



POLICY COMMITTEE

September 11, 2015

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes September 11, 2015 Council Chambers #115

Attendance:

Policy Committee: Julie Thomas, Geoff McKim, Richard Martin, Tony McClellan, Jason Banach, Adam Wason, Andy Ruff, Lisa Ridge, Susie Johnson, Jack Baker, Kent McDaniel

Staff: Josh Desmond, Anna Dragovich, Vince Caristo, Scott Robinson, Emily Avers

- I. Call to Order: Introductions were made by committee members. Josh Desmond previewed the technology upgrades to the Council Chambers.
- II. Approval of the Minutes
 - a. June 12, 2015: Kent McDaniel mentioned there was an error on the date. The minutes will be changed to show the correct date of June 12.
 - b. August 7, 2015: Richard Martin mentioned a misspelling in the minutes. The minutes will be updated to reflect correct spelling.

**Martin made motion to approve minutes with amendments. Jack Baker seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

- III. Communications from the Chair: None at this time
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - a. Citizens Advisory Committee: None at this time.
 - b. Technical Advisory Committee: None at this time.
- V. Reports from the MPO Staff
 - a. Annual Completion Report: Anna Dragovich presented. This is a report that is done on an annual basis to outline all the work staff has done throughout the fiscal year as dictated in the work program. These are things like educational events, working on the MTP, working on the TIP, coming to MPO meetings. It is for the committee members' information and will be posted on the website.

Martin asked about the percentage listed under the Fiscal Year Budget Summary for element 01 for administration, which has to do with intergovernmental coordination, the work program, staff training, and public outreach is at 102% of expected expense. How will we conduct those activities in this current year if we don't have any money left in that budget?

Dragovich said it's a 2-year work program. All the funding is fluid between the two fiscal years. We're starting to draw on the other elements now that we've started FY '16.

Desmond added we're under in some of the other elements. Overall, we're not in the hole for FY '15. Our new budget for '16 adds to the remaining funds from '15 that we will be able to spend down by the end of this fiscal year. We have a pretty healthy set of funds right now to cover those expenses.

Martin said the other budgets are about what you would expect, right around the 50% range. This one is at 100%. Even if you have some money left over in those other lines, we would be expecting those to be spent during this year. Where are you going to get the money to move out?

Desmond said this only represents how we preformed against the FY '15 budget. It does not include the '16 funds. We're only looking at the expenses from '15 versus what was budgeted for '15. We have what was remaining from '15 plus our new '16 funds. While we may have gone over in '15 for one, we've gone under for others, so the budget is still in the green.

- b. Annual List of Obligated Projects: Dragovich presented. This is a report we're required to compile on an annual basis that lists all the obligated projects within our MPO from Bloomington Transit, the City, County, and INDOT. A project will be let for construction, meaning all the bids will come in and a contractor will be selected. The project is obligated after a contractor is selected. This is when the project can start drawing funds and the federal government has promised to pay the federal portion as programmed on that project. The annual list of obligated projects is a list of projects and the amount of funding that has been drawn down in FY '16. It will be posted on our website.
- c. 2016 MPO Meeting Schedule: Desmond said all City Boards and Commissions have been asked to figure out their schedules for 2016 so the rooms can be booked. We have proposed a schedule that is in your packet as well as a slight revision of that proposal. The Policy Committee has met on Fridays at 1:30 in Council Chambers. We've had input over the years from people who would like to change the meeting date to a Thursday instead. The revision I'm showing here shows the option for Thursday meetings. The Technical Advisory Committee and Citizens Advisory Committee schedule would remain the same. We're putting forward a proposal to see if anyone has any objections to changing to a Thursday afternoon at the same time. That's perfectly acceptable to staff. We're looking for a consensus from this group to see if they're willing to give that change a try for next year.

McKim likes Friday

Martin likes Friday. Thursday afternoons he has business meetings.

Johnson is fine with Friday.

Ridge is fine with Friday.

Ruff said we could get a proxy if we would be unable to attend. That would probably happen more if we switched to Thursday.

