Desmond could explain why the Rogers Rd side path and Winslow Rd side path projects were converted to STP funds. Is it because there are not enough TAP funds to do the whole project?

Desmond said that is correct.

McDaniel asked if you could mix the two types of funding.

Desmond said you can use both types of funding on a particular project, but in this case there was just not enough funding to go around. In order to fully fund all the projects that were requested, we had to fully expend all the TAP funding on what we could and then look to STP for the remainder.

Ruff asked if the TAP selection committee or staff members were satisfied with the scoring methodology used or if there were ideas for modifying that for future selection processes.

Desmond said there are some quirks in the scoring he thinks we need to address. One of them is trail projects don't score well in the safety section of the scoring system. The safety section is weighted heavily toward correcting places where there have been crashes and typically you're building trails in field and railroad lines where you don't get a lot of crashes, so you don't get a lot of points for solving a problem in that sense. Trail projects can look like they lag behind other projects in that scoring section where they might actually be a very good project. It's just the way our system is set up when you look at the raw numbers. He knows there were some other concerns and we did have discussion about some ways we could tweak some things and he definitely thinks we'll go back and do that.

Ruff asked if it wouldn't be too much trouble, he would like to be involved in that discussion. One could argue that a good trail that is not just recreational but also useful for commuting has safety because it removes exposure which is a major factor in risk.

Desmond said once we get over the hump in the next few months with our other projects we could certainly have a subcommittee of interested folks who join us and help us make updates to this scoring process.

Baker said he had the same thought as one of the scorers. This has been around for the last couple of years and he has suggested we take a look at the system in the next year with the idea of refinement. We found scoring for the bus system was difficult at times too because it didn't fit into a road-like structure.

Micuda said one thing about the way the process works from the stand point of someone who has submitted projects as well as reviewing them, there has never been a situation where a trail project has been turned down as a result of the scoring quirk because people take that into account as they're doing their decision making. Hopefully in the next year we can get the system revised to where it is an even playing field and trails are never scored poorly for because of that flaw. He's been watching for that as someone who advocates for trail projects and they've never lost as a result of the process.

Martin said he is having trouble with the numbers. There are five projects listed in the chart, but in the Fiscal Year listings, you have three projects listed. Where is the money for the other two projects coming from?

Desmond said those are the two projects that are going to be funded with STP funds as opposed to TAP funds.

Martin said so the Rogers Rd side path, you're going to take the \$52,160 TAP and convert that in Fiscal Year 2015 to STP funding?

Desmond said that is correct.

Martin asked if it was correct that the other project being converted was the Winslow Rd side path project.

Desmond said that is correct.

Martin said the amount being moved there is \$100 some.

Desmond said it is \$110,640. That was their design request.

Martin said the question is Desmond had indicated there was \$190 some thousand left to be allocated in the TAP fund. Why move these projects to STP if the TAP fund actually has enough balance in it to cover those two in TAP funding.

Desmond said that is a question of scheduling those projects and how soon they want to get started. We could certainly fund those, but that money is not available until Fiscal Year 2019, so then both of those could not get started with their design until two years later than under this scenario so the actual completion of the project would be pushed that much further out. That's really more a question of scheduling than having the available funding, because I think you're correct. If we add those up we probably have enough funding in the last year to start the design phases of those projects. It's a question of do we really want to wait that long to start those projects.

Martin said when he goes through and adds up all the STP funding that's associated with these projects, he comes up with about \$4 million worth of funding that's going to have to be added to the TIP. Does that sound correct?

Desmond said that sounds right in terms of their full requests, but that doesn't mean it's all going into this particular TIP because some of those funding deadlines might have been pushed further out than beyond 2019 in order to find the funding.

Martin said there's probably \$800,000 going farther out. His question is, of the STP funds we still have to allocate, what percentage of those funds does this \$4 million represent.

Desmond said he doesn't have the answer off the top of his head.

Martin said the question is how much of a commitment are we making of our STP funds when we allocate these TAP funds for this activity. If we don't carry it on past the time lines Dragovich has to keep extending out because we don't have money, how much are we exacerbating that problem by making a commitment to doing these design activities now, not knowing if the money is going to be available later.

