



POLICY COMMITTEE

May 13, 2016
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes May 13, 2016 Council Chambers #115

Attendance:

Policy Committee: Jason Banach, Tony McClellan, Lisa Ridge, John Hamilton, Andrew Cibor, Kent McDaniel, Richard Martin, Kevin Tolloty, Sarah Ryterband.

Staff: Josh Desmond, Emily Avers

Others:

- I. Call to Order: Kent McDaniel called the meeting to order.
- II. Approval of the Minutes
 - a. April 8, 2016: Richard Martin approved. Jack Baker seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.
- III. Communications from the Chair: McDaniel mentioned the City is providing active shooter training and opening it to all board and commission members.

Josh Desmond provided an overview of the training. These are put on by the Police Department so we're all prepared in the event of any incident here at City Hall. It's not mandatory for Boards and Commissions but it is helpful to you if you would like that knowledge. There are 5 or 6 upcoming training sessions in the Council Chambers and the Utilities Board Room. It's a 2 hour session.

McDaniel said I work on the Emergency Preparedness Committee at IU so I am familiar with this stuff. The only time I felt I really needed it was right here in this room. It's a good idea to think about attending.

- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - a. Citizens Advisory Committee:
Sarah Ryterband said we had an interesting conversation about things our members want to look at in the upcoming year. We have a lot of education and interesting topics on our agenda. We may bring some of those to the PC.
 - b. Technical Advisory Committee:
Andrew Cibor said the TAC met and went through a review of ongoing projects in the various organizations. MPO staff reviewed their draft Unified Planning Program which we'll be reviewing today. The TAC has a couple of suggestions for future discussions. One involved relooking at the board membership. Another idea was to talk about making the process more transparent.
- V. Reports from the MPO Staff
 - a. FY 2016 Q3 Quarterly Reports:
Desmond presented the 3rd quarter report. We met with all the LPAs, INDOT, FHWA. There are not a lot of red flags on project progress out of that quarter. We've had 3 or 4 projects let in the last several months. The Black Lumber Trail let and is under construction now. The Walnut St. railroad crossing, Karst Farm

Trial Phase 3 and the Old 37 and Dunn intersection improvement project were all let and awarded. They should start construction in the next 3 months or so. The only project that had a change was Fullerton Pike Phase I. There were issues with acquiring the final pieces of right-of-way which has delayed them past the deadline for the letting date they had originally scheduled, so their letting date has been pushed from August to November. It hasn't affected the Fiscal Year funding so we don't have any concerns about that our TIP funding for the project.

Martin said in the project report the Fullerton Pike Phase 2 got split between a Phase 2 and a bridge component. What was the reason?

Desmond said INDOT has changed the way they want to track funding on infrastructure projects so anytime there's a bridge they want a separate tracking number for the bridge in addition to the overall project.

- b. June Policy Committee Meeting Rescheduled from June 10 to June 3:
Desmond we moved the next meeting date up by 1 week because no MPO staff will be in the office on that day. This will also help us get the Work Program adopted a week earlier and get it submitted to INDOT.

VI. Old Business: None at this time

VII. New Business

- a. Unified Planning Work Program FY 2017- 2018 Draft Document:
Desmond presented. The Work Program is the budget for the MPO. It's a 2 year work program. We are coming to the end of Fiscal Year '16 so it is now time to adopt one for FY '17-18 which starts this July 1st. This draft document to matches what we expect our budget and tasks to be over the next several years. The budget is somewhat fluid as we go into the second year because at the end of every two year work program any leftover funds will be audited by INDOT to determine the amount and added back to the Work Program the following spring. The numbers in the draft reflect what we know we will receive. We do expect to have some carry over funding added in the second year because the Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator position has been vacant for several months and we won't have a new hire probably until June so we will have approximately 5 months of compensation for that. The budget for our 2 year Work Program should be \$262,252 in federal funds. That represents 80% of the total budget. We spend out of our budget and then we get an 80% reimbursement from INDOT on a quarterly basis. That brings our total budget to \$327,815. The bulk of that goes to staff time. A certain times there are consultant studies paid for through this. We have some funds that go to our partners at Monroe County and Ellettsville to assist them in conducting traffic counting and other studies. Some funds go to Bloomington Transit to help them conduct studies and do annual ridership counts. We try to work with all our local partners and support their needs in addition to the core MPO tasks we have to accomplish. The budget is a decrease of approximately 13% from our current work program. The funds in our previous work program were inflated from our normal funding level because INDOT held some funds back that should have gone to the MPOs for their Work Programs and those funds were finally released and paid back. So we had a bump in funding but are returning to more normal levels. Of course these amounts always fluctuate with federal funding levels and the annual budgets in response to the transportation legislation. It is equal amounts for both years and then we will add funding back to the second year's Work Program as I mentioned earlier.

