

AGENDA
Columbus Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO)
Policy Board Meeting
1:30 PM, Monday, May 19, 2014
City Hall – City Council Chamber

ROLL CALL

AGENDA

- A. Minutes from the March 10, 2014 meeting**
- B. Reports from MPO staff**
 - 1. 2013-2014 Statement of Work (SOW)
 - 2. Budget
- C. New Business**
 - 1. Resolution 2014-4c – Approval of contract for Travel Model consulting
- D. Adjournment**

CAMPO Policy Board Meeting
March 10, 2014
Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Jorge Morales – County Council
Zack Ellison – County Plan Commission
Roger Lang – City Plan Commission
Jim Ude / proxy for Tony McClellan – INDOT Seymour District
Rick Flohr – County Commissioner
Mayor Kristen Brown

CAMPO Staff: Laurence Brown

Zack called the meeting to order.

The minutes from the December 9, 2013 meeting were approved with corrections to a few typos.

Jorge Morales made a motion to approve Zack Ellison as Chairman and Roger Lang as Vice Chair for 2014. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kristen Brown. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Laurence Brown reported on:

1. Citizen Advisory Committee had met and had 25 attendees.
2. The Technical Committee had met the previous week.
3. The Bike/ Ped Plan Update is expected to be complete by May 1. Mayor Kristen Brown asked who was involved with this plan. Laurence said contractors, and himself. Jorge Morales asked if they had looked at the 17th Street bike lanes. Laurence explained that the intention of the plan is to create a menu of options to make the City more bicycle friendly and identify streets. Jorge Morales would like another set of eyes to look at the 17th Street bike lanes. Mayor Kristen Brown agreed. Laurence Brown stated that this would be solved before moving on to other locations. Mayor Kristen Brown asked when Planning, Engineering and the public would be involved. Laurence stated this is a menu of options to choose from and the public would be involved again in May when the report comes out.

Bike/Ped Plan

Cycle Track
Speed Hump
Diverters
Contraflow Bike Lane
Bike Boulevard

Jorge Morales is concerned about not involving the public enough. Laurence Brown stated there were 3 open houses for the Bike/Ped Plan and that Dave Hayward and Ray-Leigh Stark involved the public. Mayor Kristen Brown is concerned that the public who looked at this plan were the advocates and not the true public.

4. ColumBUS Expansion Improvement Plan

This plan surveys and evaluates routes & hub locations using current resources. The biggest request is for the buses to service the west side of town. Jorge Morales asked if we know who rides the buses and what ages they are and where they get on. Mayor Kristen Brown said that the current depot location is not helpful.

5. Ready to unveil a new website which will be part of the City's website. Along with this will be a portion of the website introducing a Safety Campaign.

6. CAMPO will be hosting the statewide annual MPO conference here in Columbus, October 14-16. Approximately 250, both vendors and staff, will attend. Laurence has hired Paragon Events to assist with planning the event.

7. Carr Hill Road - utilities have been relocated
Indiana Avenue – July letting, start in Fall, complete Fall 2015
Haw Creek People Trail Project – letting July 2016
6 Pedestrian Crossings Project – delayed; waiting on FEMIS approval
5th & Lindsey will have a Hawk light, first in Columbus
Marr – Flashing Beacon with island in the middle
Railroad/SR46 – environmental assessment

New Business

1. Administrative Modification 022014 to Bylaws – minor changes to projects in TIP
 - a. 2014-2015 improve signaling along US31, State Street, and Southern Crossing/11
 - b. Bridge at SW corner of the County on SR58, 10 miles west of I65 has been delayed one year.
 - c. Add more money to PE (\$5,500) for 6 pedestrian crossings project
 - d. Will not be using MPO funds for the Clifty Creek Trail project because it would slow down the project. Park Foundation will pay the balance.

Zack asked that the Board move ahead to Resolution 4 because Mayor has to leave.

