



Evansville Metropolitan Planning Organization

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

Seyed Shokouhzadeh, Executive Director

EVANSCVILLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Regular meeting held at 4:00 p.m. in Room 301
Civic Center Complex – Administration Building
Evansville, Indiana

September 4, 2014

The foregoing are minutes and not intended to be a verbatim transcript. An audio version of the proceedings can be heard or viewed on our website at www.evansvillemopo.com.

ROLL CALL

Members Present (voting):

Jack Corn, Stephen Melcher, Russell Sights, Richard Reid, Lori Buehlman, Rusty Fowler, Kevin McClearn

Members Absent (voting):

Stephanie Brinkerhoff-Riley, Mayor Lloyd Winnecke, Todd Robertson, Donald Angel, Angela Koehler-Lindsey, William Hubiak

Members Absent (non-voting):

Karl Browning, Rick Marquis, Scott Deloney, Marisol Simon, Tony Greep, Jose Sepulveda, Bernadette Dupont, Mike Hancock, Keith Damron, John Gowins, Michelle Allen

Evansville MPO Staff Present:

Seyed Shokouhzadeh, Pam Drach, Rob Schaefer, Kari Akin, Erin Mattingly, Laura Lamb, Vishu Lingala, Craig Luebke

Others Present:

Rick Marquis, Michelle Allen, Beth Jones, Robert Howard, Karen Bobo, Mohammad Hajeer

Mr. Corn: First, I would like to introduce Richard Marquis from Federal Highway. I think he has some folks with him he's going to introduce.

Mr. Marquis: Good Afternoon, I'd like to introduce my staff from IN FHWA that are here today: Michelle Allen, Karen Bobo, and Mohammad Hajeer.

Mr. Corn: Welcome. Also, Beth Jones is here and she is going to put on a brilliant presentation shortly, from Kentucky.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Corn: The first item on the agenda is the approval of minutes from the previous meeting. I would entertain a motion for approval. (Motion was made by Mr. Reid and seconded by Mr. Melcher.) Voice vote.
SO ORDERED.

Mr. Corn: One other thing. We have a star in our mist from the Evansville Business Journal. They did a story on Kari in here. I think it just came out this week. I didn't remember seeing it then I remembered it's lying on my table at home and I received it yesterday. Very nice article. Congratulations.

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. Project Update

CITY OF EVANSVILLE

Washington Avenue – Second Street-Parrett Street Area Improvement

Ms. Lamb: INDOT has granted the city authorization to proceed with the preliminary engineering contract.

VANDERBURGH COUNTY

Burkhardt Road-Virginia Street Intersection Improvement

Ms. Lamb: The project is currently scheduled for the November 13th bid letting. The construction engineering contract with CHA is being finalized.

Maryland Street Bridge Over Pigeon Creek

Ms. Lamb: Coordination with Vectren regarding the gas main is being finalized. Bidding is tentatively planned to begin again in mid-September with a possible contract award by the end of October.

Heckel Road Widening: Green River Road to Oak Hill Road

Ms. Lamb: Survey work is complete and preliminary plans are being developed.

Green River Road: Kansas Road to Boonville-New Harmony Road

Ms. Lamb: Stage 1 design plans have been submitted to INDOT for review. A preliminary field check meeting is being planned for this month.

TOWN OF NEWBURGH

Newburgh Safe Routes to School

Ms. Lamb: A preconstruction meeting was held September 3rd.

Newburgh Sign Replacement

Ms. Lamb: The RFPs have been scored locally and sent to INDOT for further processing.

INDOT

US 41 – Lloyd Expressway Interchange

Ms. Lamb: All bids submitted during the August 20th letting were over the engineer's estimate and therefore, all were rejected. The project has been rescoped and readvertised for the September 10th letting. Those are all the updates I have. Are there any questions about those or comments about others?

Mr. Corn: That Heckel Road, is that a county project?

Ms. Lamb: That is a county project.

Mr. Corn: Any other questions? (None.) Thank you Laura. The star is up next, Kari. I mean Beth.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. Beth Jones, KYTC – Land Use Presentation

Ms. Jones: I think I've met most or all of you before. I'm Beth Jones. I'm the MPO representative from Kentucky for KYTC. I put this presentation together for the last state-wide meeting back in May. Seyed and his infinite wisdom decided that maybe something could be gained by providing it to you all too, maybe I could pass along a little information that you are not aware of. So I'm here to bring you all up to date. This is for the same reason I got in touch with KYTC before, I'm probably one of the very few non-engineers working at the cabinet. My background is in planning. I was privileged to come to the cabinet back in February. I was a planner with the Bluegrass Area Development District in Lexington for six years. There were two main parts of that job that I felt affects transportation quite a bit. One of those was that, in the six years that we were there, we put together five comprehensive plans for communities in our area. Another was that we contracted with some of our local communities to serve as their staff planners. So I was also a planner for Anderson County, Kentucky for that same period of time, about five years. It occurred to me after talking to some of the folks at District 7 that there were things that planners were doing in Kentucky that might be helpful to the transportation engineers and planners in prioritizing projects and in making decisions on specific options to choose from and that sort of thing. So that's why I ended up putting that together.

I don't think people who are not planners necessarily realize what a huge connection there is between land use and zoning and transportation. To be honest, I just graduated myself in 2006. I didn't realize when I was in school how significant transportation is in how a community grows and how communities come together.

I wanted to tell you a little about, this is all Kentucky stuff. I'm not familiar with the other states. But I wanted to tell you about how it all happens in Kentucky. There is a state regulation that outlines how everything is put together, the procedures and processes. As far as zoning goes, planning commissions can be for a city area only, for an entire county including the city. There can even be two separate planning commissions, one for the city and one for the county. Or even there is authorization for groups of counties to get together if they feel like there is enough mutual interest to work together on it. Some of the things covered under the zoning regulations are information about how planning commissions and board of

adjustments are set up and subdivision management which is the creation of parcels. There are regulations about residential care facilities, cell towers. But the two that have the most to do with transportation planning or have the most potential affect are zoning itself, land use management and comprehensive plans. The purpose of land use management (health, safety, & general welfare), it is basically to make sure they develop in an orderly fashion. These are some of the things included in the regulation itself. You see that they specifically call out airports, highways and other transportation facilities. So when this regulation was being put together, there was recognition of how important transportation is as a part of all this. For those who aren't that familiar with zoning, there are two main themes. The one that has been most used recently across the country is Euclidian zoning. That's based on a Supreme Court decision from Euclid, Ohio. Euclidian zoning has been used for a long time. It is based on the use of the land. There is not really any other consideration taken into consideration on that. But recently over the past 10-15 years, there is more of an emphasis on form based zoning and/or mixed use zoning. It is a new concept but it reminds me of the way neighborhoods and communities used to grow up organically in the days before zoning. It allows for much more flexibility in the land uses. There can be mixtures of residential and commercial. This is where you see things like the old-fashioned concept of having shops on one floor and apartments above. There tends to be even a more direct mix of different types of residential uses from apartments all the way to bigger houses and single family. It tends to be more multi-modal and less auto-dependent. You have businesses in a neighborhood that allow people to not have to get in their car to do everything that they do in their life. They can potentially walk up to the street to the grocery store or the dry cleaners. In my opinion, it creates much more of a neighborhood feeling rather than a subdivision feeling. That is something that you are starting to see more in Kentucky and around the nation. The regulations or use is still an issue. But there's also a lot of emphasis on the physical forms that the buildings themselves take and how well they work with each other. So that's where the form-based concepts comes in.

Everyone who has a zoning is generally going to have a zoning map and that will show actual uses or zones. Sometimes a zone that you see on a zoning map is not going to coordinate with the actual use that you see from your windshield simply because a lot of times things have been grandfathered in before zoning regulations were established. These maps may also show areas that are restricted in some way for development because of recreational areas or wildlife conservation, floodplains, that sort of thing. So this can be a good source of information about how a community is developing and where different types of development are happening.

There is a process that is fairly rigid for making zone changes. It is outlined in this regulation. A planning commission, legislative body, or the owner of the property can initiate a zone change. Most of the time it's going to be the owner of the property. There are requirements regarding public hearings. All the neighbors are notified. Everybody is given the best chance to try to make comments and offer their opinions and ideas. There is a fairly rigid process for making decisions. The applicant must show that the change they are requesting is in compliance with the comprehensive plan that the community has in place. Or, that the existing zoning classification is inappropriate for some reason. Maybe it was just a mistake. And what they are wanting to do is more appropriate. Or that there have been major changes in the community since the last comprehensive plan was adopted so it was an unanticipated change. After the public hearing and presentation to the planning commission, the planning staff will develop a recommendation and pass it along to the legislative body and they actually have the final decision. They can either choose to accept or reject the recommendation of the planning commission.