We discussed the Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs) a couple months ago. 3 out of the 4 are things we've already being addressing in our Work Program from past years. The new one is Title VI- Program Management. As a prerequisite for getting federal funding for transportation projects in the TIP all our LPAs have to show they are working towards non-discrimination compliance in their public facilities and programs. They are required to have programs and plans in place to insure that none of the facilities, programs or the activities of these agencies are discriminating against any parties. The MPO is going to provide education to our LPAs, staff assistance, and provide them with resources to help them along the way to get an approved and acceptable Title VI plan in place. They're doing an audit on the federal and finding some deficiencies not just in Indiana but nationally and want to make sure everyone gets a current plan in place. At a later date they'll start more strictly enforcing the requirement that all LPAs have a plan in place

before receiving federal funds. The remainder of these emphasis areas we've talked about before in our previous Work Programs.

The organization and structure has changed from the last Work Program. All the MPOs do their Work Program a little differently and this year INDOT requested we all follow the same format. The way you see work program laid out is in accordance with that. Our 4 element program is being increased to a 6 element program. Element 100 is the same as it's always been. Element 200 is our data collection and analysis- all our traffic volume counting, our annual crash reports. Element 300 is short range planning and management systems. It's largely focused on the Transportation Improvement Program where we do our short term planning for projects and our different funding programs within that. Element 400 is long range planning, so our 2040 MTP or any subsequent MTPs we are planning. Element 500 is transit and active transportation- all our bike/ped promotion and coordination, bike and ped counts, any transit studies we might be doing with BT. Element 600 is a catchall for any other initiatives we need to address. Primarily that's the Title VI plans and ongoing human services public transportation plan that helps us support some of our transit grants. I won't go through this page by page. Our liaison from INDOT reviewed the plan and didn't have any red flags or concerns. They're ready to take it through the contract process and get us locked in for our funding once we adopt a document. The CAC and TAC reviewed this a few weeks ago. They'll look at it again at their late May meeting with any changes we may have made and will vote on it. You will vote at the June 3rd meeting and then we will submit to INDOT.

There are the major things upcoming. We have a new TIP to develop this fall for FY '18-'21 so we maintain our required 4 year time horizon. That's always a major undertaking. We'll get our estimated funding allotment in October or November, do a call for projects and then find ways to fund our priorities. The 2040 MTP is still hanging out there and we are working to get some resolution on our travel demand model. The consultant has been having a legal fight with their former employee who was working on our Travel Demand Model about who is working on what projects. Our project has been caught in the middle of that and we have not been able to get our final model because of this. The good news is we paid out our contract so they've been working to finish it for no further charge. If can get the final product we'll be able to get a draft ready to bring forward this fall. We want to get it adopted by the end of FY '17 or as soon as possible before that.

Hamilton said did you say we've paid them everything we owe them but we don't have the product? We don't typically wait for the final product before we pay the full contract amount?

Desmond said we paid them as they did the work. The model wasn't finished and they kept doing work even though we paid them what we owed them.

Hamilton said in a program like that, I'd expect the delivery of the product would trigger final payment. We're not in a good position.

Desmond said I already talked about the Title VI plan. There are two consultant studies we're going to help fund for Bloomington Transit. Those are both in the second year of the work program right now. The only change I anticipate between this work program and what we'll ask you to adopt in a month is Lew May may ask one of those studies be moved up to the first year. I don't see any reason we couldn't move money around to accommodate that. Those are federally required safety plans and asset management plans BT needs to develop in response to federal legislation so we want to help them get those done. I am happy to answer any questions.

