

## **Safety Subcommittee Meeting**

May 23, 2018 1:00 PM EST

The Garrison Ballroom

Fort Harrison State Park Inn & Golf Resort

6002 North Post Road

Indianapolis, Indiana 46216

### **Bicycle Trails Task Force Members:**

Pete Fritz

Andrew Forrester (phone)

Paul Grayson

Bruce Kimball

Amy Marisavljevic

Jeff Smallwood

Noelle Szydlyk

Kyle Hannon

Mitch Barloga

### **Guests:**

Greg Beilfuss, DNR

Allen Hurst, DNR

Ward Kennedy, Indy MPO

### **Welcome & Introductions**

Pete Fritz called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM. All task force members and guests introduced each other.

### **Review Safety Subcommittee Deliverables**

Fritz reviewed all of the deliverables outlined for this subcommittee.

### **Review State and Locally Adopted Bicycle Safety Regulations**

Fritz discussed existing state code bicycle regulations under IC 9-21. Locally adopted bicycle regulations that are known to exist across the state were discussed.

### **2012 Bicycle Indiana Bicycle Collision Report funded by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI)**

The report was discussed. The group saw a need to clarify the role that ICJI, INDOT and ISDH can play in funding and conducting bicycle crash research. Bicycle Indiana's role needs to be clarified also.

### **Safety Recommendations**

The group discussed the safety recommendations that were presented at the last Task Force meeting and prioritized the recommendations based on those that the group thought were most important to bring to the next Task Force meeting. The group agreed that any safety recommendations need to be consistent with those of other states and reflect emerging best practices and standards. The group also generally agreed that protected or separated bikeways are preferred, where possible, as they attract a wider range of bicycle riders than unprotected bikeways. The following safety recommendations were agreed upon.

Three recommendations are for new or clarified state laws:

- **Adopt a statewide safe passing law (3-foot passing requirement)**
- **Adopt a statewide complete streets policy**
  - Also increase awareness of bikeway design best practices through training and promotion.
- **Clarify e-bike laws in state statute**

Three recommendations are for proposed safety programs or practices:

- **Provide bicycle safety education in elementary and middle schools.**
  - There is a need for Indiana Department of Education approved state curriculum with dedicated funding for statewide partners to assist.
- **Provide regular tracking and updating of bike crash data statewide.**
  - There is a need for a statewide protocol for consistent reporting of bicycle crashes.
- **Training of police and law enforcement regarding bicycle safety.**
  - Provide consistent ongoing training across the state.

**Adjournment** Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

---

## **Funding Subcommittee Meeting**

May 23, 2018 9:00 AM EST

The Garrison Ballroom

Fort Harrison State Park Inn & Golf Resort

6002 North Post Road

Indianapolis, Indiana 46216

### **Bicycle Trails Task Force Members:**

Mitch Baraloga  
Andrew Forrester  
Pete Fritz  
Paul Grayson  
Kyle Hannon  
Bruce Kimball  
Jeff Smallwood  
Kara Kish

Amy Marisavljevic  
Noelle Szydlyk

### **Guests:**

Allen Hurst, DNR  
Justin Swanson, Bose, McKinney & Evans  
Bob Weaver, HEC  
Greg Beilfuss, DNR

### **Welcome & Introductions**

Amy Marisavljevic, Chair of the Funding Subcommittee, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. All Indiana Bicycle Trails Task Force members in attendance, either in person or over the phone, introduced themselves. Guests also introduced themselves.

### **Review January Funding Subcommittee Minutes & Deliverables**

All those in attendance received a copy of the previous meeting minutes. Marisavljevic reviewed the deliverables set by the Task Force Chair and Vice Chair. She stated the group has already

met the deliverables for the second quarter by creating their list of existing trail funding sources. She noted a small change on the list as the TIGER program had recently been re-named to BUILD. She commented that the fourth quarter deliverables might work best if the funding recommendations included both development and maintenance, rather than separating them out.