I'm going into this detail to emphasize the fact that there is a procedure that has to be followed. The public is invited to make comments. The legislative bodies weigh in. So it's not just a decision that is made. When you see something on a zoning map, as a transportation person, you can have a little bit of reliability that there were people in the community involved in the decision and it is a community decision and not just something that somebody decided and put down on paper. So when you are considering projects and trying

to write funding justifications, there may be bits and pieces in these zoning documents that you can use as part of your case for or against a particular project.

The other one in addition to the zoning is the comprehensive plan. Any community who wants to have zoning is required to have a comprehensive plan. You cannot have zoning without a plan. It is a 20-year window that is supposed to be updated every five years. They can go through and do a complete update, partial update. They can vote to readopt as is, however the community feels is most appropriate. The committee that develops this is probably going to have local folks, private sector stakeholders, in addition folks that are involved in public agencies, that sort of thing. There are public input opportunities. Elected officials are required to approve parts of it. Adjoining jurisdictions have to be notified. So the point is that there is more to it than just putting together a document. If something is in a comprehensive plan, you can have confidence that this is something that the community has put together. There are similar documents that, because Kentucky shares MPOs with four other states, all of them have a similar kind of document. So you will be able to find those in any MPO area.

There are some required elements. There is a statement of goals and objectives. There is a base study. There is a community facilities element. There is a military installation element and you can see that they are specifically called out in the regulation that there has to be a transportation element to it. Communities can customize it to their own needs and bring in other elements that are important to them. If you are an historic community and you want that in detail, you can bring that in. It's not required, but definitely permitted.

The statement of goals and objectives is put together by the committee. Stakeholders, professionals, government officials, public agency folks. It is required to be presented for public comment. This is the part of the plan that is required to be approved and adopted by the elected officials. So we have community input, elected official input, and you have some kind of expertise and knowledge from the community on that committee.

This one is one we did for Jessamine County in 2011. They had a planning commission in the city of Nicholasville and one for Jessamine County. They have not consolidated the planning commissions but they decided for the first time to come together and do a joint plan which we thought was a great idea. So they are all on the same page as far as how things want to be built in the future. But they still have two separate planning commissions.

But you can see we had eight pages worth and there is a transportation section that talks about what needs to go on with transportation in the community. The point is to try to get a staff-based knowledge base rather than anecdotal bases and what you think about what is happening. Try to get some real facts about the community that will help you make decisions about what the future needs to be and where things need to happen.

There is a community facilities element. This is sort of an existing conditions thing. You go in and talk about schools, libraries, public safety, water and sewer, parks and recreation, anything that is important to the community as far as community-wide facilities. I can't remember how close the military installation needs to be but if it is part of the area you are planning for and is at least 300 acres, then you have to bring those folks into the process too.

Then the final required element is the transportation element. That's meant to talk about all kinds of transportation, roadways, airports, waterways, and the fact that they specifically call this out in the regulations means that there's an acknowledgement of how important it is. Here you will see some of the things we did in the Jessamine County plan. Lots of maps, discussion about what is in the Kentucky six year

plan and what is on the unscheduled needs list. What the community wants to see happen. A lot of maps and tables and trying to get into what the community wants to do.

You have the optional element that the community wants to put in. One thing we always try to include is information about soil characteristics and geology because that can tell you where it's going to be most cost-efficient to put in the two main drivers which are sewer lines and roads so that can supply you with some information that will help with those decisions too.

Then it all wraps up with a land use element where they really get into the nitty gritty of where they want things to go, historic districts, downtown development districts, things like that that the community wants to have. There will be another map that is generally with the comprehensive plan and this is different from the zoning map because this one usually will show actual existing uses, but there is the added aspect of future uses. So you can see from a glance at this map where the community sees its industrial development happening, where it sees its residential development happening, its business development happening. They have reasons they made those decisions so you can use that as part of your decision making process. Because the community is involved and elected official are involved, it is something that has some weight to it.

Key points. Comp plans do require backstage research. The planning process does require input from the people who live there, the business owners, the government agencies and elected officials and it is a reflection of the wishes of the community. So that can be something that can be really valuable to transportation planners in making those kinds of decisions. Any kind of development that is happening has to be in agreement with the comp plan. So it is a pretty good authority to be able to look at

Make local planners a partner. You can talk to, I don't think there is a lot of interaction with planners on the local level when projects are being developed. There is a lot of good resources there and a lot of information that can be looked into if you take the time to do it and if you know that it's there.

I closed up with some plans that I personally worked on. They are posted on the bluegrass add website if anybody is interested in taking a closer look at one of these. These folks know how to get a hold of me. Just shoot me an email and I will send you the link to the plan. I think it's potentially a valuable source of information that folks don't necessarily know about.

Mr. Corn: Very good. Any questions?

Ms. Jones: I just wanted to make you aware of those things and hopefully you can put it in your tool box for future planning projects that come up. Thanks a lot.

Mr. Corn: Thank you.

B. FY 2014 Performance and Expenditures Completion Report

Ms. Akin: The Annual Unified Planning Work Program Performance and Expenditures Completion Report for FY 2014 presents a summary of the activities and projects completed by the MPO during the fiscal year of 2014. Described in the report is the progress attained in completing each of the work elements and these were all contained in our UPWP that comes out in the spring. Each work element in this document includes a description of the status, related projects, and funds expended. The document also includes budget and expenditure summary tables for each funding source; the FY 2014 4th quarter project update, a listing of the 779 traffic counts that we took, and a table listing TIP amendments and modifications processed during the year. In the past year, in your packet on page 37, it is a snapshot of all of our projects as well as our budget.

So at the very bottom, it says we have two million dollars budgeted and we have expended one million and that we still have a balance of one million. All of this money has to do with our special projects, the STP projects that are still going on. These are multi-year projects such as the 502.4 METS COA, our 509.7 which is the Evansville Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan and the 509.8 which is the Regional Pavement Management System. Ninety percent of those funds are paid to the consultant so we are never sure how prompt they are going to get our invoices to us to be able to pay them before the cutoff of the fiscal year. The other one is the 505.4 which is the Public Education and Air Quality Program that WNIN is producing for us. That total balance is paid to the producer. I believe they have about five episodes left. An electronic copy has been sent to our federal and state planning partners. They are currently reviewing them. We have some hard copies in our office. The electronic copy is also available on our website. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Mr. Corn: Any questions? Thank you Kari.

C. 2014 Evansville MPO Title VI Program

Mr. Schaefer: The MPO requests your approval for the 2014 EMPO Title VI Program. Title VI states that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the EMPO receives federal financial assistance. This Title VI Program is adopted and followed to ensure that the EMPO's programs, policies and activities comply with Title VI regulations. This draft Program was sent out by email last week to the Policy and Tech committees and has been on the EMPO website the past week for review and comment. We request your approval of the Title VI Program.

Mr. Corn: Is there a motion for approval? (Motion was made by Ms. Buehlman and seconded by Mr. Sights.) Voice vote. SO ORDERED.

D. Transportation Alternatives Program

Ms. Drach: In May, we did a call for projects for our Transportation Alternatives Program. We sent the notice out to our local public agencies as well as our planning partners. We received two completed applications, one for the Indiana portion of our funding opportunity and one for Kentucky. The one for Indiana we received from the City of Evansville for the Pigeon Creek Greenway Passage, the installation of drinking fountains along the Greenway at three locations: the riverfront area near the Four Freedoms Monument, Shirley James Gateway Plaza, and Uhlhorn Trailhead. The request was for approximately \$31,000. That is just to purchase the supplies that are needed to install the drinking fountains. They are going to install the drinking fountains with local forces. They are not asking for federal funding for the installation portion of it, just to purchase the supplies they need to put them in. That project scored 39 out of 75 points.

The second project was for Kentucky Transportation Alternatives Program funding. The City of Henderson applied for Phase 2 of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. This is for additional roadway signage and pavement markings. They are asking for approximately \$36,000. That project scored 64 out of 75 points.

Mr. Corn: Do we have any idea how many miles they are going to cover with that?

Ms. Drach: It was part of the application. I don't have that with me. I apologize for that.

Mr. Corn: Any questions? Is there a motion for approval? (Motion was made by Mr. Sights and seconded by Mr. Melcher.) Voice vote. SO ORDERED.

E. FY 2013-2016 TIP Amendments

Mr. Luebke: We have several TIP amendments.

Des# 1383065: Weinbach Avenue Road Diet project. Corridor conversion to three lanes, including sidewalk improvement from Pollack to Walnut Street. They are revising the PE schedule to reflect funding for the fiscal years of 2015 and 2016, as well as adding illustrative construction costs of \$1,674,000. Construction will be funded 90% with federal HSIP safety improvement program funding and a 10% local match. The HSIP application, that call was distributed in April of this year. The Weinbach Road Diet project was the only project submitted. That did score along the prioritization process 51 out of 75 possible points. This project was approved by the state HSIP committee for those funds.

