



POLICY COMMITTEE

June 12, 2015

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Council Chambers (#115)

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

June 12, 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: Ryan Corbine, Monroe County Council; Jim Ude, INDOT; Jack Baker, Bloomington Plan Commission; Richard Martin, Monroe County Plan Commission; Susie Johnson, City of Bloomington; Sarah Ryerband, Citizen's Advisory Committee; Bill Williams, Monroe County Highway Department; Iris Kiesling, Monroe County Commissioners

Others:

MPO Staff: Josh Desmond, Anna Dragovich

- I. Call to Order:
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. May 8, 2015- Richard Martin moved for approval. Susie Johnson seconded. Iris Keisling abstained. Motion passed through voice vote.
- III. Communications from the Chair- None at this time
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - a. Citizens Advisory Committee- Sarah Ryterband said Bill Williams spoke at the last CAC meeting about the first two phases of the Fullerton Pike project. A lot of residents from the area were there. Julie Thomas has suggested a meeting in July for Bill Williams and Patrick Wooden to meet with the citizens again to talk about the suggestions the citizens offered for the project and what changes are happening.
 - b. Technical Advisory Committee- Josh Desmond said the TAC had the same agenda as the CAC, except the Fullerton Pike discussion. They voted in favor of approving the work program amendment.
- V. Reports from MPO Staff
 - a. 2040 MTP- Desmond said we are continuing to work with the consultant to get the model finalized. It's been taking a lot longer than we'd anticipated. We had a long meeting with him in May to go over the final details of the issues he identified and how they're going to be fixed. We're confident they're being addressed in the right way at this point. It's just a matter of time for him to get that done. In the meantime, staff is working on the sections of the document that aren't dependent on the model. The bones of the document are coming together and we will plug the other stuff in as we develop it. In accordance with our continued goal to have an adoption before the end of this calendar year, we hope to

start presenting some material our MPO committees after the summer break to bring some things forward for your consideration and your input before we finalize them for an adoption later in the fall.

Ryterband asked when it will go back to the public.

Desmond said it would be a similar timeline. It will have to come to the public once we have a proposal. We hope we have enough material to start presenting to you in August or September. We'll go to the public in about the same time frame.

Martin said he was wondering if there would be an opportunity for the committee to look at the model as soon as it's in to give some initial feedback.

Desmond agreed that would be a good idea. He said he will keep the committee in the loop as the model comes out.

- b. MPO Memorandum of Agreement- Desmond said this is an agreement we finalized in mid-May. This documents the responsibilities of our MPO, Bloomington Transit as the transit provider in our MPO area, and INDOT on paper. It's been a long time since we've had an agreement like this updated. We've been through several versions of transportation legislation and different executive orders have come out, so the rules have changed since the last agreement. This agreement was to make sure all of the MPOs and INDOT have a clear understanding of what our responsibilities are for the planning process. It was a document developed as a boilerplate by INDOT and sent out to all the MPOs. We made individual tweaks and finalized it. There wasn't anything in it we weren't doing already. This is just a way for us to be up-to-date and document it all for future reference. There may be updates in the future, but this is the document that will guide us for the time being.

McDaniel asked when the MPO was created.

Desmond said it was created after the 1980 census. It might have been '82 or '83 when the original agreement was set up and the Governor designated us.

McDaniel said this was the same time BT was created.

- c. August 7 Meeting Location: Utilities Board Room, 600 E Miller Drive- The City Council Chambers will be shut down between July 1st and August 15th for a major upgrade to the audiovisual systems in the room. It's been a while since we've had any real serious upgrades. They're taking a month and a half to do these upgrades, so that means if we have a meeting in August it will be held elsewhere. We've booked the Utilities Boardroom at Miller Dr. It's a very nice room with all the same technology. Hopefully, we'll be back in this room for our September meeting.

Keisling suggested the screens be improved. It is hard to read them.

VI. Old Business- None at this time

VII. New Business

- a. FY 2015-2015 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment*- For the last several work programs, we've done a 2-year work program. The work program we're under now is FY '15-'16. We're just about to wrap up FY '15 at the end of June and then as of July 1, we'll be in FY '16. There's always some money left over at the end of the second year of a work program. We don't get to add that money back in to our budget until the middle of

the next of the next work program, which is the upcoming 'FY 16. We've got \$40,000 coming back to us. 80% of this is our federal planning grant and 20% of is local match. It's not a lot of money coming back in to the work program, so we've strategically placed it in just a few places. The other thing we usually do as part of this amendment are deal with what we call Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs). If you recall, every year when we do a work program, Federal Highway, Federal Transit and INDOT come together to transmit a letter to us to highlight the 4 or 5 key policy areas they'd like the MPOs to focus on implementing during the work program years. We use that guidance to do some projects during our work program. The PEAs we got for FY '16 were not all that different from FY '15, so they didn't warrant many dramatic changes for the work program. There are only two that were any different from what we were already working under from the first year of the work program and they're not things that are going to be difficult for us to implement. Number 1 is a renewed emphasis on focusing on the low-cost systematic projects rather than the location specific major infrastructure projects for the programming of our Highway Safety Improvement Program funding. It's looking at low cost ways to deal with the causes of crashes rather than looking at one crash location and sinking a lot of money into trying to improve just that one location. We made some changes in the language of the work program to say that during our administration of the TIP we will continue to push for those types of projects during calls for projects. The second is improving project cost estimating and scheduling, which we've been working on already with our Quarterly Tracking process. As we all know, money gets tighter as time goes by, the rules get stricter in terms of how we can spend it, and we have to spend it within each fiscal year. When we're laying out a project it's important that we have a good idea of how much it's going to cost and when we're going to need that money available according to the project schedule. If we don't get a project done in the window we think we're going to get it done and it has to get pushed back, we don't get that money to come with us. We have to take the money from something else in the future. We just want to continue emphasizing we want to be as accurate as possible. That's just another change in our work program language to make sure we're emphasizing that. We'll continue to work through that as part of our Quarterly Tracking process.

