



Memorandum of Meeting
Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority (CIRTA)
September 15, 2015
The Athenaeum, Wilkie Room
401 E. Michigan Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Board Members Present:

Don Adams
Christine Altman
Jerry Bridges
Bill Ehret
Tim Haak
Larry Hesson
Marta Moody
Mark Richards
Linda Sanders

Cassie Stockamp
Larry Tunget

Board Members Absent:

Michael Biberstine
Calvin Cargile
Michael Colby
Andy Cook
Joe McGuinness
Dan Woo

CIRTA Staff Present:

Lori Kaplan
Andrew McGee
Philip Roth
Jeff Seidenstein
Heather White

A quorum was recognized and the meeting was called to order by C. Stockamp at 11:08 a. m.

Introductions

Introductions were made by the Board members, CIRTA/Commuter Connect staff and the public.

Partner Report (Change in agenda order)

- BlueIndy ride share service. Bob Briggs, Director of Business Development, presented on his company's recent launch and shared recent progress and upcoming milestones. He described the history of the concept, and how it was adapted to the Indianapolis urban environment. A general discussion ensued.

Consideration of Memorandum of Meeting 8/25/2015

The minutes of the August 25, 2015 meeting of the CIRTA board were presented for consideration. **Altman moved to accept the minutes, Bridges seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.**

Consideration of Financials

AP Voucher Register – Resolution #2015025

- J. Seidenstein presented the updated AP Voucher Register.
- **Altman moved to accept Resolution #2015025 approving the AP Voucher Register as presented, Hesson seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.**

Grants Docket #150915

- L. Kaplan explained that the grants docket will be presented at the October meeting, due to J. Seidenstein being engrossed in other matters during his transition period. There are no known concerns.

Financial Report

- Statement of Revenues and Expenses
 - L. Kaplan explained that an updated Statement of Revenues and Expenses will be presented at the October meeting. There are no known concerns with this year's budget.
- 2016 CIRTA Budget Draft

- J. Seidenstein and L. Kaplan stated that the 2016 Budget Draft was still undergoing development, and that the Board would be discussing the draft at its next meeting.

New Business

Resolution #2015025– Ratification of Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz Contract

- L. Kaplan and A. Poindexter explained the need for ratifying the contract with BDBCB.
- **Richards** moved to accept Resolution #2015025 as presented, seconded by **Sanders**. The motion was unanimously approved.

Resolution #2015026 – Approval of MOU between Amazon and CIRT for match for Whitestown Connector

- L. Kaplan presented the MOU and explained its history.
- **Altman** moved to accept Resolution #2015026 with modification that the President would sign, seconded by **Bridges**. The motion was unanimously approved.

Old Business

Resolution #2015027– Ratification of Plainfield Service

- L. Kaplan introduced a Resolution that captured the Board’s intent to provisionally continue the Plainfield Connector service, as discussed at their August meeting.
- **Ehret** moved to accept Resolution #2015027 as presented, seconded by **Altman**, contingent upon identification of funds for continuation of the service. The motion was unanimously approved.

Referendum – education v. advocacy.

- A. Gremling of the Indianapolis MPO passed out pertinent Indiana Code – 8-25-2-12. A. Poindexter discussed the Statute and its applicability to the issue of a referendum, including implications for CIRT Board Members and staff. Essentially, once the referendum has been filed for public question, CIRT may not promote a position. The question was asked whether the restrictions apply to all political subdivisions when a public question is filed, or just to the unit that filed the question; A. Poindexter stated that she would research that question and report back to the Board. A. Gremling stated that training would take place in Spring 2016 on proper conduct of IndyConnect partners during the referendum. A general discussion ensued, which included the similarities and contrasts between “education” and “promotion”.

Reports

Interim Executive Director and Commuter Connect Report – L. Kaplan

- We have received notice that the FTA Triennial Review is coming up in 2016, although a date has yet to be determined.
- L. Kaplan recognized Roscoe Brown’s promotion to COO at IndyGo.
- A new vanpool was launched this past month.
- Conversations with Hamilton County hotels are ensuing (courtesy of C. Benedict) for transporting workers.
- Commuter Challenge month is coming up in October – 4 memberships to BlueIndy has been secured as prizes, as well as memberships to Pacers Bikeshare and IndyGo passes.

Mobility Manager Report – P. Roth

- Plans for continuing the Plainfield Connector service in 2016 and beyond are continuing to evolve. Discussions have ensued with the Hendricks County Economic Development Partnership to take over the establishment of an Economic Improvement District, as per I.C. 36-7-22.
- Signs for the Whitestown and North Plainfield Connectors have been installed.
- The new Connector routes have been entered into Google Transit. The Whitestown schedule revisions still need to be included.
- An application for INDOT PMTF funds has been submitted. An application for FTA Section 5307 funds is pending.

Legislative Report – R. Cockrum

- Joint Committee on Transportation is meeting, although they are unlikely to address the transit referendum legislation.
- Candidates for Marion County elected offices have voiced support for public transit expansion.
- A presentation was recently made to a meeting of the Hamilton County Mayors group. The group wishes to pursue legislative changes to allow for independent township-level referenda.

