BLOOMINGTON • MONROE COUNTY
mpo

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 22, 2009
6:30 – 8:00 p.m.
McCloskey Room (#135)

Suggested Time:

6:30 PM I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes:
A. March 25, 2009

III. Communications from the Chair

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees

6:45 PM V. Reports from the MPO Staff
A. 10th Street Campus Mobility Study
B. FY 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program Development
C. FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program Development

VI. Old Business
A. Long Range Vision Statement/Project Prioritization Discussion

7:30 PM VII. New Business
A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment
1. INDOT - SR 48 pavement preservation from SR37 to Curry Pike *(Recommendation Requested)*
2. INDOT – SR 45/46 Bypass from Curry Pike to Pete Ellis Dr. (*Recommendation Requested)*
B. Ball State Student Study Discussion
C. Safe Routes to Schools applications (*Recommendation Requested*)
D. Transportation Enhancement Process (*Recommendation Requested*)

VIII. Communications from Committee Members *(non-agenda items)*
A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas

IX. Upcoming Meetings
A. Policy Committee – May 8, 2009 at 1:30pm (McCloskey Room)
B. Technical Advisory Committee – May 27, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
C. Citizens Advisory Committee – May 27, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

8:00 PM Adjournment

401 N. Morton Street ▪ Suite 160 ▪ PO Box 100 ▪ Bloomington, IN 47402 ▪ Web: www.bloomington.in.gov/mpo
Ph: (812) 349-3423 ▪ Fx: (812) 349-3535 ▪ Email: mpo@bloomington.in.gov

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Citizens Advisory Committee

DRAFT Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
March 25, 2009 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Audio recordings from the meeting are available in the Planning Department for full reference.

Attendance

Citizens Advisory Committee (Voting Members): Chair Jack Baker (McDoel Gardens NA), Vice-Chair Patrick Murray (Prospect Hill NA), Sarah Ryterband (Prospect Hill NA), Ted Miller (Citizen), Elizabeth Cox-Ash (McDoel Gardens NA), David Walter (6th & Ritter NA), and Natalie Wrubel (League of Women Voters).

Others In Attendance (including Non-Voting CAC Members): Joanne Henriot (Bryan Park NA), Randy G. Paul (Council on Community Accessibility), Anderson Bruce M. (Citizen), Caitlin Milburn (Citizen), Scott Robinson (BMCMCO Staff), and Raymond Hess (BMCMPO Staff).

I. Call to Order (~6:39 PM)

II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the February 25, 2009 meeting were accepted by the CAC with one correction.

III. Communications from the Chair

Mr. Baker reported that the Policy Committee did not approve the INDOT TIP amendment request for property acquisition at SR 37 and Tapp Road. He said that after committee discussion and with additional information available at the meeting he changed the CAC's original recommendation that supported this TIP request to not supporting this request and was comfortable that this change was in the best interest of the CAC's position on I-69. Other CAC members concurred with Mr. Baker's comments. Discussion continued about the possible repercussions by this action because the TIP is not consistent with the State's TIP (INSTIP). Mr. Baker then reported that the remaining TIP amendment requests passed as recommend by the CAC.

IV. Reports from the Officers and/or Committees – There were no reports.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

Mr. Robinson mentioned there is a public presentation on the final recommendations for the South Rogers Street Identity Study on Wednesday, March 8th.

VI. Old Business

A. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Projects Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

Mr. Hess provided a detailed overview of the ARRA requests from Monroe County, the City of Bloomington, and the Town of Ellettsville. He highlighted changes that have occurred since the last CAC meeting as well as clarified changes that have occurred since the meeting packet was distributed. Mr. Hess explained that staff would like the CAC to prioritize the ARRA requests since the total requests ($4,069,911.00) exceed the total ARRA funding available

