



CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 28, 2010

6:30 – 8:00 p.m.

McCloskey Room (#135)

Suggested Time:

- 6:30 PM I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes:
A. March 24, 2010
- III. Communications from the Chair
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
A. Performance Based Vision Score Prioritization
B. ADA and Accessibility
- 6:45 PM V. Reports from the MPO Staff
A. 10th Street Mobility Study
B. 2008 Crash Report
- 7:00 PM VI. Old Business
A. Long Range Transportation Plan Readoption
Recommendation Requested
- 7:30 PM VII. New Business
A. FY 2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment
Recommendation Requested
B. FY 2010-2011 Unified Planning Work Program outline
- VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)
A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas
- IX. Upcoming Meetings
A. Policy Committee – May 14, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
B. Technical Advisory Committee – May 26, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
C. Citizens Advisory Committee – May 26, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- 8:00 PM Adjournment

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Citizens Advisory Committee

Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
March 24, 2010 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 reference.

Attendance

Citizens Advisory Committee (Voting Members): Chair Patrick Murray (Prospect Hill NA), Vice-Chair Laurel Cornell (Prospect Hill NA), Jack Baker (McDoel Gardens NA), Sarah Ryterband (Prospect Hill NA), Elizabeth Cox-Ash (McDoel Gardens NA), Bill Milroy (Old Northeast NA), Joanne Henriot (Bryan Park NA), David Walter (6th & Ritter NA), and Natalie Wrubel (League of Women Voters).

Others In Attendance (including Non-Voting CAC Members): Barbara Salisbury (SICIL), Paul Ash (McDoel Garden NA), Larry Jacobs (Chamber of Commerce), Raymond Hess (BMCMPPO staff), and Scott Robinson (BMCMPPO staff).

I. Call to Order (~6:30 PM)

II. Approval of Minutes - The February 24, 2010 meeting minutes were accepted.

III. Communications from the Chair – At the Policy Committee, Mr. Murray asked Jim Stark of INDOT about the lack of audible signals on the SR45/46 Bypass project. Mr. Murray conveyed what Mr. Stark said: the State is testing different types of pedestrian audible signals, they should have an approved model by the end of the year, and INDOT was confident that these pedestrian audible signals would be installed at 3rd St. and 10th St. intersections towards the end of the Bypass construction. Mr. Murray suggested the CAC continue to monitor the situation and Mr. Robinson asked the CAC to remind staff to follow-up with INDOT on this issue later in the year. Ms. Salisbury has tried to get a hold of Ed Cox (INDOT) to discuss some of the specifics about warrants and specifics about the signals but has been unable to get a hold of him. On a related note, Mr. Murray suggested that the CAC form a new subcommittee to work on ADA and Accessibility issues as it pertains to MPO projects. The subcommittee could be charged with monitoring INDOT's progress to incorporate audible pedestrian signals on the Bypass project. Ms. Salisbury, Mr. Murray, Mr. Walter, and Mr. Milroy volunteered to serve on the subcommittee. It was also suggested that Mr. Paul and Mr. Kehrberg may be interested in this subcommittee based upon their previous interest on the subject.

Ms. Ryterband observed at the last Policy Committee that Mr. Stark was unable to answer how INDOT selects and prioritizes road projects to implement. She asked Mr. Murray if he could offer any insight on INDOT's process to select projects and if citizens have access to this process. Mr. Hess explained that MPO staff tries to relay information to the Committees when INDOT documents are open to public comment. He mentioned that INDOT is updating the State's Long Range Transportation Plan and that a public comment period should take place before adoption. Ms. Ryterband asked about the status of the 2010-2013 TIP. Mr. Hess answered that the State approved the TIP after the last Policy Committee meeting. Mr. Milroy stated that questions of accountability exist between the administrative and legislative branches of the State government.

IV. Reports from the Officers and/or Committees

A. Performance Based Vision Score – Mr. Robinson explained a draft scoring system was developed. The subcommittee will reconvene soon to review the draft and hopefully present something at the next meeting. Ms. Cox-Ash stated she is confident the scoring system will help build consensus among CAC members on how to evaluate projects.

