

The  
**AREA PLAN COMMISSION**  
of Tippecanoe County

## Citizens Participation Meeting

**Date.....December 14, 2022**

**Time.....6:00 PM**

**Place.....Virtual/ Tippecanoe Room  
County Office Building  
20 North 3rd Street  
Lafayette, Indiana**

Members of the public may watch the livestream of the meeting at

<https://www.facebook.com/TippecanoeCountyIndiana> and

<https://www.youtube.com/c/TippecanoeCountyGovernment>

### AGENDA

#### I. MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

Documents:

[CPC 9.14.2022.pdf](#)

#### II. PROGRAM

- A. 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Development Timeline, and Proposed Projects

Documents:

[TIP Adoption Schedule 2024 TIP.pdf](#)

#### III. QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

#### IV. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Dates for 2023:

- o March 08
- o June 14
- o September 13

o December 13

## Planning for Lafayette, West Lafayette, Dayton, Battle Ground, Clarks Hill and Tippecanoe County

In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), the Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs, or activities. For more information visit [www.tippecanoe.in.gov/ada](http://www.tippecanoe.in.gov/ada)

**AREA PLAN COMMISSION OF TIPPECANOE COUNTY  
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

DATE..... September 14, 2022  
TIME..... 6:00 PM  
PLACE..... Tippecanoe Room (Virtual)  
County Building  
20 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Lafayette, IN 47901

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Lynn Nelson  
Steve Clevenger  
Amy Krzton-Presson  
Deanna McMillan  
Andrew Smith  
Bill Arthur  
Nick Harby

**STAFF PRESENT**

Tim Stroshine  
Aria Staiger

Tim Stroshine called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. He conducted a roll call of the members present.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Tim Stroshine stated the June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting was used as the official public hearing for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Deanna McMillan moved to approve the minutes from the June 2, 2022 meeting. Lynn Nelson seconded, and the minutes, as submitted, were approved by a roll call vote.

**II. PROGRAM**

Tim Stroshine began by providing an update to a topic that did not make the program. The MPO has been involved in the Greater Lafayette Northern Connectivity Study, which looks at a potential future connection of the US 231 and Sagamore Parkway intersection to Interstate 65. This has been an ongoing study done in partnership with the Indiana Department of Transportation. Recently, a scope change has occurred. Previously a Planning Environmental Linkages Study was done, which looks for a needed transportation connectivity. After discussions with INDOT, it was realized that we are past the stage to be doing this type of study and need to change to a Corridor Study. The connection between US 231 and Interstate 65 has been identified in our long-range transportation plans for a while now and is in very preliminary, early stages and no road alignment has been identified.

Deanna McMillan asked if there would be a series of public meetings as a way of getting the word out, as the study gets underway, to let the community know what is happening.

Tim Stroshine said there are many people who have homes close to where the road might be built and would want some say in where the road goes or if a road is appropriate. There will be meetings, assuming this study advances, however, none have been scheduled yet.

Deanna McMillan said if people are informed, they will be less likely to balk once a plan is underway.

Tim Stroshine added that this project has been ongoing for years, and in the past, there has been heavy public engagement throughout the early phases of the project. That could be expected for any future projects that may be planned. A similar strategy would be used.

Steve Clevenger asked if the connectivity not only includes I-65, but back over to 43.

Tim Stroshine said that we would like to eventually get that portion, but it would be a separate phase. This Corridor Study would only be focused on connecting the current US 231 and Sagamore intersection to I-65.

Steve Clevenger asked if the plan included having a committee, similar to CAC, or if someone will do the study and come up with alternatives and present those.

Tim Stroshine said his desire would be to have a CAC again for this project. We are working with INDOT, so it is not solely up to us as to how it proceeds. In the past, the committee was an appropriate way for public outreach. The hope would be that something similar could be in place to have residents give their input throughout the project.

Steve Clevenger said he believes there are comments from the CAC in the reports, about the intersection of Sagamore Parkway and 231. There was a desire to possibly leave room for an interchange or some type of intersection that would not hold up traffic with two major roads.

Tim Stroshine said he does have all the meeting minutes, suggestions and comments that were collected in those committee meetings. He also has a study that was done with the previous phase that includes a bit of information about this phase. There is some historical documentation.

### **Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) Funding Update**

Tim Stroshine explained this IIJA was put together by the United States Department of Transportation. The new transportation legislation is referred to as the Investment and Jobs Act and/or the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. A new program, Safe Streets and Roads for All, is an opportunity for grant-based funding for projects that improve safety in the county. Safety of the traveling public is one focus of the grant. Tim presented slides showing statistics of traffic crashes around the world and specifically how many lives are lost on US roads (39,824 on US roads, 6,516 pedestrians) in 2020, the year of the pandemic. Even with less people traveling during the pandemic, nearly 40,000 lives were lost in 2020. Indiana statistics were not readily available. Graphs were shown to illustrate crashes in an urban area or rural area, plotting them as interstates and principal arterials versus other arterial and collector/local roads. The highest number of crashes tend to be on other arterials, not quite interstate or US highways, but just below that category, like Salisbury Street in Tippecanoe County, for example. A graph to illustrate roadway fatalities per 100,000 population, broken down by race, was shown. People in tribal governments can apply for these funds because they are disproportionately impacted by the number of roadway fatalities. A component of this grant funding is to try to correct these statistics.

Tim Stroshine explained that the USDOT and Federal Highway Administration have made the National Roadway Safety Strategy a point of emphasis. ([www.transportation.gov/NRRS](http://www.transportation.gov/NRRS)) The strategy is committed to funding engineering projects for safe roads and working with vehicle manufacturers to provide safety measures, with a goal of reducing fatalities. A slide was shown to list the effective roadway safety practices and strategies. Vision Zero and Towards Zero Deaths are separate non-profit initiatives with the goal of zero fatalities. Each have their own websites that you can refer to. Complete Streets, Proven Safety Strategies and Countermeasures that Work are engineering-based items that have been heavily researched in terms of how things are implemented. Innovative Practices and Technologies include vehicle manufacturers looking at how to make vehicles smarter and taking human error out of the driving process as well as camera-based technology showing how cameras detect people crossing the road, adding an additional factor of safety. A visual was shown to illustrate the Safe System Approach (SSA) Principles, as a representation of how these items work together.

Tim Stroshine used the website to illustrate an example of a 'complete street.' The pedestrian crosswalk is clearly marked, no faded paint, making it easy for drivers to see. There is a spot where people can wait, making it a two-stage crossing in the center, like an island. There are also detectable warning surfaces, the pads with raised dots, for visually impaired people. A 'complete street' allows for clear interactions

between vehicles and pedestrians. The Federal Highway Administration studies Proven Roadway Safety Strategies and those were listed on a slide. Examples of proven safety countermeasures include crosswalk visibility enhancements and crosswalk lighting.

Tim Stroshine returned to the topic of the legislation. He explained the funding is specifically for local governments, not the state. One billion dollars is available in annual funding, for a total of five years for FY 2022-2026. Eligible recipients include Metropolitan Planning Organizations (Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County), political subdivisions of a state (city), federally recognized tribal governments and multi-jurisdictional groups, meaning a partnership could apply for funding. There are two categories, Action Plan Grants, and Implementation Grants. Action Plan Grants identify areas in the jurisdiction that need work and how to work towards improvements. Implementation Grants focus on starting a physical project. Local governments must match 20% of the total cost, which is why it is beneficial to partner with various local governmental organizations. Each state can receive a maximum of 15% of the total funding in any fiscal year.

Tim Stroshine explained that the Implementation Grant is what we are applying for. These strategies must be identified in an Action Plan, and due to other planning efforts on our part, these strategies are already in place. We have been able to go through a self-certification stage where we show these projects are in already-established plans. A slide showing how the applications will be scored was highlighted. Items A and B are believed to be weighted the most during scoring. These items address how the project will significantly reduce or eliminate transportation-related fatalities and how it demonstrates engagement with a variety of public and private stakeholders.

Tim Stroshine asked if there were any questions.

Amy Krzton-Presson asked if public transit or increased bike infrastructure would count as increased safety, because those get cars off the road.

Tim Stroshine responded that both were applicable types of projects. He explained that the websites would provide a more exhaustive list of project examples.

No other questions were presented.

Tim Stroshine presented an aerial map of the proposed trail project. It starts near Sagamore Parkway and heads north on Ninth Street and over to Swisher Road, then follows to the entrance of Prophetstown State Park. This tie-in would then connect to the internal trail system within the park. This plan meets the criteria of increasing safety, by providing a safer path for cyclists. In 2013, there was a bicycle fatality along North Ninth Street. Additionally, a lot of public engagement has been done. The Wabash River Enhancement Corporation has worked hard on the Wabash River Greenway Corridor, checking the box of demonstrating this project is part of an existing plan. The grant also looks at how ready projects are at moving forward. The intent of the grant is to get projects constructed that have planning available to them but may be lacking in some of the necessary funding.

Tim Stroshine asked if there were any questions.

Lynn Nelson asked if the trail would be a circle route that would go out Ninth Street to Prophetstown and then could link and come back along North River Road.

Tim Stroshine said the Wabash River Heritage Trail would tie-in to this proposed trail and could create a loop. The proposed trail would run parallel to the already existing Heritage Trail.

Amy Krzton-Presson asked if this project includes access across the Tippecanoe County bridge project on the north side.

Tim Stroshine replied that there are plans for how to get across the bridge. Locally we attempted to get some funding from another source, the RAISE grant, but the application didn't go through. We are re-

applying for the SS4A grant because we believe those funds and this project address some of the considerations for that funding.

Bill Arthur asked for clarification that the south end of the project is at Sagamore.

Tim Stroshine confirmed and said the trail should tie into the existing Ninth Street side paths.

Lynn Nelson asked when we would find out if the grant is approved.

Tim Stroshine said the application is due Thursday, September 15, 2022. There is not a firm decision date, but it should be around the end of this year or the beginning of next year. We should know by January whether this project is awarded.

Bill Arthur asked about the projected cost of the project.

Tim Stroshine said that to get this type of grant, one must demonstrate that they are able to put in the 20% local match. We brought this before the WREC Board, and they were comfortable that the match can be met. The overall total cost is going to be around \$10 million so that would mean locally we would need to get \$2 million. Tim stated he wasn't exactly sure of the cost and could possibly have numbers mixed up between other projects, but he knows for sure the WREC Board is comfortable that local funding is available for the match portion.

### **III. QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS**

Aria Staiger said there were no public comments on the streams.

Tim Stroshine said the next virtual meeting is December 14<sup>th</sup>.

### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Deanna McMillan moved to adjourn. Lynn Nelson seconded, and adjournment was unanimous by a roll call vote. The meeting adjourned at 6:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristina Lamb  
Recording Secretary

Reviewed By,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Hittle". The signature is stylized with a horizontal line under the first name and a horizontal line under the last name.

David Hittle  
Executive Director

## FY 2024-2028 TIP Development Schedule

- October 19<sup>th</sup> – Distribute project programming sheets to jurisdictions.
- December 9<sup>th</sup> – Project programming sheets returned to APC.
- December 9<sup>th</sup> – CityBus and Airport project information submitted to APC.
- December 14<sup>th</sup> – Present project lists and TIP schedule presented at CPC meeting.
- December 16<sup>th</sup> – First legal and public notices published/posted.
- December 21<sup>st</sup> – Discuss project requests at Tech Committee.
- December 28<sup>th</sup> – CityBus Board endorses transit project information.
- December 30<sup>th</sup> – Red Flag analysis to be completed.
- January 18<sup>th</sup> – Tech Committee prioritizes and constrains project requests.
- February 15<sup>th</sup> – Second legal notice and public hearing published/posted.
- February 24<sup>th</sup> – Draft document completed.
- February 24<sup>th</sup> – Draft TIP sent to INDOT for review.
- March 8<sup>th</sup> – Official public hearing in conjunction with CPC meeting.
- April 12<sup>th</sup> – Adoption public notice published/posted.
- March, April – INDOT STIP public meetings.
- April 19<sup>th</sup> – Tech review & recommendation
- May 11<sup>th</sup> – Policy Board presentation and possible adoption.
- May 12<sup>th</sup> – Anticipated adopted TIP sent to INDOT.