($3,057,822.00). Staff is seeking a recommendation from the CAC on which projects should receive ARRA funding. Ms. Ryterband asked if the Heritage Trail was shovel ready and Mr. Hess said BMCMPO staff has concerns regarding the current readiness of this project. There was some discussion about the fiscal aspects of which project to remove. Mr. Baker asked everyone to give their top picks so he could arrive at a motion for a recommendation. He also asked for everyone to give their least preferable project. Discussion ensued with each participant providing their project priorities to the Chair. Mr. Hess and Mr. Robinson answered various questions regarding the ARRA requests during this discussion and also discussed the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation. Mr. Baker suggested the following projects receive ARRA funds (in order of preference): the sidewalk restoration project (City of Bloomington), the Jackson Creek Trail project (City of Bloomington), the traffic signal modification project (City of Bloomington), and the remaining bridge deck overlay and pavement preservation projects (Monroe County, City of Bloomington, Town of Ellettsville – to be combined as one and funded accordingly with any remaining ARRA funds). Ms. Ryterband made the motion (as suggested by Mr. Baker), and Mrs. Cox-Ash seconded, with no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Long Range Vision Statement/Project Prioritization Discussion
Mr. Baker suggested that because of time, the CAC table this discussion until the April meeting and that everyone read the material provided by staff in the meeting packet so we all are prepared. There were no concerns with this suggestion. Ms. Ryterband made a motion to extend the meeting past 8:00 PM, Mr. Miller seconded. Discussion ensured about technical questions related to the funding charts provided in the meeting packet. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. New Business
A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments
Mr. Hess provided a detailed summary for the Bloomington Transit TIP amendment request for additional operation funding. Ms. Ryterband made a motion to recommend support for the request, and Mrs. Cox-Ash seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Ball State Student Study Discussion
Mr. Baker talked about the history of this program. Mr. Hess showcased the internet site where the two CAC projects are posted for Ball State to review and to possibly accept as a future project. Mr. Baker asked that everyone suggest other project ideas to submit to this Ball State program. The one idea he likes is a gateway project for College/Walnut Street around Seminary Square to better integrate the park. Mr. Baker asked staff to confirm if the current projects listed on the Ball State website are still up for consideration or if we need to resubmit them again. He also asked everyone to send him their ideas.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members
A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas – no suggestions**.**

Ms. Ryterband announced that there is a public meeting at Binford-Rogers Elementary School next Monday (March 30th) to talk about the bus and parent pull off proposal which she thinks will impact the Safe Routes to School Program.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

A. Policy Committee (special meeting) – April 3, 2009 at 1:30pm (McCloskey Room)
B. Technical Advisory Committee – April 22, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
C. Citizens Advisory Committee – April 22, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

Adjournment (~8:20 PM)

These minutes were _____ by the CAC at their regular meeting held on April 22, 2009.
(staff initials:_____ 4/22/2009)

MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Members

From: Raymond Hess, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner

Date: March 18, 2009

Re: Long Range Vision Statement/Project Prioritization Discussion

---

Background
In June 2008, a member requested that the Citizens Advisory Committee consider a scoring or rating system to evaluate individual projects, especially against the Long Range Transportation Plan Vision Statement and the recently adopted Complete Streets Policy. Copies of the Long Range Transportation Plan Vision Statement were distributed at subsequent meetings. Additoinally, examples of how other communities prioritize projects were distributed in November 2008 and are available in full online (at http://bloomington.in.gov/media/media/application/pdf/4430.pdf). Staff has been asked to synthesize this information in a more compact form.

Transportation Vision Statement *(short version)*
The Long Range Transportation Plan identifies the following needs:

- Develop a truly multi-modal system;
- Create a fully developed network of alternative transportation facilities;
- Reduce the number and length of auto trips;
- Achieve a better relationship between land uses to reduce auto dependency;
- Achieve the widest possible range of alternatives to the automobile;
- Make transportation investments that are consistent with comprehensive plans;
- Make transportation investments that protect the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life;
- Increase safety for all users of the transportation system;
- Support economic vitality through strategic transportation investments;
- Improve the movement of goods through the transportation system;
- Promote fiscally sound transportation investments and maximize financial resources; and
- Preserve existing transportation investments through operational improvements.

NOTE: The following three prioritization synopses from other MPOs do not necessarily include all project types. A sampling is provided merely to illustrate the methodology employed by these MPOs.