## **Economic Benefits of Trails & Outdoor Recreation**

Marisavljevic presented on a number of statistics regarding the economic benefit of outdoor recreation, trails, and bicycle tourism coming from across the country as well as some specific to Indiana. She mentioned all of these to remind the subcommittee that bicycle trails should be viewed as investment rather than an expense. Marisavljevic also expressed that she would like the task force to have a one page supplemental document covering the economic benefits to go along with the funding recommendations in their final report.

## **Other Statewide Trail Models & Relationship to Funding**

The subcommittee heard about how other state's trail systems are owned, maintained, and funded. Equally important, Marisavljevic mentioned who provided the leadership role in these state systems. All of these factors can play a role how much and from where trail development projects get funding.

## **Brief Discussion on Enabling Mechanisms**

Marisavljevic covered the three ways in which funding mechanisms have traditionally been passed. This includes through the legislature, a constitutional amendment, or another voter approved ballot measure. She mentioned that funding mechanism could be in perpetuity, sunset, or regular renewal. She also discussed whether the funding mechanism yielded variable or set amounts, which play a role in planning for how the funding gets distributed.

## **Other State Funding Examples & Strategies**

Marisavljevic explained she would be briefly review various outdoor recreation funding models and strategies from other states. The subcommittee could then determine if that method, with perhaps some changes, could work in Indiana. If so, the group would add the model to a short list to further explore and customize for Indiana. Furthermore, the group discussed how using other states' existing funding models would provide good justification of how that particular method could work successfully in Indiana.

## **Bond Initiatives**

Marisavljevic reviewed the Clean Ohio Program, which leverages funds from state bonds to help develop over 500 miles of trail since 2000 through competitive grant awards. She covered how the voter approved initiative successfully passed because of its broad appeal to voters on a variety of environmental issues. Additionally, voters liked that it was not a new tax. The group discussed bonds on a state level rather than the more traditional local level. Kyle Hannon commented on how this works and questioned whether it was actually a funding source or strategy. The subcommittee ultimately felt like this could work in Indiana with four yes, two maybe, and zero no votes.

## **Royalties**

Marisavljevic covered Michigan's Natural Resource Trust Fund program that capitalizes on oil and gas royalties from state land. The fund was a compromise passed through the

legislature in 1976. The trust fund model allowed their funding to go further as they knew eventually the funding would begin to decline due to its reliance on a non-renewable resources. After some discussion, the subcommittee ruled out using oil & gas royalties in Indiana since they were are earmarked. However, Grayson suggested that the royalties model could be used for telecom infrastructure. Hannon followed up with that non-renewable resources, such as solar or wind, might also work. The idea was left on the list with two yes, three maybes, and one no vote.

## **Real Estate Transfer Tax**

The subcommittee learned about Arkansas' real estate transfer tax of \$2.20 of ever \$1,000 of certain real estate transactions went to natural and cultural heritage programs, including outdoor recreation grants. She mentioned that this method is a quite popular in several states, but Indiana is one of eleven states that does currently have a real estate transfer tax making this a new tax. The subcommittee discussed how real estate values could easily be tied to quality of life, such as trails and outdoor recreation, justifying this tax. This method was placed on the short list after four yes and two maybe votes by the subcommittee.

## **Sales Tax**

Marisavljevic discussed Minnesota's Legacy Fund which utilizes a new 3/8 of 1% state sales tax increase. The voter approved measure appealed to wide swath of Minnesotans since it funds clean water, conservation (including hunting/fishing access), arts/cultural initiatives, and outdoor recreation projects. Since it passed 2008, \$490 million has gone to outdoor recreation projects. Despite Indiana's state sales tax being generally average, the subcommittee did not feel that a new sales tax in Indiana would work with one yes, three maybe, and three no votes.

## **Specific Sales Tax**

Marisavljevic reviewed Texas' sporting good tax that is used to funds state and local parks as well as historic sites. This was not a new tax, but just an appropriation of up to 94% of the state sales tax on specific goods like bicycles, camping gear, and hunting/fishing equipment by the legislature. In just 2018-2019, \$277.6 million from this source will be used to fund outdoor recreation projects. The subcommittee thought this was certainly something to add to the short list with four yes votes.