Ryterband said is the quarterly report a 101 line item?

Desmond said it is in the 300 element because it is part of the TIP. It's all TIP projects.

Ryterband said the comment I have is in Appendix A there is a problem. The CAC membership doesn't include our correct members. One of the members listed is deceased.

Baker said I wanted to thank you for added information at bottom of each project in the quarterly report. It's a summary of each project so we have more information about each project. Before there was space but you didn't put any information in it. I think this is something they asked for at the CAC. In work element 104-Public Outreach, the last item is alternative methods of outreach. In light of the conversation at last meeting I want to suggest a couple things as alternative methods. One of those would be to do a public participation meeting once or twice a year for the TIP to explain and take comments. That's after the projects are designed and funding is awarded so there is not much opportunity to make changes in the project but at least it would add some transparency to how we work and what projects are there. Maybe even if we don't go over entire TIP the latest additions might be something that would be worth doing. I see that being a consortium of the CAC, TAC and PC. We could maybe present it through the CAC. The other thing doesn't really apply to this but I want to bring it up anyhow. In that conversation I didn't hear anything about how to get public participation. I suggest the MPO could require the LPAs to hold a public participation meeting early in the project design. As it comes out they're going to do a project, hold a meeting and let the public come and comment and make it more transparent that way. I think we could make a rule that must be done before the project comes to us to be added to the TIP.

Hamilton said I have some questions about the PEAs. Under ladders of opportunity it says "identification of these deficiencies could be done through the creation of performance measures used to specifically measure such gaps". Do we have performance measures that specifically measure gaps in connectivity to employment, healthcare, schools, recreation, etc.?

Desmond said we do not at this time. We are expected to develop a range of performance measures in response to federal legislation. First, the feds will establish certain performance measures, then the states must establish corresponding performance measures, then the MPOs have to determine performance measures so all three levels work together. In the next couple of years and in our transportation plan we will see a lot of those things addressed but at this time we don't have anything we would use for that.

Hamilton said measuring things like that is very important. Have we identified stages to get done by a certain time? Particularly looking at things like access to housing, access to employment and the transportation relationship to that. I don't know how much depends upon waiting for the federal or state to outline what we need to do but I think that's a really important process. My next item is Map21 requires development of performance measures. Is that same thing you just referred to?

Desmond said yes. There are eight or nine areas and the feds have only released a couple of them. The states have until next spring to establish theirs and then the MPOs will have six months after that to establish MPO level performance measures. For example, there's a safety performance measure that was just released which says we're going to measure performance of our safety programs by the number of fatal crashes per million trips on our roads. We'll have to come up with a local measure of that.

Hamilton said that's a more accessible and effective way to engage wide public dialogue about what are we measuring, how do we measure, are they the right things? The process of thinking about what we measure and what goals we set that's where you want the most public input rather than on a specific project. There you often get input from people with a very particular perspective which is not always representative of the larger community. We could get some good public input on those bigger issues.

Desmond when we started the Transportation Plan process we went through a visioning and goal setting process. We are very mindful of developing a vision and measurable goals to determine if we've been successful at achieving our vision. I think you'll see some of that born out in our plan over the next several months.

Hamilton asked what the time line is on the MTP.

Desmond said the goal is by June 30, 2017 or earlier, depending on how fast we can get things doing.

Hamilton said we have to get the model before we can start it?

Desmond said we've started it but we need the model results to illustrate different scenarios we might want to pursue before we can make some decisions about our plan.

Hamilton is the Travel Demand Model informed by these performance measures and goals or is it meant to be abstracted from the community purpose?

Desmond said it's both. We've set goals for the community and certain performance measures we want to achieve based on those goals. We can look at scenarios on this model to see how close we're hitting those performance measures. We can compare different scenarios to decide which is a more appropriate combination of projects.

McDaniel said have you kept the City's Legal Department apprised of the situation with the consultant?

Desmond said yes and it's time to have another conversation about that. We need to draw a line and say one or the other of you need to give us a product so we can move on.