B. Bicycle and Pedestrian Identification Subcommittee – Ms. Ryterband stated the group has not yet met.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

A. 10th Street Mobility Study – Mr. Hess stated that a public presentation was held on March 11th to convey the final findings of the study. The study ultimately recommended the creation of a new two-way east-west road along Law Lane and 14th St. as the preferred alternative. This alternative best accommodates all modes of transportation. Mr. Hess said the final document should be available by April and the committees will be notified when it is available for download. Mr. Milroy asked how the intersection of Law and 10th by the railroad overpass will be addressed. Mr. Hess stated the study does not get into specific design details and recommendation since it was a feasibility study. Ms. Salisbury and Ms. Ryterband expressed concerns about roundabouts and pedestrian and bicycle safety. Mr. Milroy asked about the University's plans at 10th and the Bypass. Mr. Murray mentioned that a new building will be built at the northeast corner of this intersection and this area is identified to be part of a technology park.

Mr. Milroy mentioned that the City Planning Commission will review a 34 unit multi-family unit at the corner of 10th St. and N. Walnut St.

Mr. Hess announced that the City of Bloomington will hold a public meeting on March 31st at 5-7pm in Council Chambers to discuss improvements to the Monroe St./17th St./Arlington Rd. intersection. Mr. Hess will email the announcement to the MPO committees.

VI. Old Business

A. Long Range Transportation Plan and Travel Demand Model Update – Mr. Hess explained why the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) must be updated before March 2011. The Travel Demand Model (Model) is a key input into the LRTP. It forecasts congestion based upon population, land use, travel patterns, and anticipated improvements to the road network. The MPO's model was developed by a consultant and does not directly account for transit, bicycles, or pedestrians. Staff is interested in improving the model to include alternative forms of transportation and providing a stronger link to land use, as has been suggested by Mr. Brown. However, staff feels this would be better accomplished at a later date for the following reasons: no local department has budgeted the cost of a full-blown Model update (> \$100,000); the process to overhaul the Model and the LRTP would take over a year and result in the expiration of the existing LRTP; 2010 Census data, which is a key input into the Model, won't be available until 2012 and if a new Model is developed now it would have to rely on outdated Census data from 2000; new transportation legislation and federal mandates are anticipated to be passed by Congress next year which may affect what is required to be in

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Citizens Advisory Committee

the LRTP; new transportation legislation also has an impact on the financial forecasts within the LRTP; lastly, the LRTP must have a 20 year planning horizon at the time of adoption and since the existing LRTP goes out until 2030 this requirement would be met if it is readopted this year. For these reasons, staff suggests that the MPO readopt the existing LRTP. The Technical Advisory Committee agrees with staff's recommendation. The Policy Committee did not voice any concerns over this approach but directed staff to develop a timeline for development of a new Model and LRTP. Staff will present the timeline at the next Committee meetings. Staff thinks a new LRTP could be adopted by 2013 or 2014.

The public comment period for re adoption of the existing LRTP will begin at the end of the week and run for 30 days. Comments will be compiled and provided to the Committees for their consideration before they vote on this issue. Staff will seek recommendations from the CAC and TAC next month and request adoption from the Policy Committee at their May meeting. Mr. Hess stated that the LRTP can be amended at any time after its adoption. Mr. Robinson gave the example that the LRTP was amended in 2007 to be compliant with newly passed transportation legislation (SAFETEA-LU). Ms. Cornell and Mr. Baker stated that the course of action seemed reasonable.

VII. New Business

A. 2008 Crash Report – Mr. Hess stated that the Crash Report is not yet available. It will be distributed at the next meeting.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas – There were no suggestions.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Policy Committee – May 14, 2010 at 10:00am (McCloskey Room)
- B. Citizens Advisory Committee – March 24, 2010 at 6:30pm (McCloskey Room)
- C. Technical Advisory Committee – March 24, 2010 at 1:30pm (McCloskey Room)

Adjournment (~8:00 PM)

*These minutes were _____ by the CAC at their regular meeting held on April 28, 2010.
(RCH: 4/28/2010)*

**Evaluation Form for Transportation Projects
Citizens Advisory Committee
Bloomington Monroe County MPO**

Adopted _____, 2010

The CAC of the MPO is responsible for evaluating the relative worth of various transportation projects put before it. To make sure that we evaluate them fairly, transparently, and in accord with the principles expressed by our community we have developed the following evaluation form for our use as a committee.

