



POLICY COMMITTEE

April 8, 2016

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Council Chambers (#115)

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of the Minutes
 - a. March 11, 2016
- III. Communications from the Chair
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - a. Citizens Advisory Committee
 - b. Technical Advisory Committee
- V. Reports from the MPO Staff
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business
 - a. Project Design Process and Public Input Discussion
- VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)
 - a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas
- IX. Upcoming Meetings
 - a. Technical Advisory Committee – April 27, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
 - b. Citizens Advisory Committee – April 27, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
 - c. Policy Committee – May 13, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

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



POLICY COMMITTEE

March 11, 2016

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

**Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
March 11, 2016 Council Chambers #115**

Attendance:

Policy Committee: Tony McClellan, Lisa Ridge, Geoff McKim, Richard Martin, Adam Wason, Sarah Ryterband, Mick Renneisen, Jason Banach, Kent McDaniel

Staff: Josh Desmond, Scott Robinson, Emily Avers

Others:

- I. Call to Order: Introductions were made.
- II. Approval of the Minutes
 - a. February 12, 2016
Richard Martin moved for approval. Sarah Ryterband seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.
- III. Communications from the Chair: Kent McDaniel said we've been tracking Senate Bill 128 that Senator Mark Stoops introduced, which would have allowed us to create a local income tax specifically for funding public transportation. We followed it, promoted it, worked very hard, Mark worked very hard. It passed in the Senate by a vote of 40 to 10 but it never got a hearing in the House. Mark worked very hard to try and get it amended into other bills. As recently as yesterday afternoon he was still working to get it into Senate Bills 308 and 309. We think we had some support from leadership that was willing to cooperate but I suspect we were submarined by some local elected officials who didn't like it and let that be known. The bill died. This is the 4th year that Senator Stoops has introduced similar legislation and we'll try again next year.
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - a. Citizens Advisory Committee: Ryterband said the CAC met and passed the TIP amendments. We have not received the metrics we asked for from American Structurepoint for Phase II of the Fullerton Pike project. We wanted metrics for the roundabout so we know why the roundabout is as large as it is. At our last meeting we were simply told that's what the projections indicated but projections are rather subjective, so we would like the actual metrics.

Lisa Ridge said she forwarded the chart and anticipated traffic counts several times.

Ryterband said she has never received them.

Ridge said she will send them out again.
 - b. Technical Advisory Committee: Josh Desmond presented because no representative from that group is present today. They did review and approve the same TIP amendments the CAC reviewed and that you will be looking at today.
- V. Reports from the MPO Staff
 - a. Quarterly Tracking Report: Desmond presented. This is our quarterly process where we track the progress of all of our federally funded projects through our TIP. We get together with our

consultants, with INDOT, with our local public agency representatives to talk about any red flags or problems that may have come up since the last quarterly meeting to make sure we are staying on track to spend our federal funding in a timely fashion. We have to spend it or we lose it so it's important we make appropriate progress. There is not a lot to report. The vast majority of projects are making good progress according to the expected timelines. There are just a couple to call to your attention that we will talk a little more in detail about during the TIP amendments because they are related to our later business. The City's Tapp and Rockport intersection project experienced some delay in getting to the right-of-way phase. They're still wrapping up the environmental document in the preliminary engineering phase due to some issues with a potential sidewalk conflict with a historic property in the County. That has since been resolved and we'll talk more about that further later. As we've been discussing over the last several months we've had ongoing discussions with INDOT about partnering with them to fund the 17th St reconstruction project between the roundabout at Arlington and the new overpass on the I69 project with local and state money rather than our MPO federal money which would allow us to reallocate that funding to other local projects within our TIP. Again, that's something we'll talk about more with our TIP amendments because we do have some amendments related to that project. Other than that there's not a lot to report. Everything is going forward as scheduled. We'll bring you another report in about three months after our next meeting.

Ryterband asked Desmond to briefly tell us at what point in a staged project can things be changed?

Desmond said that is a good question. I don't think there's any way to stop a change to a project, it's just a matter of how much time it would take to do that. Will you have to go back through and repeat some steps you've already gone through in terms of approvals and reviews in the federal aid process? What is that change going to cost you in terms of further design time with your design consultant? You're less likely to see a change the further you get in those stages because they go through stages of refinement in the design where you're getting down to the details versus the big picture of how a project should look and feel. My non-professional engineer opinion is you can always change a project, it's just if it is worth the time and expense to do it. And that's a decision for the LPA.

Ryterband said this is a recorded meeting broadcasted on CATS and I want the public to have a feeling for what it means in terms of design of a project, when public input can influence a project and at what point it's beyond help.