**Johnson made a motion to keep the meetings on Friday. McKim seconded. Motion passed through voice vote, 10:1.

VI. Old Business

- a. 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan: Desmond provided an update. We've been working to get the model completed and get some data so we can start reviewing the scenarios and projects we're proposing for future growth development to start making some decisions going forward on exactly what our plan is for 2040. At our last meeting we had a pretty good conversation about the performance measures that we're going to use to measure the performance of those different scenarios so we have a common set of criteria with which to judge the different scenario's outputs. In your packet you have the first set of scenarios we asked our consultant to run for us. This is the initial set that was developed based on staff input, public input, our existing plan and input from our task force. We're going to ask you to give us input on any other projects you think we need to look at based on what you see we've tested so far. That is our main focus today. When we put the packet out we did not have the data outputs. We got results within the last day or two from the consultant for 7 out of 12 scenario outputs. You haven't had those to study and staff hasn't had them very long to study so we're not going to be able to have much of a conversation today. I wanted to give you a little context as to what those outputs are so you understand what you're looking at and give you some feedback in terms of how you want to consider those different

outputs as you evaluate which scenario or combination of scenarios you think is the way we ought to go in the future.

You'll notice when we get to the outputs there's what we're listing as Scenario 0, which is the base year. We used 2013 as the base year and everything is projected forward from that. That's the best set of data we had to work with when we started building the model. When you see scenario 0, that's what the model says we're performing at today, or in 2013. Every other scenario is projected out to 2040 so we're looking at what's happening today as well as what's happening in 2040 under these different combinations of growth and development and projects that we might implement over that 25 year time period. Every scenario has a network assumption, which is the roadway and infrastructure network for that scenario and a growth and development assumption, whether it is going to be low, medium or fast growth and is it going to be sprawl type development, infill development where you're more focused on the core of an urban area or is it going to be a balance between the two. For this round of scenarios, all the scenarios except for 12 are based on the middle growth projection and the balance of different types of growth because we think that reflects how things are going and how things might go in the future. The twelfth scenario is primarily focused on infill growth as opposed to further outward growth. You won't be surprised by some of the results that come out in those performance measures. Scenario 0 is the base scenario. The first scenario is similar. We call it the Do Nothing or the existing plus committed (E+C) network- if we finish all the projects that we've already committed to building, let for construction bids or are already under construction and do nothing else. If we finish everything up that's in that status right now, how does that perform in 2040? Scenario 2 is a transit oriented scenario. What if we took bus route 3, which is an east/west route on 3rd St. and turned it into a bus rapid transit that has fast headways, direct boarding stations, fewer stops so it moves faster? Scenario 3 we call SR 37 or I69. We said what if we did everything we were planning to do but I69 never happened. We're modeling this because we want to understand how the inclusion or exclusion I69 impacts our transportation system over the next 25 years. It's more of an illustrative example. Scenario 4 we're calling a peak oil scenario. One of the neat things about the model is we have the ability to control for cost of vehicle operations which includes gasoline cost. What if we hit peak oil, gas prices go sky high, how does that impact our transportation choices throughout the system? Scenario 5 is what we call the transportation improvement project. That includes not only the projects that are in the E+C network, but everything that's in our TIP. Once we complete our 4 year plan, what does our network look like in the future? Scenario 6 is the TIP based allocation from Scenario 5 as well as some project priorities that were identified in our public workshops over the last couple years. Scenario 7 looks at finishing the TIP projects and then the majority of the projects that are in the 2035 plan right now and carrying those through. Scenario 8 is similar to 7 but more selective in terms of what projects we carried over from the 2035 plan. Scenario 9 is completing all of the TIP projects plus adding IU's hospital and research park over on the east side to see what impact that has on the system. Number 10 is the TIP plus a Sample Rd. bedroom community. What happens if we get a lot of suburban development around that interchange, how does that impact our system? Scenarios 9 and 10 are the ones where we varied our land use pattern from the standard stuff. We thought it would be instructive to see what impact land use policy decisions would have in addition to the transportation decisions we make in terms of projects we're going to invest in. 11 is an interesting one. We know in a lot of areas one-way streets are being converted to two-way streets. What if we took the College and Walnut corridor and the 3rd and Atwood corridor and turned those all into two-way streets? How would that impact access and traffic levels throughout the community. Twelve is the TIP plus a strong land use policy that focused all our growth to the core of the community on infill development rather than further greenfield development on the fringes of the community. How would our transportation choices differ and how would those impacts differ?