Saginaw Metropolitan Area Transportation Study
The Saginaw (MI) MPO ranks projects in the TIP as follows:

- Eligibility: Projects must be on the National Functional Classification Map and in the Long Range Transportation Plan or recommended by staff or the TAC
- Categories: Projects are identified as Capacity Improvement, Preservation and Rehabilitation, Intersection Improvement, Bicycle Project, or Pedestrian Project/ADA ramps. The MPO allocates a certain percentage of available funds to each of these project categories.
- Scoring: Each project is scored using the following criteria (out of a total of 200 pts)
    - *Road Capacity* (40 pts) - traffic count weighed against the capacity of the road

- *Road Safety* (40 pts) - normalized crash rate, shoulder design, presence of sidewalks, ADA compliance
- *Inter-modal Connection & Economic Development* (30 pts) - access to either air, water ports, highway, or rail within one mile radius; and improved passenger access to intercity bus, intracity bus, air, highway, passenger rail, or water ports
- *Project Readiness* (40 pts) - status of right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation, allocation of local funds, and engineering/environmental assessment
- *Land Use Suitability* (20 pts) - local jurisdiction support; and improved access to public, commercial, residential, or industrial uses within .5 miles
- *Congestion Management & Resource Conservation* (20 pts) - supports Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) or Access Management; and includes bike trails, hiking trails, or landscape elements
- *Extra Project Benefits* (10 pts) - any extra benefits not already identified

Portland Metro Area

The Portland (OR) MPO ranks projects in the TIP as follows:

- Land Use: the primary goal is to leverage economic development in priority land use areas (mixed use areas, industrial areas, among others).
- Other Objectives:
  - Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue;
  - Complete gaps in modal systems
  - Develop a multi-modal transportation system
  - Meet State requirements (for air quality) and provide bike/ped facilities
- Project Categorization and Scoring: Projects are generally scored on four basic principals: Modal Performance; Safety; Land Use Objectives; and Cost Effectiveness
  - *Bicycle Evaluation*
    - Modal Performance (25 pts) – ridership; population and employment; and connectivity
    - Safety (20 pts) – vehicular speed and volume; safety elements
    - Land Use (40 pts) – new bike trips serve identified priority land uses; economic and community development
    - Cost Effectiveness (15 pts) – cost vs. ridership; cost vs. linear mile
  - *Boulevard Evaluation*
    - Modal Performance (25 pts) – reduction of vehicular speeds; optimum sidewalk width, bike/ped/transit enhancements
    - Safety (20 pts) – safety problem correction; reduction in potential hazards to walking/biking/transit use
    - Land Use Objectives (40 pts) – location in priority land uses; regional design hierarchy; and economic and community development
    - Cost Effectiveness (15 pts) – cost vs effectiveness;
    - Green Street Bonus (10 pts) – street trees; green street design
  - *Freight Evaluation*
    - Modal Performance (25 pts) – time travel reliability; improvements to freight network
    - Safety (20 pts) – technical panel assessment of project; upgrade to bike/ped facilities
    - Land Use Objectives (40 pts) – location in and improvement to priority land uses; economic and community development

