

**GREATER LAFAYETTE AREA TRANSPORTATION & DEVELOPMENT STUDY
TECHNICAL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES
January 19, 2022**

Due to the public health emergency, the meeting was held partially virtually. Members of the public may watch the livestream of the meeting at:

<https://www.facebook.com/TippecanoeCountyIndiana> or
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8ML2Ev6HmOY>

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT

Scott J. Chandler (proxy for Bill Smith)	INDOT
Jon Fricker	JTRP
Marcus Smith (proxy for Adam Baxmeyer)	Purdue University
Jeffrey Kuhn	City of West Lafayette Project Engineer
Scott Anderson	Lafayette Police Department
Stewart (Stu) Kline	Tippecanoe County Highway Engineer
Randy Anderson	CityBus
David Griffee (proxy for Jeromy Grenard)	Lafayette City Engineer
John "Woody" Ricks	Tippecanoe County Sheriff Dept.

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT

Adam Baxmeyer	Purdue University
Bill Smith	INDOT
Jason Philhower	West Lafayette Police Department
Jeromy Grenard	City of Lafayette

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT

Colin Sullivan	BFS
David Hittle	Area Plan Commission
Aria Staiger	Area Plan Commission
Doug Poad	Area Plan Commission
Tim Stroshine	Area Plan Commission

Jon Fricker called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

Jon Fricker asked if there were any new members present.

David Griffee stated he is the proxy for Jeromy Grenard.

Jon Fricker asked if David Griffee has been approved to be the proxy for Jeromy Grenard.

David Griffee responded he has been approved.

Jon Fricker asked if there are any other new members present.

Jeffrey Kuhn introduced himself as the Project Engineer for the City of West Lafayette.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jon Fricker asked if any corrections needed to be made to the December 15, 2021 meeting minutes. There were none.

Stu Kline moved to approve the minutes from the December 15, 2021 meeting. David Griffie seconded, and the minutes, as submitted, were approved by unanimous voice vote.

II. ACCESS PERMITS

Scott Chandler said there are three current permit applications. The first is with Klondike Middle School adjacent to US 231; it is new. The application has been very recent, and it is currently under review. There are no complications or anything to discuss.

Next, we have a minor commercial permit along SR 38 and Domino's; it is also under review. There were some comments about sidewalk connectivity; we are working through some of those. There doesn't seem to be any issues. It is more making sure that the comments are being addressed and connectivity is being provided for at that location.

We are moving forward with the Yeager Road Project with the City of West Lafayette as it's adjacent to Old US 52 or Sagamore Parkway. He believes there is just a small detail that they are working out on the plans with one of the curb ramps. Other than that, he thinks everything is moving along nicely with those permits.

Jon Fricker asked for any comments or questions. There were none.

III. AMEND THE FY 2022-2026 TIP

Doug Poad said there is a request we received from the Tippecanoe County Highway Department to amend the current TIP which is the 2022-2026 TIP. Specifically, it deals with funding the construction phase, the Morehouse Road Project, if you remember it is such a large project and with our limited amount of federal funds, we need to split this into two phases. The first part of the project will be let for construction in FY 2024 with the following one being let in 2025. Since the project has been advancing, there have been updated construction amounts, and unfortunately the portion of Phase 2 that is just north of CR 350 N to the Mason Dixon part is going to cost more than what has been estimated, and the portion that is just north of Sagamore Parkway the cost is not as much, and we have recently been informed by INDOT Central Office that the initial plans to fund the construction engineering during FY 2024 for both phases unfortunately can't occur. You can only obligate federal funds for construction engineering at a maximum of four weeks before a project is let, so additional federal funds had to be moved to the other phase that will go in 2025. In looking at the numbers, we still have to remain physically constrained and INDOT still has the rule that we can't carryover any additional federal funds, so in discussing what we can do, the only thing that is optional right now is to ask other MPOs for a trade of federal funds. Currently, that is what we are proposing in order to fully fund the construction of both phases, so this amendment is proposing that in the future, we will seek out other MPOs to trade a portion of our 2024 funds for 2025 funds. This is not a guarantee at this time; this is a few years out, but this is our thoughts and ideas, and with INDOT recently approving our TIP into the current STIP, any information in 2024, 2025, and 2026 is for information only, so they are only specifically interested in 2022 and 2023. Right-now we are going to go ahead and move forward and actually propose that in the future we will start the discussion to move these federal funds. We are asking for your recommendation for approval to the Policy Board. He asked for any questions or comments.

