

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

**MEETING MINUTES  
APRIL 21, 2021**

*Due to the public health emergency, the meeting was held 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=c3IG2E-0pI8>

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mitch Lankford	West Lafayette City Engineer
Jeremy Grenard	Lafayette City Engineer
Jason Philhower (proxy for Troy Harris)	West Lafayette Police Department
Adam Keyster	Purdue University Airport
Bryce Gibson (proxy for Marty Sennett)	CityBus
Jon Fricker	JTRP
Scott J Chandler (proxy for Bill Smith)	INDOT

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT**

William Carpenter	Lafayette Police Department
John Ricks (proxy for Rob Hainje)	Tippecanoe County Sheriff's Department
Stewart Kline	Tippecanoe County Highway Engineer

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT**

David Griffee	City of Lafayette
David Hittle	Area Plan Commission
Aria Staiger	APC
Doug Poad	APC
Chyna Lynch	APC
Tim Stroshine	APC
Maureen McNamara	APC

John Fricker called the meeting to order and called the roll to establish members present.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Jeremy Grenard moved to approve the minutes from the March 17, 2021 meeting as submitted. Mitchell Lankford seconded and the minutes, as submitted, were approved by roll call vote.

**II. GREATER LAFAYETTE NORTHERN CONNECTIVITY STUDY – LOCHMUELLER GROUP UPDATE**

Jon Fricker asked if someone from the Lochmueller group is going to make a presentation.

Tim Stroshine clarified that today APC Staff will give an update based on the presentation Lochmueller Group gave at the previous MPO Policy Board meeting. Lochmueller group is close to launching a stakeholder meeting that will hopefully meet in the next few weeks. They are still working through the details of this project with INDOT because it is using the PEL (Planning Environmental Linkages) process. This is one of the first one's done by INDOT so there are still bumps to smooth out.

Scott J Chandler said that INDOT has nothing to add as far as where INDOT is in the process. He suggests striking the "US 231" from the name of the study so that it does not appear that INDOT is trying to predetermine any name, function or location. It is understandable why it is there to help understand what the study is, but it shouldn't be part of the title.

Jon Fricker clarified that Scott J. Chandler suggestion is when the minutes come out that US 231 will not appear in the title.

Scott J Chandler said Jon Fricker is correct.

John Fricker thanked Scott and asked Tim Stroshine if there is anything further.

Tim Stroshine said he has nothing further but wanted to clarify that APC staff understood Scott's concern and the US 231 wording was only put in for this to orient people to where we are. We do not want to enter this study prescribing the solution before looking at the corridor and exploring all options.

Scott J Chandler said he figured, but he just wanted to make the note.

Jon Fricker asked if this was presented to the MPO Policy Board.

Tim Stroshine said that was correct, it was presented earlier this month by someone from Lochmueller.

John Fricker asked was the presentation more for their information or was action taken.

Tim Stroshine said it was just for their information.

### **III. ACCESS PERMITS**

Scott J Chandler said there are two major permits in Tippecanoe County. One is an ongoing permit with US 52 at the Speedway gas station. Updates to the plan have been made from INDOT's last revisions and they have been resubmitted and are in review. There is movement forward and will continue unless questions come up. There is a new permit with Old 52, or Sagamore Pkwy, in relation to the Yeager Rd road project. It came in as smaller permits that have been combined into one permit. Specifically, sewer, electrical, power, work and then some work at the approach has all been combined into one permit. The application is currently in review status.

John Fricker asked if no action is needed until future meetings.

Scott J Chandler clarified that was correct.

### **IV. AMEND THE FY 2020-2024 TIP**

Doug Poad said there is two amendments to the current TIP. The first is a request from Tippecanoe County. Last September, INDOT sent out a notice of funding available for local rural projects, typically called Group IV funds, which are similar to our STBG funds. Funding for these new projects will be for FY 2026. Tippecanoe County submitted 4 requests, basically for the N 9<sup>th</sup> St Rd corridor. The first request was to rehabilitate the road between just north of Sagamore Pkwy to just north of Burnetts Road. The second request was to replace the bridge deck over the Wabash River. The third request included constructing a sidewalk that would bypass the current bridge that is in use for the Wabash Heritage Trail, basically connecting