        - Cost Effectiveness (15 pts) – reduction in VMT and travel time; benefits multiple freight modes (air, marine, pipeline, rail, truck)
    - *Green Street Retrofit*
        - Modal Performance (55 pts) – removal of storm water runoff from sewer system; tree preservation/plantings; impervious surface; infiltration devices
        - Safety (20 pts) - technical panel assessment of project; upgrade to bike/ped facilities
        - Land Use (10 pts) – location in a priority land use
        - Cost Effectiveness (15 pts) - amount of project infiltrated vs. cost
    - *Pedestrian Evaluation*
        - Modal Performance (25 pts) – location in high pedestrian activity area; upgrade to pedestrian facilities resulting in new pedestrian trips.
        - Safety (20 pts) – addresses a documented safety problem; project location currently deters walking;
        - Land Use (20 pts) – location in priority land use; economic and community development
        - Cost Effectiveness (15 pts) – mobility at a reasonable cost
    - *Road and Bridge Capacity Projects*
        - Modal Performance (25 pts) – level of congestion; connectivity and inclusion of ITS
        - Safety (20 pts) – a technical panel will evaluate the normalized crash rate, sight lines, roadway design, and the projects ability to address safety issues; upgrade to bike/ped facilities
        - Land Use (40 pts) – project provide access to priority land use destinations; economic development
        - Cost Effectiveness – cost vs vehicle hour of delay eliminated
        - Bonus – project is on a transit route or removes barriers to freight; project incorporates green street principles
    - *Transit Oriented Development Evaluation*
        - Modal Performance (25 pts) – increase in transit/bike/ped trips;
        - Density (20 pts) – increase in density (residential or employment)
        - Land Use (40 pts) – location in land use priority area; economic and community development
        - Cost Effectiveness (15 pts) – cost per VMT reduced
    - *Transit Start-up Evaluation*
        - Increased Ridership (25 pts) – new boardings
        - Safety (20 pts) – proximity (1/4 mi) to general population and transit dependent populations
        - Land Use (40 pts) – access to centers, central city, and mixed use developments; economic and community development
        - Cost Effectiveness (15 pts) – cost vs new boardings

Denver Regional Council of Governments

The Denver (CO) MPO ranks projects in the TIP as follows:

- Eligibility – projects must be identified in the Long Range Transportation Plan
- Limitations – the number of project submittals by a local public agency (LPA) is limited by population

- Funding targets – proportional allocation to each project type is identified (Roadway capacity, Roadway operational improvements, Roadway reconstruction, Studies, Transit Capacity Projects, Transportation Enhancement Activities)
  - *Roadway Capacity*
    - Current Congestion (12 pts) – volume/capacity ratios
    - Safety (5 pts) – crash reduction
    - Cost Effectiveness (10 pts) – cost per person-of-miles-traveled
    - Condition of major structure (5 pts) – bridge sufficiency rating
    - Long Range Plan Score (15 pts) – Long range plan assigns scores to all projects
    - Transportation System Management (5 pts) – provision of median barriers, access control, left turn lanes at signalized intersections, signal interconnection, ITS infrastructure, or an approved incident management plan project
    - Multimodal connectivity (10 pts) – provision of future transit facilities; other transit amenities; bike amenities; pedestrian amenities
    - Overmatch (12 pts) – providing more local mach than is required
    - Project related vision implementation and Strategic Corridors (12 pts) – implementation of and proximity to strategic corridors (airport; urban centers; and strategic highway corridors)
    - Sponsor-related vision implementation (14 pts) – this vision identifies priority areas: preserve open space; develop urban centers; increase population density; enter into a revenue sharing agreement; establish an urban reserve planning area; adopt senior-friendly development policies; implement affordable housing; establish a stormwater utility; establish alternative mode plans and connections; sign the mile high compact, reduce air pollution.
  - *New Bus Service Projects*
    - Usage (16 pts) – projected daily boardings
    - Cost Effectiveness (16 pts) – subsidy per passenger
    - Usage Support Programs (8 pts) – marketing, pedestrian access, transit service cost reduction (employer offered benefits)
    - Long Term Funding (14 pts) – demonstration of funding support for 5 years
    - Connectivity (8 pts) – fills a service gap, new connection to park & ride and existing transit routes
    - Overmatch (12 pts) - providing more local mach than is required
    - Project related vision implementation and Strategic Corridors (12 pts) – implementation of and proximity to strategic corridors (airport; urban centers; and strategic highway corridors)
    - Sponsor-related vision implementation (14 pts) – this vision identifies priority areas: preserve open space; develop urban centers; increase population density; enter into a revenue sharing agreement; establish an urban reserve planning area; adopt senior-friendly development policies; implement affordable housing; establish a stormwater utility; establish alternative mode plans and connections; sign the mile high compact, reduce air pollution.
  - *Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects*
    - Priority Corridors (4 pts) – provision of priority facilities or facilities along priority corridors
    - Safety (12 pts) – relevant crash history data, vehicular speed, lighting
    - Connectivity (18 pts) – closing an existing gap in the bike/ped network; provides direct access to employment centers or other destinations; eliminates a bike/ped barrier; provides new access to transit