## **Lottery/Sin Tax**

The subcommittee heard about the Great Outdoor Colorado (GOCO) fund, which utilizes half of the state's lottery proceeds. The fund, which has steadily grown since it was passed via constitutional amendment by voters in 1992, provides over \$60 million a year in grants for outdoor recreational development, including trails. Although the subcommittee quickly pointed out Indiana's lottery funds already support education, they moved on to discuss the viability of other sin taxes. In general, voters seem more likely to approve sin taxes. In particular, the group discussed such a tax on sports betting and perhaps marijuana if ever legalized. Focusing on sports betting, the subcommittee added this to the short list with three yes and three maybe votes.

## **General Appropriations**

Marisavljevic presented on general appropriations and gave Governor Cuomo's \$200 million successful request of his legislature in New York as an example. The \$200 million is specifically earmarked to help complete the Empire State Trail at a fast pace. She mentioned that general appropriations most often are one-time allocations and highly dependent on current politics. The subcommittee debated how likely this were to happen again in Indiana. Ultimately, the group added it to list, but not convincingly with three yes, one maybe, and one no vote.

## **Public-Private Partnerships**

The subcommittee learned about the Walton Foundation's involvement in trails in northwest Arkansas, particularly the 36 mile Razorback Greenway. Marisavljevic noted that Walmart's in one of the largest employers in the country and focuses mostly on their home region. This makes sense as they tend to see the results of the investment through improving the quality of life throughout the area, which can help them retain and attract talent, reduce health costs, and other additional tangible benefits for the company. The group discussed examples of this in Indiana, including the construction of I-69 and the Regional Cities program. The subcommittee also discussed potential partners, but noted the success for this would be convincing them to think more regionally. With six yes votes, the subcommittee felt like this was good option for funding.

## **Funding Strategies**

The subcommittee further looked into two funding strategies that are being used by other states, including two neighboring ones. The first funding strategy is to focus existing funds on a specific project to get bigger results. This is currently being done where applicable in Michigan and New York with transportation alternatives, recreational program grants, and other existing trail funding the states has access to being directed to help complete their state trail systems. The subcommittee discussed that getting the different agencies administer these trail funds on board might need to be a top down directive. With 3 yes votes and 2 maybes, this strategy was added to the short list.

The second strategy discussed was combining funding for trails with other interests, such as water, agriculture, conservation, etc. This was done in both Ohio and Minnesota's more recent voter approved measures because it had mass appeal. However, the group noted there a lot of careful thought went into what causes to partner with in these states. The subcommittee felt that this too should be added to the short list with four yes and one maybe vote.

## List of Potential Funding Source

### Discussion & Vote on What Models to Add to List

After hearing the full presentation, the group re-visited all the funding sources and strategies. The subcommittee decided at this time to remove a sales tax increase from the list. They clarified that royalties will refer to either telecommunications infrastructure or renewable energy. They also clarified that a sin tax would be in regards to sports betting. Below is the short list of recommendations agreed upon by the subcommittee, in order of the subcommittee's opinion on feasibility, to focus on for our next meeting.

### Funding Methods

- Public/Private Partnerships
- Sporting Good Sales Tax
- Bonds
- Real Estate Transfer Tax
- Sin Tax (Sports Betting)
- General Appropriations
- Royalties (Telecommunications or Renewable Energy)

### Funding Strategies

- Strategically Partnering with Other Interests
- Focus Existing Trail Funds

### Brief Brainstorm on Other Ideas to Discuss Next Meeting

The subcommittee held a brief brainstorm of some other ideas to further explore that may not have a model or example elsewhere in the country. Below are their ideas:

- Trail Memberships or User Fees
- Hospitality Tax
- Registration/License Plates
- Required Bike Operating Safety Course
- Tax Incremental Funding (TIF)

## Adjournment

Marisavljevic reminded the subcommittee that the next Bicycle Trails Task Force Meeting will be Wednesday June 20<sup>th</sup>, before calling the meeting to adjournment.