Desmond said ideally the sooner we receive input, the better. The LPA will be less likely to make big changes later in the game. Not to say they couldn't- an LPA could pull a project off the table any time they wanted. They just have to balance how much have we already invested in it, how strongly we feel about the design we have versus the concerns they're hearing. It's a balancing act.

Ryterband said is that ever counterbalanced with what might be saved if the design is changed?

Desmond said he hopes so. He can't speak for the LPAs because they're the ones who control a project, but he hopes they would factor that into the decision process.

Martin said on the Tapp Rd project I noticed the schedule is slipping again. There was a question about a particular property. Can you give me an idea why we continue to be slipping on this project?

Desmond said at the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Tapp and Rockport there is a historic farmstead. Part of the Environmental Coordination process is to deal with historic properties. The City project had proposed a sidewalk on the west side of Rockport south of

Tapp. That sidewalk would have stopped at the property line of that historic property. That was not satisfactory to the County Historic Plan Commission who argued that even having a sidewalk approaching that property was going to threaten the historic value of the property. There was a lengthy discussion back and forth with them and ultimately the City decided to drop that portion of the sidewalk in the interest of moving the project forward. At that point, the delay had already occurred so we're dealing with how we fund that project going forward.

Martin said it seems like a lengthy delay for something that was not that big a deal. You mentioned we may be able to fund 17th in a different mechanism. Can you tell me a little more about that?

Desmond said we've had discussions since late last year with INDOT. What would happen is our MPO funding would be swapped out for state funding. It would not be tied to the federal aid process and would come out of our TIP entirely. The idea is to demonstrate we can build projects faster and cheaper when we're not in the federal aid process. That's the impetus from INDOT's side, is to prove we can do this in a better way. The impetus for us is to get INDOT to pay for the impacts we're seeing from I69 and to free up that money for us to invest in other ways.

Martin said we should do more projects like that. The last question I have has to do with Fullerton Pike Phase II, where it indicates that the bridge hydraulics is causing a significant change in bridge structure. My question is how were we so far off on the original estimate?

Ridge said it is a requirement coming from the Department of Natural Resources. There is a 60' span there now. When we did the estimate cost for the project we doubled the size of the existing bridge. The DNR came back and required us to do a triple size bridge because part of that is in the flood plain. They went up to a 400' and we have it back down to 240' in negotiations.

Martin said my only other question is for the Old SR 37 and Dunn St project we had a letting date of 1/27 and an estimated completion date of 4/6/16. Are we on target with getting that project letted?

Desmond says yes.

Martin said so we can expect to see work started on that later this year.

Desmond said yes.

- b. Planning Emphasis Areas: Desmond presented. This is the exciting time where we talk about work programs and budgets. This is a brief preview of what our budget looks to be this year as well as the organization of the document. The numbers in the packet are outdated. We're getting a little more money. We get an allocation for the first year and then we flat line estimate the same amount for the 2nd year. Originally we thought we were going to get \$248,168 in federal dollars which is an 80/20 match for our funds for the MPO planning work, which would give us a budget of \$310,210. We found out we were going to get \$14,000 more federal dollars per year, which brings our total budget each year to \$327,815. I noted in the report that our budget showed a decrease of 16% from our previous 2 year work program annual budget. There were a couple mitigating factors that made our last one a little bigger than normal, so this is not a drastic reduction. With the extra money we got it's closer to a 10% change in the number from the last work program, which is not an unheard of fluctuation between work programs. I don't think it's necessarily a matter of concern for us. When we close out a 2 year work program whatever money is remaining from that sits in a fund while the work program gets audited by INDOT and then some or all of that can be returned to us later on and can be amended back in the second year of the work program. So there's more money than what's in the memo and we can expect even more money later on. Those of you

who were around a couple years ago remember we did a very substantial overhaul of the work program from what it looked like in previous years. We tried to reorganize and streamline a lot of things. We came up with 4 program areas we listed all of our budget work under; Administration, Programming, which is TIP and other funding programs, Short Range and Long Range Planning Projects and then Data Collection and Analysis, which is the crash report, traffic counts, bicycle and pedestrian counts. In the interim INDOT come to the MPOs and requested all the MPOs organize their work programs in the same way so they can review them as efficiently as possible. So we're going to go from 4 work elements to 6. The general structure is just rearranging the sections. We took our existing work program which is pretty much going to be carry over except for a few items and reorganized it under the new topic area headings. I wanted to make sure you had understanding what's changing and why before you get the full work program. If anyone has questions I would be happy to take them. Otherwise we'll plan to move forward and I hope to have a work program document for your review at our next meeting.

