



# Evansville Metropolitan Planning Organization

Civic Center Complex, Room 316, 1 N.W. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Evansville, IN 47708-1833  
PH: (812) 436-7833 FAX: (812) 436-7834 www.evansvillempo.com

Bradley G. Mills, P.E., Executive Director

## EVANSVILLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Regular meeting held at 10:00 a.m. in Room 318  
Civic Center Complex – Administration Building  
Evansville, Indiana**

**November 1, 2007**

### **ROLL CALL**

#### Members Present:

Glenn Boberg, Nick Hall, Richard Meyer, Emmanuel Nsonwu, Pat Keepses, Kent Cutchin, Dave Franklin, Dave Matthews

#### Evansville MPO Staff Present:

Brad Mills, Kari Akin, Craig Luebke, Laura Lamb, Rob Schaefer

#### Others Present:

Mike Feltz, Shelia Schmitt, Wes Hill

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Mr. Keepses:** The first item on the agenda is approval of minutes for the October meeting. Is there a motion for approval? (Motion was made by Mr. Cutchin and seconded by Mr. Nsonwu.) SO ORDERED.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

### **PROJECT UPDATE**

#### **CITY OF EVANSVILLE**

##### **Surface Transportation Program (STP) Projects**

##### Vann Avenue – Lincoln Avenue:

**Ms. Lamb:** The Board of Public Works approved the submission of the final tracings to INDOT for review at their October 11, 2007 meeting. A tentative letting is being proposed for the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2008.

Ohio Street ITS Project:

**Ms. Lamb:** The consultant has submitted the final plans for this project and INDOT has indicated that the project will be placed on the March 5, 2008 list for letting.

The Greenway Passage Project – Phase 3:

Phase 3C (Casino Aztar to Franklin Street along Pigeon Creek)

**Ms. Lamb:** A ribbon cutting ceremony was held October 30, 2007 to officially open this section of the Greenway. Miscellaneous aspects of the project, such as tree plantings, will be finalized during the month of November.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY**

Burkhardt Road – Virginia Street:

**Ms. Lamb:** Preliminary field check plans have been submitted for review. The MPO is working with the County Engineer to verify that the proposed turn lane lengths are sufficient. In addition, the MPO staff has begun work on the environmental document.

Oak Hill Road – Bergdolt Road:

**Ms. Lamb:** All right-of-way needed for this project to move forward has been secured.

Upper Mt. Vernon Road – Red Bank Road:

**Ms. Lamb:** The final design has been submitted and INDOT has indicated that this project will be placed on the March 5, 2008 list for letting.

**INDOT PROJECTS**

**Ms. Lamb:** I have inserted a flyer that we received from INDOT and it has project overviews for two projects.

US Highway 41 – Lloyd Expressway Interchange:

**Ms. Lamb:** I will highlight some of the interesting things they have included. The need for the project is to travel delay primarily on Lloyd Expressway caused by the signalized intersections at the two ramp junctions; and the elevated level of accidents being experienced at or near these intersections. At this time, a full cloverleaf interchange is being proposed which will impact the playground and parking area of the Howard Roosa School. Mitigation plans to replace playground equipment and provide alternative parking spaces are under way. Conceptual plans for routing a multi-use path through the proposed interchange developed by the Pigeon Creek Greenway and the MPO. Recommended alternate routing the multi-use path along the east side of the proposed interchange from Walnut Street on the south side to Virginia Street on the north side. A new pedestrian overpass will be constructed over the Lloyd Expressway as part of the project. The path will typically run parallel to the interchange ramps and will be separated from the ramps by a drainage swale and a chain link fence which will be constructed along the interchange's limited access right-of-way line.

US Highway 41, SR 66 to Boonville-New Harmony Road:

**Ms. Lamb:** This project is also included on the flyer. The need for the project is mainly due to the deteriorating condition of the existing pavement. Additional concerns are medians and roadsides do not satisfy current design standards, insufficient or lack of auxiliary lanes, and the CSX railroad location causing undesirable vertical alignment of intersecting roads. The current recommended alternative involves adding travel lanes from Diamond Avenue to Mt. Pleasant Road. Features of the project will include three 12 foot travel lanes in each direction, 10 foot outside shoulders, and a concrete median barrier. Improvements will also be made to intersecting roads as part of this project.