By using this evaluation form we will use discrete, objective measures; do our work in a timely fashion; and provide a tool that will help citizens understand the importance and effects transportation projects have on our community.

This document is a tool developed by and for the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) of the Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMCMPPO). It is based upon the goals of the Long Range Transportation Plan Vision Statement and intended to provide easy performance measures for everyday citizens to employ and inform others and community leaders on preferred implementation choices for community based transportation infrastructure investments.

The performance measures and their evaluation process are outlined herein. For reference, this tool and its respective methods shall be called “Performance Based Vision Score (PBVS)”

The purpose of this Performance Based Vision Score is:

- i. To create discrete, objective performance measures for transportation projects to effectively meet the community’s vision;
- ii. To achieve an accountable policy that optimizes timely and economic implementation of the community’s vision through transportation improvements; and
- iii. To provide a tool that will help citizens understand the importance and effects of transportation projects have on our community.

Our goals and objectives in developing this evaluation form are as follows:

The **goals** are:

- Community Sustainability
- Environmental Stewardship
- Fiscal Responsibility
- Connectivity for all forms of Transportation
- Economic Vitality and Economic Development
- Multi-modal Accessibility
- Cross-Jurisdictional Coordination

The **objectives** are to:

- 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
- Preserve existing transportation investments through operational improvements

These Goals and Objectives are derived from the “Core Principles” and “Goals and Objectives” sections of the Long Range Transportation Plan Vision Statement.

We evaluate transportation projects on four broad criteria: Project, General, Scope, and Priority. Each criterion has a number of questions related to it. Each question is scored on a point system ranging from negative five (-5) to positive five (+5). The total is summed for each criterion. Using these totals we can compare the relative values of transportation projects with each other.

Transportation Project Evaluation Form

Transportation Project Name:

Number:

Date of Consideration:

Here are the questions for each of the four criteria. Score them as follows: A negative five (-5) indicates that you strongly disagree with the statement, a positive five (+5) indicates you strongly agree with the statement, and points in between these values indicates moderate ranges of agreement (positive values) and disagreement (negative values). A score of zero (0) indicates you neither agree nor disagree with the statement.

PROJECT CRITERIA	SCORE (-5 to +5)
Develop a truly multi-modal system	
The project will provide options for pedestrians	
The project will provide viable options for cyclists	
The project will provide viable options for transit users	
Create a fully developed network of alternative transportation facilities	
The project will significantly contribute infrastructure to the network for alternative transportation facilities	
Reduce the number and length of auto trips	
The project will result in fewer and shorter auto trips	
Achieve a better relationship between land uses to reduce auto dependency	
For urban area projects - the project will support mixed-use, high density, urban development; or for rural area projects – the project will sustain low intensity land uses and curtail sprawl	
The project area’s current or anticipated land use context (e.g. rural, suburban, urban, downtown, campus) is consistent with the planned infrastructure improvements	
The project will support locally anticipated land use patterns	
Increase safety for all users of the transportation system	
The project will improve safety for all users/modes within the project area	
The project will improve safety for all uses/modes beyond the project area	
Support economic vitality through strategic transportation investments	
The project will create a long-term community-wide economic benefit	
The project will help balance economic vitality through access and mobility for blighted areas	

PROJECT CRITERIA (continued)		SCORE (-5 to +5)
Improve the movement of goods through the transportation system		
	The project will improve the movement of local goods to regional markets and provide a regional-wide benefit	
	The project will improve the movement of local goods to local markets and provide a community-wide benefit	
Subtotal for Project Criteria		

GENERAL CRITERIA		SCORE (-5 to +5)
Make transportation investments that are consistent with comprehensive plans		
	The project is consistent with the policy guidance found within the local jurisdictions comprehensive plan	
Make transportation investments that protect the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life		
	The project will protect important environmental assets	
	The project will reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and promotes energy conservation	
	The project will overall improve the quality of life for everyone	
	The project will meet environmental justice objectives by targeting infrastructure investments that will benefit minority and lower income communities	
	lower income communities	
	The project will meet environmental justice objectives by increasing job access and quality of life amenities to minority and lower income communities	
Subtotal for General Criteria		

SCOPING CRITERIA		SCORE (-5 to +5)
Achieve the widest possible range of alternatives to the automobile		
	The project's scope of work includes a comprehensive assessment of solutions to implement that focus on modes other than the automobile	
Preserve existing transportation investments through operational improvements		
	The project scope of work gives priority to a comprehensive assessment of operational improvements over added capacity improvements	
Subtotal for Scoping Criteria		

PRIORITY CRITERIA		SCORE (-5 to +5)
Promote fiscally sound transportation investments and maximize financial resources		
The anticipated cost of the project is a reasonable expense compared to overall needs and priorities	cost benefit evaluations	
The project investment benefits will lead to reduced VMT		
The project investment benefits will lead to energy consumption and greenhouse gas reductions		
Subtotal for Priority Criteria		
TOTAL PROJECT SCORE		

MEMORANDUM



To: MPO Technical Advisory Committee & Citizens Advisory Committee Members

From: Raymond Hess, Sr. Transportation Planner

Date: April 21, 2010

Re: 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan Readoption

The Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) Long Range Transportation Plan (Plan) will expire in March 2011, five years after its adoption in March 2006. The Plan must show a 20-year time horizon at the time of adoption, and must be updated at least every five years. In order to stay compliant with federal regulations and avoid any risk of jeopardizing federal transportation funding, MPO staff is proposing to readopt the existing Plan with **no changes**. FHWA has indicated that "it would be acceptable to just update the current 2030 [Plan], reaffirm goals, objectives and adequacy of latest planning assumptions." This would establish a new five year life of the Plan. Assuming this readoption occurs, the MPO would undertake a more comprehensive plan update prior to the new deadline of 2015.

Reaffirmation of Goals and Objectives

The 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan was developed in 2005 and adopted in 2006. The process included a combination of thorough technical analysis and extensive public participation (refer to Appendix B: Methodology; pp. 112-121). A primary focus in the development of the Plan was to formulate a vision statement that captured the priorities of the community. The Vision Statement "serves as the policy guide for the development of a system-wide, multi-modal, Long Range Transportation Plan" (refer to Chapter 2: Vision Statement; pp. 21-30).

The Goals and Objectives of the Plan are contained within the Vision Statement. Twelve goals and forty-seven objectives are organized under the following seven core principles:

- community sustainability,
- environmental stewardship,
- fiscal responsibility,
- connectivity for all forms of transportation,
- economic vitality and economic development,
- multi-modal accessibility,
- cross-jurisdictional coordination.

The Goals and Objectives of the Plan are still valid because of their comprehensive and holistic approach to transportation issues in the metropolitan planning area. There has not been a demand to update the Goals or Objectives of the Plan by the public or the Committees of the MPO.

Reaffirmation of Planning Assumptions

Staff asserts that the planning assumptions of the Plan are still valid for the following reasons:

- *Travel Demand Model Inputs remain valid* – The Travel Demand Model is a technical input into the Plan which evaluates the impact of projects on the transportation network through computer simulations. The inputs into the model, such as Census 2000 population figures, continue to be acceptable sources of data at this time.
- *Identified Projects remain valid* – The Plan's list of projects is still valid for State and local projects. In fact, many of the projects that were identified as "Existing" or "Committed" in 2006 are just now underway (e.g. SR45/46 Bypass, Vernal Pike, and W. 3rd Street; pp 124-125) and won't be finished for another 1-2 years.

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization

- *Financial Forecasts* – The financial forecasts included in the Plan remain feasible (refer to Chapter 4: Financial Forecast; pp 85-94). This may change when new national transportation legislation replaces SAFETEA-LU, but until such time, these financial projections remain valid.

