

**Association of Texas MPOs
Winter 2017 Meeting**

JW Marriott Downtown Austin
Lone Star Ballroom B
110 East 2nd St
Austin, TX 78701

WebEx Meeting Call-In: (415) 655-0003
Meeting Number: 920 846 698

**Tuesday, February 7, 2017
Agenda**

- I. Welcome and Introductions – Chris Evilia** called meeting to order at 1 p.m. and started introductions after inviting Caroline Mays to give a brief update on the Freight Plan.

States are required by the FAST Act to develop critical corridors. Dec. 4, 2017 deadline for freight funding just adopted last year by the Commission. She asked us to help her get the word out about their meetings: Dallas tomorrow (2/8/17), Texarkana Thursday (2/9), and El Paso (2/?), San Antonio and Houston both the last week of March.

- II. Notes from July 2016 approved**, notes from October 2016 not available.

- III. Mark Williams, TxDOT, reviewed the Unified Transportation Plan Amendments,**

Mark: Call TxDOT TPD if you have questions. The public needs to see this is a good thing, even if not perfect in all respects. We need to keep working together to meet the challenges of HB20 Requirements. He thanked everyone for their hard work.

- IV. Lauren Garduño, TxDOT reviewed HB 20 requirement for MPO development of 10-year Plan of Projects.**

Lauren: Update moved to March instead of February. New programs for Category 4 Corridor have been introduced. There will be workshops in February, before Commission, to explain updates, specifically to Cats 4 and 12 (ClearLanes). Of the changes MPOs are submitting, some 200 of about 400 projects are in Cat 2. TAC rules adjusted in accordance with HB20 are first major updates since 2003-2004.

Changes will focus on strategic corridors using the right performance measures (PMs) to drive project selection. Recommend you start program selection in March. By August, the UTP makes more recommendations. Start assigning funds and get moving.

The Decision Lens (Dec. Lens) product will be rolled out and you can use it to determine the full value of your projects. Projects outside the MPO areas will eventually be in MPOs. This is the crosswalk and these metrics will help will solve the debate over breakout between the funding categories. Dec. Lens will allow MPOs to weigh in and reveal their projects' value to system, preservation and safety statewide. We're scoring Dec. Lens on Cat 4 because there's less complexity than Cat 2.

Questions:

Can Dec. Lens be used for connectivity inside MPOs in some cases?
May use it in some areas such as Super 2...?

Has anyone not gotten notices about upcoming training for Dec. Lens?
No response...If not, contact Michelle at TPP if you don't have a date to train. It's important to our project selections. HB20 forces us to adjust our UTP according to trends, adjusting over time. We're not dictating you must use the tool, but want you to use it to measure your program and provide your valuable feedback.

Regarding datasets and weighting on truck VMT, etc., are you going to help us with that?
We need to decide how to best capture that data to measure performance. We have to come to a consensus before we can use it/test it.

We are planning organizations, our roads won't often score highest, so how is it going to incorporate that?
We have the ability as we develop the tool to determine what metrics it can capture inside the MPOs. We can adjust the tool to consider your priority projects. We're not going to only choose the top ten projects. You select your projects by what's important for your MPO.

TxDOT will have a base set of metrics for statewide we should all use. But you can tailor it to suit your preferences. Choose your projects according to what your end goals are. If you can benefit more from statewide connectivity, use that to your advantage. Focus on 3 types of corridors: congested, connectivity and strategic.

There is \$5 Million dollars in Cat 4. How can we determine if this is the correct Cat 4 network?
We did include future Interstates to consider. We have a large network but want public input. There may be roadways we still need to consider such as those on the U.S. Highways or the Texas Trunk System.

Does the list that is out for approval for amendment use this math?

Before the end of the week. It relates to HB20 reqs. Need criteria not details, but provide written confirmation that your project selection process should be considered to Peter Smith.

If you want to include a 10-year plan, does it have to be done by Feb. 23rd?
I thought the impetus was to have a 10-yr plan. We won't audit to see if you have it, but if you reply, you're saying you have one, but you don't have to submit it.

The letter says we do have to have a 10 year plan, funding for the first 4 years, and be in the TIP/STIP.

Define what you're going to measure. We want written confirmation and we will capture your project selection program. I'll send you a memo and you can respond. Recommend in March you should include a 10 year plan, 4 years of funding (constrained), and TIP.

V. Chris Evilia (Waco) and Alan Clark (H-GAC) Examples - 10 Year Plan

In December we asked to talk about the 10 year plan. Alan reviewed what we give to the Commission, including language from HB20, from Houston's experience.