SR 62/Morgan Avenue – Green River Road Intersection:

**Ms. Lamb:** This is also an INDOT project. On June 25, 2007, the City issued a letter to INDOT requesting that the plans for this intersection improvement be reviewed for the inclusion of dedicated biked lanes to match those that are to be installed by the City as part of the Oak Hill Road corridor project. INDOT has indicated that these design changes and the additional funding necessary has been approved, but the proposed letting of the project will be pushed to April, 2009.

SR 66/Lloyd Expressway – Stockwell Road:

**Ms. Lamb:** This project is now complete.

I-69 in Indiana

**Ms. Lamb:** This is the Evansville to Indianapolis route. The Tier 2 Final Environmental Impact Statement for Section 1, which is I-64 to Oakland City, has been released by INDOT. A record of decision approving this document from the FHWA is needed before any federal funds can be released for use on this project, and INDOT is anticipating the issuance of the ROD by the FHWA by the end of year. This document is available for review in the MPO office or on the I-69 website at [www.i69indyevn.org](http://www.i69indyevn.org). In addition, preparation continues for the expected start of construction for the initial 2.6 mile segment from I-64 to SR 68 in June, 2008. INDOT held a Maintenance-of-Traffic meeting on October 9, 2007 to review and discuss alternatives to the detours needed during the construction of this first segment.

**Ms. Lamb:** That's all I have for project updates. Does anyone have any questions or additions about these or any of the other projects?

**Mr. Keepes:** If there are no questions, thank you, Laura.

**NEW BUSINESS**

METS Federal FY 2007 Section 5307 Grant Application

**Ms. Akin:** The Metropolitan Evansville Transit System is seeking the approval of the Evansville Metropolitan Planning Organization for the METS Federal FY 2007 Section 5307 Grant Application. They are requesting capital, operating and transit enhancement assistance to fund its calendar year 2008 budget. The capital projects include preventative maintenance activities and replacement of three para

transit vehicles which have exceeded their useful life in both mileage and age. Operating assistance is requested for the normal everyday operation of the system. Transit enhancement assistance is requested for fencing and landscaping at the METS downtown terminal.

The total project cost of the application is \$5,994,333 split by the following sources:

FTA Section 5307	\$1,345,947
State of Indiana PMTF	\$1,407,813
City of Evansville	\$3,240,573

**Ms. Akin:** These are in our current TIP. If you have any questions, Shelia is here from METS. She is the one who did the grant.

**Mr. Keepes:** Do we have any questions? If not, is there a motion? (Motion was made by Mr. Matthews and seconded by Mr. Cutchin.) Voice vote. SO ORDERED.

**Mr. Keepes:** Thank you, Kari.

#### FY 2008-2011 TIP Amendment

DES#0101170:

**Mr. Luebke:** We have one TIP amendment today. This is an INDOT project. INDOT is requesting the following amendment. US 41: Major pavement road reconstruction project from Boonville-New Harmony Road in Vanderburgh County to Coal Mine Road in Gibson County. This project is being amended to add preliminary engineering for the project in fiscal year 2008. PE in FY 2008 of \$2,000,000 will be funded by \$1,600,000 in federal NHS funding matched by \$400,000 in INDOT funds. The Interagency Consultation Group was consulted regarding this proposed amendment. No air quality conformity determination was deemed necessary. In the amendment, you will see a replacement page for the TIP, and I believe it is the first item on the top page.

**Mr. Keepes:** Are there any questions for Craig? If not, do we have a motion? (Motion was made by Mr. Nsonwu and seconded by Mr. Cutchin.) Voice vote. SO ORDERED.