McDaniel said there is an event occurring Monday that I thought might be of interest to the committee. I was approached by the Transportation Security Agency about participating in the Base Assessment for Security Enhancement (BASE) program. It's an audit; they look at your security arrangements for vehicles and facilities. I talked to May with BT and Perry Maul at IU Campus Bus and we arranged for the TSA to come in Monday to do one. It makes sense to do one simultaneously because we operate out of the same facility. We also got Go Express Travel involved. It's not tied to funding and not a requirement but I wouldn't be surprised if it is one day. If it ever is a requirement, we'll be ahead of the game, plus it's just a good idea.

Martin said in the document you talk about contract service agreements we have with City of Bloomington, Monroe County and Town of Ellettsville. There are big differences in how much each of them is under contract for. Are these payments we make to those agencies?

Desmond said they are payments for work they do.

Martin said they produce a product and send it to you along with a bill.

Desmond said yes, we get documentation of the hours they spent on traffic counts and all the things they do.

Martin said in many of these work elements the MPO is doing the same thing the LPAs are doing. What benefit accrues to the MPO by doing an activity our LPAs are already doing? How can we take the MPO effort that is occurring to provide additional benefit for our LPAs? Is there a mechanism for doing that or do we all have to operate independently?

Desmond said there are probably some synergies we can find. We are expected to conduct a lot of these as basic requirements for being an MPO. We need to do public outreach on our own documents or plans. Even though vetting projects at that level may be redundant to the LPA vetting their project independently it's still a requirement we have to fulfill. I'd be happy to look for some efficiencies in the future to help take the burden off of everybody.

Martin said you get involved in a lot of these projects very early on and it would make sense we would have joint activities so we don't end up with two full staffs available in two places essentially doing the same thing. The public doesn't always feel they are invited because it's not something that's directly impacting them if, for example, the Town of Ellettsville has a meeting and it's about a trail that's going to run through the county for a considerable distance by the time it's done. There is a larger impact on these projects. I wonder if we can help identify in the language you're using to describe these opportunities for better interaction with the LPAs so it's not we do this and they do that kind of stuff.

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

- a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas:

Martin said I'd like to go back to the TAC report. You mentioned there were two things the TAC talked about.

Cibor said one member requested we talk about board membership of the various committees. The other idea that came up was looking at ways to make the process more transparent.

Martin said does the TAC want to talk about membership of the TAC and the CAC? Or was that in reference to the PC? That was established by a Memorandum of Understanding.

Cibor said I think it had to do with the membership of all three committees.

Martin said how do we do that? I know the MPO PC board is established by the MOA. How are the CAC and TAC participations identified?

Desmond said there are no official requirements I'm aware of. Typically you'll see it reflect the same organizational membership as the PC, so the technical staff that reports to the elected or appointed officials who serve on the PC. The CAC is even looser than that. It's pretty much left to the MPO for how they want to establish it.

Ryterband said anyone who's interested in joining the CAC must come to three consecutive meetings before they have a voting membership. If they miss three consecutive meetings, they're off the CAC and would have to start again.

McDaniel said there are twice as many people on the TAC as on the PC.

Desmond said it is a very large group. One of the things staff has proposed is to do an assessment of all our fellow MPOs in Indiana to get an idea of what their membership is to see if there are any ideas we can take from them. We'll bring something back in the fall.

McDaniel said it's been a while since I looked in our bylaws but I thought we had some standards about membership in the by-laws.

Desmond said it's going to be up to the PC to make any changes and it will require a bylaws amendment.

McDaniel said doesn't changing the membership of the PC requires approval from the State?

Desmond said as long as we meet the minimum requirements, we have flexibility.

Ryterband said I want to commend Neil and Andrew for all the levels of participation and involvement of the community in determining what the 4th and Rogers project might look like. It was totally commendable. The neighborhood is extremely grateful and I wanted to express my deep appreciation for how it was managed.

Martin said aren't we due for a review by FHWA soon?

Desmond said we've been due for several years. The reviews have been shifted down to INDOT to conduct and they haven't gotten to all of us yet. I anticipate that to happen at any time.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – May 25, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – May 25, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – June 3, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

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