- Multiple Enhancement (4 pts) – bidirectional use by bikes & peds; provision of bike lockers/racks; acquisition of scenic easements; conversion of a rails to trails
- Usage (12 pts) – estimated user base within a 1.5 mile radius of a bike project or .5 mile radius of a ped project.
- Cost Effectiveness (12 pts) – cost per user base
- Overmatch (12 pts) – providing more local mach than is required
- Project related vision implementation and Strategic Corridors (12 pts) – implementation of and proximity to strategic corridors (airport; urban centers; and strategic highway corridors)
- Sponsor-related vision implementation (14 pts) – this vision identifies priority areas: preserve open space; develop urban centers; increase population density; enter into a revenue sharing agreement; establish an urban reserve planning area; adopt senior-friendly development policies; implement affordable housing; establish a stormwater utility; establish alternative mode plans and connections; sign the mile high compact, reduce air pollution.

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization

MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Citizens Advisory Committee Members

From: Raymond Hess, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner

Date: April 15, 2009

Re: Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

Indiana Department of Transportation – State Road 48 Pavement Preservation from SR 37 to Curry Pike

The Indiana Department of Transportation has requested that the BMCMPO amend the Transportation Improvement Program to add a pavement preservation project (resurfacing) to the FY 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program. The project will use American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. This project is in the urbanized area. INDOT requests the TIP be amended to include the following project:

State of Indiana Projects		Funding Source	2009	2010	2011	2012
Project:	**State Road 48**	PE STP				
Location:	Curry Pike to 800' east of SR 37	PE State				
Description:	Preventive Maintenance	ROW STP				
		ROW State				
		CON ARRA	$ 534,251			
DES#:	0600605					
Support:	Pavement Preservation					
Allied Projects:	n/a	**TOTAL**	$ 534,251	$ -	$ -	$ -

Indiana Department of Transportation – State Road 45/46 Bypass Project

The Indiana Department of Transportation has requested that the BMCMPO amend the Transportation Improvement Program to update project costs and funding sources for the State Road 45/46 Bypass Project (added capacity). This project is in the urbanized area. INDOT requests the TIP be amended to update the following project:

State of Indiana Projects		Funding Source	2009	2010	2011	2012
Project:	**State Road 45/46 Bypass**	PE STP				
Location:	Kinser Pike to Pete Ellis Dr.	PE State				
Description:	Added travel lanes, including 2 bridges, signals, sidepaths, pedestrian underpass. DES. #'s: 0300585, 9010075, 9611470, (~2.80 miles)	ROW STP				
		ROW State				
		CON STP	~~$ 18,601,574~~			
DES#:	(see Description above)	CON State	~~$ 4,650,394~~			
Support:	Expansion/Major Improvements	CON ARRA	$ 36,000,000			
Allied Projects:	State Road 45 projects	**TOTAL**	$ 36,000,000	$ -	$ -	

Requested Action

The Citizens Advisory Committee is requested to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on INDOT's TIP amendments.

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization

MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Committee Members

From: Scott Robinson, AICP
Long Range/Transportation Manager

Date: April 14, 2009

Re: Local Transportation Enhancement Program (TE)

Background

Last year Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) changed the administrative aspects to, and the grant awarding process for, the popular state-wide Transportation Enhancement (TE) grant program. Now, the Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMCMPO), like the other thirteen MPO's in Indiana, will need to administer and award an annual allocation of TE funds. BMCMPO staff anticipates our annual TE allocation to be around $280,000 (based on a formulaic calculation). These funds must be used for eligible TE projects/activities within the urbanized area and as part of this transition from a state to local administrative process, the MPO's must establish a permanent local process to review and award local TE grants.

Included in this committee packet for review is a working draft of the BMCMPO Local Transportation Enhancement Program. BMCMPO staff has coordinated with representatives from our member Local Public Agencies (LPA) on key aspects to developing a local TE program. This program must also meet the general guidelines established by INDOT, which was previously detailed in a memo to the BMCMPO committees this past September.