Rationale for readoption vs. development of new Plan

Staff supports readoption of the existing Long Range Transportation Plan without change instead of developing a new Plan for the following reasons:

- *Limited Funding / Time* – The readoption can be done by MPO staff and will not require hiring a consultant (the cost of which could exceed \$100,000). It will simply require reaffirmation of goals, objectives, and adequacy of planning assumptions (as detailed above).
- *Better Data forthcoming* – There is interest in completely overhauling the Plan's Travel Demand Model from both staff and members of the public. One of the key pieces of data that goes into the model is population information provided by the Census Bureau. Waiting a couple of years to update the Travel Demand Model is strongly recommended because it would allow the MPO to use new 2010 Census information rather than relying on projections from the original 2000 Census data.
- *New Federal Legislation forthcoming* – New federal transportation legislation is expected in the next year. The forthcoming legislation may set new requirements of the Plan and the Travel Demand Model. Additionally, new federal legislation will certainly impact the fiscal assumptions made when selecting future transportation projects. Without projections for federal funding based on new legislation, it would be difficult to know what the MPO could afford to implement during our 20 year time frame.
- *20 Year Horizon* – Federal law requires that the LRTP cover a span of 20 years at the time of adoption. If the LRTP is readopted in 2010, this criterion will be met since the Plan horizon extends to 2030. This opportunity is lost if the MPO waits until 2011 to update the Plan.

Public Comment

The MPO's Public Participation Plan dictates that adoption of a Long Range Transportation Plan warrants a minimum 30 day public comment period. Staff issued a notice of public participation on March 27th which concludes on April 26th. Staff will compile all written comments and distribute them to each MPO Committee (No written comments have been received as of the date this memo was written).

Timelines

Readoption of existing 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan – the following timeline identifies the completed and future steps needed to readopt the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan.

- 2/24/10 – Broach the issue with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) & Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and seek direction (*complete*)
- 3/12/10 – Broach the issue with the Policy Committee and seek direction (*complete*)
- 3/24/10 – Discuss the issue further with the CAC & TAC (*complete*)
- 3/27-4/26/10 – 30 Day Public Comment period (*in process*)
- 4/28/10 – Seek CAC & TAC recommendations (*anticipated*)
- 5/14/10 – Seek Policy Committee adoption (*anticipated*)

Creation of new 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan – the following draft timeline is a non-exhaustive strategic development process to develop a new LRTP. Please note that the dates are very preliminary and should not be interpreted as firm deadlines, especially later in the process. It should also be noted that some the steps of the process may change as research is conducted, new goals are identified, or new direction is desired. Any number of variables could drastically alter how the LRTP is developed.

- Form an LRTP Task Force (Summer 2010)
 - Form Task Force comprised of up to 2 members from each MPO Committee
 - Task Force will work with staff throughout LRTP development and provide direction
 - Report to CAC, TAC, and PC throughout LRTP development

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization

- Identify direction and process (Fall 2010)
 - Conduct research on existing and possible federal requirements
 - Identify what other progressive communities are doing and how they are doing it
 - Refine the timeline and LRTP update scope throughout LRTP development
- Perform gap analysis and begin corrective measures (Winter 2011)
 - Inventory existing data
 - Identify shortfalls in data needed for robust Travel Demand Model
 - Begin collecting data in Fall 2010 and continue throughout course of LRTP development
- Visioning Process (Spring 2011)
 - Embark on comprehensive visioning process for the new LRTP. The visioning process should steer the rest of the development of the Document (public workshops)
 - Explore possibility of statistically significant survey gauging preference of residents
- Financial Forecast (Fall 2011)
 - Coordinate with federal, state, and local agencies on anticipated revenue streams
 - Identify how funds can be spent (restrictions/allowances for different funding sources)
- Consultant Selection process (Spring/Summer 2012)
 - Identify possible consulting firms
 - Identify selection criteria
 - Issue RFP, RFQ, or other process
- Travel Demand Model Development (Summer/Fall 2012)
 - New census data should be available
 - Collect data required by consultant to perform work
 - Calibrate model to existing conditions
- Call for Projects (Fall 2012)
 - Identify possible projects in coordination with LPAs
 - Identify possible projects as identified by the community (public workshops)
- Individual Project Evaluation (Winter 2013)
 - Evaluate projects individually against the Vision Statement
- Alternatives Analysis (Spring 2013)
 - Model different project scenarios to see which combination of projects achieves goals of vision statement
 - Seek public input on the preferred projects list to be implemented over the next 20 years (public workshops)
 - Refine Preferred Project list based on public input
- Write LRTP (Summer 2013)
 - Synthesize all previous work into new Long Range Transportation Plan
- Finalize LRTP (Fall 2013)
 - Public Workshops on final Document and written public comment period
 - Seek action from MPO Committees

Recommendation Requested

The Technical Advisory Committee and Citizens Advisory Committee are requested to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on the reoption of the existing 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan. Additionally, staff seeks input on the proposed timeline for the development of a new 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan.