**Mr. Keepes:** Thank you, Craig.

#### FY 2008-2011 TIP Amendment (Informational Item)

**Mr. Luebke:** In addition to the amendment, we also have one administrative modification to the current TIP. This has been processed. This is an informational item for the Technical and Policy Boards. No motion or approval is required. The TIP administrative modification was requested by the Federal Transit Administration. They requested the text on page 5-8 be revised to indicate the future transit operating assistance from the INDOT Public Mass Transit Fund in lieu of expired FTA Section 5307 Operating Assistance. The text revisions are shown on the next page in the second to the last paragraph on 5-8. Essentially what we are saying, in the next five years, METS will continue to require operating assistance from the INDOT PMTF fund, an operating assistance that did expire in fiscal year 2007. That is the only change to that page. Are there any questions?

Cancellation of December 2007 MPO meeting

**Mr. Keepes:** Thank you, Craig. We move on to the final item to discuss cancellation of the December 2007 MPO meeting.

**Mr. Mills:** We have typically, every December, it seems that people are always busy and away and we have difficulty in getting a quorum in December. So we wanted to know if there were any pressing items anyone knows of that we need to try to have a meeting. If there are items, we typically can do those with email. We will be bringing this before the Policy Committee this afternoon as well. We wanted to get your thoughts or comments if there were any concerns on that.

**Mr. Luebke:** We have had a couple of TIP amendments; I know KYTC has one for a project that they are indicating they would like to see in December. And potentially one for the Ohio Street rail, the ITS project as well. So we want to keep that in mind just to fill everybody in.

**Mr. Mills:** Okay. Thank you for mentioning that.

**Mr. Keepes:** Any thoughts on that? If not, we will need a motion for cancellation. (Motion was made by Mr. Cutchin and seconded by Mr. Matthews.) Voice vote. SO ORDERED.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Schedule of MPO meetings for 2008

**Mr. Mills:** Your last sheet in the packet is the list of meeting dates for next year. Please put that on your calendar for next year. Thank you.

**Mr. Keepes:** Thank you, Brad. Is there any other business?

**Mr. Matthews:** I have a couple things I would like to discuss. Craig was talking about METS and assistance needed. The Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee had a presentation by a concerned group about the need for increased routes to serve industry so people who don't have cars can use the bus to get to their jobs up Highway 41 and some areas like that. So I bring that forward to let you know there is a group out there concerned and hopefully we will pay attention to that and maybe even look at the bus routes. I know Ed Ziemer is probably involved in that, and maybe some other folks. Is there a study underway by any chance, to look at serving better these areas where people who don't have cars can get to their jobs?

**Mr. Cutchin:** Actually, there is no study underway at this time. There has been talk, meetings. Rob Schaefer may be able to add a little to that. But we are looking into doing a study. We have taken several requests, not just recently, but in years past, for expanded service. It is a dilemma. We are at a crossroads here in Evansville at not being a large super city by no means. But we are encompassing some situations where we are being inundated with requests to other areas of Evansville and outside Evansville into the county, as well as Newburgh, Henderson and Mt. Vernon. But we are looking at those issues and trying to formulate some type of plan to move in that direction.

**Mr. Matthews:** And I think they are where it is an issue of money because these don't operate at a profit in the ridership. I think you are taking a reasonable approach, but you will probably be getting some other folks coming to you and maybe already have.

**Mr. Cutchin:** We have.

**Mr. Matthews:** The other thing has to do with the new regionalism we talked about. Southwestern Indiana Chamber of Commerce, the Board of Realtors are becoming a regional board. This organization, MPO, does great work. But it is so limited in its scope. I don't know if there is any way to expand that beyond our Henderson, Vanderburgh and Warrick Counties to make it more of a regional organization. Also, just this week, the economic development coalition had a meeting and some things were discussed there about the need for a greater land use planning. I know each county has its own planning commission. But here is no regional group that handles that. So I am just asking a question. Are we moving to that direction where we can start thinking on a regional basis or beyond the boundaries of what MPO does and certainly beyond a county basis, to start looking to the future and how can we best compete as a region with other regions in the country?