Requested Action

The Advisory Committees are requested to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on the draft Transportation Enhancement Program guidelines.

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization

LOCAL TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Transportation Enhancement Information Packet

February 4, 2009

BLOOMINGTON • MONROE COUNTY
mpo

INTRODUCTION:

The Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMCMPO) is now responsible to review and award eligible Transportation Enhancement (TE) grant applications that fall within the BMCMPO urbanized area. Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) will provide technical assistance and review to ensure that any submitted TE application meets federal requirements and are activities eligible to receive TE funding (compliance review). INDOT will also continue to administer TE funds and all subsequent project management aspects (e.g. engineering design reviews, contract bids, contract awards, etc.) once the BMCMPO has awarded TE funds to a Local Public Agency (LPA).

Under this local TE administrative system the BMCMPO will issue an annual call for projects to closely coincide with INDOTs state-wide program and call for projects (e.g. for non-MPO areas). All LPA members of the BMCMPO will be appropriately notified of any pertinent dates and deadlines associated with the TE program. The reason for running the local and INDOT calls for projects concurrently is twofold. First, INDOT requires their application to be used and submitted to INDOT electronically for their compliance review. Second, this will help to ensure that the BMCMPO uses the current and most up to date application issued by INDOT.

This information packet contains general information about the Local TE Program which is a process used to select and award TE grants within the urbanized area of the BMCMPO. The packet also contains important reference material that will be needed by an LPA to submit a TE application.

SELECTION COMMITTEE:

A TE Selection Committee will be formed after the deadline for applications has passed (usually two months after the call for projects is issued). The TE Selection Committee is responsible to review and score all applications received during the respective call for projects and to provide their recommendation to the BMCMPO committees. At a minimum, the TE Selection Committee shall be comprised of at least one member from each of the BMCMPO committees: the Policy Committee (PC), the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Members that are chosen to serve on the TE Selection Committee can do so provided the following conditions are met:

- A significant organizational or personal conflict of interest does not exist with a member to any application submitted for review;
- The member is in good standing with the BMCMPO;
- The member is nominated by their respective BMCMPO committee to serve on the TE Selection Committee; and
- The member understands that in a good faith pledge their role is to serve in the best interest of the BMCMPO community and not to any subordinate agency, group, or association where a perceived or real advantage may come to being through their association by serving this committee.

In addition to the BMCMPO members serving on the TE Selection Committee, up to three at-large members may also be selected to serve on the TE Selection Committee if the MPO staff finds the composition of the committee could benefit from additional expertise outside the existing BMCMPO membership. These at-large members may be asked to serve by the MPO staff provided the following conditions are met:

- The individual resides within the BMCMPO urbanized area;
- The individual shall disclose in writing that a conflict of interest does not exist with any application submitted; and
- At least one of the at large members is associated with one of the following organizations: Bloomington and Monroe County Visitors Bureau, Downtown Bloomington Inc., Bloomington

401 N. Morton Street ▪ Suite 160 ▪ PO Box 100 ▪ Bloomington, IN 47402 ▪ Ph: (812) 349-3423 ▪ Fx: (812) 349-3535
www.bloomington.in.gov/mpo ▪ mpo@bloomington.in.gov

Bicycle Club; Indiana Department of Natural Resource; Council of Neighborhood Association, a local bicycle or pedestrian advocacy or safety group, a local historic preservation group (HPC, Monroe County Historical Society), a landscape architect, Indiana Department of Environmental Management, and Indiana Department of Transportation.

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA, REVIEW, AND AWARD PROCESS:

The TE Selection Committee shall review all applications and score them on a 100 point system as prescribed by INDOT's methodology. This scoring system is comprised of two components. One is a general score that evaluates the level of: public participation/local support, maintenance, connection to existing plans, benefit/need/quality of proposal, relation to surface transportation, assurance of local match, supplemental funding, and early coordination/consultation. The general score has a maximum of 50 points. The other component is specific to the type of TE activity for which the project is seeking funding (see Eligible Activities for the types). This component also has a maximum of 50 points. The BMCMPO may implement a different prioritization system in the future; however currently all TE activities are considered equal and thus no additional selection criteria is needed to further consider local priorities. The merits of each application and its corresponding TE activity will be evaluated with no predetermined local priorities which would favor one TE activity over another TE activity.