MEMORANDUM



To: Technical Advisory Committee and Citizens Advisory Committee Members

From: Raymond Hess, Sr. Transportation Planner

Date: April 21, 2010

Re: FY2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment

Background

Monroe County has hired a firm to do county-wide aerial photography. The scope of work includes orthophotography (aerial photos), Light Detection and Ranging (aka LiDAR - for elevation determination), and contour mapping (change in elevation). This information is then linked to specific latitude and longitude coordinates in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The resulting product is data layers that can be used in GIS programs to develop maps, perform analysis, and understand the geo-spatial aspects of an area related to a project.

Relevance to the MPO

The GIS layers collected as part of this project are shared between Monroe County, the City of Bloomington, and subsequently, the Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMCMPPO). This information is also available to the public on the County's Web GIS (<http://gis.co.monroe.in.us/>) and the City's Interactive Map (http://bloomington.in.gov/interactive_map). Other MPOs in the State support GIS initiatives because of the role GIS plays in transportation and land use planning. Additionally, the Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County (the MPO which serves the Lafayette urbanized area) has highlighted the importance of collecting these GIS data layers in a Census year because different sources of data can be linked. In other words, the GIS layers provide an accurate account of the area's built environment while the Census data provides an accurate account of the area's demographic profile.

Funding and Budgets

The cost to perform all of the identified services is \$252,732. Monroe County currently has \$147,734 budgeted for this project. A funding partnership with BMCMPPO could cover the remaining \$104,498.

The BMCMPPO is expected to have a significant amount of unspent federal planning funds at the end of this fiscal year. Staff anticipates that well over \$200,000 of federal planning funds will remain unspent by June 30, 2010. One of the reasons for this surplus is that the money allocated to update the Long Range Transportation Plan (\$111,600 in federal planning funds) has remained relatively untapped. It should be noted that only a small percentage of the BMCMPPO's unspent federal planning funds can be carried over to future years; the rest is redistributed back to the State.

FY2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program

In an effort to assist Monroe County with a project that will ultimately benefit the BMCMPPO and the area's local public agencies while at the same time drawing down surplus funds that would otherwise be lost, staff is proposing that the FY2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) be amended to include this project.

The following language would be added to Element "301 - Long Range Planning" (p. 21)

(C) Update County-wide Aerial and Elevation GIS Layers

Geographic Information Systems capture, store, analyze, manage, and present data linked to location. GIS is a powerful tool used for many applications including resource management, urban and rural planning, environmental planning, land use impacts, and transportation planning. GIS data layers can

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization

take many different shapes and forms. Orthophotography is a GIS layer which links aerial photography to specific locations. Light Detection and Ranging and contour mapping provide the elevations of an area. These GIS layers provide an important spatially accurate historical account of the existing environment in a point in time. The BMCMPO uses GIS regularly in the development of its Transportation Improvement Program, the Long Range Transportation Plan, and for demonstration purposes at public meetings. These updated GIS layers will provide the BMCMPO and local public agencies the opportunity to use data that is more current and more accurate than layers currently used.

Responsible Agency End Product(s):

- (1) MPO Staff, Monroe County, and a private consultant will coordinate on the update of county-wide GIS layers.
 - (a) Updated orthophotographic, elevation, and contour GIS layers

As illustrated below, the corresponding table for Element 301 (p. 21) would be updated to show that \$130,625 (\$104,500 federal; \$26,125 local) is being pulled out of Task (A) 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan and put into a new Tack (C) County-wide Aerial and Elevation GIS Layers project.

301					
Task	Responsible Agency	FY 2009	FY 2010	Total Cost	
(A) 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan					
2035 Long Range Transportation Plan	MPO	\$0.00	\$3,875.00	\$3,875.00	
(B) Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)					
ITS Architecture Maintenance	MPO	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	
(C) County-wide Aerial and Elevation GIS Layers					
	MC/Consultant	\$0.00	\$130,625.00	\$130,625.00	
TOTAL		\$5,000.00	\$134,500.00	\$139,500.00	

Recommendation Requested

The Technical Advisory Committee and Citizens Advisory Committee are requested to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on the proposed amendment to the FY2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program. The amendment would add “county-wide aerial and elevation GIS layers” as a project eligible for reimbursement. This project would be funded from funds diverted from the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan project.