Public Relations Report – J. Thomas

- Press release on the Connectors is upcoming, now that the MOU has been approved.
- L Kaplan noted L. Hesson’s efforts in Plainfield.
- Opposition to the Red Line has been voiced by some residents in the Meridian Kessler area.

Annual Retreat

At 12:30 PM, Altman moved to take a recess for lunch and then proceed into the Retreat, Hesson seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Retreat was initiated at 12:45 PM.

BOARD RETREAT

“Setting the table”

- C. Altman and J. Bridges provided a history of CIRT A.
- C. Stockamp led a roundtable on the question: How has CIRT A been successful?
 - M. Moody: CIRT A has transitioned from planning into service provision – e.g., vanpool program, Connectors.
 - D. Adams: Opportunities in Morgan County are not being taken advantage of; transit is a “hard sell”. The coming-together of the CIRT A Board has been gratifying.
 - T. Haak: Although a new member, he feels it is good for Boone County to be “ahead of the curve”.
 - B. Ehret: “I’ve learned a lot”; the number of players in the regional transportation arena is overwhelming. CIRT A Board members are aware of the problems, and know that the region is behind – why hasn’t this knowledge been adopted by our local officials? CIRT A need to be a “player”.
 - J. Bridges: Transit legislation has been a major accomplishment, and there is now a growing sense of regionalism by “ring counties”. CIRT A needs more than ever to stay focused on its core mission.
 - L. Hesson: “I had no idea what I was getting into when I joined the Board”; Hendricks County is a great beneficiary of CIRT A (particularly the reverse commute programs). I’m more optimistic now than I have been about the CIRT A organization; people in positions of authority are realizing that we are a region, not a collection [of independent units].
 - C. Stockamp: CIRT A recently got through a rough transition; the Board has come together very well.
 - C. Altman: CIRT A saw an opportunity with Commuter Connect, and took it over; it provided a good way to “get into the game”.
 - M. Richards: It has been “eye opening” seeing everything going on with construction around the region, and the growing understanding that it’s not sustainable; CIRT A is well-positioned to be a major player over the next several years. “I’m interested to see how it turns out.”
 - L. Tunget: “My wife (Nanette) was one of the original Board members of CIRT A”, and Southport is greatly vested in it. A lot of people depend on mass transportation; what would Downtown Indy do without transit?
 - L. Sanders: The public attitude towards CIRT A has changed in recent years. Shelby County used to think that CIRT A was all about Hamilton County, but now understands differently.
 - L. Kaplan: CIRT A now reaches places that previously didn’t have transit

“First Course”

Board members received brief updates on a variety of topics, including the IndyConnect initiative, the Indianapolis MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan, the transit funding referendum legislation, and other transit initiatives.

“Second Course”

- K. Irwin of Health by Design led the Board in a SWOT Analysis.
 - SWOT
 - Strengths
 - Diversity of the Board
 - CIRTAs has a regional brand that is recognized
 - Status as an FTA Grantee
 - Collective knowledge and history of the organization
 - Good working relationships with other stakeholders
 - Entrepreneurial spirit
 - Flexible
 - Participatory; no “big dog”
 - Weaknesses
 - Lack of funding
 - Lack of taxing authority
 - Small staff
 - Reactive, rather than proactive
 - No updated Strategic Plan
 - Difficulties in “telling our story”
 - Difficulties in getting Counties to mobilize
 - Association with prior “failed”
 - Opportunities
 - IndyConnect process provides an opportunity to re-engage
 - Record low levels of unemployment, job availability in suburban Counties – linkage to economic development
 - Public concern over environmental issues and sustainability
 - “Competitor” cities are ahead of us
 - BlueCar, Bike share, and Red Line are public involvement opportunities
 - Chamber of Commerce and MIBOR are partners
 - Emerging technologies
 - “Regional cities” initiative
 - Threats
 - General transportation funding crisis
 - “Don’t tax me” ideology
 - Plethora of Chambers of Commerce
 - Partnership management
 - Lack of understanding of benefits of transit
 - Lack of robust system now
 - Change-averse region
 - Lack of congestion and density
 - Road-building paradigm, exemplified by INDOT and Build Indiana Council

“Entrée: CIRTAs Role”

- Board members discussed various roles that CIRTAs could adopt to fulfill its mission, and decided upon three:
 - Regional transit contracting entity
 - Regional transit planner (“entrepreneur”) for outlying counties interested in forming a local transit system
 - Referenda leadership

- Board members generally saw a need to update the organizational strategic plan. Section 5307 funds were discussed as an opportunity to accomplish this.
- Organizational roles were generally seen as an outgrowth of CIRTAs as a regional transit expert, which could be used for capacity-building activities in Central Indiana communities.

“Dessert: Future directions and needed capacity”

- The opportunity to adopt the planning model of the Hamilton County Task Force to other Counties was noted.
- Some additional staff may be necessary to promote capacity building and transit planning in outlying counties.
- The potential expansion of CIRTAs influence areas beyond transit (e.g., Intelligent Transportation Systems, Travel Demand Management, school transportation) was briefly discussed.
- Major construction projects should be seen as opportunities to promote short-term transit service.

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 3:45 PM.

Board Secretary

Date