south of the river to the north of the river. The last one was to extend the trail from the Lafayette City trail on N 9<sup>th</sup> St to the Community Corrections Facility. In early March, INDOT made the announcements and Tippecanoe County received funding for the bridge project, it was nearly \$6,000,000, as seen in the staff report. The county was awarded another \$533,306 for preliminary engineering. This request is to amend the current TIP and has been included in the new Draft TIP. Of all the projects that were awarded, Tippecanoe County was awarded the second largest award behind Hancock County who received \$6,348,000 for an added travel lane project. APC staff recommended approval of this amendment to the MPO Policy Board.

John Fricker asked if everyone is clear on the projects and their jurisdictions, dollar amounts, and timing.

Mitchell Lankford moved to recommend these amendments for approval to the MPO Policy Board. Scott J Chandler seconded, and the motion was approved by a roll call vote.

Doug Poad said the second request is from West Lafayette, there is two parts to it, and it is in regard to the Sagamore Pkwy Trail project. In 2017, engineering for this project started. The terrain is very interesting and variable, and in developing the engineering plans for the project, additional work was needed. This was due to the variable terrain and the resulting difficulties to come up with a trail that was compliant with ADA requirements regarding the slope, but that was done. An unexpected need for a bridge over a small creek also contributed to the additional needed work. Due to these additional works, the cost did increase. The increase was nearly double, the total was \$233,750. The city is requesting \$187,00 in federal funds. Looking at our federal funds that we do have available, as reported last month, all our 2021 federal funds have been obligated so that does not leave us an option to look at those. Another option is to delay the additional funding to July, so we can tap into our 2022 funds. But this project is scheduled on a January bid letting, so if that is done, it would delay the bid letting which could jeopardize the funding for construction for this project. So, the last recommended option is tapping the additional funds from the Coronavirus Response Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act. Last month, those funds were discussed, this area received \$462,317 and those funds were allocated in the Draft TIP. If the board decides to approve this, the allocation for the Draft TIP will need to be relooked at. Some good news is that additional federal funds will be received. Information regarding the update for 2022 and beyond was received. In FY 2022, we are getting about \$111,000 in STBG funds and a little over \$33,000 in TA funds and a little over \$20,000 in safety funds. This is not enough to cover the full amount, but most. We will need to address that when we discuss the Draft TIP following this amendment. The other minor change is when this project was put together and programmed in the TIP, the description location was Happy Hollow to Wabash River Bridge, NEPA used a more detailed description. We have been asked to update the TIP to match the more detailed description. The new description location is 800' W of Soldiers Home Rd to the W end of the US 52 Sagamore Pkwy eastbound bridge over the Wabash River. Staff has reviewed the two parts of the city's request and recommends approval of this amendment to the MPO Policy Board.

John Fricker asked if it will take just one motion.

Doug Poad said that was correct.

Mitch Lankford moved to recommend the amendments for approval to the MPO Policy Board. Adam Keyster seconded, and the motion was approved by roll call vote.

## **V. FY 2022-2026 TIP ADOPTION RECOMMENDATION**

Doug Poad said the next staff report is regarding the new Draft TIP from FY 2022-2026. There is a need to revisit the allocation with the approval of allocating some of the Coronavirus

Response Relief funds to the Sagamore Trail project, some adjustments need to be made. We did receive updated funding information for FY 2022. It is the final amounts for 2021. The good news is that we are receiving more funds. For FY 2022, we get to carry over the additional funds from 2021 and use them in 2022. To work through this process of allocation, for the updated STBG funds, we have \$4,133,417 in FY 2022 and for TA funds, \$247,662. For the following years FY 2023-2026, we have \$4,077,538 in STBG funds and \$230,995 in TA funding. If we start looking at this year by year, no changes for Sagamore Parkway Trail for construction. For Morehouse Rd, we show the full allocation for RW and the reduction of funding down to \$275,317, the balance of the COVID funding, would then bring the Soldiers Home Rd funding for PE to \$562,968. What we have left to allocate is \$111,758 in STBG funds and an additional \$33,334 in TA funding. All three projects in FY 2022 are eligible for these funds. Since we reduced the COVID funding for the Sagamore Trail project, these additional funds can be added to the Soldiers Home PE funding to bring it back close to what was programmed last month. He then asked if that was doable for everybody or are there other options people would like to look at. He stated they could make changes to the spreadsheet live.