Just to highlight what the funding changes are. In work element 1, we added a little funding for additional legal advertising because we know we're going to have continued TIP amendments and we're going to have to do some advertising for our MTP adoption process. We added some language in Work Element 2.0 to deal with the PEAs. We added a good chunk of funding to element 3.0, which is our planning element and specifically to the MTP work element. Again, we had hoped to have the plan done by now and did not budget much money for staff time on that project, so we've put some money there to make sure we have those expenses covered. The only really new things we have funded is a pilot project the City is going to undertake which may blossom into something bigger that the County, Ellettsville and the MPO as a whole can use. It's a new traffic counting data management software called MS2. I believe INDOT has been using this program in the last couple years to manage their traffic data. It's a much better system than what we have, which is just a series of spreadsheets, which is not the most accessible or easy to use. This system is more of a database driven system. It has a map interface where you can click on segments of road and find out what the traffic counts are. It will include historic traffic counts. You can do different types of analysis based on all the data in the system. We think it's going to be a great tool. For the initial investment, it will be for internal City use as we see how it works. There's the opportunity to expand it to include Monroe County if they want to join the contract. We could do the same for Ellettsville to make it an MPO-wide database. The really neat things is there is a module to make it publicly accessible via the website. It would be basically like looking at a Google Map. The public could see what the current and historic traffic amounts are. We could allow a limit amount of analysis to be done by the public. If it works out as it's been

presented, it's going to be a really nice tool. We don't think that information has been easily accessible. We don't have a whole lot to deal with in terms of amendments. The TAC and the CAC both reviewed this and voted unanimously for adoption.

Williams suggested using a consulting service for the road classification project. They have used a consulting service for that in the past.

Desmond said we have not programmed any funds for that. It isn't a drastic of a change to what we already have, more just making sure we're still in line with the latest Map 21. At this point, we're not aiming for a consultant, but he is happy to discuss it with Williams.

Keisling said we're going to have significant changes as I69 progresses, whether it's built or not. Even unbuilt, it's causing problems. We should be keeping track of that.

Martin asked how we create a model without understanding what the functional classifications for our roads are at the beginning of the model.

Desmond said we based it on what the classifications were at the time. We do have functional classifications for all of our roads. This is a process of making sure they're the most up-to-date as possible.

Martin said we don't want a discontinuity between our classifications and the model we're using. They have to be in sync or it's not valid.

Desmond doesn't anticipate dramatic changes. That wasn't the idea behind having the MPOs update these. There were some changes to the rules under Map 21. This is just to make sure we don't see weird things happening with our road network based on what new roads might have accidentally been incorporated with the system based on the new rules.

Martin asked if it is safe to assume that everything in the Amendment with an estimated completion of Q4 of '15 or earlier has been completed. It would be nice if we called our completed project completed, instead of estimated for completion.

Desmond said after the end of the fiscal year, we do an annual completion report. That will document in more detail exactly where we stand on things.

Martin asked if it was worth mentioning that we know we can expand the Highway Safety Improvement program to more than just our local roads. It's a significant change in what we are able to do. We're changing what we are looking at because before we simply weren't looking at them.

Floor was opened for public comment. There was none.

**Ryterband made a motion to adopt the amendments. Jack Baker seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

- b. TAP Selection Committee Appointments- There was some money left over from the TIP adoption last month that was not programmed, specifically HSIP in FY '16, '18, and '19 and about \$200,000 in TAP funding for FY 2019. We did promise to do a new call for projects to find some projects to fund with those opportunities. We sent out that last call for projects June 8th, due before July 4th. We do have a TAP selection committee made up of representatives from each of our MPO committees and they will meet one time to review applications and provide recommendations to staff as to how we should fund

those applications. Assuming we have TAP applications during this call, we will need to meet once, likely in July. We would like our committee from last time to serve again, rather than trying to find new volunteers. Our TAC and CAC members have all agreed to do so. Jack Baker was on the committee previously. If he could continue, that would be great. If we have one more volunteer we could add them or we could leave it at Jack.

Baker is happy to serve again.

Ryterband will serve as well.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)- None at this time

- a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – June 24 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – June 24 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – August 7 at 1:30 p.m. (Utilities Board Room, 600 E Miller Drive)

Adjournment

These minutes were adopted by the Policy Committee at their meeting held on September 11, 2015 (EJEA).