Stu Kline said thank you.

Jon Fricker moved to proceed toward the initiation of exchange of funds with other MPOs to meet the requirements. Stu Kline seconded, and the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Jon Fricker noted this has been approved and will move forward to the Policy Board.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS TO THE FY 2022-2026 TIP

Doug Poad said this is for informational purposes. We wanted to let the committee know we did process a TIP Modification earlier this month, and it is in regard to the Lindberg Road Project. We were notified by Central Office of an advice change; that means more funding is needed for the Lindberg Road Project, and they asked if we would participate using our federal funds. For federal funding, the amount was just over \$35,000.00. Right-now we have unobligated funds specifically for the Morehouse Road Project for the right-of-way phase and for the Sagamore Parkway Trail. We reached out to Stu and had a good discussion on what to do, and he asked us to proceed to reallocate the \$35,023.00 from the right-of-way phase of the Morehouse Road Project to the construction phase of the Lindberg Road Project. The letter was submitted to the district office for this modification, and it has went through. This is only for your information that we did have that action occur. He asked for any questions or comments.

V. APC PROGRESS REPORT MPO UPDATE

2050 MTP UPDATE

Tim Stroshine said first he wants to let everyone know where we are at with the 2050 MTP. It is due for adoption in June of this year, so we are planning to give you monthly updates at these meetings as to where we are at with that and what is going on currently. Right-now one of the big things we have been working on is the Financially Constrained Project List. We have been meeting with the local government engineers to get some cost estimates and prioritization about which projects they are most interested in going forward with; they have been very helpful in providing that. The next step is to meet with our planning partners and get their approval on that as well as get some information on what projects INDOT will have in the list as they have done in the past. We are trying to get a meeting together on the 28th; that is the current tentative date on that. Tim said he did speak with Jay Mitchell at INDOT, and he suggested a few people he thought would be important to be there. Tim said he is still trying to get confirmation from FHWA, FTA, as well as INDOT District. He said he did reach out to Bill Smith, and he is not sure if Bill would want to be at this meeting or if he would want to designate someone, but Tim thought he would be a good person for representative of the Policy Board.

Scott Chandler said he thinks that is appropriate, and he asked Tim if he has reached out to Travis Kohl to see if he or anyone from his group would want to be a part of it.

Tim Stroshine responded yes, he did reach out to him, but he has not heard back from him yet.

Scott Chandler said okay, good.

Tim Stroshine said that is one of the big things that is going on. Additionally, several of us on staff are working on putting together different sections of the plan. For instance, Doug Poad has been working very hard on the Transit Section, and he has given that to CityBus for their review, and once that is reviewed, it will be able to be put into the plan. The other big section that is a little new for us would be the Sustainability and Resilience Section. We have a couple environmental engineers on staff, and they are hard at work on crafting that and putting together that important information; that is going to be one of the big highlights of what we are doing with this 2050 Plan. He asked for any questions.

THOROUGHFARE PLAN UPDATE

Tim Stroshine said this is another important plan we are working on. The current Thoroughfare Plan that we have is outdated, so we have been in the process of updating it for a while. It has been a little slow, because we have been meeting with representatives from the development community. We put together a rough draft and sent it to them to see what their thoughts were. They had some good comments about it, so we have been able to go through and address most of those. We do have one more outstanding thing

we need to work with CityBus on, so we have a meeting scheduled where we are going to discuss that with them. We are getting close to adoption of a new Thoroughfare Plan. He said he wanted to take this opportunity to thank everyone who has been involved with that. The local government engineers have been partnering with us in working on this; CityBus has helped us throughout this process, and our staff, there have been several things I have asked for their feedback on, and they have had some good comments. It has been a long effort to get to this point since we have been doing some major revisions to it, but he thinks the final product will be worth it. We are looking forward to adoption of that later this year.