Mr. Corn: Was this also replacing the widening at Lincoln and Weinbach? Was that all in this project? Or have we scrapped the widening project?

Mr. Luebke: Yes that project was kind of rescoped and led to this project I guess would be the best way to look at it. That project was there for awhile. We are pursuing this path instead.

Item# 02-79.30: US60: Widen and improve US60 from west of the Community College to KY425. Add right-of-way and utilities for \$1M in FY 2015 and construction of \$5.5M in FY 2016. Those projects will be 100% funded by STP program funding and a Kentucky toll credit match.

Des#1401105 and Des#1401106: We have two requests for the UPWP, both are FY15 planning elements. One for safety at \$100,000 for data collection, analysis and GIS mapping of crash data. And a second for CMAQ administration program development and HPMS data collection of \$44,192. 90% on the HSIP funding and 80% federal funds on the CMAQ STP side.

Mr. Corn: Any questions?

Mr. Sights: Did the Technical Committee approve all these?

Mr. Luebke: They did. They requested this for approval this morning.

Mr. Corn: Any other questions? (None.) Is there a motion for approval of items 1-4? (Motion was made by Ms. Buehlman and seconded by Mr. Melcher.) Voice vote. SO ORDERED.

F. FY 2013-2016 TIP Administrative Modifications

Mr. Luebke: These are for your information. They are minor changes to the projects already contained in the TIP. So you don't need an approval for these. Mostly we are going to revise the scheduling and some minor adjustments to project costs for KYTC projects here with this list.

Item# 02-715.00: US 41 and Wolf Hills Road intersection project. Right-of-way revised from FY 13 to FY 15. Utilities from 13 to 15 and construction from 15 to 16. Funding sources and estimates remain the same.

Item# 02-79.02: US 60 reconstruction from Corydon bypass to Henderson bypass. Right-of-way revised from FY13 to 15. Utilities from FY13 to 15 as well with a cost update. Illustrative construction revised from \$18.7M to \$24.2M and this project remains state funded.

Item# 02-79.10: US 60 Corydon bypass. Right-of-way revised from FY 13 to 15. Utilities revised also from FY13 to 15. Costs and project funding sources remain the same.

Item# 02-1080: US 60 bridge replacement over Green River Road. Construction revised from FY 15 to 16, essentially splitting out the project as well as an illustrative year so essentially FY16 and 17 construction. No change to funding sources.

Item# 02-714.00: KY 2183 and KY 1549: Intersection improvement for safety, right-of-way from FY13 to 15, utilities from FY13 to 15 and construction from FY14 to 16. Cost estimates and funding no change.

Item# 02-968.00: KY 351: Horizontal and vertical realignment, shoulder widening and guardrail installation. Revise PE from FY13 as well as adjust the federal funding source from SHN to Hazard Elimination Safety. Revise FY 13 utility funding source from federal STP and HES only. Construction from FY14 to 15 and revise that funding as you see described there.

Des# 138027: Non-KYTC project, transit Section 5310 program administration. We are revising the budget for FY 15 from \$22,623 to \$21,768.

Mr. Corn: Any questions? (None.) Thank you Craig.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Rezonings

Docket No: R-2014-17 N. Fulton Av/W. Illinois St/W. Indiana St. John F. Rogers, Owner

Ms. Lamb: This is on Fulton Avenue between Illinois and Indiana streets. The rezoning is from M-2 and R-4 zones to an M-1 zone. This is just north of the interchange at Fulton and the expressway. The property is currently mixed use of residences and commercial. The proposed use is offices and warehousing for nothing specific yet. Our recommendation was access should be restricted to Indiana Street and Illinois Street as these roadways carry less traffic and are classified for direct access purposes. As a minor arterial, any access to Fulton Avenue would need to meet the corner clearance distance set out in the MPO's Access Management Manual.

Mr. Corn: Is there just a warehouse there now and an old grocery store?

Ms. Lamb: I'm not sure if it's a warehouse, maybe an old grocery and several residences.

Mr. Corn: But the residences aren't involved?

Ms. Lamb: Some of the residences are. I believe it's on Indiana and Illinois streets on the north side.

Mr. Corn: Because there is one there off of Indiana that is supposedly historic.

Ms. Lamb: Right.