VI. Old Business- None at this time.

VII. New Business

a. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments*

- (1) Des# 1593249 HMA overlay, Preventative Maintenance on SR 48
- (2) Des# 1600125 Raised Pavement Markings on SR 446
- (3) Des# 0901730 Tapp Rd. and Rockport Rd. Intersection Improvement
- (4) Des# 1500380 Woodlawn Ave. Railroad Crossing
- (5) Des# 0801059 Fullerton Pike Phase 1
- (6) Des# 1500375 17th St. Reconstruction
- (7) Des# 1500400 40 Foot Diesel Bus Replacement

Desmond presented. We have a substantial list of TIP amendments. Two of them are run of the mill maintenance and upgrade projects from INDOT. The remainder are local projects for the City, County, Bloomington Transit. The Tapp and Rockport intersection and 17th St. are related to these in a big way. I explained the delay in the right-of-way phase for the Tapp and Rockport project. That was scheduled to be engaged during fiscal year 2016 with about \$600,000 federal dollars attached to it. Due to the schedule changes, that right-of-way phase will not be engaged until fiscal year 2017. That \$600,000 needs to be put somewhere else in this year or we're going to lose it and then we need to find replacement money in '17. So that's step one of this set of issues. Step two is the ongoing discussion with INDOT about funding the 17th St. project. The City is very confident about our ability to close out that agreement in the next few months, but we want to still keep some federal money available until we're absolutely sure that agreement is in place. What the City has proposed is to take the design money that was scheduled for FY '16 and the right-of-way money scheduled for FY '17, change those from a federal/local split to a completely local funding, because even if there are no federal funds on those two phases we still have to show them in the TIP leading up to the construction phase and then leave the federal funds in the construction phase for FY '19. So that would free up money from that project in both FY '16 and '17. We need to make sure we put those funds on projects that are moving forward in those years so they can be spent before our deadlines. At the same time there has been a change in the cost need for the Fullerton Pike Phase I project that will be going to letting this August. There have been some additional utilities expenses that were added to that project. The County is requesting some additional funds to cover that need in FY '17. Likewise the City is requesting funds to cover the right-of-way phase of Tapp and Rockport in '17 as well. So the net result of these changes is that in FY '16, which ends June 30th of this year, we have \$1 million in federal funds that we need to put to something that can be obligated before the close out of the fiscal year. It also frees up \$604,225 from the 17th St. project in FY '17 and of course we've got those two other projects requesting to have some needs filled with that money in that year. The proposal before you is to flex \$688,000 of STP to BT which would allow them to start purchasing diesel buses to replace some of their fleet and add the remaining \$312,000 in STP funds to the Woodlawn railroad crossing project, which, when it

went into the TIP was not anywhere close to an 80/20 split. That is really the only project that is going forward to letting that isn't already maxed out for its split for this fiscal year. We're going to add the remaining funding to that project, which will reduce the local obligation. For FY '17 the proposal is to split the \$604,000 between the requests from the County for Fullerton Pike Phase I and the City for Tapp and Rockport right-of-way phase. Neither are getting 100% of what they need, so the local obligation will go up slightly for both of those projects, but they are at least getting some federal funds to help keep those projects moving forward in a timely fashion. The State projects are new additions to the TIP. There is a paving project of SR 48 west of town, a preventative maintenance project, and then raised pavement markings on SR 446, which are the reflective bumps in the center line that provide some additional visibility at night. Those are two brand new project using state funding to the TIP so they have no impact on our MPO federal funding. I will end there and I'm happy to take questions. As was reported earlier, both of the other committees did recommend approval of these items. We would appreciate your action today.

McDaniel asked the source of the local funding for the Woodlawn railroad crossing.

Desmond said IU is covering the local cost of that project.

Martin asked said he did not see the TIP request form for the Fullerton Pike change in the packet.

Desmond said that is an oversight in the packet. It's pretty straightforward. It's basically just adding a revised total of what that year will look like in fiscal year '17 with those additional funds added to it.

***Martin moved to approve the 7 amendments as presented in packet supplemented by the Fullerton Pike request form. McKim seconded.

Floor opened for public comment. There was none.

***Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

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

a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas:

McKim provided a legislative update. It does appear Senate Bill 67 passed which will bring some additional local funding earmarked for roads and aviation projects. There were several different versions of this bill but the way the bill ultimately came down is the excess COIT trust fund balance as of December 31, 2014 will be transferred to the local taxing units based on their normal COIT allocation percentages. 75% of that will be earmarked for road and aviation projects. I think it's unfortunate that the general assembly chose to do that since these were local taxes collected under local authority for any lawful purpose of local government. Nonetheless, this is going to mean about \$7 million- possibly even a little more than that- coming in to the County. A little over 30% of it will go to the County and a little over 30% to the City. 75% of that would be earmarked for roads. So expect some additional local funding that will be available for road projects.

Ridge introduced the new County Highway Engineer, Paul Satterly. We're really excited to welcome him on board and to have a licensed engineer.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – March 23, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – March 23, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – April 8, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment
speaker)

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