Scott J Chandler said Doug Poad's suggestion makes sense to him.

Doug Poad asked Tim Stroshine to add \$33,334 to the TA funding and \$111,758 to the STBG funding on the spreadsheet under the Soldiers Home Rd Ph 1 project.

Doug Poad said that it still does not bring the full amount for the request of \$846,200, but it does bring it up to \$708,060, a substantial amount for FY 2022. Doug asked if that seems to be doable.

Doug Poad said with there being no comments, we would move on to the FY 2023 allocation. When we did this last month, the Soldiers Home Rd, the PE funding needed a little over \$96,000 and the need is now \$138,140 which is fairly close. One change already made to the spreadsheet is the McCutcheon Ped Safety Project. You will see \$275,507, the number from last month, but the cost went down to \$265,120. This change was already made to safety funds because there was only one project requesting safety funds at the time, so it was appropriate that those funds will go to the McCutcheon Ped Safety project reducing the amount of STBG funds needed. The S 9<sup>th</sup> St project we still have \$280,000 budgeted in. For Yeager Rd, between the two funds we have \$5,132,317. We have for the original request \$4,950,000 so in essence we have a balance of \$13,971 in STBG funds and a balance of \$16,667 in TA funds. The question is, where should we put those extra funds.

John Fricker asked if there are any constraints on these two amounts, however small they appear.

Doug Poad explained they can be added to one or more projects. Doug asked if that was what John meant by his question.

John Fricker clarified his question. He asked could they be put into a safety project for example.

Doug Poad said yes, we could do that.

John Fricker said he didn't want to overthink this when it is such a small amount. John Fricker asked if there are considerable concerns with allocating these remaining STBG and TA funds. They can put those small amounts someplace and not do too much harm.

Doug Poad wanted to double check that the amount that is now programmed in the excel sheet for the Soldiers Home PE project in 2022, if we take the \$708,060 with the \$138,140, would that bring it up to the original request of \$846,200.

Tim Stroshine confirmed, yes, that would bring the total to \$846,200.

Doug Poad said then we do have that fully funded.

John Fricker asked Doug Poad if they still need a place to put the \$13,971 and the \$16,667.

Doug Poad responded that is correct, they need to allocate those monies to a project or projects.

Jeromy Grenard asked is there any projects in FY 2023 that is short of the original ask.

Doug Poad responded that as we have it funded right now, the Yeager Rd will receive a pinch more in federal funds, but the McCutcheon project is funded right at the request. His recommendation is to add the funds to the McCutcheon project since it is for construction.

Jeromy Grenard said he agrees with that recommendation made by Doug.

Scott J Chandler asked if the idea behind that supports any change/ change of management through construction.

Doug Poad said the additional funds could be used for construction engineering or construction. With the last bids that were open in January for the Park East project, since we did get good bids, we used funds for construction engineering. But for the Lindberg Rd project, we did not have enough for construction engineering. So, we have kind of have a mixed signal with those.

Scott J Chandler said thank you.

Doug Poad mentioned he doesn't think he updated the cell showing the sum of the McCutcheon Ped Safety project in excel sheet yet, he apologized for leaving that one out.

John Fricker asked if we will be back discussing the Yeager Rd project having been bumped up by the COVID funding, or some other federal funds.

Doug Poad said yes it was increased due to the COVID funding.

John Fricker asked if that increase was already reflected in the spreadsheet.

Doug Poad said that's correct.

Doug Poad said since we allocated those funds, he'd like to move onto FY 2024. Doug said there is only one request here, but there is a lot of funding. We didn't allocate our TA funds for 2024. Since we have one project, it is recommended to add the funds to the one project, especially since the one project, Morehouse Rd, is a substantial project. Doug Poad mentioned Stu Kline had estimated it to be nearly 6.7 million dollars.

With no one against, Tim Stroshine updated the spreadsheet by allocating the TA funds to the Morehouse Rd project.

