**Who’s Behind teMPO?**

We are, your M-P-O. MPO stands for Metropolitan Planning Organization, but that doesn’t explain who we are or what we do. We’re the half dozen or so people entrusted to respond to the current and future transportation needs of the Indianapolis metropolitan planning area. This area includes the city of Indianapolis, plus all of Marion County and portions of surrounding counties (See Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) map, page 3). As such, our responsibilities include issuing requests for transportation impact studies; acting as gatekeepers for federally funded local transportation projects, including the review and recommendation of qualified applications; soliciting membership in, and interacting with, the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC);

*cont on page 7, see teMPO*

**ISTEA Refreshes Transportation System**

If you worked at the MPO, or if you attend Citizens Advisory Committee meetings, you hear a lot of acronyms for plans, programs and studies. But none more often than the evocative ISTEA (pronounced “ice tea”). When it comes to transportation planning, there isn’t a source for more refreshment.

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 is the current federal legislation governing all metropolitan and state transportation planning and programming. As the name implies, ISTEA concerns itself with various means or modes of transportation, including roadway (for single-driver vehicles as well as mass transit) rail, bicycle and pedestrian. For instance, specific funds are earmarked for Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) which include projects like pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, landscaping of areas adjacent to transportation facilities, and preservation of historic transportation corridors.

The development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), The Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and six transportation management systems are all governed by rules and regulations issued by ISTEA. Among these are 16 planning factors, listed below, that must be considered, analyzed as appropriate, and reflected in any aspect of the planning process hoping to meet with federal funding approval.

*cont on page 4, see ISTEA*

**Federal Funds Fuel Fix-up**

It amounts to nearly $70 million over the last five years. That’s how much the federal government has paid to improve the transportation system of the Indianapolis metropolitan area. And if Mike Dearing, Senior Planner of your MPO, has his way, that’s only the beginning.

*continued page 6, see Federal Funds*
Three Cs Guide Planning Process

Transportation planning is a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive process. In fact ISTEA, which governs all transportation planning and programming, has ruled that it “must be coordinated within the metropolitan area, with the State and local agencies and organizations, and that it must be conducted cooperatively and in such a way as to provide for continuous and substantive public participation (See “We Hear You”, page 3).”

In short, the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development, as the designated MPO for the Indianapolis region, is responsible for, among other things, seeing to it that the area’s transportation planning process takes into consideration the input of designated organizations. These groups include:

Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council (IRTC)

This cooperative group is composed of representatives of all the jurisdictions within the metropolitan planning area and recommends to the MPO: 1.) policies for the conduct of the transportation planning program; 2.) transportation projects involving the federal-aid Surface Transportation Program, and; 3.) mechanisms for the discussion and resolution of local transportation issues.

United States Department of Transportation

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), as non-voting members of the IRTC, provide guidance on the interpretation and implementation of federal transportation planning regulations.

State of Indiana

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) has the primary responsibility under ISTEA to develop a statewide long range transportation plan and statewide transportation improvement program for highways. The Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) is responsible for air quality issues as they relate to the Indianapolis region’s long range transportation plans and the IRTIP.

City of Indianapolis/Marion County

The unified government of the City of Indianapolis (Unigov) encompasses Marion County with the exception of four cities and towns (Beech Grove, Lawrence, Southport and Speedway) which were excluded when Unigov was formed. Unigov is responsible for all streets outside of the excluded cities and all thoroughfares in Marion County including the excluded cities.

continued on page 8, see Three Cs
And need you! Public participation is critical to the success of the transportation planning process. "The public is both our customers and our partners," said Mike Peoni, MPO Principal Planner. "That's why the MPO publishes teMPO — to inform people of, and solicit their feedback on, our on-going projects. It's also why we invite serious, public-minded individuals to join the Citizens Advisory Committee."

The CAC, formed in 1994, advises the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council (IRTC) on a variety of issues of public interest. If you’d like your voice to be heard, plan to attend the next CAC meeting at 6:30 PM on Wednesday, April 23, in Room 107 of the City-County Building. The public is always welcome.

To learn of upcoming agenda items, or for more information on the responsibilities of joining the CAC, call Mike Peoni, at 317/327-5133.
**Traffic Impact Studies**

Have you ever wondered how your MPO gathers verifiable information upon which to build the area’s current and long range transportation plans? After all, with so many public and private special interest groups participating in the planning process, how can the overall impact of their individual interests (and proposals) be objectively evaluated in relation to the common good? And, how can the cost of this ongoing evaluation be kept from completely consuming the already tight transportation planning budget?

“Since 1990, the answer has often been transportation impact studies,” says Steve Cunningham of your MPO who issues study warrants. “Studies provide site specific information that we plug into our transportation models.” Cunningham explains. “I issue a study request when proposed re-zoning of an area or a proposed development meeting minimum impact criteria threatens the efficiency of the transportation system. For example, the minimum size of a single-family residential development warranting a traffic impact study is currently 150 homes. In most areas, that's the size threshold that will have a substantial impact on traffic.”

Such a study is paid for by the developer who stands to gain the most from the proposed re-zoning and subsequent land development. The studies, which usually take three to four months to complete, are prepared by transportation engineering firms who recommend ways to mitigate any negative transportation effects the proposed re-zoning and development might cause. Typical recommendations include the re-phasing of traffic lights or the construction of additional turning lanes to existing roadways. Your MPO and the implementing agency review and comment on these studies and their remedial recommendations. “The purpose of traffic impact studies is to help the Metropolitan Development Commission take into account the cumulative impact all actual or proposed land use changes will have on an area’s transportation system” says Cunningham.

“So, we try to keep the process straightforward and completely open.” For more information on traffic impact studies, call Steve Cunningham, MPO Senior Planner, at 317/327-5403.

---

**ITEA (from page 1)**

**ITEA’s 16 Metropolitan Planning Factors**

The following considerations, paraphrased from ITEA’s 16 Planning Factors, must be reflected in any and all transportation planning products to be eligible for federal funding.

1. Preservation of existing transportation facilities and, where practical, ways to meet transportation needs by using existing facilities more efficiently.
2. Consistency of transportation planning with applicable federal, state and local energy conservation programs, goals and objectives.
3. The need to relieve and/or prevent congestion via:
   - congestion management strategies which improve the mobility of people and goods throughout the planning process; and
   - effective management of new and existing transportation facilities
4. The likely effect of transportation policy decisions on land use and development.
5. Programming of expenditures for transportation enhancement activities as required under 23 U.S.C. 133.
6. The effects of all transportation projects to be undertaken within the metropolitan planning area, without regard to the source of funding.
7. International border crossings and access to ports, airports, intermodal transportation facilities, major freight distribution routes, national parks, recreation areas, monuments and historic sites, and military installations.
8. Connectivity of roads within the metropolitan planning area with roads outside of this area.
9. Transportation needs identified through the use of the management systems required under 24 U.S.C. 303.
12. The use of life-cycle costs in the design and engineering of bridges, tunnels and pavement.
13. The overall social, economic, energy and environmental effects of transportation decisions.
14. Expansion, enhancement and increased use of transit services.
15. Capital investments that would result in increased security in transit systems.
16. Tourism and recreation.

For more information about ITEA, its overall effect on the planning process, or a complete listing of all 16 Planning Factors, call Mike Peoni, Principal MPO Planner, 317/327-5133.
Section 16 Gives Needed Lift

Applications for approximately $1,000,000 in discretionary funding for the transportation of transit-dependent elderly and persons with disabilities closed on March 14, 1997. “Three local not-for-profit organizations submitted proposals this year in hopes of sharing in the limited ISTEA funds," said Mike Peoni, MPO Principal Planner. Last year, Federal Transit Administration Section 16, the funding program, received 54 applications statewide. “Unfortunately,” Peoni observed, “available funding could only help 30-35 of them.”

The MPO participates in the selection process by putting together a review committee which evaluates local applications and selects the most worthy for recommendation to the state. The state, in turn, makes its recommendation to the Federal Transit Administration. Throughout this process, the criteria for selection includes demonstrated need, efficiency of use, driver training, insurance coverage, utilization of existing services, adequate maintenance provisions, and coordination with other not-for-profit organizations.

“The need for this money exceeds its availability,” Peoni says. “We have to do as much good with it as we can.” For further information on the Federal Transit Administration Section 16 Program, contact Brian Jones of the Indiana Department of Transportation, 317/232-1493, or Mike Peoni of your MPO, 317/327-5133.

Planning Products

Your Metropolitan Planning Organization oversees a variety of complementary and, at times, competing plans that impact the Metropolitan Planning Area’s transportation systems. Part of our job is to reconcile the interests and priorities of each plan with our prime directives of responding to the area’s current transportation needs; anticipating future needs and “paving the way” for system enhancement and expansion; and building a cohesive metropolitan area-wide system that efficiently serves the multi-modal needs of the entire citizenry.

Here are just a few of the major products that simultaneously influence our on-going planning process.

Regional Transportation Plan

This plan guides the development of the area’s transportation system for the next 25 years. It is developed through the cooperation of citizens like you, planners, engineers and public officials. One area of primary importance focuses on maximizing the effectiveness of asset allocation. The regional transportation plan looks at the area’s transportation needs comprehensively and directs the limited available financial resources to those projects that promise maximum benefit to the overall region and the overall transportation system. The plan is being updated this year and is amended as necessary in response to changing conditions.

Indianapolis Regional Transportation Improvement Program (IRTIP)

The IRTIP documents all federally funded transportation projects that are proposed for implementation in the Indianapolis MPA, including road construction, resurfacing and rehabilitation projects; intersection improvements; bridge rehabilitation; airport improvement; and state transportation projects including interstate maintenance. Prepared annually and updated quarterly through the cooperation of jurisdictional and agency representatives within the MPA, the IRTIP covers a three-year time frame and ensures that limited federal funds provide maximum benefit to the region’s transportation system.

Thoroughfare Plan

This plan identifies and prioritizes street improvement projects for 1,027 miles of roadway in Marion County. As such, it alerts citizens that streets designated as thoroughfares may carry significant traffic. It also preserves the right-of-way along these streets in advance of future development. Proposed projects are intended to accommodate traffic demand forecast through the year 2020 — the current horizon of the area’s long range transportation plan. At present, recommended improvement projects involve 73 miles of roadway, cost $373,947,411 (in 1995 dollars), and will typically take 3 years each to implement. However, The Thoroughfare Plan is updated as conditions change.
FEDERAL FUNDS (from page 1)

Reviewing, qualifying, recommending and prioritizing the projects submitted for ISTEA funding is part of Mike’s job. And it’s a process that can take the better part of a year for each application. But it has paid off well for the area’s roadways and citizenry who benefit from improved infrastructure, traffic flow, air quality, site beautification and asset utilization — funded by Uncle Sam at a rate of four dollars to every local dollar spent.

And what does that money buy? “There are four major headings of ISTEA funded projects,” Dearing explains. “Highway Improvement which uses Surface Transportation Program funds, Transit Improvements which uses Transit Administration funds, Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) and Congestion, Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ).” Of these categories, Highway Improvement is by far the largest, garnering $61.5 million over the last five years to fund projects throughout the Indianapolis metro area, like road reconstruction, bridge rehabilitation and replacement, capacity upgrading (lane additions) and intersection improvement.

“TEA projects can be smaller and more varied,” Dearing said, citing examples of pedestrian pathways, tree plantings and proposed bike trails that have received nearly $2 million in funding for fiscal years 1996-97.

The fourth category, called CMAQ, deals with the varied causes of traffic congestion, their solutions, and air quality issues. These projects, qualifying for more than $6 million in federal funding since 1994, include computer-controlled phasing of contiguous traffic signals to reduce stop/start driving and its heightened pollution and public education of air quality issues.

Before receiving federal funding, all qualified projects must be submitted for consideration to the MPO and, subsequently, must appear in the IRTIP. Typical sources of these submissions include the Indianapolis Department of Capital Asset Management or any public agency in the MPA. For further information on transportation projects benefiting from federal support in the Indianapolis metropolitan area, contact Mike Dearing at your MPO, 317/327-5139.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Enhancement Activity (TEA) Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fairgrounds Pedestrian Pathway Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Street Tree Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon - Rehab. of 1875 Whipple Truss Iron Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis - Rehab of Boulevard Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel - Acquisition of CSX (Monon) Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Greenways Monon Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congestion, Mitigation &amp; Air (CMAQ) Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Intercon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Intercon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone Public Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Intercon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Intercon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Irons in the Fire

Here are just a few of the ‘hot’ studies currently in the works at your MPO:

**Regional Transit Authority Feasibility Study**

Initiated at the request of the not-for-profit Metropolitan Association of Greater Indianapolis Communities (MAGIC), this study seeks to establish the pros and cons of creating a region-wide public transit authority. If established, this authority would enable communities within the region to band together to fund a transit system that provides service beyond the current county border limitations. The proposed benefit: greater economic interaction and employment between the capital city and its outlying areas. Now in its fourth month, this study should result in a report with recommendations in April.

**Downtown Transit Center Study**

Can downtown Indianapolis accommodate a metro bus transit center? If so, where would it be? And what benefits could such a center realistically provide? These are the questions being answered by this on-going study, now in its sixth month. The proposed center is intended to enhance the transit experience of passengers who would have a comfortable, convenient place to make their bus transfers. Such a center might encompass a food court as well as other retail establishments, and promises to boost the transit system’s image, reduce metro bus “looping” in the downtown area (and operational costs), and encourage economic growth downtown. Findings should be available in May.

**Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan**

Now in Phase II this study, originally started in 1994, responds to ISTEA’s intention to fund multi-modal transportation systems. In this case, the focus is on opportunities to incorporate the pedestrian and bicycle modes throughout the transportation system of the metropolitan planning area. One such recent opportunity is the now much used Monon trail stretching from Broad Ripple to Nora. As this example illustrates, the topic of this study has already been embraced as part of the regional transportation plan. Phase II now concentrates on developing design standards for the system recommended in Phase I.

**teMPO (from page 1)**

administering and evaluating all transportation-related studies; plus, the on-going process of updating the MPAs long range transportation plan which attempts to reconcile the area’s current and future transportation requirements based on existing conditions, and growth and development projections. As part of these responsibilities, we act on behalf of both the area’s transportation system (and you, the people who use it) and the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) — the federal legislation through which government funds can be obtained for local transportation-related projects (See related story, page 1). Qualifying projects are 80% funded by ISTEA; the remaining 20% representing local funds. In fact, even MPO salaries are paid through this 80/20, federal/local funding ratio.

So, you are not only our planning partners, but also our bosses — the people who pay us through your tax dollars. We earn that pay by making sure your transportation needs are economically and efficiently met. For this reason, we seek your cooperation and input through communications avenues like teMPO, our quarterly newsletter of the transportation planning process. Read it to keep pace with the area’s ever-changing transportation needs. Through teMPO, and the Citizen’s Advisory Committee (see related story, page 3), we can all work in concert.
Unigov Excluded Cities and Towns

These four cities and towns are responsible for streets not on the State highway system or the Official Thoroughfare Plan for Marion County.

Other Cities and Counties

As part of the MPA, Boone, Hamilton, Hancock, Johnson and Hendricks counties participate in the region’s transportation planning activities. Individual cities and towns included in the MPA within these counties are also represented on the IRTC.

Indianapolis Public Transportation Corporation (IPTC) METRO

As the public transit system provider, IPTC-METRO participates in the long range transportation planning process and is represented on the IRTC.

Indianapolis Office of Mobility Management

As part of the Indianapolis Department of Capital Asset Management, the Office of Mobility Management is responsible for transit planning and aspects of transit operation within Marion County in conjunction with IPTC-METRO.

Indianapolis Airport Authority

An active IRTC member, the IAA is the public agency responsible for the operation of the Indianapolis International Airport, the region’s commercial air carrier airports and most of the region’s reliever airports.

Private Sector

Specialized transportation carriers, such as private taxi operators, are major providers of transit service within the Indianapolis MPA. As such, they and other carrier contractees, are welcome representatives on the IRTC and participate on a number of planning committees with your MPO.
Bike & Pedestrian System: Up & Rolling!

After years of study, design and debate, it's nearly complete: a plan for a region-wide framework for the much-anticipated Indianapolis Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian System (Bike/Ped System). What began at the request of those seeking alternative transportation routes, and in response to federal legislation, (See Where the Plan Began, this page) is now reality — a blueprint of a way to get from here to there without using motorized vehicles.

"It a big plus for the areas recreation, convenience and transportation needs", said Mike Peoni, Principal Planner for the Metropolitan Planning Organization.

"In fact, the recommended plan for the bicycle and pedestrian system is in the shape of a plus sign circumscribed by a circle." (See map, page 5). Peoni and Mike Dearing, MPO Senior Planner, are both staff members of the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the group primarily responsible for the areas transportation plan of which the bicycle and pedestrian system is a component. "We enjoyed the cooperation of many planning partners.” Dearing noted. “To take maximum advantage of existing bicycle and pedestrian trails, and to insure future tie-ins to the system by host communities, we relied heavily on the continuous input of interested parties like the Indiana Bicycle Coalition, the Hamilton County Alternative Transportation Task Force and B & O Rail Corridor Development, Inc.

Where the Plan Began

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) placed new emphasis on alternative transportation, especially the bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel. The most recent National Bicycle and Walking Study, conducted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), a part of the United States Department of Transportation, also emphasizes the need for alternative means of transportation. This study generated these two aggressive goals that have been adopted by the U.S. Department of Transportation:

cont on page 10, see Up And Rolling

Where the Plan Began

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) placed new emphasis on alternative transportation, especially the bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel. The most recent National Bicycle and Walking Study, conducted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), a part of the United States Department of Transportation, also emphasizes the need for alternative means of transportation. This study generated these two aggressive goals that have been adopted by the U.S. Department of Transportation:

cont on page 12, see Plan
Where The Path Led

The physical design of the Bike/Ped System plan can be characterized as a regional framework that serves as a link between existing and future local and regional systems via unifying design standards. This concept was refined under the direction of the MPO and Study Review Committee and finalized with the advice of citizen participants.

As part of this refinement, a development model aids local communities in the consistent consideration and incorporation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities within their own plans. Because implementation is more likely when supported by strong policy objectives and planning tools, the Bike/Ped System plan comprises not only physical design standards but policy guidelines.

These guidelines are recommendations for implementation that direct the development of the regional framework and enhance provisions for bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of all appropriate transportation projects within the Metropolitan Planning Area.

The intention of this system is to foster the development of localized networks in neighborhoods and communities throughout the Indianapolis region by providing basic design and policy support.

The goals and objectives were developed in cooperation with the Study Review Committee and the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council. After presentation of potential approaches and extensive discussion, the Study Review Committee established several objectives for the project. These included:

• Support the goals of the National Bicycling & Walking Study and the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) by providing alternatives to motor vehicle travel;
• Be designed for incremental implementation building on existing or planned facilities; and,
• Provide a strong regional framework supporting the development and expansion of local systems

From these objectives, the overall project goal of giving the interests of bicyclists and pedestrians an official “place at the table” in the area’s transportation planning process was developed. Toward this end, the system plan was officially adopted as part of the Transportation Plan for The Indianapolis Region on June 6, 1996. Now, the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian System Plan, as well as other interests of bicyclists and pedestrians receive consideration during the implementation of all roadway projects.
Steps along the way

Successful establishment and utilization of the Bicycle & Pedestrian System Plan is, and will continue to be, an on-going process. Work done to date was accomplished in two distinct phases.

Phase #1 - Recommending Routes

The first priority of this phase focused on the north-south, east-west spines of the system in order to make it as broadly accessible as possible to the greatest number of potential users. This approach also benefits from the synergy of development timing to facilitate streamlined, lower cost development through the cooperative efforts of the Metropolitan Planning Organization, Indiana Department of Transportation and other jurisdictions. The second priority of route recommendations focused on the longer term benefits that will come from implementing a loop that circumscribes the region and connects outlying communities. Actual implementation of these recommendations depends on a variety of factors, but the plan preserves the possibility of incorporating bicycle and pedestrian facilities into current or future roadway and development plans.

Phase #2 - Developing Designs

Since May, 1996, facility design standards have been under development for each of the route recommendations from Phase #1 to ensure compatibility and continuity as the paths develop across the region. In addition, these design standards play the important role of determining how much right-of-way needs to be preserved in current development plans to allow for further Bike/Ped System incorporation.

Drawing from nationally accepted standards, and in cooperation with the Indiana Department of Transportation, this minimum design criteria promotes independent development of corridor segments as improvements are made to existing roadways. These standards also provide for the seamless integration of local community bicycle and pedestrian facilities with the regional system, including newly developed model ordinances which guide the implementation of sidewalks, trails, bicycle parking facilities and bike lanes.

Travel Itinerary

The process of developing the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan can be viewed as four separate stages of implementation.

1. Master Planning
2. Schematic Design (i.e. producing a map)
3. Design Development
4. Construction Documents

To date, stages 1 and 2 have been completed through the cooperation of the Study Review Committee and the facilitation of HNTB, project consultant, via a series of public involvement meetings. Stage 3, Design Development, is currently nearing completion. And Stage 4, Construction Documents, will occur incrementally as projects are identified on the corridors designated as routes in the regional framework.

DID YOU KNOW?

"...people's transport decisions are not chiefly influenced by levels of income, technology or urbanization. The difference lies in enlightened public policy and strong government support"

Bicycle Federation of America
Why did we analyze the bicycle and pedestrian systems of Denver, Dallas and Minneapolis-St. Paul as case studies? “To learn from their similarities and differences,” said Dave Wenzel of HNTB, who worked in the Community Development Departments of both Denver and Dallas. “These communities support walking and bicycling through comprehensive, infrastructures and high levels of public appreciation for alternative transportation — aspects we hope to emulate here.”

The system plans of these cities share factors we consider critical to the success of our own plan, including:

- incremental development over 20-30 years
- local and regional policies institutionalizing plans for bicyclists and pedestrians; and
- broad reaching public relations and education

The developmental strategies of Denver, Dallas and Minneapolis-St. Paul were incremental in two ways:

- bicycle and pedestrian facilities were built as components of larger transportation projects, new subdivisions and commercial developments; and,
- initial projects were designed as primarily recreational in character but, over the years as use increased, were expanded to accommodate convenience trips and, ultimately, were maximized as commuter routes.

“But the plans also had their differences,” Wenzel points out, “and that helped us decide which options worked best for us.” Dallas, for example, took a more organic approach to planning than did Denver, incorporating dozens of miles of local trails without first establishing a unifying framework. Denver, instead, developed a regional framework into which local community bike/ped routes could link. “The simplicity and design logic of Denver's approach addressed our own goals,” Wenzel said, “even though the layout of Indianapolis is more spread out and requires a more complex framework.”

Executional differences aside, the basic purpose of all systems studied remains the same as our own: to provide an option for traveling from one place to another by foot or bike rather than automobile.

**Plan Poster**

Biking buff? Proud pedestrian? Then, show your enthusiasm for the Bike/Ped System plan with this colorful, 17” x 25” poster. Pick one up for just $3 at the City/County Building, or by sending a $3.50 check, payable to the City Controller, to:

Bike/Ped Poster, c/o City Controller
City-County Building
200 East Washington Street, Suite 2260
Indianapolis, IN 46204-3310

---

**Y O U R M P O S T A F F**

...includes these people who would be happy to address your comments or questions on any aspect of the transportation planning process:

**Steven P. Cunningham • Senior Planner**  317/327-5403

**Mike Dearing • Senior Planner**  317/327-5139

**Kevin R. Mayfield • Planner**  317/327-5135

**Lori Miser • Manager—Transportation Planning**  317/327-5136

**Michael Peoni • Principal Planner**  317/327-5133

**Sweson Yang, AICP • Chief Transportation Planner**  317/327-5137

---

**t e M P O** is published quarterly by your Metropolitan Planning Organization, part of the Department of Metropolitan Development. In addition, several special reports are issued throughout the year as circumstances warrant. If you know of anyone who would like to receive teMPO, or if you have any questions regarding its publication, please call:

**Mike Peoni** of 317-5133
Department of Metropolitan Development
Metropolitan Planning Organization
City-County Building
200 East Washington Street
Suite 1841
Indianapolis, IN 46204-3310

teMPO was written and developed for publication by Whitman Communications, Inc.
For a closer look at the recommended North/South & East/West routes, see the detail maps on the following page. Please Note: Implementation of this plan is dependent on successful acquisition of right-of-way and additional community comment.
**North**

The north route of the spine begins at St. Clair Street in downtown Indianapolis and follows the old Monon Rail right-of-way through the Old Northside and the Citizens Neighborhood; across Fall Creek Parkway near 38th Street; along the west wide of the Indiana Fairgrounds north to Broad Ripple; roughly parallel to Westfield Boulevard across White River and the east side of Marott Park and the Indiana School for the Blind; continuing north across 96th Street into Hamilton County through an underpass at I-465. Extensive portions of the “Monon Trail” are currently open of under construction. The city of Carmel and Hamilton County intend to develop the Monon between I-465 and 146th Street. Hamilton County has identified the corridor in its most recent Alternative Transportation System Plan and the City of Carmel has commissioned design standards for the corridor.

**South**

The south route of the spine is designed to provide both on-street and off-street facilities from downtown. The recommended on-street route begins at Ohio Street on the one-way pair of Pennsylvania and Delaware. The route continues southeast to Virginia Avenue turning south onto East Street at South Street; following East Street south to Garfield Park and then continuing along Pleasant Run Parkway to Bluff Road. The alternative, off-street route follows along White River as planned by Indy Parks Greenways, crossing the river at Raymond Street and joining the on-street facilities at Bluff Road. Both routes continue along Bluff Road south to County Line Road.

**East**

The east route of the spine begins at State Avenue south of Arsenal Technical High School on the one-way pair of Michigan and New York Streets. The route continues east to Ellenberger Park and follows Pleasant Run Parkway east across Arlington Avenue; along the south side of Pleasant Run Golf Course to Kitley Avenue; and south across Washington Street where it turns east onto the abandoned Penn Central Rail Corridor. The route follows the grade separated corridor east over the Shadeland Avenue rail bridge and through the underpass at I-465 to County Line Road. Here, the route joins Indiana Department of Natural Resources’ State Bicycle Route on Washington Street (US 40) to Richmond, Indiana. If adequate right-of-way can be acquired, the route could be developed along the rail corridor to Greenfield.

**West**

The west route of the spine begins at College Avenue and stretches west along St. Clair Street through downtown at Indiana Avenue; through IUPUI campus and the Haughville Community; and, connecting with the B & O Rail Road in Speedway. The route follows along the rail corridor beyond the boundaries of the Metropolitan Planning Area.

Please Note: Areas have been designated for further study along each of the routes described above. For further details, please see Special Study Areas Present In Plan, page 7.
Special Study Areas Present In Plan

Although the framework for the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System is “up and rolling”, there are still areas inside the plan where route locations are unspecified. The reason for this is because our public participation programs have determined that further study of local issues and concerns in these areas is needed. Once all design standards for system facilities are established, which can impact type of route and right-of-way requirements, routes in these special study areas will be specified. Areas needing further study include:

**North**
The Special Study Area identified along the North Route is roughly bound by 16th Street to the north, Ohio Street to the south, Arsenal Technical High School to the east and Delaware St. to the west. This area is designated for further study to:

1. facilitate coordination with on-going Indy Parks projects within and adjacent to the corridor; specifically, Nowland Brookside Parkway and the Indy Parks Greenways plans for the Monon and linkages to Massachusetts Avenue from 10th Street, and
2. ensure route selection is consistent with neighborhood redevelopment plans in the Citizens’ Neighborhood Area.

**South**
The special study area along the south route is roughly bound by Stop 11 Road to the north, County Line Road to the south, Perry Meridian High School to the east, and SR 37 to the west. This area is designated for further study to:

1. facilitate coordination with on-going bicycle and pedestrian projects in the City of Greenwood to explore linkages and ensure maximum regional access, and
2. make sure route selection is consistent with community development plans south of Bluff Road.

**East**
There are two special study areas along the east route. The first is roughly bound by St. Clair Street to the north, Michigan Street to the south, Arlington Avenue to the east, and Ellenberger Park to the west. This area is designated for study to facilitate detailed route selection and coordination with on-going Indy Parks projects at Ellenberger Park, especially the determination of safe crossing alternatives at Arlington Avenue.

The second study area is roughly bound by Washington Street to the north, Bonna Avenue to the south, Franklin Road to the east, and Shortridge Road to the west. This area is designated for further study to:

1. facilitate coordination with INDOT to ensure that I-465 expansion and reconstruction plans accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel across the corridor through facility options like culvert designs, pedestrian bridge designs and alternative routes, and
2. continue coordination with INDOT to pursue development of the Penn Central Corridor as part of the Washington St. Added Travel Lanes Project.

**West**
The special study area along the west route is roughly bound by 16th Street to the north, Washington Street to the south, West Street to the east, and Tibbs Avenue to the west. This area is designated for further study to:

1. identify re-use opportunities of the B & O Corridor south of Michigan St.,
2. determine appropriate linking opportunities for the B & O Corridor to Indy Parks Greenways projects,
3. facilitate bicycle and pedestrian access with the IUPUI Campus, White River State Park and the Indianapolis Capital City Landing and Canal Expansion Projects, and
4. coordinate with neighborhood communities in the Haughville area as requested by community leaders during the public workshop series.

**Loop**
No areas of special study have yet been designated for the recommended route that circumscribes both the Metropolitan Planning Area and the North/South & East/West routes. However, as implementation of this loop proceeds, as part of the IRBPS plan, such areas may be identified and studied.
Info Collected Along the Way

As part of the planning process for the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan, the following information was compiled:

- A comprehensive inventory of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the Metropolitan Planning Area.
- All existing policy guidelines in the form of Subdivision Regulations and Thoroughfare Plans were reviewed for content concerning bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Demographic and statistic data relevant to determining target areas for system facilities was collected from the US Census Bureau.
- Data linked to Traffic Analysis Zones as maintained by the City; and
- Planning documents concerning existing and proposed projects.

With the exception of the Zionsville and Hamilton County Plans, the above projects are primarily separate from motor vehicle traffic and recreational in nature. The Zionsville and Hamilton County plans, while enhancing recreational opportunities and providing related health benefits, were designed as components of the existing transportation system rather than as recreational facilities. Their primary purpose has always been to improve transportation mobility through alternative modes in their communities, just as the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan now intends. By institutionalizing these alternatives as viable transportation choices, the system plan helps to maintain, and potentially reduce, the current level of vehicle emissions impacting air quality — just as a similar effort has done in Denver which reports a 3% commuter mode split for bicycling and walking — a number equaling the total who ride transit to work on a daily basis!

The Dollars and Sense of Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

Public opposition to pedestrian and bicycle plans can be strong when such projects appear to be a frivolous use of tax dollars. Nothing could be further from the truth. Recent studies indicate that alternative transportation facilities are not only environmentally smart, but economically sound.

The Maryland Greenways Commission documented in its June, 1994 “Analysis of Impacts of the Northern Central Rail Trail” that the “Northern Central Rail Trail provides a number of substantial economic and qualitative benefits to the people of Maryland, including attracting spending by non-county residents of $294,000 to $630,000 annually. With an annual operating budget of just $192,000, the trail generated tax revenues estimated at more than $300,000 in 1993 alone! In addition, the trail supports an estimated 254 jobs across the State of Maryland and generates nearly $3.4 million in trail-related product sales. In addition, nearly two-thirds of residents responding to a questionnaire felt that the development of the Northern Central Rail Trail had enhanced nearby property values!

How We Got Here

To ensure implementation and future viability of the bicycle and pedestrian system plan, the recommendations for its operational programs and policies were based on supporting research and analysis. This planning process included:

Case Studies
Reviewing successful programs in other communities which are similar in scope to our proposal. This analysis provided guidance for realistic goal-setting and provided practical examples of facility types.

Data Collection
Synthesizing the previously collected demographic, statistical, geographic, economic and regulatory data supported final design decisions and policy recommendations and provided a foundation for selecting design treatments and development strategies.

Design Application
Recognizing what worked in case studies from Denver, Dallas and Minneapolis-St. Paul, and identifying the Indianapolis region’s unique circumstances as revealed through data collection, helped determine achievable physical plans and implementable development strategies.
Who’ll Use the System

Bikers, walkers, joggers, roller bladers, shoppers, commuters, you name it! Anyone seeking an alternative to motorized transportation while going from here to there. Their reason for seeking an alternative mode of travel may involve recreation, convenience or necessity. But all seek a pleasant, safe experience.
To insure they get it, system planners needed to characterize the type of cyclists they could reasonably expect to use the system. Bicyclists were considered over other types of system users (pedestrians, joggers, roller bladers, etc.) not because they are preferred, but rather because bicycle travel puts the system to greater use. Bicycle travel has, arguably, the potential of reaching the greatest speeds and covering the most ground along the system plan. In addition, bicycle operators represent a broad range of skill levels. For these reasons, cyclists were given special consideration during the facility design phase of the plan.

The Federal Highway Administration classifies “design bicyclists” in the following three categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Advanced cyclists</td>
<td>experienced riders who can operate under most traffic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Basic cyclists</td>
<td>casual or new adult or teenage riders who are less confident of their ability to operate in traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>pre-teen riders whose roadway use is initially monitored by parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Key to System Success: Accessibility

The factor most critical to meeting current demand for bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities and encouraging increased system use in the future is accessibility. In fact, access is as important to promoting use of bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel as facility design.

To insure maximum accessibility of our bicycle and pedestrian system, early planning incorporated these three areas of consideration:

**Existing Conditions**, including an inventory of existing facilities plus existing or planned physical developments which may impact the bicycle or pedestrian plan, such as roadways planned for repaving or resurfacing over the next five years and could provide bike lanes; rail lines scheduled for abandonment in the next 5 to 10 years and could be converted to alternative transportation routes; and, roadways identified in the 1995 Congestion Management Study as needing congestion mitigation which would benefit from the addition of alternative transportation facilities.

**Origins**, including areas of high population density as identified through analysis of U.S. Census Data and the Traffic Analysis Zones, where anticipated pedestrian and bicycle trips might originate. While the relative volume of bicycle commuters is small in a regional context, it’s important to recognize that those areas with the greatest percentage coincide with areas offering a variety of facilities to support alternative transportation. Specific examples are found in those census tracts that include Broad Ripple Village, Butler University, downtown Indianapolis and Irvington and other locales that provide alternative transportation access for people needing to travel short distances, usually less than three miles.

**Destinations**, likely for short distance, recreational or convenience trips, were determined from analysis of U.S. Census Data and Traffic Analysis Zones. These include:

- Areas of High employment population Density
- Retail Centers
- Park and Recreation Facilities
- Junior & Senior High Schools
- Public & Special Interest Facilities (such as The Indianapolis Museum of Art)
**Design Guidelines**

The Federal Highway Administration has established design guidelines for the following five facility types in the system:

**Shared Lanes** have no special provision for bicyclists or pedestrians. These lanes, typically 12 foot wide with no shoulders, serve system needs well only in areas of low traffic volume and low speed.

**Wide Curb Lanes** are a minimum of 14 feet wide and allow bicyclists and motorists to share the roadway without forcing either to navigate out of the travel lane to pass the other. These lanes require the least maintenance and are favored by bicyclists in both group A and B (see group descriptions in “Who’ll Use the System”, page 9.)

**Bike Lanes** are defined by AASHTO as a portion of the roadway designated by striping, signing, or pavement markings for the preferential but not exclusive use of bicyclists. Such a lane, with a recommended width of 5 feet, is appropriate for Group B and C cyclists.

**Shoulders**, with a recommended minimum width of 4 feet, are one of the most common, least expensive ways to accommodate cyclists within the existing transportation system.

**Separate Bike Paths** are physically separated from roadways carrying motorized traffic by a buffer of open space or other barrier and may be located in the right-of-way of a parallel road or independent right-of-way.

**UP AND ROLLING** (from page 1)

In addition, private alternative transportation advocates and residents of the neighborhoods most affected by, and benefiting from, access to the proposed framework were encouraged to participate in the planning process via 6 public meetings held throughout the 18 township, 6 county area since 1994. “This system will touch peoples’ lives throughout the area,” Peoni said, “whether they use it or just breathe the air it’s helping to clean up by eliminating some motorized travel. That’s why the process of gathering as much input as possible was critical to the project”

As a “quality of life” initiative, The Indianapolis Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian System Plan has several specific missions, including:

- to provide a regional framework for local systems to tie into.
- to provide users the opportunity to travel by bike or on foot for recreational, convenience or transportation reasons.
- and, to provide direct and continuous travel routes for system users throughout the metropolitan planning area (see map, page 11).

**DID YOU KNOW?**

“Of the 1.38 million people in the Indianapolis Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), nearly 57% are part of the work force, the vast majority of which commute to their jobs in single occupancy motor vehicles.”

“1990 Census of Population & Housing”
U.S. Depart. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
In the Fall of 1994, the Metropolitan Planning Organization started preparing a bicycle and pedestrian system plan for the Indianapolis area. With the aid of the newly formed Citizens’ Advisory Committee (CAC) and HNTB, Inc., a transportation consulting firm selected for the project, your MPO began to address the need for bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the area's regional transportation plan. Through research, case studies, and the help of the Study Review Committee (SRC), a plan has been adopted that provides a framework for the consideration and creation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as components of the Indianapolis Regional Transportation plan. This plan affects the entire Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) and includes the consolidated city of Indianapolis-Marion County and portions of Boone County, Hamilton County, Hancock County, Hendricks County, and Johnson County.

The Study Review Committee represents various jurisdictions within the MPA, as well as private citizens and community and special interest groups. The plan was also reviewed and supported by the 30-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee and the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council Technical and Policy Committees, which includes engineers, planners and elected officials within the Metropolitan Planning Area. In addition, through public meetings and informative newsletters, your MPO protects the public interest in this and all planning efforts.

The Indianapolis Bicycle & Pedestrian System Plan is the result of the cooperation and hard work of those listed at the right:

INDIANAPOLIS METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA

Meteoropolitan Planning Area
(Projected Urbanization By The Year 2020)

MPO Modeling Area
(Studied Below To Its Proximity To, And Influence On, MPA Traffic)
PLAN (from page 1)

• to double the number of trips now taken by bicycle & walking
• to simultaneously reduce the number of motor vehicle accidents involving bicycles and pedestrians by 10%

Clearly, to achieve these goals, communities must develop effective implementation plans. Your MPO, being principally responsible for the area’s regional transportation plan, coordinated its efforts with those of its planning partners (See “Who Made The Trip”, page 11) to encourage and secure this commitment to the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian System Plan.

DID YOU KNOW?

“Almost 49% of trips currently made in motor vehicles are 3 miles or less in distance, while approximately 27.5% of those trips are 1 mile or less.”
National Bicycling and Walking Study

Metropolitan Planning Organization
City-County Building
200 East Washington Street
Suite 1841
Indianapolis, IN 46204-3310
Get in the KNOZONE

Did you know that you can help improve our air quality? Over the last few summers in Indianapolis, there have been a few days when levels of an air pollutant called ozone — a colorless, odorless gas formed when the emissions of vehicles, lawnmowers and industry react with sunlight in the air around us — slightly exceeded federal air quality standards. Should this become a trend, Marion and surrounding counties will have an air quality problem. And that affects all of us!

To help educate the public about the ozone problem, and enlist their aid in dealing with the issue, the City of Indianapolis and the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce teamed up to develop The KNOZONE Public Awareness Program which encourages people to “get in the know.” The program’s tag line, “It’s not over your head.” features a double meaning. First, it points out that the program is not referring to the ozone layer in the upper atmosphere. Secondly, it means that the subject matter is not so technical or scientific that you can’t do something about it.

“It’s easy to get confused” explains Lori Miser, Manager of Transportation Planning for your MPO, “because we’ve all heard about the natural ozone in the upper layer of the atmosphere that protects us from the sun’s radiation. But, the polluting ozone we’re talking about now is a major, man-made constituent of smog.”

cont on page 7, see KNOZONE

Transit to Tame NE Congestion?

A recently completed feasibility study of the northeast corridor, prepared for your MPO by consultants Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. and HNTB, recommends further detailed analysis of transit alternatives as a way to mitigate increasing congestion in that area. The corridor runs northeast from just south of downtown Indianapolis to just north of Noblesville and includes most of the northeast quadrant of Marion County, the Town of Fishers and the cities of Noblesville and Carmel in

cont on page 6, see Transit
The official Thoroughfare Plan for Marion County identifies 25 missing roadway segments, which are represented by dashed lines on the plan map. By their absence, these “missing links” keep our transportation system from being as continuous, safe and efficient as it could be. “To increase travel safety, and decrease the time and pollution associated with start-and-stop driving, we need to make these segments a reality,” says Steven Cunningham, MPO Senior Planner. “As a preliminary part of that effort, the width of the required corridor and proposed alignment of these links needs to be determined.” This was the purpose of the Sketch Plan Supplement undertaken in 1996. Specifically, the supplement was to:

1.) provide definitive alignment for the proposed new roadways,
2.) preserve right-of-way as pressure increases to develop surrounding lands, and
3.) define project constraints, including where the road must go and features to be avoided.

“In short, the sketch plans are intended to provide preliminary roadway alignments in sufficient detail to preserve the necessary right-of-way as development occurs,” says Cunningham.

These plans provide the recommended number of lanes for the Thoroughfare Plan while 1.) minimizing the impact on adjacent property owners and 2.) maintaining acceptable engineering requirements. Proposed roadway segments found to have an extreme impact on individual property owners (defined as preventing development of the property), or that are found to be unfeasible from an engineering perspective, are subject to special study or elimination from the Thoroughfare Plan.

“Thoroughfare Plan supplements of this kind are intended to insure that the development and expansion of the metro area’s transportation system can be accomplished as efficiently and economically as possible,” Cunningham explains. “Visualizing that future system, and identifying exact right-of-way requirements, does that while aiding current and future area development.”

The Sketch Plan Supplement will be completed by late October of this year.
Public participation is critical to the success of the transportation planning process. The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed in 1994 to inform and solicit feedback from the public on various aspects of this process. Since that time, the CAC has advised the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council (IRTC) on a variety of issues of public interest. If you’d like your voice to be heard, consider applying for membership using the form on this page. Just fill it out completely, cut it out and send it in. Applications will be reviewed, and selection made, by the CAC review committee.

Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Area

Note: all roads on boundary lines are excluded except Marion County’s east and south county lines.

Citizens Advisory Committee Membership Application

Serving on the Citizens Advisory Committee requires active participation by those interested in transportation-related issues, dedicated to community service, and committed to making a difference. Attendance at four evening meetings throughout the year is required. In addition, committee members will be given the opportunity to volunteer for additional responsibilities as the need arises.

Name _________________________________________________________
Address ______________________________________________________
City ______________________________  St ________  ZIP __________
Home phone _____________  Work phone _____________
Occupation __________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
Transportation areas of special interest _______________
________________________________________________________________
Other community organizations on which you serve __________________

County in which you live _________________

How do you get to work?
  ❑ Drive Alone  ❑ Carpool  ❑ Ride the bus
  ❑ Bicycle  ❑ Walk

Remember, you don’t need to serve on the CAC to attend its quarterly meetings. For details on the next meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee, call Mike Peoni, MP0 Principal Planner, at 327-5133. Or, to submit this application, mail it to:

CAC Application Review Committee
Metropolitan Planning Organization,
City-County Building,
200 West Washington, Suite 1841
Indianapolis, IN, 46204
Parking Update

Positive

Ten years ago, your MPO studied the parking adequacy of the “Regional Center” — the Central Business District (CBD) of the greater Indianapolis Metropolitan Area, bounded by the inner loop freeway and the White River. Since then, this study has been updated eight times to monitor parking supply and demand using the same formula.

Demand is determined by multiplying the square footage of land use by the “demand ratio,” which represents the number of spaces required per 1,000 square feet of building, according to land use type. Supply is determined by the effective supply ratio, or roughly 90% of the gross commercial spaces, to account for turnover delay.

“Parking adequacy is the comparison of these two numbers,” explains Sweson Yang, MPO Chief Transportation Planner. “It usually connotes a surplus or deficit of parking spaces in the four quadrants of the downtown Mile Square, plus the State Capitol complex.”

Now, your MPO maintains a computer model to monitor changes in parking supply and demand. Development information, compiled from the Regional Center Zoning Review process, is added to the model which groups the 101 city blocks of the Mile Square into five districts: Northeast (NE), Northwest (NW), Southeast (SE), Southwest (SW), and State Capitol (SC). It also accounts for additional parking available in the “fringe” area of the Regional Center.

In early 1987, when the study was first done, demand exceeded supply by 5,200 spaces in the Mile Square. Taking into account the fringe areas adjacent to the Mile Square reduced the deficit to 2,000 spaces in the Regional Center. By comparison, the 1996 update reports a surplus of 3,100 spaces in the Regional Center and 500 spaces in the Mile Square. “The difference is due to the construction of more than 14,500 new parking spaces in the Mile Square over the last ten years, mostly in the form of new parking garages,” explains Yang.

For more information on the Regional Center Parking Study, contact Sweson Yang, AICP, MPO Chief Transportation Planner at 327-5137.
Meet Dorothy Mack, an avowed advocate of alternative transportation who has dedicated much of her adult life to issues of getting from here to there safely, economically and with grace. “It all started in 1975,” Dorothy explains. “I was returning home after spending six years in Tunisia where I had no car. I’d gotten used to the benefits of traveling on foot, bike or public transit and didn’t want to have to give them up.”

So, Dorothy has dedicated herself to initiatives that de-emphasize the car as America’s dominant means of travel. Between 1979 and 1985, she was instrumental in founding and promoting Hike, Bike & Bus Week — an annual public relations opportunity that raised public awareness of the benefits of alternative transportation “My favorite activity was the Great Commuter Race,” says Dorothy. “We would have a bus rider, car driver, biker and jogger all start from the same point at the same time and see how and when they finished.” It was a real eye-opener for a lot of people, and even attracted the attention of local celebrities like Lt. Governor John Mutz and then-Mayor Bill Hudnut.

Today, Dorothy divides her time among volunteer advocacy work, projects in her near-east side neighborhood, and her business, East Side Connections, which is under contract with various programs and agencies to transport their clients. Currently, Dorothy serves on your MPO’s Citizens Advisory Committee (see related story, page 3) and the Study Review Committee for the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan. Closer to home, she is working with DCAM to help re-design the intersection of 10th and Rural to incorporate traffic-calming, pedestrian-friendly technology. “This is a good time for alternative transportation” Dorothy says. “For years my motto has been, meet people face-to-face instead of bumper-to-bumper. There’s more interest in doing that now than ever before.”

MPO Profile is a semi-regular feature of teMPO that focuses on those from both the public and private sectors whose involvement in the transportation planning process benefits the Indianapolis region.

Here are just a few of the ‘hot’ studies currently in the works at your MPO:

**Bike/Ped Model Ordinances**

The Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan is closer to becoming a reality with the development of model guidelines to ease implementation. These ordinances address a variety of subjects, including standards for the provision of pedestrian and bicycling facilities along the system path, and can be incorporated into a community’s planning process in three ways.

1. Facilities meeting these ordinances can be mapped or generally sited in a community’s Comprehensive, Greenways, or Parks & Open Spaces Plans.

2. Mapping and standards of such facilities can be provided for in a community’s Thoroughfare Plan.

3. Basic construction standards of facilities, and application guidelines, can be provided in the community Control Standards. Here, standards could be identified for sidewalks, trails, bikelanes and bicycle parking facilities.

A teMPO Special Report, featuring the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan, will be distributed in August. For model Sidewalk or Multi-use Path Ordinance specifications, or for model Bicycle Parking Requirements, call MPO Principal Planner Mike Peoni at 327-5133 or MPO Senior Planner Mike Dearing at 327-5139.

**Intermodal Freight System Plan**

How can the region’s freight transportation system be improved that will make Indianapolis businesses more competitive in global markets? Answering that question is the primary goal of this study which kicked off in March with a presentation to the IRTC Study Review Committee. By the end of the year, the study will also have suggested a priority list of projects for inclusion or re-scheduling in the TIP and identified steps to establish an effective freight planning process.

The study consists of three phases. Phase I, which should be complete by the end of June, will inventory and assess existing intermodal freight facilities, services and operations in the Indianapolis area. Phase II will develop and assess alternative scenarios for future intermodal freight transportation in Indianapolis and Phase III will recommend implementation programs. Contact MPO Chief Transportation Planner Sweson Yang at 327-5137 for more information.
Transit (from page 1)

southern Hamilton County (See map, this page). “Think of the Indianapolis Metropolitan Area as a clock face, “ says Lori Miser, MPO Manager of Transportation Planning. “We’re talking about the area between 12 and 2 — the fastest growing area in the state!”

According to forecasts in the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Plan, the area’s population will grow by 27% (from 1 to 1.3 million), households by 38 % (410,000 to 565,000) and employment by 44% (729,000 to 1 million) by the year 2020. Nearly all new development attending this growth is expected to occur in suburban portions of the planning area, largely outside of Marion Country. This means continuing growth will further stress an already overburdened transportation system with:

- a 48% increase in daily person trips (1.8 million more trips per day)
- a 69% increase in vehicle miles (18.2 million more miles daily)
- a 77% increase in vehicle travel hours (467,000 per day)

From these projections, two things are clear. First, such dramatic increases in travel could threaten the very quality of life that makes the northeast corridor attractive. Secondly, the traditional approach of expanding highway facilities to handle increased traffic capacity is inadequate to handle projected growth of this magnitude.

The Transit Alternative

Coinciding with an increased interest in transit, or perhaps contributing to it, was the formation of the Hoosier Heritage Port Authority by the Town of Fishers and the City of Noblesville. When the communities purchased the 46-mile Norfolk Southern rail corridor that runs from Tipton to Indianapolis — the southern portion of which cuts through the center of the northeast corridor — the stage was set for serious consideration of transit options. This study is preliminary to analyzing the issue in detail in a Major Investment Study (MIS). An MIS is the

Transit Modes Under Consideration

In addition to various roadway and combined roadway/transit improvements, the feasibility of an enhanced transit system is being studied for the northeast corridor. The three modes under consideration are.

Express Busway

This mode entails express buses operating on a busway or separate bus lane along the roadway or segregated right-of-way. These buses normally collect passengers on local streets or at park-and-ride facilities at one end of the busway, then operate with few, if any, stops until reaching the end of the line. Express buses may serve the Central Business District (CBD) directly, or may feed a rail transit station. This service can:

- serve medium to high passenger volumes
- generally serve long distance commuter trips
- continue on local streets to provide a one-seat ride without transfers
- operate in high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes with other traffic or on exclusive lanes, and
- operate at high speed by avoiding roadway congestion via use of exclusive lanes

Commuter Rail

Commuter rail service uses standard railroad technology to provide long distance, high speed commuter service. Examples of this mode are in service around Chicago, New York, Boston and other large cities. Commuter rail service usually consists of unpowered passenger vehicles that are pulled or pushed by a locomotive. This transit mode can:

- serve medium to high passenger volumes
This ozone forms only in the presence of sunlight, especially during hot weather, and can be found near the earth's surface. In high concentrations, it can be a health risk for individuals with respiratory problems. And, if levels continue to exceed the federal standards, Uncle Sam could impose strict federal regulations, including mandatory vehicle maintenance and inspection programs, gas pump controls that result in higher fuel prices, and restrictions on industrial development that could slow economic and employment growth.

“The good news is, we can do something about it” says Miser. “Over 60% of the formation of ground-level ozone is the result of people activities, not industry. So, we've undertaken a public awareness and education campaign, called KNOZONE which kicked-off on May 14 at Washington Township’s Fox Hill Elementary School.”

Light rail trains can operate in mixed traffic like street cars, using overhead power collection; on an at-grade right-of-way with street and pedestrian crossings; or, on a fully segregated right-of-way. Light Rail Service can:

• serve medium to high passenger volume
• operate at low to high speed (depending on distance between stops and degree of separation of right-of-way)

Light rail transit is a flexible mode that can operate in a variety of settings.

Light Rail

Light rail transit is a flexible mode that can operate in a variety of settings.
An important addition to this year’s campaign program is the “Did You Know?” elementary School Kit that was distributed to all third and fourth graders in Marion County. Featuring fun-facts and interactive games, the kit encourages children to include a grown-up in the activities. Included in each kit is a certificate intended to promote family-wide ozone reducing activities. Once completed, signed and returned by the parent or primary caregiver, these certificates will be used for a drawing in which two lucky children per township will be awarded new bikes. “The school kit has been a real hit!” Miser says, noting that there are already plans to expand the school program next year.

Other components of the campaign include brochures, radio and television spots, a toll-free information line (1-888-DJA-KNOW), various public relations activities, a KNOZONE web page (www.knozone.com), and reduced transit fares on weekday NOZONE Action Days.

“The NOZONE Action Days are really important,” stresses Miser. “When people see the NOZONE symbol on TV or in the newspaper, they can help out by simply changing the way they go about their day. Nothing big. Just common sense things.” Those interested in doing their part can get bus route information by calling IndyGo at 635-3344 or carpooling information from the Indianapolis Rideshare Program at 327-RIDE.

NOZONE Action Day Activities includes...

- Filling your gas tank after 6 pm
- Mowing your lawn after 6 pm
- Choosing in-store service rather than drive-thru lanes
- Carpooling and/or combining errands to reduce number of car trips
- Keeping your car tuned
- Making short trips by bike or on foot
- Ride the bus, and enjoy reduced fares!
- Using water-based, rather than oil-based, paints and solvents
- Avoiding the use of aerosols
Harvest Time at Your MPO

In honor of Fall, this issue of teMPO celebrates the fruits of our labor — benefits of our comprehensive, cooperative and continuous transportation planning process. Included among these is the adoption of the 1998-2000 Indianapolis Regional Transportation Improvement Program (IRTIP) which relies on the “3 Cs” to help prioritize improvement projects for federal funding throughout the Indianapolis region. In this way, the IRTIP ensures that federal funds are spent where they are most needed. To find out about the people and projects sowing the seeds so we can reap the benefits of the newly updated IRTIP, read on!

IRTIP Programs Project Priorities

As previously reported in teMPO, nearly $70 million in federal funds have been allocated to this region over the last five years for urban transportation improvement projects in the Indianapolis metropolitan planning area (teMPO, Vol. 1, Issue 1). These dollars, made available through the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), represent only a part of the U. S. Government’s investment in our regional transportation system. Additional federal funds are designated for local projects under the jurisdiction of other authorities such as the State of Indiana.

For the average citizen, the various revenue sources including, but not limited to, federal funding; the many government agencies holding jurisdictional authority; and, the diverse criteria used to qualify each project for funding eligibility would seem to form a confusing puzzle of acronyms and competing agendas.

Fortunately, it doesn’t . . . thanks to the 3-C process. “The Indianapolis Regional Transportation Improvement Program is an annual reminder that the system works” says Mike Dearing, the Senior MPO Planner responsible for, among other things, updating the IRTIP every year. “Consider that over 70 different groups — as diverse as four county Boards of cont on page 6, see IRTIP

Local Funds Pave Way

With all of the talk about federally-funded roadway projects, including the 185 IRTIP projects that are 80% funded by Uncle Sam, it would be easy to assume that the area’s transportation system is primarily supported by the U. S. Government.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact, millions of local dollars, raised through property taxes, are annually invested in our transportation system and the plan it reflects. The key, though, is how these different funding sources are spent.

cont on page 8, see Funds
Here's a list of the agency and program acronyms mentioned in this issue. Refer to it to keep your understanding letter-perfect.

**AIP** - Air Improvement Program
**CAC** - Citizens Advisory Committee
**CMAQ** - Congestion, Mitigation & Air Quality - a specific area of ISTEA funding
**DMD** - Department of Metropolitan Development
**DSB** - Donor State Bonus - a specific area of ISTEA funding
**FHWA** - Federal Highway Administration
**FTA** - Federal Transit Administration
**IAA** - Indianapolis Airport Authority
**IDEM** - Indiana Department of Environmental Management
**INDOT** - Indiana Department of Transportation
**IRTC** - Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council
**IRTIP** - Indianapolis Regional Transportation Improvement Program
**ISTEA** - Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
**MDC** - Metropolitan Development Commission
**MPA** - Metropolitan Planning Area
**MPO** - Metropolitan Planning Organization
**NHS** - National Highway System
**R-O-W** - Right-Of-Way
**STIP** - State wide Transportation Improvement Program
**TEA** - Transportation Enhancement Activity - a specific area of ISTEA funding
**TIP** - Transportation Improvement Program
**TIS** - Transportation Impact Study
**3-C** - Comprehensive, Cooperative and Continuous

---

**Planning Partners Promote 3-Cs**

The adoption of the IRTIP annual update (see related story, page 1) by all interested parties is a triumph of cooperation and compromise.” says Mike Peoni, MPO Principal Planner. “As an integral part of our transportation planning process, the development of the IRTIP relies on the 3-Cs. In fact, to receive the federal funds we do, law requires our planning process to be comprehensive, cooperative and continuous.”

In other words, your MPO is responsible for, among other things, soliciting and considering the input of jurisdictional interests within the Indianapolis MPA. This is done through the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council.

The IRTC is a voluntary, intergovernmental organization consisting of appointed representatives from transportation agencies in the Indianapolis region, including all area municipalities, the Indianapolis Airport Authority, the Indianapolis Public Transportation Corporation, the Indianapolis Department of Capital Asset Management, and the Indiana Department of Transportation (For a more detailed listing of IRTC members, refer to teMPO, Volume 1, Issue 1). The main goals of the IRTC is to 1.) provide a forum for discussion and resolution of regional transportation issues, 2.) recommend planning policy, and 3.) approve proposals requiring federal funding.

The new interchange on I-65 at South County Line (see “Benefits Tops With IRTIP”, page 4) is an excellent example of the type of cooperation and coordination needed to implement a regional transportation improvement. The project has been years in the planning study which required the cooperation of all of the affected jurisdictions.

This proposed interchange, which will attract industrial and commercial development to the study area, was the impetus for the recently adopted I-65 County Line Road Strategic Plan. The plan evaluated the fiscal impacts of alternative land use patterns, while developing a recommended land use plan, to maximize the economic opportunity for the study area. This process allowed for broader participation from the business community, area residents, several neighborhood associations and institutional agencies from two townships and both Johnson and Marion County. “It was a model of how diverse our planning partners can be and how well the 3-C process can work” says Peoni. For more information on this project, call Kaizer Rangwala of the Indianapolis Planning Division at 327-5111, or Mike Peoni at 327-5133.
Your participation is critical to the success of the transportation planning process. Get involved now by attending public information meetings or joining the Citizens Advisory Committee.

The CAC was formed in 1994 to involve the public in, and solicit feedback on, various aspects of the area’s transportation plan. Since that time, the CAC has advised the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council (IRTC) on a variety of issues of public interest. If you’d like your voice to be heard, so would your MPO!

Consider applying for CAC membership using the form below. Just fill it out completely, cut it out and send it in. Applications will be reviewed, and selections made, by the CAC review committee.

CAC Membership Application

Serving on the Citizens Advisory Committee requires active participation by those interested in transportation-related issues, dedicated to community service, and committed to making a difference. Attendance at four evening meetings throughout the year is required. In addition, committee members will be given the opportunity to volunteer for additional responsibilities as the need arises. They also serve as liaisons to their constituents, facilitating communication and coordination among all interested parties.

Name _______________________________________________________
Address ______________________________________________________
City __________________ St _______ ZIP ______________
Home phone _______________ Work phone ______________
Occupation ___________________________________________________
Transportation areas of special interest _________________________

Other community organizations on which you serve ___________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
County in which you live _______________________________________

Remember, you don’t need to serve on the CAC to attend its quarterly meetings. For details on the next meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee, call Mike Peoni, MPO Principal Planner, at 327-5133. Or, to submit this application, mail it to:

Mike Peoni
Metropolitan Planning Organization,
City-County Building,
200 East Washington St., Suite 1841
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Benefits Tops with IRTIP

Focusing on the adoption of the 1998-2000 IRTIP — its many planning partners, the cost of all projects, and the federal and local dollars that will finance their completion — may distract from the motive behind it all: improved transportation safety and efficiency.

A closer look at three of IRTIP’s projects help put the process into perspective.

**I-65/South County Line Road**

**PROJECT:** a new interchange on I-65 at South County Line Road to be constructed by INDOT starting October, 1997. Projected completion date is June, 1999.

This project is associated with another: the two additional travel lanes added between Madison Avenue and Emerson Avenue.

**COST:** Approximately $6,350,000, funded 80% federal ($5,080,000); 20% local ($1,270,000).

**BENEFITS:** These two projects together will provide improved access to southern Marion County and northern Johnson County, and will relieve the high traffic volumes currently found at the I-65 interchanges at Southport Road to the north and at the Greenwood (Main Street) interchange to the south.

**North/South Corridor in Eastern Hendricks County**

**PROJECT:** A new corridor along Hendricks County roads 950 East and 1050 East between Interstate 70 on the south and Interstate 74 and CR 600N (West 56th Street) on the north. One segment from US 36 (Rockville Road) to County Road 100 North (10th Street) was completed in 1996. The remainder is planned for multi-stage construction, from now to 2008.

**COST:** Approximately $36,500,000 for the road portion of the project including engineering, land acquisition and construction.

**BENEFIT:** Initially designed as a two-lane facility, but preserving enough right-of-way for eventual expansion to four lanes, this corridor will provide a much needed connecting route for high growth residential, commercial and light industrial areas in western Marion County and eastern Hendricks County, including the Indianapolis International Airport. Once expanded to four lanes, this corridor becomes a viable north/south route alternative to SR 267 on the west and I-465 on the east.

**West 16th Street Corridor in Marion County**

**PROJECT:** This completed project included re-configuring the lanes to allow for left turns and interconnecting the traffic signals on West 16th Street between Lynhurst Drive on the west and Montcalm Street on the east.

**COST:** $1,082,291 for the construction of the signal interconnect, funded 80% federal via CMAQ ($865,833); 20% local ($216,458).

**BENEFITS:** This project creates smoothly flowing traffic with a minimum of slowing and stopping by removing left-turning vehicles from the through traffic lanes and synchronizing traffic signals. Vehicles traveling at the speed limit may now proceed from one end of the corridor to the other without encountering a red light.
Meet Bill Gervasio, a civil engineer who commits his professional expertise to the transportation planning process. “My first “run in” with highway issues was in 1965,” Gervasio remembers. It was in that year, while working as a structural design engineer, that he participated in the Indiana Highway Needs Study — the goals of which the plain-spoken Gervasio characterizes “to assess the state’s future needs and to justify raising the gas tax.” It’s astute observations like these that combine the potential of design with the reality of government that Gervasio has brought to the Citizens Advisory Committee since its founding in 1994.

In addition to his participation on the CAC, Gervasio serves on the Johnson County Planning Commission, the Johnson County Board of Zoning Appeals, the Johnson County Drainage Board, the Johnson County Technical Review Committee and the Indiana Economic Development Council — all while serving as a consulting engineer to several of the area’s financial institutions, a niche he developed after retiring from his own company in 1987.

“As a structural engineer, I specialized in bridge design where we sometimes had to innovate within a set of physical or financial limitations” Gervasio says. A good case in point is the rural bridge he designed out of eight flat cars to accommodate the client’s tight budget restrictions. “They needed a safe, reliable and inexpensive way to cross a river,” Gervasio says. “Aren’t these the same characteristics we expect from transportation?” While acknowledging that some of his more traditional bridge designs cross the White River in downtown Indianapolis at New York Street and Harding Street, he is clearly fonder of that inventive solution in Harrison County.

It’ll take inventiveness like this, Gervasio says, to effectively address the Indianapolis region’s need for mass transit — a subject he calls “transportation’s next big story”. “We love our cars and the feeling of independence they give us” Gervasio notes. “But, with the congestion levels and traffic delays common to the northeast corridor, and even parts of Johnson County, it’s clear we need a rail system that is separate from our highway system. And, to alleviate our transportation problems, this system needs to be convenient, inexpensive and reliable — everything you’d expect a bridge to be.”

MPO Profile is a semi-regular feature of teMPO that focuses on those from both the public and private sectors whose involvement in the transportation planning process benefits the Indianapolis region.
Irons in the Fire

Here are just a few of the issues “heating up” at your MPO:

Strategic Transit Planning
Your MPO staff continues to assist the Office of Mobility Management (OMM) on a variety of transit issues. With the help of consultants, a team of transit experts has compiled statistics on each route of the transit system. This information will be used to recommend system improvements, including route revisions and new service. This information will be synthesized into a “Strategic Action Plan” to enable transit officials to make informed decisions. In addition, a public transit survey will be conducted prior to end year to collect information on total passenger ridership, transfer patterns and fare tallies. This data will be used to further improve transit system operation.

Bike/Ped Plan
The regional study committee of your MPO is gearing up to enter Phase III of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan. Phase I provides a region-wide framework that envisions the future of alternative transportation in the Indianapolis region (For more information, see the teMPO Special Report on the Bike/Ped Plan, published August 1997). Phase II provides design guidelines which standardize the construction of planned bike/ped facilities throughout the region. Building on the work of these previous phases, Phase III will provide an implementation strategy to help turn the plan into reality.

Regional Plan Update
The transportation plan - the master document that reflects the on-going planning process of improving and enlarging the area’s multi-model transportation system to keep pace with current needs and anticipated growth — is about to be updated again. “It’s really a continuous process” says Mike Peoni, Principal Planner for your MPO. “We are always evaluating various aspects of the plan to ensure that it reflects our best thinking on all transportation-related issues and influences.” Prompting this update is a reevaluation of the area’s socio-economic forecasts as well as the forecast of revenues available to fund system improvement projects. In addition, a comprehensive analysis of I-465 is planned to assess, among other things, where the interstate is meeting, or failing to meet, traffic capacity requirements.

IRTIP (from page 1)
Commissioners, almost 20 city or town governments, and dozens of state agencies and private sector not-for-profits — have input in the IRTIP. Naturally, most have special interest in the projects that directly benefit their own jurisdictions. But the federal funds only go so far and, each year, we’re able to jointly agree on the projects that best serve the area’s transportation system as a whole.”

Reaching this consensus, and developing the IRTIP, is the responsibility of the MPO and the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council (IRTC) which serve as gatekeepers for more than $13,000,000 worth of federally-funded transportation projects in the Metropolitan Planning Area (see map, page 3) every year. In this capacity, your MPO and the IRTC act on behalf of both the area’s transportation system (and the people who use it) and the federal legislation which allocates government funds for local transportation-related projects (ISTEA).

“The real job is trying to maximize the positive impact of these limited dollars on our local transportation system.”

Dearing says. “The key things to keep in mind are that federal funds can only account for a maximum of eighty percent of a qualified project’s cost, and that a project must first appear in the IRTIP to qualify for federal funds.”

The IRTIP is defined as a staged, multi-year program of transportation improvements that is made available for public comment before being endorsed by the IRTC and adopted by the Indianapolis Metropolitan Development Commission as the policy arm of the MPO. Like the Indianapolis Regional Plan of which it is a part, the IRTIP is multi-modal — that is, it incorporates various means of transportation, including bus, pedestrian and bicycle. However, because car travel plays a predominant role in meeting our mobility needs, projects in the newly updated IRTIP pertain mainly to roadway improvement. Adopted in July, 1997, it presents projects proposed by our planning partners and recognized by the MPO and IRTC as priorities for the three year period of 1998 to 2000.

cont on page 7, see IRTIP
### 1998 MPO-ALLOCATED, STPMA-FUNDED URBAN PRIORITY PROJECTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Co. Line Rd - Sherman Dr to Emerson Ave</td>
<td>Added travel lanes</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Ave over Luck Creek - Beech Grove</td>
<td>Bridge rehabilitation</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut St and Stop 10 Rd - Southport</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Ave over Connail</td>
<td>Bridge rehabilitation</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Rd over Fishback Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$493,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarland Rd over Little Buck Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Rd over Buck Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southport Rd over White River</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Rd - 86th St to I-465</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Expressway — I-70 to Holt Rd</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Ave - S. Co. Line Rd Noble St - Greenwood</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>$2,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynhurst Dr - 10th St to 16th St - Speedway</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>$1,611,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th St over Big Eagle Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** TOTAL $15,075,110**

### 1999 IRTIP PROJECTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynhurst Dr - 16th St To Crawfordsville Rd - Speedway</td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td>$632,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan St Over Little Eagle Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Rd over Big Eagle Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$641,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Co. Line Rd - Meridian St to Shelby St</td>
<td>Added travel lanes</td>
<td>$3,034,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Ave - 21st St to 38th St</td>
<td>Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st St over Little Eagle Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$433,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond St over Big Eagle Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Valley Rd at Peterman Rd/Berry Rd - Johnson Co.†</td>
<td>Intersection improvement</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116th St - Rangeline Rd to College Ave - Carmel</td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** TOTAL $15,901,356††**

### 2000 IRTIP PROJECTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison Ave - Noble St to Smith Valley Rd - Greenwood</td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ave over Bean Creek</td>
<td>Bridge rehabilitation</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookville Rd - Arlington Ave to Hunter Rd</td>
<td>Added travel lanes</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding St - Hanna Ave to the White River</td>
<td>Added travel lanes</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th St over Conrail</td>
<td>Bridge rehabilitation</td>
<td>$478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Rd - 1-65 to 56th St</td>
<td>Added travel lanes</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** TOTAL $14,978,000***

---

* Note: These are not all of the transportation system improvement projects in the Indianapolis region being funded by the Federal government for the year indicated; only those under the jurisdiction of your MPO because of their urban locations. Federal dollars have also been allocated to the State, as well as other jurisdictional authorities, which will help fund additional projects in the Indianapolis MPA.

** - $12,060,080(Federal), $3,015,030(local)  † - land acquisition  †† - $12,721,085(Federal), $3,180,271(local)  *** - $11,982,400(Federal), $2,995,600(local)  

---

The IRTC and the Metropolitan Development Commission make the final determination of which projects will be programmed based on this assessment and meetings with each agency to discuss project priority and scope. Following this procedure, a recommended program of urban funds for fiscal Year 1998 was developed. Additional tables provide a complete listing of all projects requesting urban funds for Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000. “Viewed together,” notes Dearing, “these three tables summarize the results of nine months of planning and cooperation among all those who participated in the development of the IRTIP.” For further information on the Indianapolis Region Transportation Improvement Program, call Mike Dearing, at 327-5139.
Fund (from page 1)

Generally speaking, federal funds are available for major projects that meet specific criteria set forth by either federal legislation or program funding sources.

The use of local funds is far more discretionary. All of the municipalities in the Metropolitan Planning Area oversee the allocation of local funds for smaller, but no less critical, transportation improvement projects which do not qualify for federal funding. Naturally, there are far more of these projects — including re-surfacing, minor road reconstruction, intersection re-design, signal reconfiguration, lighting addition and re-design, and some expansion initiatives — than major federally funded projects.

For example, in 1997 alone, The Indianapolis Department of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) has budgeted $45,000,000 in local funds for capital improvement projects, such as major road improvements. The Indianapolis Department of Public Works has budgeted an additional $12,000,000 for street maintenance, such as snow removal and pothole repair, and $4,500,000 for road paving and signs/signals. So, it's fair to say that, even though Uncle Sam helps keep our transportation system running smoothly, local dollars play a big part in “paving the way.”
When most of us think of travel, we concentrate on getting from here to there: by bus, bike, foot or, being American, car! If we think of land use at all, it's in terms of specific function (e.g. my doctor's office, an auto repair shop, the shopping center). Seldom does the average citizen consider the profound influence land use has on the region's transportation system as a whole.

"To most people, land use and traffic appears to be a chicken and egg thing," says Mike Peoni, Principal Planner for the Metropolitan Planning Organization. "But not to the MPO. To us, "land use" refers to the specific use made of land in terms of its traffic-generating characteristics (See "Trip Generation Formulas", page 4), cont on page 6, see Role of Land

The relationship between land use and transportation is based on the principal of accessibility. To illustrate this point, consider the Transportation/Land Use Study completed in July of this year on the area surrounding the intersection of 96th and Westfield Boulevard.

The study had among its purposes:

- Consider viable reconfigurations of 96th Street and Westfield Boulevard, taking into account Traffic Impacts (volumes, capacity & safety) and Bicycle/Pedestrian Issues (Monon Trail system continuity)
- Identify appropriate land use options that would be consistent with existing area land uses and consistent with community development plans.

cont on page 8, see 96th St.
Transportation is a function of land use,” says Lori Miser, MPO Manager-Transportation Planning. “As such, the unique characteristics of each area needs to be assessed in light of any proposed re-zoning or development. However, some general rules of thumb can help guide the process.”

These Land Use Guides include:

- High Intensity land uses, such as Regional Shopping Centers and Office Centers, should be clustered or assembled in a group to form an activity “node.”

- Generally, the highest intensity land uses should be surrounded by compatible but lower intensity land uses, with a continuing decrease in intensity as one moves toward areas where land uses are least intense.

- Generally, the more traffic associated with a land use, the greater the street capacity required to serve the land use. Usually, higher intensity uses such as commercial or industrial uses should be adjacent to major roadways, and lower intensity uses such as parks and residential uses should be on local streets.

- Usually, high intensity uses should be adjacent to each other and not adjacent to low intensity uses. Similarly, low intensity uses should be adjacent to each other and not adjacent to high intensity uses.

- The greater the differences between the intensities of adjacent land uses, the greater the amount of buffering necessary to shield the less intensive use.

- Employment and residential areas should be balanced geographically to minimize transportation problems.

- The capacity of the infrastructure needed to serve an area should be evaluated in determining the intensity of development for that area.

- Redevelopment proposals and infill development (development of vacant land that is surrounded by developed areas and served by municipal water and sewers) should be compatible with surrounding land uses.

---

**Defining Our Terms**

You’ve probably heard the terms before, but maybe a little fuzzy on their meanings and how these tools of the land use planner relate to each other. Here’s a little help:

**Zoning Ordinance**

Zoning specifies one permitted land use and sets development parameters for each portion of a community. Zoning regulates land use.

**Subdivision Regulations**

Subdivision regulations are local ordinances that regulate the division of land into smaller parcels or lots for transfer of ownership, development or other purposes.

**Re-zonings**

Re-zoning requires the filing of a petition for change in the zoning designation of an affected parcel. The re-zoning process is authorized by the zoning ordinance and re-zonings are considered in public hearings.

Zoning and subdivision ordinances are the tools most integrally involved in the implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (See Defining the Documents, page 6). The adoption of the plan is both a legal and policy prerequisite for making zoning decisions. State statute (Indiana Code 36-7-4) requires adoption of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan as a foundation for zoning ordinances and attention to the comprehensive plan in making zoning decisions. Decisions pertaining to the re-zoning of land have the greatest impact on affecting the plan’s integrity.

---

**teMPO**

is published quarterly by your Metropolitan Planning Organization, part of the Department of Metropolitan Development. If you know of anyone who would like to receive teMPO, or if you have any questions concerning its publication, please call:

Mike Peoni at 327-5133
Department of Metropolitan Development
Metropolitan Planning Organization
City-County Building
200 East Washington Street
Suite 1841
Indianapolis, IN 46204-3310

teMPO was written and prepared for publication by Whitman Communications, Inc.
To develop and update the Regional Transportation Plan for the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)(see map this page), which attempts to anticipate trends and associated needs up to 20 years out, your MPO considers relevant input from a variety of documented sources, including Comprehensive Land Use Plans and Thoroughfare Plans (see “Defining the Documents”, page 6).

The purpose of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan is to aid in the orderly physical development of a community. Developed with considerable input of the resident businesses and citizenry, it serves to guide policy and advise decision-makers.

The main purposes of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan are:

• to improve the quality of the physical environment of the community in response to social, economic, and physical realities and forecasts;
• to provide for the well-being of the entire community rather than to advance the special interests of any one individual or group within the community;
• to promote community goals, objectives, and policies;
• to coordinate the political and technical aspects of community development in order to eliminate conflict or duplication of public and private projects;
• to insert long-range consideration of goals in decisions about short-range actions; and
• to enhance citizen participation in community development and provide citizens with a sense of security and civic pride.

Most municipalities within the Indianapolis MPA have both Comprehensive Land Use Plans and Thoroughfare Plans. For more information on those documents in your area, contact the appropriate individuals listed below.

**Boone County**
Tony Allender
482-3821

**Brownsburg**
Mark White
852-1124

**Carmel/Clay Township**
Mike Hollibaugh
571-2417

**Fishers**
Roger Johnson
595-3120

**Greenwood**
Ed Ferguson
881-8698

**Hamilton County (Thoroughfare Plan only)**
Tom Stevens
773-7770

**Hancock County**
Lowell Thomas
462-1134

**Hendricks County**
Dennis Slanghter
745-9254

**Indianapolis-Marion County**
Kasiser Rangwala
327-5111

**Johnson County**
Jeff Colvin
736-3723

**Plainfield**
Rich Carlucci
839-2561

**Westfield (Land Use Plan only)**
Matt Skelton
896-5577

**Zionsville (Land Use Plan only)**
Lana Funkhouser
873-2484

**Zionsville (Transportation)**
Don Dudkowski
873-4544
**Land Use & Traffic Generation**

There are a set number and type of uses to which a community can designate land. (See "Land Use Categories & Characteristics", page 5). Each of these different use classifications generates its own number and schedule of trips throughout a given day. For example, if an area is designated for single-family residential development, it will generate, on average, 8 trips per household spread throughout the day. That includes Dad and Mom going to and from work (4), and two kids going to and from school (4). If there are fewer or more children, or if only one spouse works, the numbers fluctuate from house to house. But, with trips to the store or band practice or the lodge, the overall residential average is eight trips per day.

“That’s why we do Traffic Impact Studies,” says Steve Cunningham, MPO Senior Planner, “to assess the impact a proposed development will have on an area’s transportation and to recommend infrastructure improvements that will accommodate the additional traffic.” Cunningham is responsible for requesting traffic impact studies when proposed re-zoning or developments meeting minimum impact criteria threaten the efficiency of the area’s transportation system. “For a single family residential development, that minimum criteria is 150 homes,” Cunningham says, “That’s the smallest development size with the potential of substantially impacting traffic flow.”

Other land use categories have other minimum criteria, because of their developed) but also on its type and unique generation characteristics. For example, the PM Peak Trip Generation Chart on this page compares the trip generation potential of five different 10-acre sites with land use densities typical of Marion County. This comparison demonstrates that development intensity and the unique trip generating characteristics of the various land uses produce dramatically different trip volumes from the same amount of land. Put to retail use as a shopping center with 85,000 square feet of space, the 10 acre site generates 592 trips during the peak pm hour. As a medium density residential development with 45 single-family homes, it generates only 53 peak pm hour trips — less than a tenth of the traffic of its retail counterpart!

“Because of all the variables, we have to pay attention to the cumulative effect of re-zoning and land use development decisions” Cunningham warns. “We can’t just check our tables or formulas.” Because the MPO has primary responsibility for developing the Regional Transportation Plan, it must apply an informed, comprehensive overview to the process that incorporates, among other things, future land use assumptions and current input from Comprehensive Land Use and Thoroughfare Plans. “It’s really a perspective that only we have,” Cunningham says, “because we seek out the documents that contain this information.”

Some of these documents are the Traffic Impact Studies that help analyze the on-going relationship between land use and transportation. “Our goal is to provide decision-makers with enough information to make informed decisions regarding the safety and efficiency of our transportation system” Cunningham says, “That’s why Marion County is first in the region to systematically employ a traffic-impact study process, and why the Regional Transportation Plan considers both Comprehensive Land Use Plans and Thoroughfare Plans.” For more information on traffic impact studies, call Steve Cunningham, at 317/327-5403.
The following categories are used to designate recommended land use options within Marion County. Although definition specifics vary from region to region, the categories described below are typical of criteria used in most land use plans.

**Residential**

**Very Low Density (VLD):** appropriate land use for areas having extreme topography, that are conducive to estate development, or are environmentally limited to very low densities. May not be served by sanitary sewers, or service may be unfeasible. This designation includes a recommendation of 0-2 dwellings per acre. VLD use is often recommended adjacent to Urban Conservation as a way of protecting sensitive areas.

**Low Density (LD):** appropriate for areas that do not have the physical constraints present in VLD areas. Recommended residential density level is 2-5 dwellings per acre. 

**Medium Density (MD):** is the land use category with the highest density normally serviceable in suburban areas. Dwelling recommendation here is 5-15 units per acre.

**High Density (HD):** category for areas suited for development of more than 15 dwellings per acre. Appropriate only within relatively intense urban areas.

**Commercial**

**Office Buffer (OB):** for low intensity office uses, usually outside an integrated center, such as medical services, engineering firms and financial institutions. This category recommends physical development that reflects residential characteristics and scale.

**Office Center (OC):** appropriate for integrated office development that usually includes three or more buildings, approximately 100,000 square feet or more of total leasable office space, and an internal street and parking network.

**Commercial Cluster (CC):** assigned to retail and service businesses that have developed independently of one another. Though this designation recognizes some existing commercial strips, additional “strip type, non-center” development is discouraged.

**Neighborhood Shopping Center (NSC):** Mixed tenant, usually several types of specialty stores, unlikely to draw outside of the immediate neighborhood. Developed to function as a unit on one parcel. Floor Area: up to 125,000 sq. ft. Site Area: 5-15 acres. Service Radius: 2 miles

**Community Shopping Center (CSC):** Usually planned as single projects, although they may be subdivided with outlots for free-standing stores. Floor Area: 125,000 - 700,000. Site area: 15 - 40 acres. Service Radius: 5 miles

**Regional Shopping Center (RSC):** A major enclosed shopping center with outlots and, usually, a number of smaller specialty retail centers clustered around a central mall. Floor Area: More than 700,000 sq. ft. Site Area: 40 - 120 acres. Service radius: 15+ miles.

**Heavy Commercial (HC):** for commercial uses characterized by extensive outdoor storage and display, such as mobile home sales. HC uses should not be located near residential areas.

**Downtown Mixed USE (DMU):** incorporates a wide variety of uses at very high or high density levels, including hotels, apartments, and retail trade. Located in the Regional Center Area (RCA), or Central Business District (CBD), these can include significant public and semi-public uses.

**Industrial**

**Light Industrial (LI):** appropriate for industries which conduct their operations within completely enclosed buildings, creating minimal impact on adjacent properties.

**Heavy Industrial (HI):** intended for intensive industries characterized by smoke, nose or outdoor storage.

**Airport Related (AR):** for business and industries requiring locations near the airport, that are beneficial to airport activity and depend on airport facilities for all or part of their business.

cont on page 10, see Land Use Categories and Characteristics
Role of Land (from page 1)

However, the term has different meanings to different people. Developers think of land use in terms of development opportunities. Suburban homeowners may think of it in terms of preserving or jeopardizing their property values. Shoppers may acknowledge only its influence on convenience and the time it takes to run to and from the mall in heavy traffic. And, those views can all be true,” he concludes, “But not the whole truth.”

The greatest truth is that most of us still think of transportation planning as building more and better highways, and with good reason. Since the 1940s and ‘50s, this has been the traditional engineering solution to traffic congestion. Back then, transportation policy makers had a prime directive: to accommodate the growing number of vehicles being bought by prosperous, post-war Americans. As income rose, so did the demand for cars and highways to drive them on. And, government responded to that demand with the Interstate Highway Act of 1956 which provided long-term federal support for road and highway construction.

Defining the Documents

A Thoroughfare Plan recommends roadway improvements designed to mitigate traffic congestion and delays — both measurements of a roadway system’s efficiency. In addition, Thoroughfare Plans usually include recommendations for right-of-way preservation, and assign improvement priorities. Implementation of the plan’s recommendations is dependent on funding and the priority schedule for improvements throughout the area.

A Comprehensive Land Use Plan considers various land use options for a given area. It is intended to reflect the specific development goals, concerns and interests of its citizenry as a whole and ensure that this information is considered by those policy-makers guiding a community’s development.

Nothing has had greater impact on land development patterns in and round American cities this century than highways which minimized the cost of transportation (both in time and money) within and between urban areas. In effect, cars and highways made the suburbs possible, where the average American thought he could get “better bang” for his “housing buck”. Retail firms quickly followed their customers to the suburbs, followed by manufacturers who could now escape expensive factory sites near ports or rail terminals thanks to long-haul, low-cost trucking. Service-industries, too, eventually followed the retail and manufacturing firms they did business with.

In short, cars begat highways, highways begat suburbs, suburbs begat urban flight. Or did it?

cont on page 7, see Role of Land

? Did You Know?

In the last seven years, the population of the Town of Fishers had quadrupled — from 7,100 in 1990 to 28,000 in 1997!
Access vs. Capacity

“Transportation is a function of land use,” Peoni explains, “and, in some ways, vice versa.” The “egg comes from the chicken”, he says, because real estate value is determined by location, or convenient access to the things businesses/individuals want most. These include access to environmental amenities (e.g. waterfront living at Geist Reservoir), employment centers, and shopping, recreational and cultural activity centers.

However, as the buying/use cycle of such property matures, perceived real estate value can be diminished because access is no longer as convenient due to traffic congestion. All the buyers who moved to the suburbs seeking a certain lifestyle end up bumper-to-bumper trying to get to work in the morning and home at night.

This is how the “chicken comes from the egg”: the necessity of access dictates the importance of transportation. For this reason, most transportation planners now recognize the inherent and inevitable interdependence of transportation systems and land-use patterns. And since the transportation system is the basic infrastructure element that influences the pattern of urban development, and vice versa, controlling congestion and preserving access requires changing not only transportation policies but land-use policies.

“This realization is why we consider all relevant Comprehensive Land Use Plans and Thoroughfare Plans when developing the Regional Transportation Plan,” says Peoni. As part of this effort, your MPO coordinates complementary changes in both land-use and transportation policies at a regional level. These policies can include:

- Improving the quantity and quality of infrastructure that serves pedestrians, and bicyclists (See teMPO Special Report on the Bike/Ped Plan, August, 1997) and high-occupancy vehicles (See the teMPO Summer Issue, “Transit to Tame NE Congestion”)
- Increasing the price of auto travel relative to other modes of travel.
- Regulating more directly the design of new development
- Controlling urban expansion
- Encouraging suburban development at higher densities
- Creating pockets of new high-intensity development.

“It’s all about preserving the benefits of growth while reducing its cost. In transportation planning that means planning for the safe, convenient, efficient transportation of the people in our region.” Peoni says. “To do that, we have to use all of the tools at our disposal (see “Defining Our Terms”, page 2). Of those, responsible land use is the most effective.”

Footnote: Some information for this article was gathered from “The Transportation/Land Use Connection: a Framework for Practical Policy” by Terry Moore and Paul Thorsnes.
To accomplish these goals the study, which was commissioned by the Carmel Department of Community Services and the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development, followed the process described below.

1. **Assess Base Conditions**

   This was a matter of assembling existing transportation data for the study areas roadway network. Sources for this information included the Carmel/Clay Township Thoroughfare Plan, the Indianapolis Transportation Monitoring System (TMS), the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Plan, the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan, and the Hamilton County Alternative Transportation (HCAT) Plan.

   Existing characteristics of the roadways relevant to the study area, including 96th Street east and west of Westfield Boulevard, Westfield Boulevard north and south of 96th Street, Real Street west of Westfield Boulevard and Interstate 465 west of Westfield Boulevard, were established from this data, including daily traffic volume estimates, level of service (LOS), occurrence of significant delays, peak traffic times and number of accidents.

   Base Conditions were also assessed from a land use perspective, using the Carmel/Clay Comprehensive Plan, the Washington Township Comprehensive Plan, and the Indianapolis Greenways System Plan. These documents show that the predominant land use of the area is, and will remain, low-intensity residential. North of 96th Street (Carmel/Clay Township) the area is identified as a residential/community area. South of 96th Street (Indianapolis/Washington Township), the land use is planned as residential, from low to very low density near the intersection. Medium density residential is shown west of the Monon Corridor where several apartment complexes exist.

2. **Identify Transportation Options**

   The study evaluates six alternatives of changes in the 96th Street alignment, which evolved from past area studies, staff input and suggestions from the public. These options include a bridge over I-465, an “S” curve under I-465 using the abandoned Monon Corridor underpass, and a connector road from 96th to 101st Streets. Evaluation of these options was based on cost factors, traffic service levels and public input.

3. **Alternatives Analysis**

   Each of the identified alternatives were analyzed for the transportation positives and, in some cases, negatives they bring to the area’s traffic service. It’s important to note that none of the considered alternatives are mandated by existing conditions since the intersection currently offers an acceptable level of service. However, traffic conditions are likely to change when the new 96th Street bridge is opened across White River east of Keystone Avenue. For this reason, each alternative was analyzed for its traffic service potential based on estimates of future traffic from outside the immediate area as well as trips generated by the various land use scenarios under consideration.

4. **Land Use Options**

   Four land use scenarios were developed for the vacant, 80-acre parcel northwest of the intersection of 96th Street and Westfield Boulevard, including a regional office park, neighborhood commercial center and two residential developments of different densities. These options were evaluated both from their trip generation potential (shown here) and a land use/traffic service review, which relates land use decisions with thoroughfare needs. In this review process, traffic was estimated and planning level capacity analyses were conducted, for the vacant site and the four identified land use options. This process provided a rough timeline as to when each roadway change might reach its traffic handling capacity.

   cont on page 9, see 96th St.
96TH ST (from page 8)

5. Public Participation

Three public meetings were held throughout the duration of the study to solicit comment from interested citizens and groups. The first, held March 6, 1997, described the study and asked attendees to identify potential issues and provide preliminary input. The second meeting, on April 3, presented the result of the alternatives analysis and provided the opportunity to discuss preliminary recommendations. The third public meeting, held on May 21, solicited comments on the first draft of the final report. Approximately 100 interested area residents attended each of the public meetings, primarily to show support for quality of life issues. Their predominant message was that they want the residential character of the area, as reflected in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, maintained and would prefer only roadway changes necessary to serve local traffic needs.

6. Conclusions & Recommendations

As a result of all the input gathering, evaluation and analysis, the study reached the conclusion that the intersection was currently providing an acceptable level of service and would continue to do so if the vacant land were developed residential with a maximum density of three dwellings per acre—a land use designation consistent with both the areas Comprehensive Land Use Plan and voiced public preference. In addition, the study recommended the implementation of traffic engineering improvements to the existing roadways and the close monitoring of traffic conditions at the intersection following the opening of the 96th Street bridge. Other alternatives, such as constructing a bridge over I-465, will be retained for consideration in the event of increased future demand.

---

**Land Use/Trip Generation Options**

### Regional Office Park - 500,000 Square Feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>5,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood Commercial Center - 100,000 Square Feet

(*Pass-by* Percentage = 30%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>7,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-PASS-BY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>4,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential Development (12 units/acre)

(80 acres = 960 units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>9,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential Development (3 units/acre)

(80 acres = 240 units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pass-by traffic is traffic that already exists on the roadway and decides to enter a land use.
Land Use (from page 4)

Parks

Neighborhood Parks (NP): this category is intended to provide open space and facilities to satisfy the everyday recreational needs of the immediate neighborhood, within walking or bicycling distance. Typically between 5 and 25 acres, with a preferred minimum of 10 acres.

Community Park (CP): intended for areas that provide major recreation area with organized programs oriented toward family and all-age-group recreation. Size: 25 - 100 acres. Service Volume: 10,000 - 50,000 people. Service Radius: no more than 15 minutes drive. Typically incorporate recreation centers, swimming pools and picnic areas.

Regional Park (RP): for large parks ranging in size from 100 to several thousand acres. Most contain natural features, like rivers and lakes, and provide a natural retreat from the urban environment. Service Radius: within 1 hour's drive. Typically incorporate play areas, picnic areas, shelters, nature centers and trails.

Linear Park (LP): public park trails located on or parallel to floodways, streams, parkways, wooded areas and abandoned railroad right-of-ways or other public easements.

Special Uses (SU): included in this category are colleges, cemeteries, airports, military installations, hospitals and fire stations and other public or semi-public facilities that serve the entire community rather than just the immediate neighborhood.

Urban Conservation (UC): the appropriate designation to help preserve land of special environmental or valuable natural characteristics, such as steeply sloped areas, woodland areas, wetland areas, and areas with significant aquifer or other water resources.

Did You Know?

Traffic on I-465 increased 24% between 1992 and 1994 — an increase of 1.1 million vehicle miles traveled a day!
teMPO Looks Back, Moves Ahead

With this issue, teMPO completes its first full year of publication. As such, now is a good time for your MPO to review the past year’s transportation achievements and 1998’s upcoming challenges/opportunities. You’ll find mention of both in articles concerning the Transportation Planning Element of the Overall Work Program (OWP) where we glance into the rear view mirror to describe 1997 accomplishments and look “up the road” to designated projects that lay ahead.

Also in this issue is a look into the Office of Mobility Management which celebrates its second anniversary this January. What does Executive Director Paul Larson see as the transit-related priorities for his office? Find out, as teMPO enters the new year as the region’s official journal of the transportation planning process.

1998 Overall Work Program: Where the Rubber Meets the Road

“It’s not just a list of projects,” says Lori Miser, Manager-Transportation Planning, of the Transportation Planning Element of the 1998 Overall Work Program. “It’s more like a map of where our transportation system is headed in the coming year and how we plan to get there.”

As previously reported in teMPO, your MPO is responsible for guiding a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process (see teMPO issues #1, #3) that addresses the concerns and incorporates the work of a variety of planning partners, such as the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council (IRTC), the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA). These issues and interests take the form of many diverse planning and implementation avenues which first intersect during the development of the OWP’s Transportation Planning Element.

cont on page 4, see Rubber Meets the Road

Office of Mobility Management Completes Transit-ion

Since its founding in January 1996, the goal of the Office of Mobility Management (OMM) has been to improve the city’s handling of transit-related issues. That remains the goal of Paul Larson who was named OMM Executive Director in July, 1997.

“The purpose of founding the OMM was to separate transit policy-making and planning functions from operational concerns,” Larson says. “Clearly, those are two very different perspectives.

cont on page 9, see Mobility
To contribute to a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process, the OWP Transportation Planning Element incorporates five sub-elements. Definitions, 1997 accomplishments and 1998 priorities of these sub-elements follow:

**Transportation Monitoring and Management Systems**

The purpose of this sub-element is to ensure effective management of new and existing transportation facilities via travel demand reduction and operational management strategies. As a result, it serves to implement Transportation Monitoring System (TMS) strategies and the continuing development of the Intermodal Freight System Plan. (For more information, see “Irons In The Fire”, teMPO, Vol. 1, Issue #2). Due to the variety of operating agencies involved in management systems and operations planning, this sub-element also provides a forum for the exchange of information and coordination of all planning efforts.

**1997 Accomplishments include . . .**

1. System monitoring and data-collection
2. Completion of the Transportation Monitoring System for the Indianapolis MPA.
4. Partnering with INDOT to develop management systems.
5. Working with INDOT to develop the region’s Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) early deployment strategies plan.

**1998 Priorities include. . .**

1. Implementation of the GIS-based Transportation Monitoring System, which contains multi-modal transportation planning information. Your MPO will update, maintain and expand this system to include planning attributes, like the Highway Performance Management System (HPMS), throughout the coming year.
2. Continuation of Phase Three of the Intermodal Freight System Plan which will recommend intermodal implementation programs and identify related Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) costs and benefits. Phase One established performance measures, reviewed goods movement studies and regulations, and described the current freight-handling system. Phase Two conducted freight modeling and logistical forecasts and examined future scenarios and alternatives. A final report, detailing the findings of all three phases will aid in the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan.
3. Coordination of ITS deployment in the Indianapolis MPA to ensure compatibility with the Congestion Management System (CMS), the Transportation Monitoring System (TMS) and other transportation planning initiatives.
4. Expansion of the Metropolitan Traffic Counting Program initiated by INDOT and DCAM in Marion County to include urbanized areas of surrounding counties thereby providing more comprehensive monitoring of existing traffic patterns.
5. Investigation of how emerging telecommunications technologies will impact future transportation planning and infrastructure needs.

*cont on page 6, see OWP*
The Overall’s Overview

Because it is a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive process, transportation planning incorporates a lot of land use, environmental and socio-economic information. (For more information on this topic, see the tcmPO Special Report on Land Use, November, 1997). It uses this input to monitor conditions, predict the travel behavior of area residents, and accommodate increasing travel demand in ways that minimize social, economic and environmental harm.

Monitoring these conditions ensures that the assumptions upon which the transportation plan is based are consistent with other adopted plans. Interrelated activities carried out by MPO-counterparts in other sections of the Planning Division, the Department of Metropolitan Development and the Indianapolis Department of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) include:

Air Quality Analysis

In November, 1994, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency reclassified Indianapolis/Marion County as a maintenance area for the ozone pollutant. For this reason, approval of the region’s Transportation Plan is contingent upon conformity with the air quality regulations required of the area by the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA). Your MPO is responsible for air quality conformity analysis and documentation for Marion County. Other transportation-related air quality activities are conducted by the city’s Environmental Resources Management Division (ERMD).

Land Use Planning

The Comprehensive and Sub-Area Planning sections of the Planning Division, counterparts of your MPO, develop a variety of plans and specific development studies, including the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Neighborhood Plans and Corridor Plans. This information is used to ensure that existing land use conditions, and future land use recommendations, are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It also provides current and future land use data to traffic impact studies.

Economic Analysis/Data Development

The Research and Policy Analysis section of the Planning Division analyzes social and economic data, such as the 1990 Census, to develop future population and employment projections, among other things.

Permit Data

The Division of Neighborhood and Development Services compiles and maintains housing starts and losses data, improvement location permits and maps re-zoning approvals.

Traffic Count Data

Every three years, DCAM counts traffic on Marion County thoroughfares, excluding interstate and selected state routes, and makes this information available in a FoxPro database format. Traffic on routes under state jurisdiction is counted by INDOT every four years.
Rubber Meets the Road (from page 1)

This annually updated document reflects the mission of the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development's Regional Transportation Planning Program, which is to develop local and state government plans/programs for moving people and goods in compliance with federal requirements throughout the Indianapolis MPA. (see map, page 3).

Specifically, the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Planning Program, and the document that reflects it, provides:

1. Identification of future transportation needs by analyzing existing conditions/trends and making projections of future changes.

2. Provision of a factual basis for comprehensive public policies to meet the transportation needs of people and their communities.

3. Preparation of plans in which streets, public transit, highways, airports and other means of moving people and goods are properly related to plans and programs for the physical, social, economic, environmental and energy needs of the Indianapolis region.

4. Maintenance of a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process that meets the requirements of the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and will enable plans to be kept current and modified as necessary to meet changing conditions and the requirements of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA).

To help achieve the 3-C goals of the transportation planning program, the planning element of the Overall Work Program must be developed with an overview of the entire region’s needs from a variety of perspectives. (See “The Overall’s Overview”, page 3). As such, the planning element incorporates the funding and project priorities of five transportation-related sub-elements. It also reviews program efficiency and funding effectiveness by reviewing the previous year’s accomplishments in each area.

The five subelements that contribute to the overall transportation planning perspective are:

- Transportation Monitoring and Management Systems
- Major Investment Studies and Multi-modal Plan
- Transportation Plan
- Transportation Planning Support
- Transportation Improvement Program

For brief definitions, past accomplishments and upcoming projects in each of these areas, read “OWP Tran Plan Do’s & Dones”, page 2.

“By considering each of these five areas, and working closely with our various transportation planning partners throughout the year, we make sure that the regional transportation plan stays on course, meeting current and anticipating future needs as they develop,” says Sweson Yang, MPO Chief Transportation Planner.

cont on page 10, see Rubber Meets the Road

CAC ’98

If you’d like a voice in the transportation planning process of the Indianapolis region, plan on attending the quarterly meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). As the public’s arm of the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council, the CAC works in concert with your MPO to address the area’s current and future transportation needs. In 1998, quarterly CAC meetings are planned to take place from 6:30 to 8 PM in Room 107 of the City-County Building, 200 East Washington Street (northeast corner of Washington and Delaware), in downtown Indianapolis on the following Tuesday evenings:

February 3  May 19  August 11  October 27

Call Mike Peoni, MPO Principal Planner, at 327-5133, with questions or to be placed on the CAC mailing list.
Meet Lee Rahmoeller, a transportation advocate who takes the subject of open door paratransit service very seriously. “I’ve been in the chair nine years,” says Lee, referring to a 1989 traffic accident that broke his neck and shoulders and left him paralyzed for life. “As a C5-C6 quadriplegic, I’ve seen the best and worst of both the walking and non-walking worlds.”

It’s that personal experience Lee brings to his role of transportation advocate now serving on an estimated 10 committees, including the METRO Advisory Committee (Chairman), the Transit Advisory Council, the Council of Volunteers of Hoosiers with Disabilities (COVOH), Partners in Policy-Making, the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Indiana Council for Special Transportation which serves the older, transit-dependent, undeserved and disabled. In addition, Rahmoeller was appointed to the Indiana Council on Independent Living by Governor O’Bannon and the Mayor’s Council on Disability by Mayor Goldsmith.

“It all began for me back in 1992 when I attended a transportation public hearing to complain about service for the disabled. At that time, I only lived 15 minutes from work, but I had to get on an open door bus at 4:15 am because that was when they had time to deal with me,” Lee remembers. “So, they’d drop me off early at work and I’d wait until 8 o’clock when a co-worker could help me get in.”

Since that time, Rahmoeller has actively worked to improve transit conditions for the disabled, often serving as guinea pig to test new bus stops, bus accessibility and curb cuts. And he has seen a lot of progress.

“The I.P.T.C. transit system is still not in compliance with the 1992 American Disabilities Act (ADA), but we’re a lot closer than we used to be,” Rahmoeller notes. “Though we are not fully “demand responsive” as the ADA requires, we’re gaining on it,” he says. “We have 44 paratransit buses and 29 handicapped-accessible fixed route buses in daily operation with 14 more of each being added in early January. In another two years, all fixed route buses will be accessible. That’s a big leap forward.”

With such visible signs of progress, does Rahmoeller plan to retire from transit advocacy to concentrate exclusively on his own transportation consulting and computer-programming firms? Not on your life. “Our transit system provides a maximum of 850 trips a day to people like me who depend on transit to get around. That’s not bad, but we still turn down 5% of all Open Door calls because we can’t handle them,” he says. “I know what it’s like to wait for a ride, to want to participate, to contribute, and to have no way of getting out. So, I’m going to keep doing this until everybody who needs a ride has one.”

MPO Profile is a semi-regular feature of teMPO that focuses on those from both the public and private sectors whose involvement in the transportation planning process benefits the Indianapolis region.

Irons in the Fire

Here are just a couple of issues “heating up” for your MPO, and its planning partners:

Transit Study

The Office of Mobility Management (see related story, page 1) is in the midst of a transit study geared toward improving service. “We’re putting together a one-day snap shot of the entire system,” says Paul Larson, OMM Executive Director. “Data from every route and every hour of the day will be collected with the intention of better matching transit service with transit need.” Possible recommendations could include the use of smaller buses on certain routes and new service options such as zoned collection service that would pick up transit customers at their homes in sparsely populated areas. The study is scheduled for completion in the first quarter of 1998.

Traffic Calming

Traffic calming is an umbrella term for the re-design of street spaces in order to reduce the volume and speed of traffic and to allow the space to be safely shared among pedestrians, bicyclists and cars. “The basic goal is to return the streetscape to a human scale.” says Kaizer Rangwala, Principal Planner, Division of Planning. Techniques include placing obstacles in the road, such as changes in the pavement and curbline, and encouraging pedestrian- and bicyclist-use by widening the sidewalks, creating bikeways and “greening up the surrounding environment.” Currently, there are dozens of traffic-calming projects under consideration or construction in the Indianapolis MPA. For more information, read “Excitement over Traffic-Calming” in the Spring 1998 issue of teMPO.
Major Investment Studies & Multi-Modal Planning Activities

This sub-element includes any activity necessary to complete Major Investment Studies (MIS) and incorporates many multi-modal planning activities, such as those dealing with auto, bus, rail, pedestrian and bicycle travel. Your MPO will work with INDOT, the Indianapolis Public Transportation Corporation/Metro, the Federal Highway Administration, the Indianapolis Office of Mobility Management, and all other appropriate agencies and jurisdictions to ensure that the region’s transportation plan is multi-modal in scope and addresses the requirements and guidelines of the federal government set forth in ISTEA.

1997 Accomplishments include . . .

1. Working with the Indianapolis Office of Mobility Management (see related story, page 1) to implement key recommendations of the Strategic Plan and assist in planning activities.
2. Conducting the Transit Center Study to determine ways to better match service to need.
3. Completing the Regional Transit Authority Feasibility Study.
4. Completing the Northeast Corridor Evaluation, which supports a request for special federal funding of a Major Investment Study (MIS) (For more information, see teMPO, Vol. 1, Issue #2).
5. Continuing the “Knozone” public awareness program which triggered the observance of eight Nozone Action Days during the program’s second year.
6. Completing Phases I and II of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (For more information, see teMPO, Special Report, August 1997).
7. Developing an action plan for coordinating specialized transportation Services.

1998 Priorities, include . . .

1. Continuation of multi-modal planning, such as assisting Indianapolis Public Transportation Corporation (IPTC) and OMM with public transportation activities, coordinating Section 5310 Regional Center Parking Study annual update, participating in planning activities for Indianapolis International Airport, co-sponsoring the 1998 Indiana Bicycle Conference, and updating the Bicycle User Map.
2. Implementation of strategic transit planning assistance, including bus shelter evaluation, downtown transit strategies, and coordination with the Regional Transit Service Plan to help improve the Indianapolis’ public transit system.
3. Development of a Regional Transit Service Plan, in conjunction with the newly forming Central Indiana Regional Transit Authority (CIRTA).
4. Continued refinement, implementation and expansion of the ozone public awareness program, including educational materials, broadcast advertising, elementary school programs and possible enhancement of the Rideshare Program.
5. Coordination of the Northeast Corridor MIS with your MPO, INDOT, METRO, Office of Mobility Management, FHWA and IDEM, and possible initiation of other major investment studies for INDOT projects already in the “pipeline”, including I-65: South of Greenwood Road to south of Whiteland Road and S.R. 37: I-465 South to Smith Valley Road.
Regional Transportation Plan

The purpose of this sub-element is the continuing refinement of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Indianapolis MPA, which includes a Thoroughfare Plan, a Transit Plan, a Bike/Ped Plan, a Congestion Management System, Air Quality Conformity and Cost Feasibility. In 1998, plan refinements will concentrate on re-evaluating the major assumptions that underlay the plan, including socio-economic forecasts and future revenue projections. In addition, a thorough analysis of I-465 will be conducted in close cooperation with INDOT.

1997 Accomplishments include . . .
1. Updating Traffic Count Maps and computer files.
2. Updating Street Facilities inventory.
3. Continuing planning of the Airport/Six Points Road/I-70 Interchange.
4. Continuing traffic forecasting and sub-area/impact studies.

1998 Priorities include . . .
1. Re-evaluation of the Regional Transportation Plan, including modification of socio-economic related assumptions such as population, retail employment and average household size. Also, review of 2020 revenue forecasts, complete operations analysis with INDOT, and run Air Quality Conformity Analysis, as needed.
2. Continuation of the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) Process including review of TIS for proposed development projects (For further information, see “Land Use & Traffic Generation, teMPO Special Report, November 1997) and follow-up analysis of past TIS to assess accuracy.
3. Revision of Data Management and GIS/Mapping facilities, including existing traffic-count maps and street inventory and development of presentation-quality computer-mapping capabilities.
4. Provision of Thoroughfare Plan Support services, including amending the Thoroughfare Plan, collecting traffic data, reviewing projects to assure conformance and developing project-specific forecasts.
5. Development of standardization guidelines for the Thoroughfare Plan and right-of-way (ROW) requirements throughout the MPA.

cont on page 8, see OWP
Transportation Planning Support and Special Studies

This sub-element provides overall management and policy direction, fiscal analysis, and accounting and personnel services for your MPO’s Transportation Planning Process. “It also provides staff-training, professional development workshops, administrative meetings and a forum for public information and citizen participation,” says Mike Peoni, MPO Principal Planner. In addition, this sub-element provides transportation planning support and special studies facilitating any planning support activity required by state or federal legislation or deemed necessary by state and local officials to address pressing transportation issues.

1997 Accomplishments include . . .
1. Fulfilling administrative and budgetary requirements associated with the MPO function, including completion of the 1998 OWP-Transportation Planning Element, 1997 OWP Quarterly Progress Reports and the 1997 OWP annual Completion Report.
2. Conducting all planning support activities to meet state and federal funding requirements for the Indianapolis MPA.
3. Contributing to various Indiana MPO Council, INDOT, FTA, FHWA and Metropolitan Association of Greater Indianapolis Communities (MAGIC) meetings.
4. Conducting quarterly Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings and publishing six issues of teMPO — newsletter of the Indianapolis MPA’s transportation planning process.
5. Completing the I-70/Six Points Road Status Report, the Naval Air Warfare Transportation Impact Study and traffic projections for various INDOT projects.

1998 Priorities include . . .
1. Preparation of program documentation required for federally-funded projects.
2. Continuation of the on-going transportation planning process, including participation in senior staff meetings, processing of consultant contracts, training staff and citywide personnel and coordinating with other functional areas such as land use, neighborhood and township planning.
3. Coordination of interagency functions for the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council and the Citizens Advisory Committee meetings, and additional ISTEA rule-making and implementation activities.
4. Participation in statewide MPO Council meetings, MAGIC meetings and other regional meetings, as well as serving on the project Management Team and Steering Committee for the Central Indiana Transportation and Land Use Vision Plan sponsored by the Central Indiana Regional Citizens League (CIRCL) and funded by the Lilly Endowment.
5. Encouragement of citizens’ awareness and participation in all aspects of the transportation planning process via publication of six issues of the teMPO newsletter, preparation of a citizen participation handbook and constant review/expansion of the public involvement process.

Transportation Improvement Program

This sub-element provides for the programming activities of the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Improvement Program (IRTIP) — a program of regional transportation projects proposed for implementation over the next three years. Inclusion of a project in the IRTIP is a prerequisite for eligibility for certain federal funding sources. The IRTIP also provides the quarterly monitoring of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) projects and the on-going analysis of fiscal resources available for transportation improvements. (see teMPO, issue #3, for more information on current IRTIP).

1997 Accomplishment include . . .
1. Coordinating the programming and funding of regional transportation projects.
2. Evaluating guideline conformity for the Transportation Plan and the IRTIP.
3. Monitoring of federally funded projects on a monthly basis.
4. Instituting amendments to the IRTIP.
5. Presenting IRTIP materials to the IRTC and MDC.
6. Initiating electronic conveyance of information between the MPO and other agencies.

1998 Priorities include . . .
1. Preparation of the 1999-2001 IRTIP.
2. Coordination of quarterly and annual programming activities, including preparation of IRTIP amendments, monthly monitoring of federally funded projects, and assessing transportation funding levels.
3. Management and monitoring of all 1999-2001 IRTIP programs, including the standardization of computer software, in conjunction with INDOT, to permit electronic information exchange.
4. Coordination of air quality conformity analysis with INDOT, IDEM, the Indianapolis Environmental Resources Management Division, FTA and FHWA.
Mobility (from page 1)
“The people at METRO, provide the core transit services. Their job is to run the buses — a task that requires an internal focus and one hundred percent of their attention,” he explains. “At the OMM, we believe our job is to sell rides. That’s an externally-focused, service point-of-view that puts the customers’ needs first.”

Having acted as METRO’s Interim Director back in 1992, Larson is uniquely qualified to appreciate the distinction, and maximize the benefits, of OMM’s independent perspective. “I think my mission is to find the best way to connect different parts of the community, such as people and jobs,” he states. “Sometimes, that means finding alternatives to traditional bus service.”

Over the last two years, OMM’s “customer-oriented perspective” has brought big benefits to transit-users throughout Indianapolis, including an independent evaluation of quality that’s resulted in improved service, competition among providers resulting in more flexible, lower cost transit options and, generally, customer-focused service on all transit-related issues.

A good case in point concerns $8 million dollars in transit funding the state allocates to Indianapolis. This money, along with nearly $2 million in fares collected for the transit services provided, used to go to METRO. “Now, that nearly $10 million dollars comes directly to the city, through the Office of Mobility Management, which purchases services that best meet the needs of transit customers,” Larson says.

“In addition to the ‘big bus, regular route’ core services provided by METRO, we are now considering the transit efficiencies of smaller vehicles, and more flexible service concepts, such as pick up services that meet the needs of outlying customers” Larson explains. “In these ways, transit costs can remain steady while customer service and satisfaction increase.”

Your MPO Staff

... includes these people who would be happy to address your comments or questions on any aspect of the transportation planning process:

Steve Cunningham • Senior Planner 317/327-5403
Mike Dearing • Senior Planner 317/327-5139
Kevin Mayfield • Planner 317/327-5135
Lori Miser • Manager-Transportation Planning 317/327-5136
Michael Peoni • Principal Planner 317/327-5133
Sweson Yang, AICP • Chief Transportation Planner 317/327-5137

TeMPO is published quarterly by your Metropolitan Planning Organization, part of the Department of Metropolitan Development. If you know of anyone who would like to receive TeMPO, or if you have any questions concerning its publication, please call:

Mike Peoni at 327-5133
Department of Metropolitan Development Metropolitan Planning Organization City-County Building 200 East Washington Street Suite 1841 Indianapolis, IN 46204-3310
TeMPO was written and prepared for publication by Whitman Communications, Inc.
Rubber Meets the Road (from page 4)

In fact, that’s one of the goals of the OWP, which include:

1. Setting transportation project priorities.
2. Aiding in the budgeting of available federal and local funds.
3. Identifying areas and issues requiring major investment studies, such as transit development in the Northeast Corridor MIS, detailed in the Summer ’97 issue of teMPO.
4. Serving as a planning aid to the Regional Transit Authority (RTA).
5. Annually updating the Regional Transportation Plan.

“It all comes together in this one document,” says Yang of the 1998 OWP Transportation Planning Element which was completed in mid-October and approved on December 3, 1997.

“Thanks to it, we know where we’re headed throughout the coming year, what we’ll be doing to get there, and how we’ll pay for it.”

In the next issue of teMPO:

• Excitement over Traffic-Calming Techniques
• Growth Increases Hamilton County Road Work
• Plus, other 1998 transportation plan priorities!