Resolution 2014-4

Laurence stated that the MPO has 3 products they produce. One is the Statement of Work, a two year plan of what Laurence will do. Part of this is the Complete Network Plan (MTP), which is a 25 year plan to look at every mode of transportation. First, build a Travel Demand Model, then Multi-Model Scenario Planning, where the city looks at all options of how the city will grow and satisfy the movement of people, then come up with a transportation plan from that. In the December 2012 meeting, in the staff report Laurence stated he wanted to do the Complete Network Plan which includes doing the Travel

Model in 2013 and Multi-Model Scenario Planning in 2014, then have the plan update in 2015. A RFP was planned for January 2014, however not completed until August and it was decided to do RFQ instead, because it was important to look at specialty companies that produce travel demand models. Laurence stated that is what he did for 5 years at INDOT. In the minutes of the December 2012 meeting, Laurence stated it may require 3 years and \$250,000. The Statement of Work was approved by this group, goes to INDOT they approve it, then to Federal Highway and they approve it. This is the main product of an MPO, to plan transportation in a long range planning effort.

We went through a process. Roger and Zack were both members of the selection committee to choose a consultant, with Eric Frey, Laurence Brown and Carl Malysz. We went through a substantial process, and Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates (BLA) earned the selection. They can create this in a 2 year process. In 2014, the technical aspects of the Travel Model would be \$115,000. The whole thing would cost \$200,000; the model, scenario analysis, plan and public input, and again this is 80% reimbursed. We talked about this at the last meeting. A travel demand model is needed to make good decisions.

Laurence has split it out into options to consider: \$130,000 for 2014. Laurence has \$130,000 budgeted for this: \$50,000 encumbered from 2013 money and he has \$80,000 set aside for this. Then the \$70,000 for 2015. If we decide not to do \$70,000, Laurence could do that portion. Bloomington and Evansville use travel demand models. Option One for the full contract is \$200,000 and the county is willing to pay 1/3 of local costs. City portion would be \$27,000, county portion \$13,000. Option Two is to split it into \$130,000 for 2014 (travel model & some public input sessions), and then \$70,000 (the plan) for 2015, or Laurence is capable of doing the \$70,000 plan portion once the travel model is finished.

Mayor states that she is not supporting this at this time. Laurence brought this contract to BOW for \$200,000. City does not have this budgeted. She thought it was a \$50,000 contract and that it was encumbered and that it was a requirement. Mayor has learned since that this is a methodology to get to the long term plan. The new City Engineer and Planning Director do not believe it is necessary. She stated it seems extravagant and even if it is 80/20 split we should be responsible for federal dollars too. It is not free money and is hard on the peoples' money. The City has a number of things going on that are using outside consultants, and the product of those consultants is only as good as how it is managed. Transit consulting to date has been very unsuccessful. Hopefully that changes. The Engineering Office is buried with thoroughfare update, road overlay planning, bike/ped plan, and need to be engaged in implementing parking study recommendation. Mayor asked Laurence to reevaluate for next year.

Jorge Morales asked what is pushing this?

Zack said it has been said all along, and Laurence showed, that we have a need for a travel model. That is how you do a better job predicting where your road improvements should be and spend your money more wisely. Ultimately you end up with a model, once it is tweaked, that you end up spending money once, rather than twice. There are benefits to models, same as any engineering model. We had discussion with the previous City Engineer and he spoke highly of this and also Jeff Bergman thought it would be applicable to the Planning Department. We had heard it both ways. It is not a \$200,000

project, even though you can look at it like that, because we do a lot of projects where we pay a percentage and federal pays a portion.

Mayor says it is still \$200,000 that we can use it somewhere else. So we are spending the City's' money where it is not budgeted.

Zack said I don't think you would budget \$200,000 because the City doesn't spend that. We are getting apples and oranges mixed in.

Mayor says it has to be in budget to be reimbursed.

Jorge Morales says so the federal pays \$160,000 and the city pays \$40,000.

Laurence says federal portion is 80%

Mayor says to look at opportunity costs. That is \$200,000 we can spend on something else.

Laurence states that the MPO has duties and we cannot spend MPO \$200,000 planning dollars for something else besides planning. This was approved from INDOT and Federal Highway and this is what they want to see. This is a tool that is useful to everyone. We have already used a rough planning model for analyzing and planning emergency management services. We included Jeff Bergman in discussions. This particular model has a land use model as part of it that can be helpful.

Mayor said Jeff can do this without this tool. Jeff Bergman said it would be helpful, but can do without.

Roger Lang asked Mayor is there was not a consensus among staff.

Mayor said no there was not.

Jorge Morales asked Rick Flohr if he was aware of this and had budgeted for it.

Rick said yes they were willing to participate at this level. Not pushing for or against, but willing to do.

Mayor said you have to consider the opportunity cost and she would like to see what other things we can do. \$200,000 is extravagant expense for something I am being told we can do without. And there is so much going on. We can only start up and manage so many of these consultants to successful completion and implementation so many things. I asked Laurence to look at it next year. We have done just fine without it.

Roger Lang said it was his understanding there was a consensus. If that is not the case, we need a consensus before we proceed.

Rick Flohr asked Laurence if you don't do this, what else would you do? You are saying this is what the MPO does.

Laurence said this has been my plan from day one and this is where I want to get. I know it will be a great tool and a great use of dollars. I believed we had consensus. This is news to me. When I took it to

BOW and it got tabled. This whole time I have been giving these presentations, you saw my presentation showed cost at \$250,000. I have been moving forward and you have been involved in the planning. Jeff and Dave were on board. Everyone was on board.

Roger said there is new info and no consensus now.

Jorge Morales said there seems to be a disconnect somewhere. How do we prevent this from happening in the future?

Zack said he doesn't sense disconnect. We have talked about this for several meetings. I am surprised there is no consensus at this meeting when we are ready to vote on the resolution. If we don't have planning models, it is left up to individuals' best judgment and sure everyone has an opinion. If you have a model you actually get data from a model that might actually help you make the right decision. That is the sole purpose of models. If we didn't need models we wouldn't spend money on CAD cam, finite analysis for engineering. We would just have someone chisel out a piece and hope it works. That is the power of a model to help us make better decisions. That is why I am a supporter of this and why it seems strange that we have had a shift in the tide completely where we were pro model and we are now obviously now not in consensus.

Jorge Morales said I agree with what you are saying but if the city doesn't have the money and they are the biggest contributor, they don't have the money. That is unfortunate. Maybe we need to take something else out and transfer the money to that and see if there are other alternatives. No matter how much federal money you get it won't make a difference.

Laurence said that the City Council did approve 2 line items specific to this project and this has been budgeted.

Mayor said not the full \$200,000

Laurence said the full \$130,000 had been fully budgeted.

Mayor said her disconnect came from thinking it was \$50,000 and I was led to believe it was necessary and now I understand it is methodology and a very expensive one at that, but not necessary. The City Engineer came from Lafayette and West Lafayette and she said they didn't use one and can do without. Planning says nice to have but can do land use without. I have never seen other proposals for this. Selection made by someone. I don't even have a matrix on this. What were the other proposals and costs? Also, the other part of this is the transit study is severely delayed, bike/ped plan is a work in progress and if this consultant needs anything from Planning or Engineering they are tapped out.

Zach Ellison said we certainly hear what you are saying if we don't have the money. But, we don't know the value of this until you actually have it and implement it.

Jorge Morales said you raise an interesting point about having a model to go ahead and I agree, but if you don't have the money, why do it? We are at an impasse. Alternatives? Postpone it time wise?

Mayor asks what do the other proposals look like?

Zach says we are not going to serve ourselves on this commission to talk about what the other proposals were because there was a group of selected individuals that were a part of that selection process. It was run openly and I thought very effectively with grading sheets, and we can pull all that out, if you have 3 hours we will review those with you, but unless you want to be involved in it all, you have to have a little trust in the process that it delivers the best option. I go back to earlier point that if we don't have the money, that is about \$25,000 between the city and county, for option two, if we don't have that we don't have that, but I think what Laurence says is he has enough to get this thru and he is willing to do a lot of the work. That would also still require some funding from the city and the county. It is not a free ride.