Each TE Selection Committee member will be responsible to review and evaluate the submitted TE application(s). Each application/project shall be scored as described above by each TE Selection Committee member. Once the applications have been scored by the committee, the average of their respective scores will determine the rank order of the applications. In addition to the scoring and subsequent rank order of the applications, the TE Selection Committee members will also make funding recommendations based upon the estimated amount of available TE funds, the respective rank score, and the relative application funding request for each application/project. The TE Selection Committee shall not recommend partial awards.

The results of the TE Selection Committee review will be their recommendation for which application(s) to award and how much TE funding the application(s) should receive. Their recommendations then will be sent to the CAC and TAC for their consideration and subsequent recommendation. The PC will finally consider all these recommendations and make the final determination any TE awards.

ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:

Eligible activities to be considered for TE awards are promulgated by the Federal Highway Administration. Generally these activities are described as follows:

- Provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles;
- Provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicycles;
- Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites;
- Scenic or historic highway programs;
- Landscaping and other scenic beautification;
- Historic preservation;
- Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities;
- Preservation of abandoned railway corridors;
- Inventory, control, and removal of outdoor advertising;
- Archaeological planning and research;
- Environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff or reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity; and
- Establishment of transportation museums.

LIMITATIONS:

TE grant awards are based upon a grant formula where no more than 80% of the eligible costs will be reimbursed; which in turn requires a minimum of a 20% local match to be paid by the applicant. The BMCMPO will get estimated amounts to award annually for the local TE program. Because of the popularity of the program and the time generally associated with design, ROW, and construction, INDOT is currently awarding TE funds several years in advance of when the funds will actually be available to disperse. The BMCMPO will have the ability to rollover or bank any previous TE funds allocated to the local TE program that were not awarded. These funds can be used any subsequent year or TE grant award cycle in addition to the annual allocation. For the most current estimate available for the local TE Program, contact the BMCMPO staff. Generally the BMCMPO will receive approximately $280,000 annually. This amount is subject to change and is only an estimate to give LPAs an idea on the amount of funding typically available per each call for projects. The following are guidelines and limitations to the Local TE Program:

- No limitation on the number of applications an LPA can submit for consideration;
- New projects, components of existing projects, and multiple phased projects are eligible;
- Application requests cannot exceed the estimated amount of TE funds available, and are capped at $1,000,000 under any scenario.

APPLICATION:

All TE project applications must be submitted by a Local Public Agency (a unit of government with authority to levy taxes) and by the deadline established by the call for projects. The application must follow INDOT guidelines as detailed in their information and application packet (see the resources listed below for additional information). Generally the following conditions apply:

- Limit each application's scope to one single project;
- Limit each application to a total of 35 pages in length;
- Include additional information pages, maps, pictures, letters of commitment/public support etc.;
- Include a detailed budget for your total project with itemized cost estimates;
- Include a signature page signed by the highest local elected official;
- An electronic copy of the application (not to exceed 5 MB in size) must be submitted to the BMCMPO and to the Seymour District Local Programs Coordinator; and
- Re-submissions for future cycles will be accepted; however, the application must be updated and meet any new guidance or requirements.

These application requirements may change from time to time and it is recommended that applicants follow INDOT's most current application requirements to avoid any review delays or compliance issues.

RESOURCES:

The following list provides pertinent information related to various aspects of the TE program and materials needed to submit an application to the BMCMPO:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Final TE Guidance http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/te/1999guidance.htm
- INDOT TE Program Guide, application, and state information http://www.in.gov/indot/2988.htm
- TE project evaluation form, score sheets and other BMCMPO information http://bloomington.in.gov/sections/viewSection.php?section_id=191