MEMORANDUM



To: MPO TAC & CAC
From: Josh Desmond, AICP
MPO Director
Date: April 21, 2010
Re: Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Unified Planning Work Program

Background

Staff is currently developing the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Unified Planning Work Program. The UPWP must be submitted, in draft form, to INDOT and FHWA by May 1, 2010. Staff intends to seek final adoption of the new UPWP at the Policy Committee meeting on June 11, 2010. The TAC & CAC will have the opportunity to review a full draft of the UPWP at the May 26 meetings, prior to final Policy Committee action.

FY2011-2012 Estimated Budget

The MPO previously adopted a two-year UPWP covering Fiscal Years 2009-2010. The budget for that work program initially included the standard allocation for those two fiscal years, plus carryover funds from FY 2007. Carryover funding from FY 2008 was later amended into the UPWP. As a result, the total two-year budget for the FY 2009-2010 UPWP was \$961,037.50, representing \$768,830 in Federal funds and \$192,207.50 in local matching funds.

The funding for FY 2011-2012 will be noticeably reduced from the previous budget. One significant change is the lack of carryover funding from FY 2009. Since the previous work program covered two fiscal years, any unspent funds from FY 2009 were simply expended in FY 2010 prior to tapping in to FY 2010 funds. Final carryover funds from FY 2010 will be available to amend into the budget at a later time, as was the case with FY 2008 carryover. The budget for FY 2011-2012 is \$656,770, representing \$525,416 in Federal funds and \$131,354 in local matching funds. This breaks down to \$328,385 per fiscal year.

Planning Emphasis Areas

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides the MPO with Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs) that must be addressed for each new work program. These are key areas that FHWA wants the MPO to focus its energy on during that time period. The PEAs for FY 2011-2012 remain that same as those for the last UPWP, so no new additions to the UPWP are required to address these issues. Please review the UPWP Executive Summary for more information on the existing PEAs.

UPWP Outline Highlights

As part of the development of the new UPWP, staff has taken the opportunity to do some reorganization of work program elements and tasks to better reflect the current operations and responsibilities of the MPO. The following is an overview of the revised UPWP structure.

Comprehensive Planning Coordination & Outreach

101 Transportation Planning Coordination

- A. Intergovernmental Coordination
- B. Unified Planning Work Program
- C. Planning Grant Administration
- D. Indiana MPO Council
- E. Staff Training & Education
- F. Web Site Administration
- G. Public Participation Process

102 Transportation Improvement Program

- A. Transportation Improvement Program

Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization

- B. HSIP Administration
- C. TE Program Administration
- D. Safe Routes to School Program Administration

Transportation Planning

- 201 Long Range Planning**
 - A. 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan
- 202 Short Range Transportation Studies & Activities**
 - A. Transit Feasibility Study (placeholder)
 - B. CAC/Student-assisted Study
 - C. ADA Transition Plans
- 203 Data Collection & Analysis**
 - A. Traffic Volume Counting
 - B. Infrastructure Management Plan
 - C. ITS Architecture Maintenance
 - D. Annual Crash Report

Alternative Transportation Planning

- 301 Long Range Planning**
 - A. BT Grimes Lane Facility Study (carryover)
- 302 Short Range Alternative Transportation Studies & Activities**
 - A. Alternative Transportation Study (placeholder)
 - B. Coordinated Human Services Public Transit Plan
 - C. Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety and Project Coordination
- 303 Transit, Bicycle & Pedestrian Data Collection & Analysis**
 - A. Transit Ridership & Bicycle/Pedestrian Counts

Input Requested

MPO staff is requesting input from TAC and CAC members as to the final contents of the FY 2011-2012 UPWP. It is important for staff to hear from interested members as soon as possible about possible funding needs for activities and projects, particularly if they are significantly different from those noted in the FY 2009-2010 UPWP. Due to the significantly reduced budget, we will have to be judicious about how we fund various activities, so please be as accurate and realistic as possible with any funding requests. No formal action is being requested at this time. All questions and suggestions are welcome.