Laurence states that he gets money every year from INDOT to finance my work and I have specific duties. Federal Highway is wanting performance measures to be used on long range plans and are emphasizing you can't have those without travel demand model. If you don't have a travel demand model what are you going to use to measure performance.

Zach states that it is in fact a part of future projects, although maybe not a requirement

Laurence Brown says it is a requirement to have performance measures

Jorge Morales asks what projects would be impacted by not having one.

Laurence says the Lowell Road connection, something parallel to SR 11, south bypass, Southern Crossing are project concepts that could not be evaluated.

Zack made a recommendation to table this for now, do some further confidence building that it is the right way to go and get back together and decide if we move forward or not. Too much doubt and not sure why we are doing it and we need to pull that information together.

Jorge Morales would feel comfortable with that and he is fairly new to the group. Says he feels he voted for something without really knowing the impact, he is talking about US31 and Southern Crossing roundabout. Somebody help us get educated. I hear Laurence and I hear Mayor and to be honest I am torn.

Zack says he and Roger were involved in selection process so they have seen models and they feel positive support for it.

Jorge Morales says that you two have been more involved in different capacities than Rick and I.

Roger Lang says that the heads of the departments should be together also.

Jorge Morales made a motion to table the issue.

Rick asked Laurence if postponed for a year what will you do? Do you have other things to work on in the meantime?

Laurence Brown says I have already delayed it a year. It is something I really want to get going. I am disappointed. I thought there was a consensus and have set up my budget so that I could. It won't hamper me, but hamper the community. We won't have the tools we need to make decisions until a year later. Laurence has \$80,000 2014 and \$50,000 from 2013 which total the \$130,000.

Jim Ude seconded the motion.

Jorge Morales said we shouldn't wait for 3 months until next meeting.

Zack asked for any more discussion on motion. Passed unanimously.

Resolution 2014-1

INDOT to repave 2nd, 3rd, State Street and Mapleton in 2015.

State Street Corridor study/plans

Bridge on 31 – Sandcreek

Bridge on SR 7

Motion made by Jim Eudy. Seconded by Jorge Morales. Passed unanimously.

Resolution 2014-2

Rick made a motion to approve. Jim Ude seconded the motion.

Jim Ude, Jorge Morales and Rick Flohr voted aye, Roger Lang voted nay

Zack Ellison voted aye and broke the tie. Motion passed.

Resolution 2014-3

Rick Flohr made a motion to approve. Jorge Morales seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Resolution 2014-5

Jorge Morales made a motion to approve. Roger Lang seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Laurence is being recertified.

Zack says we need to work on the model. A lot of this info is good to know. Having the info and power points available prior to the meetings would be helpful.

Roger said he was biking on county roads and the winter took a toll. Specs should be written to have roads last longer than 8 months.

Zack Ellison made a motion to adjourn at 2:03

RESOLUTION 2014 – 4c

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CONTRACT WITH BERNARNDIN LOCHMUELLER ASSOCIATES FOR TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL DEVELOPMENT

WHEREAS, the Columbus Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization the City of Columbus and Bartholomew County; and

WHEREAS, a Travel Demand Model is a transportation tool necessary for accurate prediction of future transportation needs, land use options, transportation policy, mode shifts, and a valuable tool for analyzing solutions to today's traffic demands, traffic events, emergency vehicle movement, to name a few, and

WHEREAS, a thorough and fair vendor selection processes was followed with a diverse selection committee and BLA as the superior vendor, and

WHEREAS, this travel model will cover the movement of vehicles in the entire county and areas in Edinburgh that are outside the county, and

WHEREAS, this project is 80% federally reimbursed, and

WHEREAS, the County Commissioners have considered this as a valuable tool for the county and are willing to pay for 1/3 of the local costs (20%) not covered by federal reimbursements (80%);

WHEREAS, this project will not commence, via a Notice to Proceed, until after November 1, 2014;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the CAMPO Policy Board that the contract for Not-to-Exceed \$130,000 with BLA for Travel Demand Model work be approved.

Adopted this 19th day of May 2014

Zack Ellison, President

Laurence Brown, CAMPO Director

Indiana MPOs - Travel Demand Model / Long-Range Plan Questions

	Metropolitan Planning Organization Name	City	Do you all have a travel demand model?	Did you use it for your last long-range plan?	When was that?	How important was it in influencing your plan?	Additional comments:
1	Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Council	Portage	Yes, NIRPC does and has for about 25 years. It's multi-modal and is an essential part of metropolitan area transportation planning.	Yes, very much during the development of our current long-range plan, particularly the transportation element of the 2040 Comprehensive Regional Plan. Besides the usual travel demand forecast modeling, it helped in the analysis of future scenarios, which we augmented with the CommunityViz software.	The 2040 Plan was adopted in June, 2011 and is due for an update by mid-2015.	Invaluable. It helps people understand how efficient and effective the current transportation system is and provides that information about any expansion of the system. I don't think it's meant to be as exact as the air quality conformity analysis demands of it, but it's what we and other MPOs have at this time.	
2	Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council	Fort Wayne	Yes	Yes	2013	Extremely Important!!	
3	Ohio Kentucky Indiana Regional Council of Governments	Cincinnati	Yes	Yes	June 2012	Very useful and important but it's just one of the tools for decision makers.	
4	Evansville Metropolitan Planning Organization	Evansville	Yes	Yes	MTP was adopted 1/8/2014 by policy Comm. Waiting on EPA, FHWA	Only tool to check LOS for Future scenarios. We have to use it for conformity.	
5	Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization	Bloomington	Yes, one existing model from our previous (2030) plan and a new one under development for our 2040 Plan.	Yes, the old model was used for the 2030 Plan while the new model will be used for the 2040 Plan.	The model for the 2030 Plan was completed in 2005/2006, while the new model has been under development since 2013 and will be done later in 2014.	It was a significant factor in the 2030 Plan as we used LOS/Congestion as one of the primary project selection factors. The new model will be important to the 2040 Plan in much the same way, though we will use a broader set of factors to evaluate future project scenarios that simply LOS/Congestion on the model.	
6	Michiana Area Council of Governments	South Bend	Yes	Yes	In process of updating LRP right now	Important to project identification, congestion management system, In addition do you have air quality conformity responsibilities?	
7	West Central Indiana Economic Development District, Inc.	Terre Haute	Yes	Yes	2013	Important since it helped identify potential problem areas that could be targeted for improvement.	

8	Madison County Council of Governments	Anderson	Yes. We are rebuilding it at the present time to add more zones.	Yes	Last time was 2011.	It was important as to expansion projects. We originally had large reconstruction projects (preservation and maintenance) as well in our 2005 plan. We are headed back in that direction for our next plan update. I do believe moving toward preservation and maintenance type projects lessens the importance of the model. The model should still be there to validate forecasts for the future to see if expansion projects are needed as well as where your trips are going. Approximately 25% of the workforce in our county goes to central Indiana to work.	As you know, we are developing a land use model (UrbanSim) that includes Hamilton County; part of the land use model development will include expanding our travel demand model to include Hamilton County. We are working with the Indy MPO in regard to the TAZs they use in Hamilton County so our models will be built on the same network in that area. I would tell you to do your model. If you do not do a model, you will be totally dependent upon the state as to travel forecasts for your area. I would suggest that you do a model to remain as independent as possible for as long as possible.
9	Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County	Lafayette	Yes	No, we have been waiting on traffic counts from Lafayette to add to the model.	Adopted June 2012	Not for this go-round, because we weren't adding new roads, mostly converting rural to urban, using road diets, and adding bike and ped facilities.	Typically, we run the model and use various scenarios as our starting point. We also use the model when INDOT and LPAs need traffic forecasts for specific projects and to make decisions about traffic signals. We use it a lot and for more than just the MTP.
10	Kokomo and Howard County Governmental Coordinating Council	Kokomo	We have a model from the US31 FEMIS; we are looking to partner with INDOT to create "sub-area" analysis capabilities	Not really...	4 years ago...working on the new LRP now	model concepts are mentioned within project justifications	
11	Muncie-Delaware County MPO	Muncie	[yes]				Did not respond
12	Indianapolis MPO	Indianapolis	[yes]				Did not respond
13	Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency (KIPDA)	Louisville	[yes]				Did not respond



BERNARDIN • LOCHMUELLER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

6200 Vogel Road • Evansville • Indiana 47715-4006
PHONE (812) 479-6200 • TOLL FREE (800) 423-7411 • FAX (812) 479-6262

April 14, 2014

Mr. Laurence Brown
Director
Columbus Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
123 Washington Street
Columbus, Indiana 47201

RE: Proposal for Transportation Planning Services
Columbus, Indiana
513-0096-00P

Dear Mr. Brown:

Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates (BLA) is thrilled to be selected to provide transportation planning services for the Columbus Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO). These services would include development of a travel demand model and stakeholder/public engagement in accordance with the attached scope of services in Appendix A. This scope addresses the first phase of a two-phase process, which would culminate with the development of a metropolitan transportation plan.

We have assembled an exceptional team of professionals that in addition to BLA includes sub-consultants Resource Systems Group (RSG) and Christopher Burke Engineering. RSG will support development of the travel demand model, and Christopher Burke Engineering will help facilitate the stakeholder/public engagement.

The BLA Team looks forward to working with CAMPO on this exciting project and we appreciate CAMPO's offer to help contribute to the project where possible and to invite additional facilitators (i.e., Center for Coalition Building) to aid with the stakeholder/public engagement process. A list of information and services to be furnished by CAMPO is provided in Appendix B.

Per your request, these services will be invoiced on an hourly, time & materials basis with a not-to-exceed limit of \$130,000.00. This fee will be subject to increase if any tasks in addition to those listed in Appendix A are requested or required. A budget and milestone schedule is provided in Appendix C. We will invoice you monthly and include a report summarizing progress on key tasks as well as budget status and percent complete.

If you accept these terms and conditions, please sign and return the attached Agreement for Limited Professional Services for final execution. We will return a fully executed copy for your

Mr. Laurence Brown
April 14, 2014
Page 2 of 9



records. Please contact me at 314-621-3395 if you have any questions or comments. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher W. Beard". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Christopher W. Beard, PE, PTOE
Associate



AGREEMENT FOR SERVICES

Scope of Work. Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates (BLA) shall provide transportation planning services for the Columbus Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO). These services shall include development of a travel demand model and stakeholder/public engagement in accordance with the attached scope of work in Appendix A.

CAMPO Duties. CAMPO has offered to help contribute to the project where possible and to invite additional facilitators to aid with the stakeholder/public engagement process. A list of information and services to be furnished by CAMPO is provided in Appendix B.

Compensation & Schedule. Services shall be invoiced on an hourly, time & materials basis with a not-to-exceed limit of \$130,000.00. This fee shall be subject to an increase if any tasks in addition to those listed in Appendix A are requested or required. A budget and milestone schedule is provided in Appendix C. We will invoice CAMPO monthly and include a report summarizing progress on key tasks as well as budget status and percent complete. BLA shall provide all receipts for expenses charged. All food purchases shall specify items purchased and no alcohol can be included. Other items deemed unnecessary, luxurious or inappropriate may also not be paid.

Personnel. In the event that there are personnel changes with either party that materially affect this project, the CAMPO Director or City of Columbus shall determine if this contract shall be continued or terminated. If terminated, BLA shall deliver all work products in their current state and CAMPO will be responsible for payment to BLA for all effort incurred to date.

Non-Discrimination. Pursuant to Indiana Code 22-9-1-10, BLA represents that it and its subcontractors shall not discriminate against any employee or application for employment to be employed in the performance of this Agreement with respect to the employee's or applicant's hiring, tenure, terms, conditions or privileges of employment or any matter directly or indirectly relating to employment, because of the employee's or applicant's race, religion, color, sex, disability, national origin or ancestry. Breach of this covenant may be regarded as a material breach of the Agreement.

Investment Activities in Iran Prohibition. Pursuant to Indiana Code 5-22-16.5 et seq., BLA certifies that it not engaged in investment activities in Iran as those terms may be defined in Indiana Code 5-22-16.5 et seq.

Employment Eligibility Verification pursuant to Indiana Code 22-5-1.7-11, 12 and 13.

BLA affirms under penalties of perjury that it does not knowingly employ an unauthorized alien. BLA shall enroll in and verify (or has enrolled in and verifies) the work eligibility status of all its newly hired employees through the E-Verify program as defined in Indiana Code 22-5-1.7-3.

Mr. Laurence Brown
April 14, 2014
Page 4 of 9



BLA is not required to participate should the E-Verify program cease to exist. Additionally, BLA is not required to participate if it is self-employed and does not employ any employees.

BLA shall not knowingly employ or contract with an unauthorized alien. BLA shall not retain an employee or contract with a person BLA subsequently learns is an unauthorized alien.

BLA shall require its subcontractors, who perform work under this contract, to certify to them that the subcontractor does not knowingly employ or contract with an unauthorized alien and that the subcontractor has enrolled and is participating in the E-Verify program. BLA agrees to maintain this certification throughout the duration of the term of a contract with subcontractor.

CAMPO may terminate this Agreement for breach of contract if BLA fails to cure a breach of this provision no later than thirty (30) days after being notified of such breach by CAMPO.



APPENDIX A: SCOPE OF SERVICES

PHASE 1: TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL

Task 1.1 Base Data Development

Base data for use in developing the travel demand model shall be acquired as available through public sources. This will include population and employment data from the US Census and Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, local travel characteristics from the American Community Survey, and street networks from sources such as the National Highway Planning Network. In addition, CAMPO (with the assistance of local agencies) shall furnish traffic count data, land use and zoning ordinance information, and sidewalk and trail locations preferably in GIS format. Performing new traffic counts or obtaining proprietary data are excluded from this scope of services.

Task 1.2 Network and TAZ Layer Development

Street networks delineating number of lanes, speeds, and functional classifications shall be developed in TransCAD format. Networks previously developed by CAMPO staff would be leveraged to the extent possible to minimize duplicative efforts. In any event, effort will be required to ensure network compatibility with the hybrid model. Traffic signals and all-way and partial stop-controlled intersection locations as provided by CAMPO will be incorporated into the network. Transit networks shall be developed from transit route and scheduling information provided by CAMPO. A layer of Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) shall be established. Networks and TAZs will be limited to the CAMPO region, which includes the entire Bartholomew County, Edinburgh (which is in both Johnson and Shelby counties), and other areas deemed necessary to accurately model traffic in the CAMPO region. Sidewalk coverage and intersection density will be incorporated as proxies for walkability and bikeability for purposes of mode split.

Task 1.3 Import Hybrid Model

The hybrid travel demand model previously developed for the Evansville Metropolitan Planning Organization using TransCAD shall serve as the basis for the new CAMPO travel demand model also in TransCAD. The existing framework and components of that model will be fully retained as elements of the new CAMPO travel demand model subject to the model enhancements and calibration described in subsequent tasks. The model will have a 2010 base year and will output daily, morning peak period, and afternoon peak period trips and traffic assignments. The model will support interim year and horizon year (2040) forecasts. CAMPO will retain ownership of the travel demand model and all developed code. All code shall be well commented and structured for easy readability.



Task 1.4 Enhance Transit Model

Functionality shall be added to enable transit network travel time skims to feed into the model's accessibility calculations for mode choice. Transit travel times will assume riders walk to/from transit based on route proximity. Mode shift will be sensitive to transit service levels, walkability/bikeability, and land use developments or redevelopments. CAMPO staff shall get sufficient training to be capable of modifying transit routes independently.

Task 1.5 Integrate with Indiana Statewide Model

Functionality shall be added to incorporate long distance passenger and truck trips passing through or starting/ending outside of the CAMPO region. These trips will be represented as a static matrix of external-to-external, internal-to-external, and external-to-internal trips based on the Indiana statewide travel demand model.

Task 1.6 Travel Demand Model Calibration

The model and its embedded formulations will be calibrated to local conditions to the extent possible as informed by the base data developed in Task 1.1. Validation statistics will be compared to industry guidelines and summarized in a brief technical memorandum for submission to CAMPO. Resource Systems Group will support travel demand model development, particularly the model calibration process.

Task 1.7 User Training and Documentation

A user guide shall be developed as an instructional manual for running the model, performing analyses, and interpreting model results. The document will include a description of the software architecture; the functionality of each model "step"; and the equations, parameters, and methods that are used. Software will include comments indicating what is happening in each section and what the key variables are. The guide will include suggestions for routine model maintenance and upkeep. It will be submitted to CAMPO for review and comment prior to finalization in electronic format. One half day in-person user training session with the model will be provided for CAMPO staff.

Task 1.8 Stakeholder/Public Engagement Management

Individuals representing relevant agencies, organizations, businesses and interest groups will be assembled to serve on a single stakeholder committee for providing input to the model development process. Meeting promotion and logistics will be the responsibility of Christopher Burke Engineering with support from CAMPO and possibly other local organizations. As a designated



subcontractor, the services of Christopher Burke Engineering are included in this contract.

Task 1.9 Stakeholder/Public Meetings

A total of 3 meetings shall be held to engage stakeholders and the public. These meetings are expected to occur throughout the course of developing the travel demand model. Meetings may be co-branded and/or co-hosted with the “Go Columbus” strategic plan. However, the stakeholder and public engagement included herein is limited to supporting this scope of work and not a broader campaign.



APPENDIX B: INFORMATION/SERVICES TO BE FURNISHED BY CAMPO

1. Existing TransCAD model networks and TAZ layers, as available
2. Locations of parks and schools and their enrollment
3. Locations of traffic signals in GIS format
4. Locations of sidewalks and pedestrian/bicycle trails in GIS format, as available
5. Bus routes and stops in GIS format
6. Bus schedules and fare data
7. Transit ridership data
8. Traffic counts for major roadways
9. Land use and zoning information
10. Roadway functional classification map
11. Information regarding approved/planned developments
12. GIS database of wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, prime farmland, forested areas
13. All meeting venues
14. Assisting with meeting facilitation and meeting logistics planning

APPENDIX C: PROJECT BUDGET/SCHEDULE

Project Component	Anticipated Completion Date	Budget
Travel Demand Modeling	December 31, 2015	\$115,000
Stakeholder/Public Engagement	December 31, 2015	\$15,000
TOTAL NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT		\$130,000

Travel Demand Modeling Milestones	Target Completion Date
Notice-to-Proceed	Nov 1, 2014
Completed Network/TAZ Layer	January 31, 2015
Fully Imported Hybrid Model	March 31, 2015
Transit Skims & Statewide Model Integration	May 31, 2015
Calibrated Model	July 31, 2015
User Guide and Training/Model Delivery	Sept 30, 2015

Stakeholder/Public Engagement Milestones	Target Completion Date
Meeting #1: Steering Committee Meeting	February 2015
Meeting #2: Steering Committee / Public Meeting Project Kickoff / Educational Topics	May 2015
Meeting #3: Steering Committee Meeting	July 2015

Mr. Laurence Brown
April 14, 2014
Page 9 of 9



IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hands and seals this _____ day of
_____ 2014

Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, by:

Keith Lochmueller, Chief Executive Officer

Zack Ellison, President

Laurence Brown, CAMPO Director