FEDERAL FUNDING OBLIGATION

Doug Poad said this will now become a monthly discussion regarding our federal funds for FY 2022. We do not have a date yet as to when these funds have to be obligated usually it is in April, but we wanted to make sure this committee and also the Policy Board knows the status of our federal funds. The information on the top of the page is information provided by INDOT. These funds have already been obligated. You can see the amounts, the projects, and the phase. Below that, we have a more detailed table, and this shows the amount of federal funds that we have allocated to the projects by the federal funding type, the actual amount that has been obligated that INDOT reports, and then the balance. You can see we have not allocated all of our federal funds; basically, we have two projects which we need to do that. One is the right-of-way phase for the Morehouse Road Project, and this will be straightforward what we call a FMIS Request. Once we get, what we call, a LID Report from the consultant, then we can quickly proceed and submit the request to obligate those federal funds. That will be going very quickly once we get that information. Second is the Sagamore Parkway Trail Project. Unfortunately, the news we have to pass along about that is that it has been moved to an April bid letting. It was on a March bid letting, and in order to keep that April bid letting all of the documents that are needed will have to be submitted and approved by Central Office next Wednesday. We reached out to the project manager last week and asked for a status report and everything appeared to be fine, and we will be doing that again today. Basically, we are going to stay on top of this to make sure it does go on an April letting. There is a chance that if it does miss the April letting; we could go to a May letting, but that does raise an issue in that if the bids come back too high, then what do we do. If that happens, we may have the possibility of not being able to move that project forward and lose those federal funds. That is why we are trying to keep on top of this especially before next Wednesday's deadline. He asked for any questions or comments.

Stu Kline asked is this because of the shortage of reviewers where they are asking us to move projects back.

Doug Poad asked for the Trail Project.

Stu Kline said yes, because they asked us to reschedule because of their review times stretching out because they are shorthanded.

Doug Poad said when we had the discussion several weeks ago, the information was submitted to the Central Office for their review; all the information was submitted. There were questions about certain items; for example, an issue with one of the walls for Soldier's Home Road in terms of maintaining the slope. I guess that was a proposed change, and there were some deficiencies in some of the documentation, so it was requested that it be updated so that specific things could be addressed. The consultant has been working fairly hard in terms of getting the information in, and now it is making sure that everything that has been submitted addresses all of INDOT's questions.

Stu Kline asked if we are now waiting to hear if we did meet all their expectations.

Doug Poad said we haven't heard of anything at least since last Thursday. We will send our weekly email out after this meeting, and he is hoping to have some additional information either tomorrow or Friday. If anything is outstanding, we will proceed to pass on that information. We had a fairly good meeting with central office staff and district staff about two weeks ago, and they are aware of this, and it appears that they have made this a high priority in getting the information reviewed and turned around fairly quickly.

INDOT 18-MONTH LETTING LIST

Doug Poad said the report is in your packet. Projects 1, 2, and 3 were on a December bid letting. Project 1 on SR 38, there were two bids submitted and both were rejected, because they were over the engineer's estimate. That project will be rebid in February along with two additional projects.

The two projects on SR 26; those are in the very western part of our county. There were two bids submitted. The low bid was Milestone, and it was under the engineer's estimate. The bid was just over \$18.1 million dollars, and the engineer's estimate was almost \$19.3 million dollars.

Projects 4 through 14, the widening of I65; basically, north of the I65 Wabash River Bridges to approximately CR 725 N. There were two bids that were submitted. One bid was from Walsh, and the other bid was from Milestone. Walsh had the lowest bid at \$99,418,926.33. The engineer's estimate was \$99,481,491.68, so Walsh was close to the engineer's estimate. When he looked this morning, he did not see where it was awarded as of yet, but with it being under the engineer's estimate he is assuming it will be. Construction will begin on this roughly around April 1st.

Projects on the February bid letting, there are three on SR 38, a couple District Wide Projects, and other than that, there have been no changes. The additional information about the January bid letting that is more unusual than what has happened in the past is that out of all the road projects that were up for bid, 19 of them were rejected. He said that is a very significant number.

Scott Chandler said he has never seen that many rejected.

Doug Poad said he heard that a lot of the bids were higher than expected, so something is going on. What specifically, he doesn't know, but it will be interesting to see what happens in a couple weeks with the February bid letting. He asked for any questions or comments.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

VII. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There was a one-minute pause to allow for public comments. There were none.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Jon Fricker noted next month's meeting will be on February 16th.

Jon Fricker moved to adjourn. Jeffrey Kuhn seconded, and the meeting was adjourned by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:27 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Ewen
Recording Secretary

Reviewed By,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "D. L. Hittle". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line extending from the end.

David L. Hittle
Executive Director