- The call for projects is an opportunity to tailor your area.
- Major investment evaluates qualitative or quantitative
- Results met some HB20 requests such as aligning goals and working with districts (Prop 1 and Prop 7)
- Next steps involve trying to coordinate the 10 year plan
- Opportunities for continued partnerships

Chris compared Waco's process:

- Short term priorities ranked every project (approx. 20) in our plan.
- Similar metrics, crash, LOS, TDM, threshold problems, etc., and came up with rank order, compared to financial constraint. Whatever fell into the first 10 years would receive funding.
- Gives us a starting point to talk with the district about our 10 year plan.
- Like H-GAC, our process isn't perfect.

How can we help each other moving forward? Suggestions or comments?

- *Differentiate between roles. We fall into very different processes.-Jeff*

Alan: Step one is Project Prioritization, step two is Project Readiness. What needs to happen to move from step one to step two?

Step three is funding, more direct influence. Apply the most restricted funds first. In spite of the questions and worry over funding, just keep projects moving forward.

- *We need to help districts operate most efficiently.-Jeff*

Alan: Money is available, and the districts say we should keep it as close to the original schedule as possible in order to use those funds.

- *What is the difference between the first 10 years vs the TIP?- José*

Alan: Include everything in the TIP. The 10 year plan is more focused on high-priority. When they're in the TIP, they're all the same. We estimated projects in the UTP and the plan.

Lauren: For the 10 year plan, \$10B is not sub-allocated. Get to the 4 year TIP, it should look closer at the total project cost. UTP breaks out funding summary 4 lines below \$20B cash forecast for planning forecast.

Alan: The ten year plan is coming up next. It's good to have a larger picture that gives us as much flexibility as possible to implement. Then there will be the 4 year and the 6 year plans to pick up after that. Coordinate all the documents to plan toward the same thing. Lauren understands and just wants to know you have a plan.

- *Are there specific dates and formatting for each document? This 10 year plan seems vague.- José*
- *How did you come up with different funds and what was the strategy?-E'Lisa*

Chris: We started with more restricted, then moved to local funds.

Alan: added he estimated using a "homemade" transportation model, on what 10 years projects would cost today. We won't get 10% every year, it will come in lumps. We don't worry about things like inflation until it's moving into the pipeline. We need to be reasonable in our estimations, but not too detailed. The UTP and the 10 year plan don't need to look the same.

Lauren: We're trying to put together a planning strategy to start constraining at 4 years and take advantage of all unused funds. We've not done that in the past. We can spend everything we get if we have a portfolio of projects with a little bit of everything.

Chris tabled this discussion to be continued at a later time.

VI. Review and Discussion regarding TxDOT Category 2 Formula Status – Chris Evilia, Dan Kessler

- 2 Groups, the "Big 6" and the 19 remaining MPOs
- Drafts to be submitted by mid-April with minority reports May final.
- Next amendment due spring FY19.
- Cat 2 next – two year old formula
- Dan – Large TMAs spousal relationship did well. Getting through 24-27 alternatives thanks to Peggy Thurin and Bill Frawley and all the MPOs participating.

VII. Review and Discussion regarding 2017-2020 TIP/STIP and concerns from FHWA – Mike Leary - FHWA, Lori Morel – TxDOT TP&P

Mike: July is 5 months, the STIPs are pretty clear and simple, and the requirements are easily accessible and available as a subset of the MPP.

- This is the first year to use the ESTIP
 - i. lack of quality control
 - ii. variances in language
 - iii. 2/3 did not move forward
 - emissions
 - CMAQ
 - Infrastructure
 - TIP didn't transfer to ESTIP

One reviewer found inconsistencies and provided 42 pages of validation. We became a QAQC across the state. Huge backlog of over-programming and a lot of projects

aren't moving forward. Do a QC at the MPO level before sending it to FHWA. If you adopt a TIP it has to be the same as the ESTIP.

Lori: 75% did not get approval. The majority were not consistent with the MTP. The total project cost (TPC) should be populated on all projects. Y.O.E not matching up with finding/phase cost. TIP revisions are being entered into the day they're supposed to be finished.

- *Get all the way through your process before you lock it and submit – David Wurdlow*

I can unlock it for you if it has not been submitted to FHWA. The ESTIP should match exactly to the TIP. Develop Authority (D.A.) projects should not be listed.

- *I'm confused on that. If a project didn't have utilities and ROW it shouldn't be in the STIP. – Ashby Johnson*

Lori: Construction shouldn't be in it.

- *D.A. first two years. Expectation of reasonable fiscal constraint reasonably available is not committed. It's a tool we worked hard for. Construction shouldn't be in STIP if not expected in those 4 years. - David*
- *Will there be ESTIP training, and if so, is there a schedule for the whole year? – E'Lisa*

Yes, training is available and I will send out the schedule again.

- *In the past, we had a TIP/STIP subcommittee. Christy Gotti, NCTCOG is starting it back up to begin discussion about improving the process. TxDOT is replacing DCIS and other systems with MPPM (currently), to step up the process. I'm asking the work group to look into this. Projects in year 2 may have been a problem. Left out of TIP and had to wait to do amendment to move forward and in the new TIP cycle. How do we keep from repeating work for FHWA but not slip on a project? It was authorized in the old TIP, but we got clocked because it was in a previous TIP. – Chris*

It should be in both documents. Michael added the STIP cannot be approved if it's not fiscally constrained.

- *In the ESTIP there was a problem with Prop 1 and 7 finding and Lori said put Cat 2. I had previously put "other." – Linda*

Lori: Whatever category it's programmed under, that's where it should be.

- *TxDOT TPP called it out as P1 or P7, but now, being mixed into one bucket it can be used as federal, but no specific P1 and P7. – Peggy Thurin*
- *Citizens agree to Props for State Hwy funds and they question if called otherwise. Seems deceptive. – WebEx Caller*
- *All money is treated as Cat 2. – Peggy*
- *Officially going in a Cat 2, but in our own discussion call it Prop 1/Cat 2 or Prop 7/Cat 2. – Christie Gotti*
- *I'm concerned with transparency. – Linda*
- *We have the same problem. Funds cannot be used on off-system roads and we don't know how to explain to constituents inside the MPO but outside of the city limits. – E'Lisa*
- *25% could be used on off-system; otherwise Cat 2 should be off-system. - Peggy*
- *This should be clarified, and something sent out to the MPOs to use in PI.*
- *Lori has a difficult job and needs appreciation. – Dan followed by a round of applause.*

VIII. Review and Discussion regarding TTI Legislative Request for Truck Congestion Data Study – Ginger Goodin and Bill Eisele – TTI

Ginger: As a state agency we have to identify what we can. Freight and ports of entry are requesting data sources to leverage for truck-related. Bill Eisele is the tech on this (referenced handout) twist on using datasets for truck destination for strategies.

We've had two requests for feedback as to value and concerns of this technology, such as a letter from your policy board if you are so inclined.

- *What is the timeframe? Two years to make \$3M, or as early as possible to get data? Differentiate between Hazmat, etc.? – Jeff*

Bill: Hazmat is difficult, but can drill down to vehicle type. We have done a couple of high-level types by economic value of those truck flows.

- *We're in a port-access study now and will communicate results. – Alan*
- *This is great. In Category discussions, it's a little understudied when we rate criteria. We should unanimously support this effort – Dan*
- *We're working on trucks and it may be helpful on the 40 mile stretch. – Cameron*
- *The ability to send a letter is something we should do. Federal dollars can't be used to lobby, but can be used for education. - Chris*

IX. Review and Discussion regarding FTA requirement for adoption of Transit Performance Targets by MPOs no later than June 30, 2017

Chris: Transit agencies had a deadline of June 30, 2017, to adopt transit performance targets. What have your conversations been with your transit agencies and can FHWA offer any suggestions?

David: 180 days after providers decide depends if providers have assets to manage.

Michael: Talk to your FTA representative.

Javier: Coming ut of PMs, rules are rolling out. Transportation planning rules came out last year. 2 years until April-May 2018 conformity measures need to follow these PMs like safety, etc.

? - Rules are out as of January on a 2-year timeline. You are encouraged to ask questions (FTA) and look at 25 CFR, etc.

Tim: We have attainment and non-attainment info to take into account in the process of asking for MTP updates.

X. Legislative Update Review

Chris: The TEMPO Executive Committee agreed to have a multi-day summer mtg. in Harlingen July timeframe. Workshops to be held on Day 1 and meeting on Day 2, and over the weekend allow for family time.

- No dates for spring, likely in May

XI. Announcements from Federal and State Partners

Barbara: Reminder of federal update email today for MPOs using CMAQ dollars. Reports are due March 3.

Kaplan: PTD Statewide allocation workshops this week and into March.

Kirk Fauver: FHWA April/May workshops. No dates yet, flexible according to legislative updates.

- Resiliency Workshop

4:00 p.m.

Adjournment