Docket No: VC-6-2014 5600 Diamond Av/Woodhaven Dr. Boots Diamond, LLC, Owner

Ms. Lamb: This is at the intersection of SR 66 and SR 65, the northwest corner, Big Cynthiana and Diamond Avenue. The rezoning is from agricultural and R-1 zones to an industrial M-1 zone with a use and development commitment. They stated the listed proposed use was industrial or commercial development. So that is not specific. Our recommendation is any access to INDOT right-of-way will require INDOT approval and may require a traffic impact study and accessory improvements that result from that study.

Mr. Corn: Do we know what the use and development commitment is?

Ms. Lamb: I do not.

Mr. Melcher: The last I heard, they are going to withdraw this.

B. Subdivision

Docket No: 8-S-2014 Schnucks North SM Properties Darmstadt, LLC/German Bancorp, Owners

Ms. Lamb: This is a nine lot, 16 acre commercial subdivision at the northeast corner of Highway 41 and Boonville-New Harmony Road. The property is currently zoned commercial and partially developed as Grant Hills subdivision which was a five lot, 11 acre subdivision. The existing public roads, Riley Drive and Dixie Lane, are to be vacated and replaced with a private, internal frontage road. A request has been submitted to INDOT for a proposed $\frac{3}{4}$ access which would not allow left turns from the property to southbound 41 but would allow right-in/right-out and southbound left onto the property. Through the acquisition and zoning of the property to the north, if you remember last month, we brought property on Highway 41 before that was just to the north of this property that was being rezoned. They are asking for an access through that property to Highway 41.

Mr. Corn: Not through this property.

Ms. Lamb: It's just to the north so those properties would be combined.

Mr. Corn: Then they are going to ask for the one on Old State Road out of this one too?

Ms. Lamb: Yes. Our recommendation is that any access to US Highway 41 requires INDOT approval. Access should be restricted to the existing improvement location on Boonville-New Harmony Road at Riley Drive and one additional access onto Old State Road. The traffic impact study submitted in September 2001 for a portion of this property should be updated to include the proposed subdivision layout and all proposed points of access to determine if additional improvement are required within county right-of-way such as extending the concrete median along Boonville-New Harmony Road to the intersection at Riley Drive and to verify that the level of service at these intersections do not fall below acceptable levels.

Mr. Corn: Do we know where they are going to ask for one on Old State?

Ms. Lamb: There is a certain distance, there is a property at the corner there that is zoned commercial but not part of this development.

Mr. Corn: And I assume we are going to try to line up this entrance with the one across the street.

Ms. Lamb: It's already there, the one on Boonville-New Harmony Road is already there.

Mr. Corn: I would think the traffic study is going to be interesting with this new one here. Any other questions? (None.) Thank you Laura.

C. Approval of Bills

Mr. Corn: I would entertain a motion for approval bills. (Motion was made by Mr. Melcher and seconded by Mr. Sights.) Voice vote. SO ORDERED.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Drach: I just wanted to provide the committee an update on the Regional Pavement Management. We had a kickoff meeting yesterday with the consulting firm. They plan on starting to drive the network the end of this month, the beginning of October. So I will be reaching out to all the local agencies because I will be needing some information from you as to who we need to notify that the van will be driving your roads because we anticipate you may be receiving some phone calls from people wanting to know what's happening and who to call and what they are doing. So we are going to reach out to you looking for contact information for maybe the law enforcement agencies, your local dispatch, any local elected officials we may need to get this information in front of, if you have any neighborhood association groups you would like for us to send a notice to so they can talk to their neighborhood association folks. But anybody that you have in mind that you would like for us to get this notice in front of, we will be contacting you. So start thinking about that so you can get that information to us.

Mr. Sights: What is the time frame?

Ms. Drach: I will be contacting you next week.

Mr. Corn: Is the van marked?

Ms. Drach: We plan on having them put a magnet on the side and we will probably have Metropolitan Planning Organization and our phone number on there so if they see it, they can call our office. We also considered giving the driver of the van a letter that has a notice on it as to what they are doing so if somebody stops the van, they will be able to hand a letter out as well. But we would also like to do some kind of media announcement as well where they will bring the van and you can have whomever you want there to talk to the TV station, maybe the newspaper, so we can kind of publicize it that way as well.

Mr. Corn: Are they taking pictures?

Ms. Drach: Absolutely. They have three cameras positioned.

Mr. Corn: Thanks Pam.

Meeting adjourned.