



Mid-Ohio Regional
Planning Commission

111 Liberty Street, Suite 100
Columbus, Ohio 43215

T 614.228.2663
TTY 800.750.0750

www.morpc.org

NOTICE OF A MEETING

ATTRIBUTABLE FUNDS COMMITTEE

MID-OHIO REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
111 LIBERTY STREET, SUITE 100
COLUMBUS, OHIO
SCIOTO CONFERENCE ROOM

Wednesday, July 6, 2016
10:00 a.m.

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Approval of January 6, 2016 [Minutes](#)
3. Existing MORPC Funding Commitment Project Updates
4. Updated Funding Available for New Projects
5. Summary of Initial Applications
6. Statewide CMAQ Program Update
7. Timeline and Next Steps
8. Other Business

PLEASE NOTIFY BRENDA AT 233-4146 or bnoe@morpc.org
TO CONFIRM YOUR ATTENDANCE FOR THIS MEETING OR
IF YOU REQUIRE SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

The next AFC meeting is
August 31, 2016
111 Liberty Street, Suite 100
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Note: Short Street is closed April 25 through November 2016. MORPC's parking lot is accessible via Front Street or Liberty Street.

When parking in MORPC's parking lot, please be sure to park in a MORPC visitor space or in a space marked with an "M." Handicapped parking is available at the side of MORPC's building. MORPC is accessible by CBUS.

William Murdock, AICP
Executive Director

Eric S. Phillips
Chair

Matt Greeson
Vice Chair

Rory McGuinness
Secretary

**ATTRIBUTABLE FUNDING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

Wednesday, January 6, 2015
10 a.m.
Scioto Meeting Room at MORPC
111 Liberty Street, Suite 100
Columbus, OH 43215

Members Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Ted Beidler	Franklin County Eng.	Greg Butcher	Violet Township
Todd Fortune	LCATS	Nick Gill	MORPC
Jud Hines	City of Columbus	Darryl Hughes	City of Grandview Hgts.
Holly Mattei	Fairfield Co. RPC	Kim Moss	OSU
Mark Nemec	City of New Albany	Rob Platte	Etna Township
Rob Priestas	City of Gahanna	Rob Riley	Delaware County Eng.
Larry Robertson	CAC	Denny Schooley	DATABus
Scott Tourville	City of Pickerington	Thea Walsh	MORPC
Ira Weiss	CAC	Jeannie Willis	City of Dublin

Staff Present:

Name
Ronni Nimps
Brenda Noé
Rob Powell
Nathaniel Vogt

Guest Present:

Andrea Lossick, Franklin County Engineer's Office

Meeting Summary

- 1. Introductions.** Chair Rob Riley called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. Members/guests introduced themselves.
- 2. Approval of the December 2, 2015 Minutes.** Ira Weiss moved and Ted Beidler seconded the approval of the December 2, 2015 minutes. The motion carried.
- 3. Draft Policies for Managing Attributable Funds.** Nathaniel Vogt sent the draft policies document to the committee last week. All of the changes that were tracked or highlighted in the previous document have been accepted, and the new changes that were discussed at the last meeting are in this document and are highlighted with the comment balloons. He walked through the changes in the document since the last meeting.
 - Section on Toll Revenue Credit, page 5, Section 4.4.2: There was some discussion about various scenarios, including one where if a project came in under its estimate and we are in danger of losing those funds (having them recalled). A way to simplify this is to add a phrase "minimizing funds subject to recall by ODOT's carry forward policy."

To review the Toll Revenue Credit, we sent a memo after the last meeting explaining what has been made available to us through ODOT. It is not additional funds. These funds allow the local match to be reduced from 20 percent down to between 20 percent and 0 percent. This section addresses how we might use those credits.

- Section 6.1, page 9: This is a listing of the types of information we will receive on the screening applications. During the last cycle forms were attached that were part of what we approved. We tried to stick to those as much as we could, but it did kind of restrict some of the things we could do with the on-line form. Summarizing the information we are asking for here will hopefully make the on-line form work more smoothly.
- Page 10, Final Application: This is a listing of the information that we are asking for regarding requests for new funding. It does not include the evaluation information. Those are all in the tables that follow.
- Page 11: We also discussed the Partnering Agreements - whether or not ODOT is a party to them. There are other agreements into which ODOT enters with those sponsors. The old language from the last cycle mentions ODOT as being part of that agreement. This time we have decided to use the phrase that the "agreement is between the sponsor and MORPC, but drafted in consultation with ODOT." This definitely points out that ODOT is aware of these agreements and helps draft agreements that are workable.
- Page 17 of Criteria Tables: There was a comment at the last meeting that the penalty for asking to use Toll Credit should be increased. That is being increased from 1 to 2 points.
- Page 21: There is a table of weights that are applied to the scores for each category of projects by the goal. As we discussed, having moved some traffic-related criteria from the Health, Safety and Welfare goal to the Economy goal, we considered adjustments to the weights. The change in this table is 5 points moving from Health, Safety and Welfare to the Economy goal for two categories of projects, those categories being the Major Widening and the System Preservation. This is partly in response to the survey we sent.
- Page 24, Section 9.3 (new section): The update form has never really been addressed, specifically. This section defines the purpose of the Commitment Update Form.
- Page 29, Sample Partnering Agreement attached. It was developed and approved during the last cycle.

Referring to Page 21, Rob Platte wanted to know if there were a reason the 5 points would not be added the Economy on Minor Widening, also. Nick Gill replied that we did not receive any comments on this after sending out the survey. Minor Widenings are not as much about congestion as the major projects are. Riley asked if we were to add another 5 points if it would come from the Health, Safety and Welfare goal. Holly Mattei said she likes the higher Health, Safety and Welfare. It serves more safety reasons than it would in a development.

Referring to Page 11, Weiss wanted to be sure that this is reflected in the actual text. Right now it just says "in conjunction with ODOT," I would add "applicant and MORPC must agree on the schedule when the Partnering Agreement..." Gill said that the applicant and MORPC are on the signature blocks, so they are agreeing on that. Vogt

suggested moving the phrase after "must agree on a schedule" to say "sponsor and MORPC must agree on a schedule in consultation with ODOT." Weiss felt that made sense.

Platte made a request that the change he requested on Page 21 be accepted. Riley agreed that this was important in thinking about the types of projects, particularly Minor Widening intersections, where one is dealing with adding two-way or a turn lane, etc. Riley asked if the traffic criteria were in Economy two years ago. Vogt said that before the last application cycle in doing this process, we had moved them from the Economic goal to Health, Safety and Welfare. This was an outcome of a process where subcommittees were looking at the goals and criteria. There was a lot more focus on the job creation portion of Economic Development. The new Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) has largely the same goals, but the last MTP considered these traffic criteria under both of those goals, but the new one has them only under the Economic (or Economy) goal. Another reason for moving them back to where they were is consistency with the MTP. Gill added that in previous rounds a chunk of the Minor Widening category was for the Columbus Coordinated Signal Systems. Gill did not know if any of those projects were in the pipeline this round, but there may be more traditional roadway projects. Riley said that if we were to take the 35 down to 30 in the Minor Widening category, we may also want to look at that in System Preservation. Gill said that by definition and by the criteria in System Preservation it's about the bridge rating and pavement conditions. If a project has congestion relief by adding turn lanes it's a Minor category project.

Riley asked if there were support to increase the Minor Widening to 25 for Economy and drop to 30 for Health, Safety and Welfare. Greg Butcher asked if this were a time-sensitive matter that we approve this today. He wanted to know if the deadline could be extended and revisit this matter at the next meeting. Riley said he had hoped to get to a final draft today and vote on it. Gill said that the timeline is to incorporate final comments, then do a public involvement period of 30 to 45 days. We do not meet in February, so it would extend to mid-March, and we would adopt it in April. Ideally, we would not meet again. We could extend the deadline and do the discussion and vote by email. Riley proposed to accept Platte's proposal to change the numbers in Minor Widening. There were no objections to taking 5 points from Health, Safety and Welfare and moving it to Economy for the Minor Widening. Riley directed MORPC staff to make this change.

Vogt also pointed out that the Commitment Update Form section says which outstanding commitments need to submit a form, which is new. Projects with final plan package submittal after January 1, 2017, are expected to submit an Update form. Exceptions can be made, if warranted. We want to be sure that a project will sell by the time the updates are due.

Section 6 on Page 9 shows the list of information MORPC is requesting for the screening and final applications. We are now asking for a category. Vogt said that another addition on the final application is specifically calling out right-of-way services as something for which to estimate costs. Some sponsors are not sure that is eligible, but it is. A discussion ensued about right-of-way acquisition, Item 93. It was suggested that a line be added for right-of-way services and right-of-way purchase costs. Riley wondered if there should be some guidance on that. Gill said that staff would provide guidance on this.

Riley suggested also adding some guidance on construction engineering cost.

Riley decided to convene a small group to provide feedback on the online application form.

4. **Statewide CMAQ Program Update.** Gill said that the 8 large MPOs connected by email in November to approve the program of projects to receive CMAQ funding. There was no opposition. Gill said that staff is working to get the information updated.
5. **Timeline and Next Steps.** Gill announced that later in January a press release will go out for a formal 30- - 45-day public comment period. Staff will finalize and incorporate any comments and determine if there is a need to meet in April. The Policies document will be adopted in April. Riley thought that this committee would formally approve the document. Gill then suggested that Riley make a motion to formally approve this document to go out for public comment, and to communicate any changes from the public comment period by email. This would determine if we will need to meet in April. Riley would like to get this out for the 30-day public comment period sometime this month, and if there are any minor changes to wrap them up in late February by email, and this committee adopt the document in March. Mattei said she did not see the need for a meeting in March if there were no substantial changes. Gill added that the application will be available after TAC in April. Riley decided that this committee did not need to formally act on the document. Riley asked for a motion to submit this document for public comment as amended today with the 5-point change in the criteria. Weiss so moved, and Rob Platte seconded. The motion carried.
6. **Other Business.** Riley adjourned the meeting at 11:09 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thea Walsh
Secretary