Desmond said that is a very good question and he will try to illustrate it a little. We're doing a TIP right now for 2016-2019 but given that we're starting design phases at different times during that TIP, we'll have different ROW phases and construction phases after that that will be beyond 2019. Martin is right, if we start the process now at some point we'll have to find that money. In 2020, some of those projects come in for ROW, 2021 some of them come in for construction and in 2022 construction. We will have to keep these projects at the top of the list. If we start them now, we'll have to finish them later and how are we going to do that?

Martin said what has him bothered is we're talking about doing a new MTP which is going to identify for us priority projects and it's getting pretty clear that we can prioritize all we want, but there's not going to be any money there. We're making the commitment now for these projects and saying they're going to have a higher priority than anything that the MTP identifies as something that should be a high priority project. We're making the commitment now so that we don't have the option of doing anything later. Is that correct?

Desmond said we can always change our minds later if we want to amend the TIP based on future guidance. This money we're talking about now isn't until Fiscal Year 2017, which is more than a year from now, so presumably we would have a plan in place if we decided we didn't want to make that commitment, we could do that because we wouldn't have started anything until at least July 1st of that year.

Martin said it is a problem with the way we have to use the money because we don't have flexibility with its use. What we're doing is trying to leverage it to decrease the amount of STP funding that we have to use for those projects in the future. Is there another strategy for using this money that allows us to actually complete projects with it, rather than only doing a piece of a project and committing ourselves to other long term funding?

Desmond said when we only get \$150,000 a year of TAP if it's a project that is going to cost more than that to build, which most of these are, you're getting into STP one way or another. That's really your only option. Unless you want to build it completely locally. We have to commit our funds somewhere.

Martin said it just seems like a really poor way to manage funds. It's crazy.

Micuda said the fundamental problem is getting \$150,000 a year for active transportation. If your community or the MPO has active transportation priorities, which he believes we do, you have to use the TAP funds essentially to get the ball rolling and get some design work, maybe some property acquisition, but essentially that's where you have to stop and then you have to tap into STP funds which means you're competing with other needs. That's just the reality of the world we're operating in and again, the \$150,000 is a pittance for these kinds of needs. It's way less than the STP allocation. We're just essentially doing the best we can. He thinks the new plan will place just as high a priority on these particular projects as the existing documents, so he doesn't worry about it, but we will have competing projects probably starting in 2020 and beyond.

Martin said it's just an unusual way for us to have to make a commitment that precludes some good action in the future unless we throw away the money we already put into it. That's what he's concerned about. We end up at some point saying, well, we spent \$100,000 on the trail designs but we haven't got the money to put into them and that money is essentially wasted in that point in time. He doesn't want that to happen. He would like to figure out a way to make sure these projects do get carried forward but that we do so in a way that doesn't end up making it difficult for us to do other high priority projects. That's his concern.

Baker said they had a discussion recently about the \$199,000 for 2019 and the fact it was unassigned. At what point in time would we lose that money if we don't go through with a call for projects?

Desmond said the money is lost if we are unable to cut a purchase order for that money before the end of Fiscal Year 2019. Realistically, we need to get projects in the pipeline

immediately so they are ready to spend it at that time and ready to go to construction or design at that time. The absolute drop dead moment is if you can't get a purchase order cut for that money through INDOT by the end of that Fiscal Year, that money is lost.

Baker asked what kind of category of projects are available for that money.

Desmond said these are bicycle and pedestrian type projects, so side walks, side paths, trails, and those kinds of projects.

Baker asked if we would do another call for projects sometime this spring.

Desmond said after we get the new TIP adopted we'll follow that up with a new call for projects and then we'll amend those in once we go through that process again.

Baker said we have plenty of time to get the money allocated.

Desmond said it needs to be done before the end of this calendar year so we have a reasonable amount of time to get those projects moving.

Martin asked what form they want the motion to be. Are we approving the program applications?

Desmond said they would be approving the award of TAP money as outlined in the memo.

***Martin moved to approve the TAP funding as specified in the memo dated 3/06/2015 with the exception that the TAP funding shown under category PE fiscal year 2016 for the Rogers Rd. side path project is to be excluded since it is changing to STP funding and that the funding in the amount of \$110,640 under PE fiscal year 2016 for the Winslow Rd side path project is to be excluded because it is also being converted to STP funding. Micuda seconded. Motion was passed through unanimous voice vote.

C. HSIP Grant Awards*-

Desmond presented the HSIP grant awards. This is a similar situation as we have discussed with the TAP in terms of having an annual allocation for this type of project which is for safety improvements to reduce the frequency of fatal and serious injury crashes in our community. We are looking to do a variety of different types of projects that will improve those crash rates and make our community safer. We had a number of requests for our fiscal year 2016-2019 in our TIP. For this type of funding there is not a selection committee. There are two different types of projects that can be proposed.

One is called low-cost systematic projects or systemic projects. These are basically the kind of projects that would be rubber stamped because there is an accepted rate of improvement for these types of projects if you implement them throughout your community. The other type of project is a more substantial intersection or road segment improvement project, which is a more traditional construction project where you have to go through a higher level of analysis where you do a cost-benefit analysis and a road safety audit and look at your different options to decide which is the best treatment for

that particular segment of road or intersection. Most of the applications we received fall in the first category which is the low cost systematic project which are basically automatically eligible. From that sense we didn't have an eligibility problem except for one project which he'll get to in just a moment.

We do have quite a bit more in this category as we do with TAP. Our allocation is \$507,304 for each fiscal year. In addition, we do have some prior year balance available for HSIP, but the vast majority of that is already spoken for because we do have two projects from prior to 2016 that are carrying forward into 2016 and to 2017 that were already awarded our old HSIP funds. So even though we have that back balance, that's really spoken for. The projects that already have approved TIP funding that we don't need to worry about re-approving today. One is the City/County's Old 37 and Dunn project that we're working on for that intersection and curve correction.

That's going to take over 1.5 million dollars of funding out of HSIP from our old balances. That project has been in progress for quite a while and is supposed to be let this fall, so we need to make sure that money remains tied to that project. The other project will take about \$430,000 out of our HSIP and was previously approved. It is the downtown intersection improvement project. We're going to try to improve as many intersections as possible in the downtown area to get them up to ADA compliance with ramps, signals and striping we want to provide for safe pedestrian crossings. Those projects take a big chunk out of the funding that is available in those years. For fiscal year 2016, we have our allocation plus \$34,000, for 2017 we'll only have about \$83,000 left after the existing projects take the rest of the money and for 2018 and 2019 we have the full allocations.

We did get several requests for allocations for those years. For fiscal year 2016, the only application we have is for black backing plates for the County's traffic signals.

The County has 7 traffic signals that they maintain. The black backing plates are a visibility improvement they can add to the signals to make them more visible to drivers from a greater distance to give them greater stopping distance at those intersections.

For fiscal year 2017, there are three awards. One is for a guard rail on Moore's Pike by Southeast park. There is a major drop off from Moore's Pike into the park property and we'd like to provide a safety guard there. Another project in fiscal year 2017 would be a rectangular rapid flashing beacon at the existing crossing of Walnut St at the Allen St neighborhood green way. There is already a pedestrian island and striping there that we would like to make more visible by providing a flashing beacon for when people cross the road. The third project is the pedestrian island at 4th and Rogers. It did recently get some striping but it is still a fairly heavily trafficked and we would like to offer more protection by adding an island there. There were a number of other signal upgrade projects that at the time we thought would be eligible under the low-cost eligibility guidelines, but we found out that they were not. Those will have to come back to us via the other type of HSIP application and will require more analysis and a safety audit before we can award them money. That does leave us with some money to assign in the last couple of years of the TIP because we don't have enough project applications at this time to fill out all of the funding. In 2018 and 2019 we still have the full allocation of

funding to assign. That call for projects would be sent out with the TAP call for projects.

Desmond highlighted that in fiscal year 2016 we still have, even with the committee projects and the award we want to make for the black backing plates, about \$467,000 unassigned in HSIP funds. That is such a short term problem because it is this coming fiscal year and it will be very difficult for us to find projects we can get on really quickly and get that to construction by the end of fiscal year 2016, but we certainly want to extend that opportunity to our LPAs to see if they can quickly come up with any projects that we can slide in under the systematic type of projects. Our 2016 money is the most at risk right now in terms of not being able to spend it in that category. We have more time to deal with 2018 and 2019. It would have been better to have projects in the pipeline ready to spend that money by now, but that didn't happen so now we have to try to find something easy to implement so we can get to that purchase order by the end of fiscal year 2016. We're definitely open to some suggestions there.

What we're asking you to award today are the automatically eligible projects that are outlined in the memo for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 and we do have more than enough money to fund those. Then we'll come back to you with proposals after a call for projects later this year for the rest of that money. We did run this by the two other committees and they did recommend approval as proposed.

Ruff said it's hard to believe we can't come up with some projects that could use those 2016 funds. That window is going to close soon. How much flexibility do we have? Do projects have to be on the street? Could bike lanes be eligible? Or there was a lot of talk recently about how to move forward and get the cross walk reestablished east of the hospital on Rogers. Could that type of project be eligible? He is just trying to get an idea of what is not eligible.

Desmond said there is a specific list of project types that comes from INDOT that says which projects are eligible under the low cost side of HSIP. There may be some opportunities out there. Some of them are kind of quirky and not every MPO would have a need for those things. A lot of them are you have to put something new where there isn't something to solve a problem, so routine maintenance of things does not qualify. There are some allowances for putting pedestrian striping and pedestrian signals and things where there aren't any now, so that is certainly an option we could explore. We could go down that list and see what projects are eligible but he's not sure all of them really fit.

Ruff asked if it would make sense to go to the Bike and Pedestrian Commission and ask them to brainstorm and maybe some of what was thought of could be investigated as possibly eligible.

Martin said at the top of the crash report are always state highway intersections. Can any of these funds be used on state highways?

Desmond said the state has its own HSIP funds they use.

Martin asked if we could partner with them to use these funds where we have a particular problem in our county which falls below the threshold of funding they have available at the state, so we could augment whatever funding deficiency they have specific to Monroe County.

Desmond said that is a good question. He is not sure how they would handle the mixing of state funds and local funds on a state highway project.

Martin said that's another option to look at because that's where our accidents occur. It would be nice if we could figure out some way to address that. He understands the state's problem trying to do it state-wide, but if it's our money to deal with and we can deal with it locally on their highways, we ought to be able to find a mechanism that would allow us to do that. This is an interesting problem where you have to find a lot of small projects. The other thing to do would be to think about a larger project, segment it into small pieces and then apply the funding to each of the smaller pieces, so you can break it down into multi-year pieces that can fix this in certain circumstances. It's interesting we get so much money here where we have difficulty finding applicable projects because of the constraints and so little money in the other kitty where we have no problem at all finding projects.

McDaniel asked what the threshold was for low-cost funding.

Desmond said it's not a dollar amount. It's based on the type of project they are. They tend to be lower cost than multi-million dollar intersection improvement project, so in that sense they're lower cost. The County's backing plate project is \$75,000 so it's not a huge investment compared to other major projects, but it's low cost because based on research and past practices we know it is going to provide improvements.

McDaniel asked what happened to the money if it reverts. Does it get reallocated within the state or does it go straight back to federal?

Desmond said the way the state is managing the money right now is when an MPO has a prior year balance that they want to use in a year that's coming out of another project somewhere else in the state. We used to think it was coming out of an INDOT project, but they have decided now it will come out of another local project that's not in an MPO. So, some other non-MPO locality that thought they would get federal funding for their project is not going to get federal money because INDOT has to pay their debt to us as an MPO.

McDaniel was thinking about Martin's comment about possibly working with the state. McDaniel thought if the money reverted back to the state maybe we could cut a deal with them. But it sounds like that wouldn't work.

Desmond said right now their focus is on segregating the state and federal side.



Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Policy Committee

McKim asked if Desmond would send out the eligibility criteria for the low-cost type of funding.

**Martin moved to approve the grant applications outlined in the memo dated 3/06/2015 concerning 2016-2019 HSIP awards. Bill Williams seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)- None at this time
1. **Topic Suggestions for future agendas**

IX. Upcoming Meetings

1. **Technical Advisory Committee** – March 25 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
2. **Citizens Advisory Committee** – March 25 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
3. **Policy Committee** – April 10 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

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

These minutes were adopted by the Policy Committee at their meeting held on May 10, 2015 (EJEA).