---

### Trails Corridors Subcommittee Meeting

May 23, 2018 3:00 PM EST

The Garrison Ballroom

Fort Harrison State Park Inn & Golf Resort

6002 North Post Road

Indianapolis, Indiana 46216

### Bicycle Trails Task Force Members:

Mitch Barloga

Rep. Wes Culver (phone)

Andrew Forrester (phone)

Pete Fritz

Paul Grayson

Kyle Hannon  
Amy Marisavljevic  
Dean Peterson (phone)  
Jeff Smallwood  
Justin Schneider  
Noelle Szydlyk

**Guests:**  
Greg Beilfuss, DNR  
Allen Hurst, DNR  
Michael Popa, HEC  
Ward Kennedy, Indy MPO

## **Welcome & Introductions**

Mitch Barloga called the meeting to order at 3:02 PM. All subcommittee members introduced each other.

## **Review Trail Corridor Subcommittee Deliverables**

Barloga explained that being the inaugural meeting of the subcommittee, deliverables would be decided upon after another meeting or two based on feedback. He did quote the Task Force legislation and the focus on bicycle trails.

## **DNR Presentation on Trails Inventory/Visionary Corridors**

Amy Marisavljevic and Greg Beilfuss explained the background of Gov. Daniels' *Indiana State Trails Plan* from 2006, and the DNR efforts to keep this plan updated since release. Details on criteria were explained, including engaging stakeholder input. Inventory maps were shown regarding all built and planned trails in the state, which also serves as the basis for the visionary corridor network. Visionary corridors are divided into those realistic, and those more conceptual in scope (potential visionary corridors).

It was emphasized that all information is stakeholder driven, with no visionary corridors identified solely by DNR. Beilfuss mentioned that another update to the routes is planned for this year. He also mentioned that visionary corridors must meet two objectives:

1. A visionary corridor must cross into two or more counties
2. A proposed corridor must have segments completed, under development, or formally planned (not conceptual)

A hybrid map was handed out during the meeting of the visionary corridors.

## **Trail Corridor Planning in Other States**

Barloga presented on broad trail planning concepts in other states. He lauded Indiana on being out front with their visionary corridor concept, which just about stands alone from all other states. An emphasis was afforded on ideas to break out each visionary corridor, and create a separate webpage outlining progress to date, and remaining gaps. Barloga also floated the idea of prioritizing visionary corridors akin to NIRPC's Priority Regional Corridors Map in NW Indiana. This map breaks down routes in high, medium or low priority, and aides with regional funding priorities.

Marisavljevic offered her research on other state trail initiatives, including the Empire State Trail Plan in NY, and the Industrial Heartland coalition in eastern Ohio & western Pennsylvania. This latter example is being facilitated by the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, who offered their assistance to the Indiana efforts.

Barloga mentioned that Indiana should consider branding the visionary network, much like Industrial Heartland. This could help provide excitement for those communities either along network, or those wanting to connect into it. Expansion of the visionary network to parts of the state not currently served should also be considered.

## **Brainstorming Session on New Corridor Criteria**

A number of ideas and concerns were generated on how the subcommittee should consider enhancing the state visionary trail network. These included the following:

- SW Indiana has health concerns
- Use name branding for the visionary trail project
- Use Formal Canals?
- Where do the trails go?
- Combine with “Trail Towns” (tourism concept)
- Identified economic development for links
- Ask Legislature to work with stakeholders > Ongoing TIF
- Design standards
- INDOT doing state non-motorized plan (how to dovetail)
- Creation of a state PED/Bike council
- Population size
- Destinations
- Interaction with national network
- Feasibility
- Criteria Critical (for land owners)
- Respect rural towns
  - Weave into vision
  - Engage (give them a voice)
- State agencies don’t engage very well
- Foster partnerships
- Deliver plan for priority
- Follow-up recommendations
- OCRA > Part of Solution

A discussion ensued about what the subcommittee should be responsible for. It was decided that a series of recommendations should be presented to the legislature to enhance state trail planning.

Barloga concluded the session by stating a “menu” of ideas based on this meeting will be generated and discussed in full at the next meeting. This will include criteria for new corridors, prioritization of existing corridors, branding and funding options.

**Adjournment** Meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM