



Meeting Synopsis

Wednesday, February 22, 2006
One Texas Center, 3rd Floor Training Rm.
505 Barton Springs Road
Austin, Texas
9:00 a.m.

MPO Representatives

Robert Allen	Abilene MPO
Harold McDaniel	Amarillo MPO
Bob Dickinson	Beaumont – Port Arthur MPO
Mark Lund	Brownsville MPO (LiveMeeting)
Linda LaSut	Bryan/College Station MPO
Michael Aulick	Capital Area MPO
Tom Niskala	Corpus Christi MPO
Dan Kessler	Dallas-Ft. Worth MPO
Roy Gilyard	El Paso MPO
Juan Sanchez	Harlingen – San Benito MPO
Andrew Canon	Hidalgo County MPO
Ashby Johnson	Houston - Galveston Area Council of Governments
Shannon Mattingly	Killen – Temple MPO
Vanessa Guerra	Laredo MPO
Karen Owen	Longview MPO
Sam Woods	Lubbock MPO
Brian Roe	Midland-Odessa MPO
Dan Kessler	North Central Texas Council of Governments
E'Lisa Smetana	San Angelo MPO
Sid Martinez	San Antonio – Bexar County MPO
Bob Wood	Sherman – Denison MPO
Brad McCaleb	Texarkana MPO (LiveMeeting)
Heather Nick	Tyler MPO
Ray Miller	Victoria MPO
Christopher Evilia	Waco MPO
Lin Barnett	Wichita Falls MPO

Other Attendees

Ben Finley	Abilene MPO
Jennifer Timms	Bryan/College Station MPO
Maureen McCoy Daniel	Capital Area MPO
Cathy Stephens	Capital Area MPO
Michelle Meaux	Capital Area MPO

Art Zamorano	Capital Area MPO
Jeanne Geiger	San Antonio – Bexar County MPO
Nick Page	San Antonio – Bexar County MPO
Clifford Gholson	Waco MPO
Ed Kabobel	TxDOT
Ed Collins	TxDOT – Austin
Darcie Schipull	TxDOT – Austin
Carol Nixon	TxDOT - Houston
Dale Spitz	TxDOT - Tyler
Karen Dunlap	TxDOT - PTN
John Bendele	TxDOT - TPP
Jack Foster	TxDOT - TPP
Tim Juarez	TxDOT – TPP(s)
Cary Karnstadt	TxDOT – TPP
Lori Morel	TxDOT - TPP
Peggy Thurin	TxDOT - TPP
Bill Frawley	TTI
Monte Wade	TTI
Mike Leary	FHWA Austin
Jesse Balleza	FHWA Austin
Jose Campos	FHWA Asutin
Tom Bruechert	FHWA Austin
Mitch Batuzich	FHWA Austin
Genevieve Smith	FHWA Louisiana

1. Welcome and Introduction

Michael Aulick convened the meeting at 9:10a.m. Mr. Aulick asked that all in attendance introduce themselves.

2. Approval of minutes from October 4, 2005 Meeting

ACTION:

Bob Dickinson made the motion for approval of the TEMPO minutes for the October 4, 2005 meeting; the motion was seconded. The minutes were approved as presented.

3. Election of a member to the Executive Committee (to fill in the vacancy by Joanne Walsh)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Aulick informed the TEMPO members that a vacancy has opened by Joanne Walsh SA-BC MPO who is no longer the director. Nominations would open for a TMA member to sit on the TEMPO Executive Committee. Nominations for a TMA representative to the Executive Committee were opened. The following were nominated:

- Roy Gilyard, El Paso MPO
- Sam Woods, Lubbock MPO and
- Tom Niskala, Corpus Christi MPO.

ACTION:

Roy Gilyard was elected to the Executive Committee.

4. Presentation by FHWA on SAFETEA-LU implementation

Jose Campos and Jesse Balleza made a presentation on the anticipated requirements of SAFETEA_LU (see Attachment A).

5. Discussion of the Planning contracts

DISCUSSION:

Jack Foster briefly stated that through the committee comprised of MPO, TxDOT Districts and TPP staff, three versions of the Planning Contract that has been created and distributed to all 25 MPOs. TxDOT TPP has set a date of June 1, 2006 by which TxDOT would like to receive the signed contracts from the MPOs.

6. Other business and open discussion

Jose Campos informed the MPOs that all the UPWPs have been approved and letters will be sent to each MPO informing them of the approval.

Mr. Aulick adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Michael Aulick, TEMPO Executive Director

Attachment A

SAFETEA-LU Transportation Planning and Programming Requirements (as amended by SAFETEA-LU Sections 3005, 3006, and 6001)

KEY:

ISTEA/TEA-21 Requirements (No Change)

Texas Specific Items

Checklist Action Items

Statutory Planning and Programming Requirements	Key Changes Between ISTEA/TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU	Potential SAFETEA-LU "Closing the Gap" Steps	SAFETEA-LU Checklist (Comments)
<p>UPDATE CYCLES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long-range statewide transportation plans [23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(f)(1)] ▪ Metropolitan transportation plans [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(1)] ▪ TIPs and STIPs [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(j)(1)(D) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(g)(1)] 	<p>Long-range statewide transportation plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ No key change in update cycle (as needed or appropriate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TxDOT should review and/or establish a regular update cycle. 	
	<p>Metropolitan transportation plans (MTP) in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ To be updated every four years (as opposed to the former requirement of every three years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This SAFETEA-LU provision took effect on August 10, 2005. MPOs in non-attainment and maintenance areas should review and revise their MTP update cycles as appropriate. • Should not be a concern for Texas. This will be addressed with each non-attainment MPO. 	
	<p>Metropolitan transportation plans in air quality attainment areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ No key change (to be updated every five years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional steps for update cycles are likely necessary for MPOs in attainment areas. 	
	<p>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ To be updated at least every four years (as opposed to the former requirement of every two years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an approvable TIP with projects/project phases covering four years. • Requires fiscal constraint to be addressed for all years of the TIP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Next MPO TIP updates expected to be completed by May 2007.

Statutory Planning and Programming Requirements	Key Changes Between ISTE/TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU	Potential SAFETEA-LU "Closing the Gap" Steps	SAFETEA-LU Checklist (Comments)
	<p>Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ To be updated every four years or more frequent if Governor so elects (as opposed to the former requirement of every two years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an approvable STIP with projects/project phases covering four years. • Requires fiscal constraint to be addressed for all years of the STIP. • TxDOT has indicated a desire to retain a two-year STIP update cycle. • MPO TIP years beyond the STIP time-frame will not be considered part of the approved STIP. A STIP amendment is required to move projects into the STIP time-frame. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Next STIP update expected to be submitted to FHWA/FTA by mid September 2007.
<p>ANNUAL LISTING OF PROJECTS [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(j)(7)(B) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(g)(4)(B)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Specifically requires that pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities projects be included. ◆ Added requirement for cooperative development by MPO partners (i.e., State and public transportation operators). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPO (with TxDOT and public transportation operator(s)) should review existing process for developing the Annual Listing. • MPO to publish list identifying all projects for which Federal funds were obligated in the preceding program year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All Federally funded projects should be included in the annual project listing. <input type="checkbox"/> Annual project listing to specifically identify bicycle facility and pedestrian walkway projects.

Statutory Planning and Programming Requirements	Key Changes Between ISTE/TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU	Potential SAFETEA-LU "Closing the Gap" Steps	SAFETEA-LU Checklist (Comments)
<p>METROPOLITAN AND STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FACTORS [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(1) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(d)(1)]</p>	<p>◆ Added a new stand-alone factor to “increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review current safety goals, objectives, performance measures, and strategies. • Ensure that adequate safety data are available to support development of a safety element in statewide and metropolitan transportation plans. • Ensure outreach to and input from safety stakeholders (e.g., Local and State Emergency Response agencies). • Incorporate the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) elements into statewide and metropolitan transportation plans (for metropolitan transportation plans, use the portion of the SHSP related to the MPO region). • Review TIP/STIP project selection criteria to ensure they reflect safety priorities (e.g., SHSP and/or MPO region’s priorities). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> TxDOT has contracted with TTI for development of SHSP. SHSP is expected to be completed by end of 2006 FY. <input type="checkbox"/> MPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) should reflect as appropriate consultation and coordination activities undertaken in consideration of the safety planning factor.
	<p>◆ Added a new stand-alone factor to “increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review current statewide and metropolitan transportation plans for emergency planning/security elements. • Define the role of the public transportation operators/MPO/TxDOT in promoting security (e.g., review State/local legislation for roles and responsibilities). • Ensure outreach to and input from security stakeholders (e.g., Local and State Emergency Response agencies). • Identify critical facilities and transportation system elements (e.g., transit system, rails, ports, Interstate system, NHS routes, and Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) routes). • Develop security goals and appropriate strategies (may be of particular interest for MPOs near or on the Mexican border). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> MPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) should reflect as appropriate consultation and coordination activities undertaken in consideration of the security planning factor.

Statutory Planning and Programming Requirements	Key Changes Between ISTE/TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU	Potential SAFETEA-LU "Closing the Gap" Steps	SAFETEA-LU Checklist (Comments)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded the environmental factor by adding the phrase "promote consistency of transportation plan and transportation improvement programs with State and local planned growth and economic development patterns." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPOs/TxDOT review current process to coordinate transportation and land use/economic development planning. Where needed, consider methods to improve or expand coordination. Include appropriate activities in statewide/metropolitan transportation planning work programs. Identify State and Local agencies responsible for growth and economic development; and include these entities in the development of the MTP and TIP (e.g., Governor's Office for Economic Development, City Economic Development Agencies, Chambers of Commerce, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) should reflect as appropriate consultation and coordination activities undertaken in consideration of the environmental planning factor.
<p>FISCAL CONSTRAINT [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(C); (j)(1)(C); (j)(2)(B); and (j)(3)(D) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(f)(5); (g)(4)(E); and (g)(4)(F)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant changes in SAFETEA-LU. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and reaffirm fiscal constraint of transportation plans and programs as they are updated or amended. Confirm revenues and costs related to system operations and maintenance activities covered in transportation plans and programs. Refer to the FHWA/FTA Interim Guidance on Fiscal Constraint of Transportation Plans and Programs (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/fcindex.htm). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FYI... FHWA Division office is considering documentation of total project cost (i.e., construction, right-of-way, utilities, etc.) versus construction costs only in Metropolitan Transportation Plans.
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION ACTIVITIES [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(B) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(f)(4)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metropolitan and statewide transportation plans shall include "discussion" of environmental mitigation activities. This "discussion" shall be developed with Federal, State, and Tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metropolitan and statewide transportation plans must include a general discussion of potential impacts, avoidance and mitigation activities (at the policy/strategy-level, not project-specific). Compare transportation plans with available State conservation plans, maps, and inventories. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPO should include documentation in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan of how environmental mitigation was addressed.

Statutory Planning and Programming Requirements	Key Changes Between ISTE/TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU	Potential SAFETEA-LU "Closing the Gap" Steps	SAFETEA-LU Checklist (Comments)
<p>CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transportation Plans [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(g) and (i)(4) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(f)(2)] ▪ TIP and STIP [23 U.S.C 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(j)(1)(C) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(g)(2)] ▪ Land Use Management and other Resource Agencies [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(4) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(f)(2)(D)] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Consultation with non-metropolitan local officials and Tribal governments in the development of the statewide transportation plan and STIP. ◆ MPOs and State DOTs shall consult with local/State land use management, natural resource, historic and other agencies in the development of transportation plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing consultation with partners (i.e., TxDOT, MPOs, non-metropolitan local officials, and Tribal government) [no change]. • Compare transportation plans with available conservation plans and maps and/or compare with available inventories of historic or natural resources. • Identify and coordinate with Federal, State, and Tribal, wildlife, land management and regulatory agencies (see attached for additional information). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> TxDOT working on update of plan for consultation with non-metropolitan local officials. <input type="checkbox"/> MPO Public Participation Plans (PPP) and consultation procedures should be developed to include coordination with noted Federal, State, Tribal and Local agencies (see attached for additional information).
<p>AIR QUALITY/ CONFORMITY [23 U.S.C. 134(i)(3)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Planning requirement to determine conformity is now every four years (instead of every three years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conformity determinations adopted or approved after July 1, 2007 must be based on a SAFETEA-LU compliant transportation plan and TIP. 	
<p>PUBLIC TRANSIT ELEMENT [49 U.S.C. 5310, 5316, and 5317]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. ◆ The Plan is a requirement under the FTA formula programs for the Elderly and Individuals with Disabilities (5310), Job Access and Reverse Commute (5316), and New Freedom (5317). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Plan should be developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human services providers and participation by the public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> "Regional Coordinated Plans" currently being developed by TxDOT, the MPOs and Transit Operators <u>MAY</u> address this requirement. <input type="checkbox"/> Additional, work <u>MAY</u> be required based on final FTA rule-making on this provision.

Statutory Planning and Programming Requirements	Key Changes Between ISTE/TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU	Potential SAFETEA-LU "Closing the Gap" Steps	SAFETEA-LU Checklist (Comments)
<p>TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(D); 23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(k)(3); 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(f)(7); and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304(i)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Operations and management strategies in metropolitan and statewide transportation plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine if the current transportation plan adequately address operations and management strategies (for both the transit and highway network). • Consider and develop strategies and costs (capital and operational investment) to preserve, improve and enhance the existing multi-modal transportation systems. • Consider and develop strategies and costs for improving the intermodal connectivity of the existing transportation systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> MPO should include documentation in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan of how operational and management strategies are being addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Congestion Management Process (CMP) in Transportation Management Areas (formerly known as Congestion Management System (CMS) in ISTE/TEA-21). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a process that provides for effective management and operation, based on a cooperatively developed and implemented metropolitan wide strategy, of new and existing transportation facilities through the use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies. • Identify operations partners (e.g., traffic operations centers, ITS, and traffic engineers). • Work with partners to develop projects, priorities and schedule for implementation. • CMS requirement for SOV projects in non-attainment areas remains. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> MPO should include documentation in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan of how CMP is being addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> MPO should develop and adopt CMP by July 1, 2007. <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of adopted CMP to be provided to FHWA/FTA.
<p>Planning Certification Cycle [23 U.S.C 134(i)(5)/49 U.S.C. 5305(e)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Planning certification review to be conducted at least every four-years (as opposed to the former requirement of at least every three years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective August 10, 2005, unless TMA was previously conditionally certified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> FHWA and FTA will revise certification review schedule to accommodate new 4-year cycle.

Statutory Planning and Programming Requirements	Key Changes Between ISTE/TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU	Potential SAFETEA-LU "Closing the Gap" Steps	SAFETEA-LU Checklist (Comments)
<p>INTERESTED PARTIES AND PARTICIPATION [23 U.S.C. 134/49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(5), (i)(6), and (j)(4) and 23 U.S.C. 135/49 U.S.C. 5304 (f)(3) and (g)(3)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Definition of "interested parties" to be engaged in statewide and metropolitan transportation planning has been expanded. ◆ MPO Public Participation Plans Shall be developed in consultation with "interested parties." Publish or make available for public input transportation plans and TIPs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hold public meetings at convenient and accessible times and locations. ◆ Publication of statewide and metropolitan transportation plans, and TIP... to the maximum extent practicable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make information available in electronically accessible formats (e.g., world wide web). ◆ Employ visualization techniques to depict statewide and metropolitan transportation plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MPO must develop, publish and adopt a public participation plan. Public participation plan must be made available for public comment for 45-days prior to adoption. ● TxDOT and MPO should identify and confirm that stakeholders, interest groups, general public have opportunity to comment on public involvement plans and transportation plans/programs. ● MPO should consider holding MPO Policy and Technical Committee meetings at a time convenient and accessible to the general public (e.g., evening meetings instead of during the work day). ● To maximum extent practicable, statewide and metropolitan transportation plans and programs shall be available in electronic formats (e.g., on a website). ● To maximum extent practicable, MPOs and TxDOT should employ visualization techniques to depict statewide and metropolitan transportation plans (see attached for additional information). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Public Participation Plan adopted that provides for expanded consultation and stakeholder involvement by July 1, 2007. <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of Public Participation Plan to be provided to FHWA and FTA. <input type="checkbox"/> TxDOT/MPO has current and user friendly website. <input type="checkbox"/> Current TxDOT/MPO Plans and TIPs/STIP should be available on website. <input type="checkbox"/> MPO Public Participation Plans should be available on the website. <input type="checkbox"/> TxDOT and MPO Transportation Plans should describe visualization techniques implemented.

NOTES:

1. New MPO definition is not expected to impact Texas.