If you look at the spreadsheet included in the memo, you'll see there's a column for each scenario that was run and a list of all the projects that were included each scenario. We have the first set of outputs, which I will get to you after the meeting so you can take some time to look at it. I think it would be helpful to put the project matrix next to the output matrix so you can see which projects were included. We have outputs for scenario 0, 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, and 12. We will get the results from the remaining scenarios in the very near future. We have 3 different sets of data here on this sheet. The first block is the raw output. For example, the measure for Vehicle Miles Travelled is the actual Vehicle Miles Travelled projected for each scenario so you can compare them to each other, or the Daily Ridership for Transit Services are the actual numbers projected for those. The next set

of information is all the same performance measures showing the percentage changes versus the base year. So versus today's performance, 25 years from now under these scenarios, how do they compare? For instance, vehicle miles travelled under E+C, vehicle miles travelled increased 21.3% compared to what's happening today. When you compare versus the base year there's a natural amount of growth that's going to happen, so virtually all of these measures are going to grow regardless. It's just a matter of to what degree are they going to grow under different scenarios. That doesn't hold true for every measure, but for many of them that's the case. The last set is percentage change compared to Scenario 1, which is the existing plus committed network. How does that performance compare against these other scenarios 25 years from now. I will point out when we run a scenario, whether it's the base year or in the 2040, that scenario output is a snapshot of a day in 2040, not a cumulative number for a year or for 25 years. That's what you're looking at when you see the raw data change from the percentage change. For a lot of these scenarios, the variance between what you'd say is the worst performer versus the best performer for a given performance measure may not be very big. It's a matter of small degrees over which scenario really is performing the best for a given performance measure. If we look at the non-motorized share of trips- trips by bicycles or pedestrians- the base year output is 38.3% of trips are non-motorized. The scenarios vary between 34.7% and 39%, so even our top performer in that category is 39% where as our base year is 38.3%. We're not seeing drastic changes in a category like that. There are some examples where you are going to see big changes. One of those examples would be vehicle miles traveled. We have ranges on that performance measure from a 3.2% decrease in our top performer to a 14.6% increase for our worst performer so far. That's an almost 18% range which is a pretty significant number when you're talking about millions of vehicle miles travelled over time. Some categories you can see a wide variety of outputs, some categories you're not going to see very many. The darkest green is the top performer in the category, the darkest red is the worst performer in a given category and then there are gradations in between to help guide your eye to where the highest and lowest are across the different scenarios. There's no single scenario that is going to win or lose in every single category. It's going to be a matter of degrees. We will really need to consider what our priorities are and to what degree we're willing to accept some things in order to achieve other things. It will be a matter of tradeoffs as we evaluate our options and really try to consider what's going to be the best. We haven't had this data for very long, you haven't had this data at all, so staff has not drawn any conclusions at this point. We want to hear if you have any thoughts about other projects you think might need to be tested as part of these scenarios, projects that weren't part of the 2035 plan you think we need to consider or things we didn't consider from the 2035 plan that we should put back in. We want to hear from you what other scenarios and projects you think we ought to consider as we move forward and look at the rest of these results. Next Thursday is our tentatively scheduled date to have the consultant install the model in our office and train us in how to actually use it. That will give us the ability to tweak some of these scenarios and add other elements to them as we move forward.

Ruff said in Scenario 3, Section 5 of I69 doesn't get it to Indianapolis. So don't you think the potential for a scenario that connects to Indianapolis is more likely to have a significant effect on the model's output then getting to Martinsville on Section 5? Is there any reason we couldn't model that?

Desmond said we could. The limitation is we don't know where the interchanges and frontage roads are going to be on that road, so we don't know exactly what the access issues are going to be in terms of generating traffic. Right now when we talk about traffic from outside the county we identify where the traffic is going in and out of the county and we have a raw number that we assume is coming in and out at that point. It may be a matter of just tweaking that number.

Ruff said the bedroom community scenario would seem to be somewhat dependent on the completion of Section 6. Otherwise it doesn't really change that much from the current scenario to warrant a project like that compared to the absence of Section 6.

Desmond said that's a good point. I will check with our consultant on how we dealt with Section 6 now that you raised that. But you're right, the access situation will be different with or without Section 6 and that may not make it as desirable to have that sort of a community there.

Ruff asked if this type of modeling been done anywhere else far enough back that they are able to compare predictions generated by the model with measurements of actual changes. Can they look and see how their model predictions compare with what they actually saw 10 years later or 15, 20 years later? Or is the whole approach new enough that that data is not out there?

Desmond said to some extent it's out there. One thing we could do is look back at our outputs from our previous model where we projected to 2030 and we can look at what we thought the issues were going to be and see if that really happened or not, at least through today.

Ruff said this is a more sophisticated model. I'm wondering if there are examples from a model more like this in terms of its level of detail and sophistication that is old enough and was applied far enough back that there's results we can compare, just to see how they worked out. Lastly I know staff has just begun to look at these numbers but as professional transportation planners, was there anything that surprises you to the point of generating some skepticism of any kind or any red flags?

Desmond said he doesn't see anything like that. Something that is sort of jumping out is the land use policy scenario changes have had more impact than the transportation infrastructure changes we modelled. The bedroom community and the infill development scenarios are largely land use policy issues and not transportation investment issues that we would focus on in a plan like this and which are not necessarily in our control as an MPO either. But those are the ones that seem to have the biggest impacts in terms of changes versus the base year and versus the no build scenario. If you look at those, you'll see the infill development has a lot of positive impact in a lot of categories and the bedroom community has more of a negative impact in a lot of categories. They're the most extreme impacts.

Ruff said when you say positive impacts you mean relative to our stated goals and priorities are.

Desmond said relative to our expected performance based on the system as it is now.

Ruff said you're not necessarily surprised by that.

Desmond said not necessarily. For a long time we've understood land use policy has had a pretty profound connection and impact to people's transportation choices. I think that's playing out pretty clearly as we start to look at this date.

McKim said all scenarios except 3 include I69 Section 5 including the permanent closures of other roads associated with I69.

Desmond said that is correct.

McKim would like to see a connection of Industrial Blvd with Whitehall Crossing Blvd and a connection extending Profile Pkwy east across the ABB property to connect in with Gates Dr and then further extending Profile Pkwy south through the ABB property to connect with Jonathan Dr. He would like either a separate scenario or this scenario added to an existing scenario to see if the tool would show any difference related to those three projects.

Martin said since we take on these planning activities at least on a 5 year cycle, not a 10 or 15 year cycle, we aren't going to wait until 2040 to do it again. I'm more interested in the end point 5, 10, 15 years from now from these scenarios than I am in a 2040 end point. I want a way to think about what we're going to do the next time we take a look at this, how we're going to react at that point and how we're going to change what we might be doing at that point. The other one is I noticed you have a base set of projects we're going to do and then you have some selected projects you've added in. They don't all occur at once. If we're looking at scenarios in 5, 10, 15 year increments we can see how the impact of a particular project influences the entire system in a much shorter period of time and how we have to react to that. It may not be that adding a particular project is the right thing to do at that point in time. How can we use the model in a more dynamic way? We don't really do transportation planning 30 years at a time. You may end up with

aberrations that occur in the shorter period of time that get masked when you look at the entire system 35 years out.

Desmond said that's why we look at groupings of years when we do the financial evaluation.

Martin said the model should help us when we start putting in the financial analysis. We would know which projects we would be funding and then we could do the modeling for those projects. It is important for us to use the model in a more dynamic way.

Baker said the 12 scenarios are not stand alone. They are all based on E+C and then add on different projects. Am I correct?

Desmond said there are common elements between all of them. In some scenarios we drop in one change for another.

Baker said when I get down to item 12 and compare that back to 10 I don't understand why 10 seems to be a major change but 12 is a minor change. What is the reason for that? 12 looks almost trivial. We're talking about adding some granny flats in to urban infill. Why would we be looking at that and not at major projects that are happening now in the urban core?

Desmond said the granny flats are just an example of development that might occur in that scenario, not the only type. It's more a percentage of the overall development in the area that is going to occur within the core area. We're not excluding major developments as part of that. It's more of what geographic location is that development happening in. The other scenarios are what we call standard, which is a mix of both infill and greenfield development. In scenario 12, there would be virtually no greenfield development, it would all be concentrated in the core for different types of housing and employment locations.

Baker said he's arguing with the wording in the scenario.

Thompson said in scenario 2 you have a bus rapid transit route. Could we get a scenario done where we have transportation that goes out of the city limits? Even if it's on the 4 or 5 main arteries.

McDaniel said on that note BT has spent some time looking at a bus rapid transit corridor on the 10th St. corridor for a while. Is that something you considered?

Desmond said not at this point, but we could look at that. I think there are some limitations with the 10th St. railroad bridge, but it's certainly an option.

VII. New Business

- a. Functional Classification Changes*: Vince Caristo presented. We brought this item to you in 2013 and continued it at that time. The impetus for this is the 2010 decennial census. After each decennial census the Federal Highway Administration does a complete review of their Federal Functional Classification system. Because the National Highway System and National Truck Network are closely associated with the Federal Functional Classification Networks, INDOT decided to ask MPOs to review all three networks at the same time. Based on feedback we've received from several of you as well as staff members as the City and the County, it is the staff's recommendation to defer considering the Federal Functional Classification network at this time. We need to get more comfortable with what we're proposing. Unless there are any objections with that, we'd like to move forward just with the National Truck Network and the National Highway System today.

Johnson appreciates taking the time to understand the options. We need to have a better understanding and more in-depth information before we can make a good sound decision.

Thompson said it would be really useful if that proposed update list for Federal Functional Classifications, if you could provide a comparison of the last one with the current one. That would be useful as well.

Johnson said if it would be helpful for the policy committee to review the criteria that would be used in awarding those functional classifications prior to staff going through the motions. We would like to know the criteria before you go through all the trouble of doing it.

Caristo said we can send the committees the guidelines and criteria that were prepared by the Federal Highway Administration for Federal Functional Classifications.

Johnson said maybe an accompanying memo that would talk about what kind of leeway and discretion we have outside of the guidelines. I want to know the limits we're bound by.

McDaniel announced Vince served on a bicycle master plan steering committee that IU put together. I wanted to report the study is done and I have delivered it to Vice President Morrison, who seems quite happy with it. We had Scott Robinson help us out with that as well. We wanted to make sure whatever we did at IU coordinated well with the City's plan. Right now it's in Tom Morrison's hands and I believe he's going to present it to the trustees. I hope he does that sometime this fall. Once the trustees approve it, it becomes official IU policy, so it gives a lot more authority. Thank you Vince and Scott for your help on that project. I think it's going to really make a difference.

Caristo said the National Highway System was created in the mid-1990s as a system of high priority routes that are critical to the nation's economic, military and mobility functions. The idea was to find a way to prioritize high priority investments on these roadways that are critical at the federal level. Being designated part of the National Highway System has implications for a roadway. There are implications for design, there are design standards such as 12 foot lanes, there are additional performance reporting requirements. For example bridges are required to have element level bridge inspections which are much more detailed and more costly than otherwise required on routes. There are additional controls on outdoor advertising. Federal law gives state DOTs more authority for selecting projects on NHS routes. That doesn't mean if a local road is included on the NHS system that INDOT would have entire control over projects, but they would have a significant say. After the passage of the last Federal Transportation Bill, Map 21, in 2012, every roadway that was classified as a primary arterial or above in the federal functional classification system was added to the NHS. That included a lot of local roadways across the country. The NHS system that exists today following Map21 includes most major state highways, SR37, SR45, as well as several local roadways within the City of Bloomington, College and Walnut, W. Bloomfield Rd. E 3rd St, Atwater. in the plan we're proposing to forward to INDOT and the Federal Highway Administration we've removed all local roadways that were included with Map 21 and we have removed SR 45 to the southwest on the logic that I69 supplants that roadway. We're proposing to include just the major state highways and interstates in the County. We think this fulfills the intent of the National Highway System from the federal perspective. We have shared this with INDOT and they feel what's proposed here is consistent with what the NHS should be. Today we're looking for your approval either on this network as proposed or with any changes you might have. We'd like to be able to send INDOT a proposed network of some kind.

Ruff said SR 48 on the west side out to the airport, Ivy Tech, is it not included because it's sort of a dead end? It does serve some important facilities.

Caristo said that was our thinking. We were trying to take a federal perspective here. It seems to be on a different scale than SR 37, I69 and SR 45.

Johnson asked why we would preclude them. What benefit do we have by taking them off the list? 48 and 45 specifically.

Caristo said the one thing that would impact us is roadways on the National Highway System would have to pertain to design standards for the NHS which could change in the future. Under INDOT's design manual today, NHS roadways must have at least 11 foot lanes. In some cases 12 foot lanes are required. 10 foot lanes are not allowed although you could request a design exception. I don't know if the particular roadways in question are going to comply with the same design standards whether they are on the NHS or not, but there's the potential for the standards

nationally on the NHS to change that would impact us locally. With a lot of these things there are risk factors. There are changes that could happen in the future that we just don't know about.

Johnson said one of her concerns is ongoing maintenance. If it's not on the list, does it make it easier for INDOT to walk away from it?

Desmond said along with all the additional requirements that are placed on NHS roads, there is no additional funding for those NHS roads. In a lot of ways, INDOT's effort is a less is more effort where can they focus their investments on a more prioritized list of streets versus including many more streets that they just know they are never going to be able to maintain to NHS level. While we might expect them or want to have them live up to a higher standard, they may say there's no way we can afford to do that, we're going to have to prioritize roads to a different way.

Johnson said even more reason to leave 45 and 48 on the list.

Martin said in the memo you say only 20% of counties have responded. If this is a national highway system, us taking an action to determine what's national seems a little bit out of place. We don't even know what our surrounding counties are going to do. I would be looking for direction from INDOT as to what they would consider to be part of the national highway system. I would be very concerned about us removing obligations that the state and federal government might have for the maintenance of those roads or degrading the standards by which they are constructed such that they go from being reasonably safe now to being unsafe. You have to remember it's those state highways that always sit at the top our crash report list. I would be very concerned about us removing an opportunity to get funding to deal with safety problems, like through HSIP funds, that on those roadways. If they're state highways I think they belong in the national system. I would also include 446. 446 is a major tourist destination route for us, as well as a connection down to US 50 and serves that function very well. 45 going up to Lake Lemon and the community up there and moving us off into the northern parts of Brown County. While I understand 45 going down to Bloomfield should not see the traffic there is because of the creation of I69, it is still the alternate when I69 becomes a problem. We know that every interstate from time to time has to be closed because of some kind of accident that occurs. It happens on 69, 65, 465. 45 would be used for interstate commerce under those conditions and we should make sure that the standards we use are standards that apply to roadways that handle interstate commerce. Those are reasons I think to keep these things as part of the NHS.

McKim asked if this is a decision only being made by MPOs or is this a county by county decision. Let's say we decide to keep 45 going to the southwest out of the system, but let's say Greene County decides to include it in the NHS. Does that mean there's a gap in the NHS or does INDOT resolve the county by county gaps?

Caristo said it is our understanding that INDOT is looking to the MPOs for understanding of local nuances they might not know about. What they're most interested in is our feeling on the inclusion of local roadways, the local primary arterials that were automatically added to the NHS after Map21. I think for Federal Highway Administration to approve changes, they're looking for concurrence with INDOT and MPOs and local government so if there's a disagreement in an area, I don't think the change will go through. So, for example, if we propose as an MPO to INDOT to add 446 to the NHS but they don't agree, I don't think it's going to be added.

McClellan said he is not most knowledgeable on the subject but he does believe what was stated is correct. Essentially, stuff like College and Walnut, that's what we're interested in. Do you want that included or do you not? It doesn't add funding, it does add cost when you come to design. If you don't have it on the system it makes it more flexible so you can do with it what you want. I would also add if you ever want to do some Complete Streets or something like that on the routes you have mentioned, being in the NHS will have an impact on that as well. The idea is we want to know what the local MPO would like to see with their roads because there are advantages to having it off the system.

McKim agreed with keeping the local roads off the system.

Johnson said one could interpret what you said to mean that funding for a federally funded project would not be eligible if it comes off this list. So for example, Bloomfield Rd, if it were removed from the list between Walnut and I69, you said it would be cheaper for us to do a project there. Would it be cheaper because we wouldn't have to follow the INDOT guidelines and therefore not be eligible for federal funding?

McClellan said the NHS system of roads has its own specialty requirements. If you use federal dollars, there are still federal requirements, you still have to meet those, but for the NHS there is other stuff you'll see. The main intent is to make sure we can move things like military, that kind of stuff, on these system roads and to make sure that the characteristics on those roads can support that. I think that's the difference.

Johnson said she does want an expert to answer those questions. I really appreciate you doing you best. Those are really important questions that I think we need to have answered.

Desmond said to the best of our understanding the funding is not tied to the NHS designation. It's the functional classification that is primarily tied to the STP funding eligibility. I will confirm that.

McDaniel said it sounds like we're not ready to take action on this today.

Ruff said so there's not a pot of federal money that's reserved for NHS funding.

Caristo said what INDOT and the Federal Highway Administration have told us is "NHS mileage in a state does not affect the total amount of federal funding the state receives nor the distribution of funding among programs. Inclusion of a route on NHS will not provide local governments with additional funding opportunities for newly designated NHS routes." That's what exists today. As I said before there's the potential for federal law to change in the future and that always exists. As it exists today there are no funding implications locally and having additional state highways on the NHS doesn't increase the amount of money that INDOT will have to make improvements. I think that's the best we can offer to that question right now.

Johnson said the one word you used that triggered a thought in my mind is newly designated. As it stands the roads in the map are currently designated so if we took them off and then later decided to put them back on, then they would be newly designated, right?

Caristo said he's thinks she's correct that it refers to routes that are not currently on the system. Right now the local roadways we've been talking about are on the system.

Martin said it's an interesting wording that says it's not going to increase for newly designated roads which means we're getting something designated for the roads we have. That's the other side of that statement. We have this truck route designation which when we discussed it didn't seem to have any impact on anything and yet it's a designation that exists and why wouldn't our truck route designation be the same as our national highway designation? Why would anybody consider them to be a difference on that?

Jay Montelle from the Federal Highway Administration is the freight coordinator for our division office. I came down because MPOs across Indiana are all debating and discussing what they would like to have and INDOT is trying to make this effort to make sure what they provide to us is something that is consistent with what you all would like. We would love to combine the truck network and the national highway system. Unfortunately the federal regulations currently have two separate network designations. There's this National Highway System which Vince mentioned is from 1995 and then there's the National Network for Trucks. Very few people really understand what it's about. When the administrations' latest proposal to Congress came out, it defined the national network as being the National Highway System. As a division office, I would tell you I would like to see the two merged to avoid all of the confusion. When you're on a National Network Route there are restrictions on what kind of controls you can place on that route as a community because that is a national network identified for truck purposes. A lot of communities and a lot of MPOs around Indiana are looking at this national highway system and national network question to stop the confusion and make sure they all understand where we want the trucks to go. That's what

we would like to see because we think it would be easier for all of us. We have been talking to INDOT about the National Highway System. The NHS was designated in 1995 but then in 2012 Congress said let's put every principle arterial on the national highway system. We had all these corridors that we called principle arterials, but they weren't principle arterials from a national or statewide perspective. In their long range planning process we've heard from INDOT staff that they've looked at statewide mobility corridors as their first cut as what are the roads of national significance that they think would rise to the category of NHS road. As far as the approval process, both functional classification changes and changes in National Highway System requests come to the Federal Highway Administration from the state DOT, but we want to see good coordination and cooperation. The federal regulation specifically call out larger Metropolitan Planning Organizations, but we've encouraged INDOT to make sure they're doing it with all metropolitan organizations. There's no current involvement I'm aware of that INDOT has done to see what individual counties would like to see. The regulations only speak to the need to have good coordination between metropolitan areas as well as the state DOT. One offer I would suggest is to have meeting between Federal Highway Administration, INDOT and your MPO to talk about some of these questions about what it means to be on or off the NHS, what are some of the requirements not just on the engineering design standards but as Vince also mentioned some of the other requirements. There is an asset management requirement, which is part of why Federal Highway Administration is very interested in seeing if areas wanted their local roads to be on that national system or not. The asset management plan looks at bridge conditions of all roads in the NHS. There are several communities that are saying they don't want to have a higher element level bridge inspection in order to be on the National Highway System. I'm not sure I'd put it on policy committee time because the conversations have been very helpful. We've done it with Indianapolis MPO already, we went to Northwest Indiana. We've had counties coming asking if they are not on the NHS or if they are not considered principle arterial will they lose funding for the projects they have designated. The answer is no. There are all kinds of scenarios you might have. I would offer up that kind of technical assistance opportunity where we can sit down together and go over these in a little more detail. That might be helpful before you make a final decision.

McDaniel asked how long it would take to set something like that up and when do we need to ask on this.

Montelle said next week would not be good, but 2 or 3 weeks. I will have to check with Eric Rader at INDOT. He's presented some of the background information.

Martin asked how long the session would be.

Montelle said they did a session for 2 days with Indianapolis. I would say let's see how one afternoon goes and if we want more time we can schedule additional time later. Sometimes things are very simple and we can give you information in advance. This way every one of you will understand more what kind of questions you have about how this decision may impact you.

Caristo said it's his understanding we're in the same position as a lot of MPOs across the state. I don't think there's an immediate urgency.

McDaniel said so we can afford to wait and set something like this up. Why don't we do that. We'll postpone action on this for now until we can have a chance to get together.

Montelle said I'll go ahead and talk to Mr. Rader and set something up. We'll work with Vince on staff.

- b. **Transportation Improvement Program Amendments***: Desmond said we have a couple of Transportation Improvement Program amendments. If you recall from the adoption of the FY '16-'19 TIP earlier this spring there was still a significant amount of HSIP as well as TAP funding left over that we did not have programmed to any specific project. There was funding available in FY '16 for HSIP, in '18 for HSIP and then in '19 for TAP and HSIP. We did a secondary call for projects specifically for those sources of funding. We received 2 applications which are under consideration today. Both of those applications are for FY '16 HSIP funding. We did not receive any applications for '18 or '19. We're not going to keep doing calls for projects over and over again. We're just going

to keep our LPAs aware that funding is out there and it's a use it or lose it situation so the sooner they can get an application to us and get it approved, the sooner they can have access to that money so we don't lose it.

One of the requests today is from the City for \$202,500 to fund a city-wide signal retiming project. It would do a study of all our signal timings and come to a more cohesive signal timing system that would better manage traffic speeds and flow throughout the city as well as provide better gaps for pedestrians when they're crossing those busy streets. We think that would be a great benefit to city traffic users of various modes. The County has requested \$239,913 for 2 HAWK pedestrian signals. Those are the signals where you push the button, it flashes red and then goes solid red for traffic to stop, allow the pedestrians and bicycles to cross, and then will resume to normal traffic flow. The 2 signals requested are for placement along the Karst Farm Trail Phase I that was recently opened, one at Endwright Road and one at Gifford Rd. The two requests total up to just under the amount available for FY '16 so we don't have any conflict. They are both fundable in '16 and they are both eligible under the low-cost systematic side of the HSIP eligibility system so there's not worries in terms of submitting those for final eligibility up at INDOT. In fact, there are so few worries, that both projects are actually getting started with their design phase right now in the INDOT project system because we're confident these things are going to go through. We can't afford to lose any time if we want to get those funded this fiscal year. Both the TAC and the CAC unanimously supported both these projects at their last meeting. We would request you do so today so we can move forward.

McKim said we already have one HAWK signal on the Karst Farm Greenway at Vernal Pike and Losch Rd. and we definitely appreciate the MPO's support for this application for the 2 additional HAWK signals.

Floor was opened for public comment. There was none.

**Martin moved to approve the TIP amendment. McKim seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

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

- a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas: None at this time.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – September 23, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – September 23, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – October 16, 2015 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 _____ (EJEA).