**Mr. Mills:** We do cover the three counties you mentioned. We also do rural planning with Posey and Gibson counties. We just met with Gibson County this week and we are looking at roadway network improvements they want to work on and data collection that we do for them. We are going to be meeting with Posey County in the next few weeks to go along the same similar discussions. We do work regionally at this point. We work with Warrick and Vanderburgh counties in how the roads will connect. We do modeling for the area which includes Gibson and Posey counties. So I don't know, what more regionally do you want us to do? Do you want us regionally economically to get more involved with that? Or, what are you asking?

**Mr. Matthews:** I think moving beyond the scope of transportation, there are other things. There are utilities, airport, and rail. There is a lot besides looking at roads and wondering who is looking after that. It is such an important need that we have, not just roads, but also land use. You kind of wear a lot of hats in county. Is there any way we might be looking in the future to combine some of those functions so that we all know what everybody is doing? If it weren't for you serving this position, you are kind of the only overlap between all these different areas. Don't we need a little better monitoring and maybe planning on a land use basis that goes along with the transportation as well?

**Mr. Franklin:** I think one of the problems is the MPO's; it is, in fact, a federal entity that was created by federal law and is charged with carrying out transportation functions that are more or less federally mandated. That doesn't mean they can't do more. But in order to receive the federal funds or the planning funds, they can't do things outside of that scope that the federal government allows. When you start mentioning utilities, I don't think that is part of it. Brad already talked about, the long range plan has a 20 year horizon and that is the planning area. I am not sure, and correct me if I'm wrong, some MPO's bring their planning area out to the counties to make it more neat and tidy. Some don't. But the metropolitan planning area is where the MPO expects their transportation network to be in 20 years. Also, if I could go back to your question before this one about the transit. During the last certification or the first one a few years ago, that was one of the recommendations that the MPO do a study to examine connectivity between Henderson and Evansville. I believe that was looked at.

**Mr. Mills:** We do, when you are talking about land use and better coordination, we work with the plan commissions in Henderson and Warrick counties when we do a long range transportation update. So we

do look at their plan. We do talk to them and ask for their input. We use that information when we do our model updates. So all that information is added into it. Do we need to get more involved in their economic development in trying to help push them or guide them? I don't really know that that is our scope for our agency to do. We do try to work together as a team though and make sure we are considering all the changes and all the work they plan to do in their particular counties.

**Mr. Matthews:** A couple examples. Where should the next large industrial park be? In other words, if we ever have to move the airport because in 20 or 30 years it is obsolete. Where would we move that? The intermodal facility they are talking about for Gibson County, where should that be and how should that be tied in? The slack water port. Is that good land use? Those are the kinds of issues that I am concerned about. Are we properly studying those and thinking in a regional concept?

**Mr. Mills:** I think we consider some of that. I don't know that we have the slack water port in our plan at this time? But we do take the planned growth for industrial. For example, the I-69 development, we show that corridor up at I-64 and I-164 as all being planned to be industrial. So we are looking at the impacts and trying to consider everything as we go 20 years out in the future. Now, as things change and are added, we do update our plan about every four years. So we have the opportunity to be flexible and consider new things as things come on board. The slack water port would be one example of those. So we will consider that in our next round I'm sure.

**Mr. Matthews:** And which hat are you wearing when you say "we"?

**Mr. Mills:** It will be both; the Area Plan Commission, because we will have to look at what the land use might be. Then also with the MPO, we would have to consider what transportation impacts it would have. That is going to be a major impact on trucks that will be traveling to that and up the Lloyd Expressway. So we would obviously have to consider that.

**Mr. Matthews:** Working with the various counties and area plan commissions, you could do that from the MPO point of view trying to get all these folks in one room to discuss the future that would be the best group to use?

**Mr. Mills:** We can do that from a transportation planning aspect. So we can get everybody together and talk about how the transportation impacts are going to be done. If you are talking a bigger picture of the economic development and how do we see everything moving, I don't know if that is GAGE or who that might be a better vehicle for that. As Dave mentioned, we are limited to the transportation impacts. We can't really get into trying to do the land use planning for another community. We can consider their planning, but we really can't guide that.

**Mr. Matthews:** Thank you very much.

**Mr. Keepes:** Is there any other business? If not, is there anybody in the audience who would like to comment? Seeing nobody, thank you for attending. We are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned.