

## Minutes

Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority (CIRTA)

August 25, 2010, 9:00 – 11:00 AM

Held at

IndyGo – Indianapolis Public Transit Corporation

1501 W. Washington St.

Indianapolis, IN 46222

IndyGo Board Room

### Members Present:

Chuck Fewell

Rob Thoman

Bill Kirchoff

Jerry Bridges

David George

Don Adams

Marta Moody

Mike Terry

Larry Hesson

Christine Altman

Bob Sterrett

Sue Ritz

### Members Absent:

Mike Hale

Ron Deer

Ben Ledo

Linda Sanders

Gil Holmes

### Staff:

Ehren T. Bingaman

A quorum was recognized by the chair and the meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM. The members of the board introduced themselves to the public that was present.

The minutes of the July 28, 2010 meeting of the CIRTA board were presented for consideration by J. Bridges. *C. Fewell moved to adopt the minutes as submitted, M. Terry seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.*

E. Bingaman and B. Kirchoff present the 2011 Budget for adoption. B. Kirchoff asked that the final printed budget strike "CICS at \$850.000" in the notes section of the budget. E. Bingaman agreed. R. Thoman moved to adopt the 2011 Budget as presented and amended, B. Kirchoff seconded. The motion was approved unanimously. E. Bingaman presented Claims Docket #100825. C. Altman discussed the nature of the expenditure. *R. Thoman moved to pay claims docket #100825, M. Moody seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.*

Under the order of old business the board considered acceptance of the Rural On-Demand Transportation Final Report presented at the July 28, 2010 meeting. B. Kirchoff identified a few typos. E. Bingaman advised that he would have Christy Campoll contact the contractor and make the cosmetic edits. S. Ritz moved to accept the study; J. Bridges seconded.

E. Bingaman introduced the Regional Transit Organizational Study Draft Recommendations and Erik Cempel, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., the project manager of the study. E. Cempel outlined the organizational recommendations and thought processes of the working assembled by CIRTA to develop a proposal for a new operating and organizational model. The approach calls for an integration of CIRTA and IndyGo into a regional serving transit agency. The reorganization is triggered by the passage of a referendum for transit funding.

The board asked several questions in follow up E. Cempel's presentation. The key points are summarized by the following bullets. (This is not intended to be a detailed record of the discussion that occurred.)

- Regional all-or-nothing vote versus a county by county vote for referendum. This option was reviewed by the team. The final report will make clear in the "peer review" section of the

Final Report, and make clearer in the recommendations why county by county referendum was recommended.

- Due to an urban/rural divide in some counties, can the geographic division of membership be smaller than a county, e.g., municipality or township? This option was reviewed by the team. There are issues with checkerboard/doughnut effects as well as with tax administration. The consultant will provide further detail on examples of these issues in the “peer review” section of the Final Report, and make clearer in the recommendations why the county level was recommended.
- The proposal to add a seat for a county as its population reaches “50% of Marion County” is not a fully vetted proposal, where did that idea come from? The 50% figure was suggested by the sub-Working Group at the meeting on August 12, and is a reasonable threshold for increasing the number of seats from less than 50% to greater than 50% of Marion County’s seats (i.e., from 2/5 to 3/5). The exact number can be set at whatever is amenable to all parties, so this recommendation can be worded less strongly in the Final Report.
- What is the relationship between “candidate counties” and the new RTA, particularly in terms of the board, regionalism, existing rural transit operations, and FTA funding? Continue with recommendations of the rural transit study, FTA funding would continue, and non-voting seats would be allowed. No consultant action necessary.
- What are some of the specifics for the TIF? Could a TIF be laid upon an existing TIF? What if an entire town is within a ¼ mile of a station? It is unlikely that a new TIF would be laid upon an existing one. TIF details will be worked out by the legislature. No consultant action necessary.
- Will IndyGo still exist? As CIRT/IndyGo move forward, need to be careful about how this is marketed to avoid confusion.

Under New Business E. Bingaman presented that the Indianapolis MPO had submitted a Sustainable Communities Planning Grant to the HUD/DOT/EPA partnership and that he submitted a letter of support in the name of CIRT.

E. Bingaman provided the Executive Director’s Report.

M. Terry shared copies of the IndyGo annual report.

*C. Fewell moved to adjourn; R. Thoman seconded the motion carried by consent.*

~ Respectfully submitted: Jerry Bridges, Secretary