Doug Poad said they have allocated those TA funds for 2024, but the spreadsheet was not updated for 'Total Balance'. The overall balance should now be \$0.

Doug Poad said looking at FY 2025, we have several options. There is a small balance to allocate. The allocated funds from the COVID relief could be split between the two projects, Morehouse Rd and Soldiers Home Rd Ph 1. This could be adjusted if the committee would like to allocate funds differently. Between FY 2024 and FY 2025 we would have more allocated than what was originally requested for the Morehouse Rd project.

Mitch Lankford said for the Soldiers Home Rd project, that he could see needing more than what was requested for the Right of Way.

Doug Poad said ok to Mitch Lankford, with the approval of the committee, they could add the funding to the Soldiers Home Rd project.

With no opposition, Tim updated the spreadsheet and added the funds to the Soldiers Home Rd project.

Doug said for FY 2026, we probably do not need to flex any part of the safety funds, we could eliminate the \$4,000 up in the top box of the excel sheet since we won't need those, if that's ok. We could do it if we still want to, but FY 2026 is still pretty far out. We could leave it this way and we could allocate the funding to the S 9<sup>th</sup> St project, but it is up to what the committee would like to do.

Mitch Lankford asked Doug Poad to explain the flex.

Doug Poad explained that when they went through this exercise back in January, there was not enough STBG funds to fully fund the request for the construction phase. So, we had to use a small part, \$4,013, in safety funds. We are allowed to move roughly half of our funds over to use in projects like this for STBG. With the additional funds, we no longer need to do that. Though, we could still do that and add the additional federal funds to the project as well. It's one project and a small amount so it is straight forward where the allocation should go,

John Fricker asked if this capability is not likely to expire, we can still flex the safety funds in the future.

Doug Poad said that is correct. Since this in FY 2026, we will revisit this again in two years and going through this exercise again. He suspects that changes in costs will occur so we can adjust the numbers if needed in the future. We need to focus on FY 2022 and FY 2023 which we have already done during this exercise.

Doug Poad said there is one more exercise to look at, the safety funds. We now have an additional amount of funds for FY 2022 and beyond. At some point, we will need to discuss what to do with these extra funds. At the moment, we can leave a positive balance, but we probably need to discuss either flexing these over to one of our projects in 2022 and use those for something or if see if NIRPC would need the additional \$20,000. So, at this time, we don't have to do that. But, if we do need a bit more funding for the projects that we allocated in FY 2022, we can move these funds over. Likewise, in FY 2024, the same occurs and we will have a small balance. In FY 2025 and FY 2026, we have no requests.

Doug Poad asked Jeromy Grenard, Stu Kline, Mitch Lankford, to start considering what projects we could use these funds for in the future. The only project that is available to use these funds is the McCutcheon Ped Safety project. The project has been approved to build a sidewalk trail

all the way up to the mobile home park, which it now does not. So that is an option, but it would be good to start thinking of other safety projects to tap into these funds.

John Fricker asked if there are any other questions.

Tim Stroshine read a written comment made by Aria Staiger on GoToMeeting. Is it possible to flex the entire \$20,000 in FY 2022 to STBG?

Doug said yes, we can do that. It is up to the committee if they want to move that amount over now or some other time.

Jeromy Grenard asked if there is a specific project that makes sense to allocate those funds to now.

Doug Poad said they can flex to any one of the projects listed in the spreadsheet (Sagamore Pkwy Trail, Morehouse Rd, and Soldiers Home Rd Ph 1). Flexing the funds to Sagamore Pkwy Trail project is recommended since it is a construction project. If the bids did come in a bit high, then there would be the extra funding for that.

Mitch Lankford agreed with Doug Poad's suggestion, especially considering the particulars of that project.

Doug Poad said ok and that he would go ahead and make those changes. Now that we have completed this allocation, the next step is to add all of these changes to the funding tables in the TIP and to the individual projects that are listed in Table 4. The next step in terms of TIP, is to start the adoption process. INDOT has not made any changes to the development timeline and still would like to have our TIP approved by early May, so we would like to move forward. We did receive, as indicated in the staff report, the unofficial FHA comments and we have gone through and updated the Draft TIP per their comments. The only comments we have received from INDOT is in regard to adding preliminary engineering funds for about a dozen projects. There have been no questions or comments regarding the document outside of that. If we do receive comments that would substantially change the document after the adoption process, we would like to bring it back for re-adoption. The document itself include all the requirements by the FAST Act and its extension, all the public comments/questions have been received and kept in the appendix and we also have all the responses. So, in order to maintain INDOT's timeline, we are asking for a recommendation of adoption to the MPO Policy Board with the update of the allocations that were just completed.

John Fricker said this looked like an amendment, but it was actually the TIP through FY 2026 that we are proposing to the MPO Policy Board. He asked if that was correct and if Doug Poad was calling it a draft.

Doug Poad clarified that it was a draft now and what we are recommending is adoption to the MPO Policy Board so that with the recent changes and everything else in the document is included in the Draft TIP. It meets all the requirements of the FAST Act, addresses all the FHA comments, and what we have received from INDOT, so APC staff would like to move it forward and have the MPO Policy Board adopt it at their next meeting.

John Fricker said it makes sense to him, and it's a good chance everyone else does as well.

Tim Stroshine added that the big challenge here is that APC staff wants to stick to INDOT's timeline, but we haven't gotten the comments back from INDOT such that would have met their

timeline. So, APC staff is trying to reconcile those two issues. That is why Doug mentioned that we may have to re-adopt this if we get substantial comments from INDOT.

John Fricker asked if that would be next month, or perhaps whenever the comments are received.

Doug Poad answered that staff is unsure of INDOT's timeline at this point.

John Fricker recommended motioning to approve what was just did and forward it to the Policy Board as our recommended Draft TIP through FY 2026.

Mitchell Lankford moved to recommend the Draft TIP for approval to the MPO Policy Board. Jeromy Grenard seconded, and the motion was approved by a roll call vote.

**VI. APC PROGRESS REPORT**  
**MPO Update**  
**THOROUGHFARE PLAN – CURB DESIGN**

Tim Stroshine said the first item relates to the Thoroughfare Plan. His hope was that someone from the County Highway Department would be present, because this change came about from a request from Stu Kline. Some background, currently in the county, when a subdivision is designed, you are allowed to use mountable curbs in that subdivision, whereas in the cities we will almost always see the non-mountable curbs.

Tim Stroshine said Stu Kline brought forth the idea of bringing the design standards into uniformity. Tim Stroshine said that Stu Kline asked APC staff to take a look at some of the pros and cons of making a change to non-mountable curbs in subdivisions in the county. So, APC staff put together that list, which was included in the meeting's packet. APC staff is looking to get action on this at next month's MPO Policy Board meeting. By action, APC staff wants some sort of recommendation as to whether it is something APC staff should include in the draft version of the Thoroughfare Plan for comment or if it is something that should be scraped before that stage. It is a significant consideration because APC Staff does need to approach all of the stakeholders in this process. Some of those stakeholders do include developers and this would be a significant change for them. All the engineers have been involved in the design of the document, but we want to be sure it is out there and there is a chance for comments and questions. APC staff hopes to get this pros and cons document to the appropriate local elected officials so that they can have some time to consider it before the meeting. This is meant to be transparent and hopes everyone gets the chance to comment.

Tim asked Mitch Lankford and Jeromy Grenard what their comments are on the pros and cons document.

Jeromy Grenard said the list of pros and cons looks well put together and he is good with taking it to local elected officials.

Mitch Lankford agrees with Jeromy Grenard that the list is well constructed.

Tim Stroshine thanked the committee, stated he will leave it up to them to give the document to their elected officials and that the discussion will continue at next month's MPO Policy Board meeting.

John asked how binding is the document and has adequate consideration been given to stormwater runoff. He interprets non-mountable as curb and gutter.

Tim Stroshine said yes, stormwater has been considered. There is a section about drainage in the pros and cons document. The design standards in the final Thoroughfare Plan will be adopted into the subdivision ordinance. At this time, nothing is finalized since there hasn't been a chance for all stakeholders to give feedback and APC Staff needs to consult the MPO Policy Board on this proposed change. It was again why Tim Stroshine's hope that Stu Kline would be present to state his position, but there has been discussion between Tim Stroshine and Stu Kline about this, so Stu Kline is aware of this document.

John Fricker said thank you and added that the pros and cons document is well done.

### **PLANNING CERTIFICATION REVIEW UPDATE**

David Hittle said there was a planning certification review that took place on March 22, 2021. It was spearheaded by INDOT and had representation from the FTA and FHA. It was an all-day event taking the form of an audit. APC staff, which included Sallie Fahey, Tim Stroshine, Doug Poad, Aria Staiger and Maureen McNamara, all presented the operations and activities of the last several years of the department regarding transportation to the reviewers. As an observer, David stated it went very well. INDOT's immediate feedback included much praise and asked if they could use the presentation as a model for other MPOs which is a great thing. APC staff is awaiting formal feedback regarding the presentation and the review and will be acting on that when it is received.

Tim Stroshine added that APC staff is supposed to receive a formal report on the results from INDOT. They have sent an example of the formal report, the example being the one INDOT conducted for MACOG, but as David Hittle mentioned APC Staff had not received anything regarding their presentation and will bring updates to the committee when received.

David Hittle thanked Tim Stroshine.

### **FEDERAL FUNDING OBLIGATIONS**

Doug Poad explained that we did receive a one-page report from INDOT's Central Office that is included in the meeting's packet. Looking at the update closely, all our funds have been obligated with a small balance of \$0.02 for STBG and \$0.45 for bonus funds. This small difference is because we don't allocate our funds in the TIP by cents. As mentioned in previous month's meetings, this report will not show the trade that occurred with INDOT for the \$169,011. In essence, all of the funds are obligated, and we are good to go. In addition to receiving the information for Lafayette, INDOT also sent out information about all the MPOs. Looking at the list, we are 1 of 4 who have obligated all of our funds. There are 5 additional MPOs that have obligated 90% of their funds. The Terre Haute MPO however, has not obligated any of their federal funds. Michigan City and NIRPC have only obligated 11% and Bloomington has only obligated 44% of their funding. So, we are considered a part of the good group.

### **INDOT 18-Month Letting List**

Doug Poad said there were 5 projects that were on April 7<sup>th</sup>'s letting. The first project, SR 38 ADA Sidewalk ramp construction, was let to Milestone Contractors. Their bid was a little over \$400,000, which was fairly close to the engineer's estimate. There were four bids for that project. The second project, SR 38 Debris Removal, was let to Crackers Demo LLC. Their bid was a little over \$263,000. There were 3 bids. The engineer's estimate was a little over \$700,000. The third project, SR 38 HMA Overlay, Structural (Tip shows project as Road Rehabilitation), went to Rieth-Riley Construction for \$1.5 million. The engineer's estimate was \$1.8 million. There were 3 bids. The fourth project's, US 231 pavement patching, bid is currently

pending. There were 3 bids. Rieth-Riley Construction was the low bidder at a little over \$146,000. That was above the engineers estimate. The last project, I-65 pavement patching, had 2 bids. The lowest bid from Rieth-Riley Construction was \$1.5 million. Its bid as well as the bid made by Milestone Construction were both rejected. It has been moved to the May bid letting. The construction estimated completion date has been moved to September 15, 2021.

Doug Poad said looking further down the letting list, project # 13, the district wide bridge maintenance, has been moved from the July letting to the November letting. Project # 14, Sagamore Pkwy Trail, will be moving from the November letting to the January letting. Project # 17-27 are all related to the next phase of widening I-65. That is still on target for a Nov 17<sup>th</sup> bid letting.

Scott J Chandler said Travis Kohl sent him a list of minor notes that Shane Spears had previously brought to the MPO Policy Board. He said he would send the list to Doug Poad and suggested that he goes through that list and if he has questions, then Doug Poad should reach out to Marcy.

Doug said he would be glad to. Doug and Marcy have weekly contact so it shouldn't be an issue.

#### **VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

#### **VIII. CITIZEN COMMENT**

There was a one-minute pause to allow for public comments. No comments were made.

#### **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting is May 19th, 2021.

John Fricker adjourned the meeting at 3:36 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maureen McNamara  
GIS Specialist

Reviewed By,  
**ENTER DAVIDS SIGNATURE**

David Hittle