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**Association of Texas MPOs 2017 Fall Meeting Notes**

Central Texas RMA Board Room

3300 North IH-35 Frontage Road, Suite 300

Austin, TX 78705

**Thursday, November 9, 2017**

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chris Evilia
2. Election of Officers for the TEMPO Executive Committee, Terms of Office: October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2019:

 TMA Place 1 – Incumbent: David Jones, Lubbock MPO, Re-elected

 Non-TMA Place 1 – Incumbent: Lin Barnett, Wichita Falls MPO, Re-elected

 Non-TMA Place 3 – Incumbent: Bob Dickinson, Beaumont / Port Arthur MPO, Re-elected

1. Review and Discussion regarding Memorandum of Understanding proposed between TxDOT, MPOs and Transit Agencies for Performance Based Planning requirements – Peggy Thurin, TP&P / Kirk Fauver, FHWA / José Campos, FHWA

See [Presentation: Development of Performance Based Planning Agreements in the State of Texas](https://www.texasmpos.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Development-of-Performance-Based-Planning-Agreement-in-Texas-November-2017.pdf)

May 27, 2018 is the deadline. An MPO 101 Class is being offered to all MPOs, which FTA plans to join.

*Do requirements have to be in Plan and TIP by May, even if not adopted until 2020?*

There are windows for meeting certain reqs. For example, the safety rule came out in August, and deadline is in May. We need a formal resolution to identify targets. Use these MOU targets or your own template? PM3 and PM2 are still evolving; MOU is not static as resolutions come and changes are adopted. Discussion needs to be planned to determine how this is going to look. Slides 6,7 & 8 cover requirements for the plan. A paragraph or chapter addressing targets would be helpful. Safety targets have been set and can be provided as needed by TxDOT-TPP and Transit Asset Management. FHWA will meet with MPOs as needed.

*Chris Evilia asked who the TxDOT signatory is, and Peggy Thurin noted it is the District Engineer.*

Actions of TIP renewal, dates for adoption and approval and action are in October/November. Be compliant with as much as we know moving forward and always be looking and planning ahead.

1. Review and Discussion of Safety Targets adopted by TxDOT, MPO Safety Target Requirements and TxDOT Crash Records Information System (CRIS) – TxDOT TP&P

See [Presentation: Safety Targets TEMPO Fall Meeting](https://www.texasmpos.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Safety-Targets-TEMPO-Fall-Meeting.pdf)

Peggy Thurin, TxDOT-TPP, introduced staff: Lori, Danny, Darren McDaniel, Larby Annie, and George Federali.

We have two options: 1) adopt Statewide targets, or 2) establish targets or additional targets.

Difference between FARS & CRIS is timing. FARS is annually static; CRIS is dynamic, constantly changing. In Texas, both teams work together in the same office. FARS data can lag because other states lag, but CRIS data is always current.

Minute differences between state and federal reporting. TxDOT produces annual reports as of a specific date. We can announce the date data is pulled to coordinate with MPOs. We have MPO data and coordinate with HSIP. Peggy will send out data received last week. The HSIP is identical, the SHSP is consistent but scope and dates are different.

The State will be measured on our 2018 targets in 2020 with consequences if they’re not met. MPOs must have new targets established May 27 or state that they will adopt state targets. Communication with federal partners is recommended.

*Alan Clark concerned about public perception – rapid population growth reason to not use federal methodology over VMT.*

Projections are higher based on growth trends. The two ways of establishing targets are way apart, but hope they get closer in the future. Communications may look like we’re not trying – in a few years may appear suddenly to be way down. People who do safety may not have correct perception.

Slide 11 – Data covered every public road

TSHS – sign up for emphasis areas, action plans and communication plans.

*Chris Evilia asked if there are metrics to use, crash reduction measures/strategies?*

Return on investment reports, safety projects have huge return.

Larby will go over how to obtain crash data/annual summary report

1. Texas Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Facts Report: crashes & injuries occurring in work zones
2. CRIS Query – TxDOT App Tool: available to public, design your query, select search area, has no VMTs, incorporates data from other source
3. Texas M.V. Report Crash Data: Select county, city, etc., and select criteria
4. Extract Extrication File: sample or specific, CRIS micro-strategy development tool, crash records info system-log-in, CRASH (Crash Reporting and Analysis for Safer Highways) Map App, Test user has to choose criteria, year, area, etc., MPO level crash data, crash correlation analysis by MPO, can send a link to this dynamic data

*E’Lisa Smetana asked if CRIS training is available for Abilene*

There is an online course, take the test and process through TxDOT, then you can gain access. TxDOT staff can help you learn how to interpret. Access certification can be sent with ino on how to use at your convenience.

What is TxDOT’s confidence level you have all the data? All agencies are required to report by 10 days. Do analysis to make sure data is not missing, especially if not fatal crash or in the news.

1. Review and Discussion regarding HB 89 and state requirements for public sector contracts – Chris Evilia

See handouts: [HB\_89.pdf](https://www.texasmpos.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/HB_89.pdf), [SB\_252.pdf](https://www.texasmpos.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/SB_252.pdf), and [Israel-form selected contractor or vendor.pdf](https://www.texasmpos.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Israel-form-v2-2017-09-01-effective-for-RFB-RFP.pdf)

Chris Evilia presented 2 pieces of legislation: 1) House Bill 89 – all entities restricted from doing business that boycott’s Israel, get verification; and 2) State Bill 252 – identified by Texas Secretary of State as known terrorists, see list online. No discussion.

TIP/STIP Update from yesterday’s Executive Committee meeting. Topics were: amendment cycles; fiscal constraint and documentation, closely reviewed carryover to next fiscal year and constraint; another meeting before long; those interested can contact Chris.

1. Review and Discussion regarding Travel Time Performance Measures and MPO required adoption of targets – Tim Lomax / David Schrank, TTI; Michelle Conkle / Casey Dusza TxDOT TP&P

Many State dots have had a proactive arrangement- with mpos to establish what trends look like at local level. Miami. Orlando. Florida one in our pooled fund. Some discussions have happened here in Texas. We are taking baby steps. Getting DOT and MPOs to interact on exchange of data. And on exchange of trend information. We will target measures as key part of decision making. These performance measures are part of Feds? Probably not. Better measures on daily basis to convey at public meeting to convey to joe citizen. Is goal to meet targets or use targets as aspirational? I believe its more to get ball rolling. Then as we get it rolling figure out additional measures to talk about local situation with local constituents.

These targets from fed perspective aren’t going to be what is in local process. They will be recorded, then narrowed down further. It’s iterative, adjustable, not set in stone. The map 21 measures sent to DC so box will be checked. Then back to work on what you need to do on daily basis. Vast majority of DOT and very few MPOs are using these measures. Fairly course PMs from Map 21 perspective. Could spend lots of money on interchange and might not show results in these measures. Might not show performance changes happening locally. Plan for adjusting targets. Once things get out there, time frame is tight, maybe not enough time to say. Aggressive or conservative, decide up front which way you are heading. You have 6 months after State submits to get your MPO numbers. It’s a fairly short turn around.

Five Basic Target Setting Steps

Convert targets into measurable objectives. Agencies goals clear in these. Setting parameters in targets. Targets can be defined several ways; measurement units, numbers, time frame, scope of app, (road system, MPO boundary, etc). all clearly dfined in target parameters such that there is no confusion .set baseline data. Analyze trends. Sounds easy. But impact of recession can skew. Setting baseline data in historic context is important consideration. RHINO Data. FARS Data. All things can be used to do some of these trends and target setting. Its important to get understanding on those- and get trends clear. Also private sector data entering in the picture. Speed data as example. ID and assess influence and factors. Fiscal limits – constraints to all stakeholders. How influencing factors change over time. Constant flux. Small MPOs whether become a TMA or not. Changes funding. Change slots of things. Keep in mind as set targets going forward. Establish target. Submit. Also need feedback. Is it right target? Mention time is of essence. This first target is to be considered a draft. Its an iterative process. Talk to DOT. Talk to local region. Where want to be. What want to do. That influences how you decide on target.

Florida DOT Description of the range of target types

Spectrum- minimum changes. Or Aspirational. Most are in conservative to realistic range (after minimum0 before stretch). Statutory/Legislative requirements put most targets in conservative to realistic range.

State Congestion Measures

Top left- assume congestion occurs when vehicles can t drive at speed limit plus a few miles per hour. So at 100% shows how much delay we have. Every time you come right on this graph- you drop down a percentage off that free flow speed. When come down five miles per hour- 15% you will be at 50% of delay. If drop speed 10 mph. congestion doesn’t occur till below 50 mph. In small MPO 50 might be acceptable as congestion, but in large MPO 30-40 is congestion. So adjust your targets per your region. Majority of you in room- arterials have huge chunk of delay.

We say any speeds below 40 mph. If we drop down to 35 mph- puts us in

Local Congestion measures

Talk about failing miles. Goes to fed defs. One measure says if link of road is at 67% of free flow for 1 hour. Meaning one whole hour at peak period- its considered a failure. In case of Houston 435 miles of their road fail. But for every mph – we move over- we come over 5 mph- about 7% points of those miles are not failures. So its important how you set your target speed cause it changes your grade. Arterial. See- it’s a different axis – but on arterials- perhaps 20% of your arterials are failing. But its more a smaller city thing. In Laredo if you get 3 -4 more mph- if you changing grading point to go after A- then 7 or more mph becomes an A. Are you after 60 mph on freeway? 50mph on freeway? What are some of your thresholds? Your answer changes on how you set that.

Questions on National Target Setting? (we plan to retool this document for MPOs vs. DOT).

Corpus Christi- So much is function of data source, quality- level its collected; different MPOs ability to acquire good data. Whats out there for guidance to standardize for MPOs. In our case- take travel speed and reliability study next year in first time in 7 years. I am aware unattended negative consequences having higher res data in our community to compare against larger national data sets. Could be disadvantageous for us- not all MPOs taking on this type of study.

David- you can get different answer using different data set. Important you look thru your options. What others are doing. You will get a better data set as a result. What is the data set that your study will rely on? Have you set up RFP for this / awarded it?

David- NPMRDS- we are GIS conflator/shape file folks as it relates. INRIX provides speed data. UMD is data downloader front engine on that- so you get your speed data. I know more now than few months back. That national data set provides speed data for NHS only. And its 5 min. data thru year. Its speed data. Theoretically thru year- if have lots of probe out there have speeds for every link of road. Lots of hole- lots of pieces of road don’t have enough probes on it to provide accurate data. INRIX data has a lot greater coverage- based on their XD network. 3-4 times coverage of NHS system as far as miles go. It’s based on average week of year. Every 5 minutes- we know what average Monday at 7am looks like. 15 min average data for every day and week of the year. We have INRIX data for Texas 100. Every September 1st work with TPP to produce list of top 100 congested roads in state. Originally we didn’t have speed data. We estimated-using AADT levels- that was about 700 road sections. Few years- decided missing out lots of area- small MPOs have congestion- might not equal Dallas but added more sections. 10k centerline miles- focused on more of a connectivity issue. have 20-30 sections of road in this data set. Way this works- take RHINO traffic volumes and INRIX speeds- together- allows us to calculate delay. We convert AADTs to 15 minute volumes. Assume Monday to Thursday not as bad as Friday. And Sat to Sun volumes lower than weekdays.

Texas 100 is also computing GHG as function.

Corpus Christi- Congestion Cost basis?

David- time for people. Time for Trucks. And Fuel for both. We redid value of time. VOT for autos close to what was. VOT for commercial vehicles drops. We followed a trend – consumer price index. But the CPI for personal vs. trucking is n ot 1:1. VOT for truck costs is 75% of what we have been reporting. 4 components. Fuel use curves for autos averages and for trucks. That’s how we get

CC- so nothing about monetizing air quality impacts. Carbon emissions

Dave- if we had good numbers yes. But we don’t. GHG done at segment level using Moves curves. Is it a car truck. What are speeds. Its not perfect but gives ball park. GHG due to congestion is tiny compared to GHG overall.

Texas 100 Amarillo

147 plus change. 240th ranked congestion. Annual delay per mile 81k hours on western street in Amarillo. So total price tag for all pieces in Amarillo was 16.8 million dollars. We have an interactive map here that shows all the streets. Mention Texas 100 mandated by leg. TxDOT has RFP for that speed data. One more year for INRIX then goes out for bid. Allows ut o have a common platform. This data is available to TxDOT, Districts, and MPOs as well. I have not done a good job getting you this data so I am here today. I know its being used. If not familiar- Speed data is from GPS probes- use to be on top of 18 wheelers. But now its more in dash systesm, cell phones. Now INRIX may not get all those data. May get Verizon but not ATT. May get Ford but not GM. All have a certain amount of fleet data coming from commercial vehicles. Cause these vehicles never leave the road- always out there. You and I are parked more than half of day so not as good quality from us.

Bill- Going back to previous slide – showing fleet vs. hand held. Vs domes vs trucks. Over time as that mix changes how does it affect precision of data- sounds like going from truck base to more overall mix of traffic. Has that changed anything re quality.

Dave- getting better coverage- MAT coverage- We can get collectors now. Used to be just freeways. 672 bins coming in full of data. In case of NPMRDS

Speed Data

This is example of what you would see- this is example of what I can put in shape files to get you guys. What I give- for Texas 100- every roadway link in state- where have speed data- I link to volume- RHINO. Then I provide a roadway ID number for RHINO- MP direction. Saturday. 44 is 11am- 15 minute periods. 11-4 in afternoon. Average speeds. Free flow speed. Truck speed.

IF YOU CAN RANK THE IMPACT OF ITS INVESTMENTS ON CONGESTION COSTS COMPARED TO CAPACITY INVESTMENTS YOU MAY OVERLOOK ONE OTHER BENEFIT AND THAT IS ROADWAY RELIABILITY. ADDING CAPACITY TO A ROADWAY MAY NOT ALONE ADDRESS RELIABILITY. BENEFIT OF OPERATING A ROADWAY – VALUE OF TRAVEL TIME RELIABILITY VS. VALUE OF TRAVEL

MPO

-Data is good. Reference. Why are you using free flow speed vs. posted speed. Simple reason- I don’t trust stuff posted in RHINO. Its outdated. You don’t have them everywhere. Don’t have speed limit data. Some private providers. Mapping companies have that. Its an add on in the cost. Its hard to come by on every piece of road. From 50k foot perspective. You can do your ownsurvey. We need to know hat smith road is- is it 35-40. Locally you can. Is that how local constituents want to grade them? What we let happen over 20 years- notworry about speed limit. Its more how does road perform. Usually its plus 3 or 5.

MPO-

For a decade now we used a float car method for our CMP. In relation to posted speed limit. We have had some roads went back and raised speed limit. A road at 35- a float vehicle- doing 42 mph. we keep our float vehicle – so that it mvoes at what herd is moving at.

Dave- once popuilated its good to go. You can bring your speed limit in here and merge with. On arterials- many times you rarely match posted speed limit. It says 40mph but if stop one signal- only hope to make 38 mph even if you drive at 50 in between. Tenth of a mile spacing you wont reach posted speed limit due to slow downs from light changes.

Speed Data

NPMRDMS- 5 minute bins for the entire year. Supposed to be norm. Tom Tom. Map Makers. Generally

MPO Speed Shapefiles

1st. Base RHiNo Shapefiles.

2nd- RHINO plus Texas 100 pieces highlighted with all congestion stats shone in spreadsheets. Calculate directional. Stats done directionally. Added up to give you cross section. Speed data sets

3rd- Speed Data not in Texas 100. Many miles not followed in Texas 100. Not a major freeway. Not a major arterial. 3rd data set has these additional.

These data sets are massive. I give average Wednesday from 5am-9pm. Meaning most of time don’t care whats happening overnight. Delay is during day. I boildown. Give average Wednesday. Then give Saturday. In some cases around malls weekends can be worse than weekdays on some of these arterial streets. I am going to do all 5 together- Friday included. May change shape of speed curves a little bit. 2016 data being prepared right now.

Harlingen MPO- What is reported to TxDOT for Top 100 list? is it all the same?

Dave- the length of segments vary. We use delay per mile to normalize it. When you report something locally. I-35 AUSTIN number 2- its all between river and 12th- not down to Ben White. Really big problem is in downtown portable geometry. So in this data- you see half of 8 mile corridor half is in mile or two

Harlingen MPO- If y ou shorten geometry- you make more congestion- artificially raising a segment. We don’t fund projects that way. Txdot wont look at it if between riverside and 13th- we look at corridor basis for planning purposes. I sat in hotel room – facing 35- everything southbound was a red light- 930 at night. My concern is we don’t measure all segments the same. If you shorten geometry- you artificially raise something higher for greater congestion- may nto match corridor length analysis

Dave- agree. For arterial stuff- be careful reporting a one mile piece. Same on freeways. Go out- this interchange- if that is only problem- corridor numbesr might not look bad overall- because effect of that interchange is watered dwon. So we go a minimum distance of 3 miles in Texas 100. Some we cant. Its geometric boundary. Small piece of roadways. Run into that sometimes in downtowns. A road may only be a cuple of miles long. To be a top 5 pice fo road have to have congested all hours of road. I-35 west loop in Houston, stimmons in Dallas. Top pieces messed up all day long. When go to I-35 in Flugerville- inbound morning- outbound afternoon bad. But rest of day okay. If I take that Buda piece and examine worst intersection it may jump up. Worst mile. Why we do per mile thing. To normalize it.

MPO 2- the more congested the mocha chica- saw combination. TxDOT worked to improve system. Paint the lines. It began to improve. It’s a good tool for us.

Dave- in addition to Texas 100- we create m itigation list for top 100. Case DOuza asks for input. In it, put things doing in corridor. And in related corridors that could affect this one. That is opportunity to tell story in the top 100. In addition, at TTI we try to figure out local perspective- what are ongoing condition saffecting the local arterials and freeways on a corridor. In spreadsheet online it has a list of at least in top 100 local feedback on what may be causing some of these things. Almost all of them are some kind of construction either in parallel road or in the actual road. Split from Hillboro to Denton in construction. This piece gets fixed, speed sfly thrtu it- and either side of it are still in cnosntrcution- jamming up middle. It’s a moving target. Provides opp to talk issues

Bill- its 10:15-10::20- are you good to keep going?

Is there some value. We compare 2017 you have against 2017 model. You acknowledge. – in perfect world. Model showsme numbers similar to what you have there. Is that not the same?

Dave- yes. I know enough to avoid model experts. Zach gram in san Antonio. Used this data to help examine. See whether or not in same ball park.

Bill- clarify please

Dave- chances are good your speed line wont line up. But it may show in west bound PM peak is worse than AM peak show general same trend. Line may show similar shifts. If 9 out of 10 roads were generally the same and this one was really not- spend more time on that one thatis odd cause something isn’t synching up.

-They don’t valdate model with respect to speed. If doing air quality do close processing with respect to speed. Perkinson- has a spreadsheet that will post process the speeds- specific to air quality. We used it in 2014 to do some of our MTP stuff. Used results from that air quality model to calculate annual hours of delay.

Dave- I know things are being done out there. Not sure how.

Bill- I have a question. On length of segment. If look at 1 to 1.5 miles on I-35 in Austin it rises to top. Whereas moving to 3-5-8 mile corridor doesn’t look so bad. That seems to be pretty useful to find root cause of congestion on your corridor. HB 20 workshop- talked about looking at segment lengths. Longer you go better it seems. Whether freeway or bottleneck. Or arterial streets. If it’s a signalized intersection causing drop in speed. That helps do root cause analysis. I don’t care where I fall on Texas 100- I am trying to zoom in and find out do detective work.

Cameron- that is what our job is. I cant give them a 3 mile piece of 1788 out near airport when the problem child is at I-20. We need to feed them info on money spent to fix that area and benefit the 3 mile piece. They don’t care about 3 mile piece. They care about root cause.

-We use it by section to find red herring. Based on that everyone works TxDOT to find out what is problem. They document system. Paint different approaches to see

Corpus- Is the higher res useful? I say yese. Without that res, its hard to know when you can argue to address congestion explicity vs. implicitly. In our MPO we don’t have congestion mpos when it comes to recurring. We get more bang for buck on mobility option addressing. But explicit treatment could make huge impact. The more you can explode data- at segment- level node level- the more we are hydrating oru investments

B- drilling down to root congestion causes.

CC- yes.

B- so setting performance targets- I look at this. I see there is about. I look at some results. – annual hours of delay. Annual congestion cost- , Delay per mile- 22, 708. When setting performance targets what are you considerations?

-For members- use travel time delay. And unit costs. Show 8 imllion in boca chica- wow losing that money in on year- need to solve that problem. Next year went to 541.

Cameron- how long has cost been around?

Dave- we have had congestion costs a long time. But we provided this data to you for 3 years. 13-14-15. Now getting to 16. Have a few years of trend. Caveat- lots of moving parts. Traffic volume is changing. Some is growth. Some is changes in how you count. Some can affect changes in evolution of speed data; getting more on smaller pieces of road. In rural- TMC maps had 20 mile sections on it. With XD downt o 1 mile maximum. And then amount of data within those is greater. Oen of slides ptu in there. Does it make sense if valleys and peaks in it- is it on the ground, something man made; in case of lots of intersatate hihways PPP has adjusted things statewide on freeways. Was it something that came into play here. Look at AADT in RHINO- traffic numbers up 6%- perhaps some adjustment. You have 3 years. You can lay some of this stuff out. One thing locally you can set targets. Look at what delay is

(WHICH MPOS ARE SUCCESSFUL WITH THESE TYPES OF DATA SETS IN FLORIDA? IN TEXAS?)

MPO- what you are saying- it’s not just numbers. Its definition or threshold of what is a problem. That is something you have to compare to what you observe out there in real life and what your PB is saying the problem is. The data wont tell you or help you identify that threshold for what is an acceptable level of X.

Dave- some of that is based on I have x amount of money available. You can potentially get to that aspirational.

Cameron- there are so many ways to skin this cat. 7 board members with consistent rotation. They wont grasp nitty gritty. They’ll get day to day. I know problem areas. Get to it. We talk at staff- why not ask PB if its over 1.25 on TTI. Or Why not pull down and ask PB to address. There is just so much on this. Depends on common sense. My board has no itereste in this. Cant use congestion cost to them. I have high paid truck driving pop. My number differs from Bryan. Lots factors into differing rates and costs for drivers vs. commuters.

Dave- Delay gets at what is happening outside peaks. TTI can be high. All these measures together paint a greaet picture. Ought to look at one. In terms fo communication, Delay per mile you can monetize it; and time is beneath it. CA uses 35 mph on freeway. If its above 35 its all good. That is what they chose. It will differ in Midland or Houston. You are right. PB isn’t interested. But it can help educate- and lead to better TAMPs. Better CMPs. Better options to present. And then you can use numbers. This red on this corridor is 4 times the delay overall. Allows for more discussion. More data behind discussion.

Bi.ll- we will have tlak with Fed to determine the types of target categories. In real time trying to figure out how we can get best menu

HGAC- it’s a resource question. Existing relationship with TPP and TTI to help MPOs prepare for these requirements. Then what does TEMPO want. How can you help us with that

Bill- we will intermingle that question with regional vs. one on one meetings.

MPO- There is fed requirements reported; then requirements we around room make decisions on.

Bill- but they will be linked

Dave- to add to that. The data sets – fed requirements are in NPMRDS. Those measures are course. They will bring all up to here. We have many up here- already. Don’t stop what you do; what you know. We talk measures already. Those federal measures are trying to get all at the same level on talks of delay, measures, etc.- One measure goes off to DC> one stays here to help make decisions

Bill- 5, 15, one second pings. Does it matter to anyone really if 5, 15, or 1 second. Is that good to know its getting better

Dave- I prefer to hasve more data. In case of producing very course measures- if looking back at whats in original draft. Changes in early requirements. Initially 5 minute. Now 15 minutes in fed requirements. Its generally heading to point where that data is more a planning level set. 5 minute is more operational data. You can see a crash and tings happen in system. More you aggregate it less you see individual instances. Where headed right now, for these, PMs dealing with planning level speed data sets. Because so course, don’t need to know if crash happened at 5 pm on Tuesday. Just that crashes happen at that spot all the time. But the 5 minute operational archive data has a lot of bang in it. And going forward as it gets moree robust you can use it more and more to get behind this stuff and see that you can do school year vs. non school year. Permian in summer vs. rest of 9 months. When Lowes is opened or not in a corridor. You can do all that with detailed data.

Dave- one of things going forward. At a macroscopic level- providing some treatment effect values for you. If put raised medians in this corridor. We know on corridor 353k hourso f delay per year. Raised medians lower delay 15%. Then take this number, lop of 15%. Lop off congestion costs. Say if spend 2 million on raised medians- save 3 million in congestion costs. Very planning level. We hope to provide that thing in future to give you some way high first shot at what are some of treatments and benefit you get. It may be 12% here; 18% there; nationally 15% when do math. At least when do signal timing, you do 20% and it costs this much. And then you can jup to your detail. Doing design and alternatives things done. Perhaps best option is retime signals. Not raised median treatments. Do little bit of high level BC kinds of things. Especially as related to arterial phase. What if we had area wide TDM programs. What delay reduction could we get if had lots of telecommuting. Or Flexible work hours. DO ball park shots of those. Getting lots of benefit for reduced cost. That is coming.

Bill- Next question comes to my mind- Day of week factors. Planning level. Very generic. In some areas of cities. Sat traffic more than Monday traffic. Getting traffic impacts from huge complexes and land use developments. Could happen on smaller scale in smaller areas. Question- travel time runs gone by wayside. Using automated data sources- INRIX, etc. When is it useful to do some type of ground trothing at a micro level- arounda traffic generator or on a certain corridor to get at the Saturday Mall effect.

Dave-

Bill- I could look at the data sets. Now that I have details. Sprig creek parkway on Sat afternoon has to be different. Those numbers don’t match.

Cameron- You have all these tools available to uys. When it comes to decision time. Look at it- and consider all factors involved. On our loop service road- there is a transit stop- before entry to a neighborhood. When bus stops- everything stops. So mere installation of a transit bulb out- or relocation of that transit stop may affect that fictitions 220k number on screen. The data is useful to screen.

Dave- what you might see – Saturday being a problem Delay numbers may pick it up more cause of slow speeds in Saturday draft. There is a sat set of EB/WB for those roads. It might show there is a lot of slow time for sats. So question to take back locally- look at this graph. Recreational traffic on Saturday morning. Do we redo system for that- and sat traffic or keep as is for the commuter traffic. Adding actuators at a signal.

-The MPO members. TENCA members TAC- works to solve. When have solution send to PB. SO we work thru these details with TAC. Make agreement. Select. Then Invest recc to PB. SO the audience needs are different per each committee.

Bill- whether I am PB member or TAC member- or staff person- they are going to go out to bid- whether INRIX or so provides. Will that make a difference if X provides data vs. INRIX. Will that adjust everything? OR are they really using same pings?

Dave- good question. I would be shocked if nice easy hand off. If HERE wins contract- they use TMC network. INRIX we are getting XD network. Segmentation will change. When get shorter segmentation get more congestion. Math will change over segmentation. not to mention composition of data set. Generally, speed data is going to be fine. INRIX v HERE v TomTom. Maybe mile or hour difference. but Trends will be same.

Bill- so no matter provider- that shouldn’t change a whole lot. Top segment- math. Sources.

Dave- not too much concerned. If concerned about this spot. Nothing will change. Reliability. That is often difficult to predict what is going to happen with reliability. Its hard to say because we add a lane you wont have crashes anymore. You may still have them. B ut reliability should compress the peaks and valleys of spikes in congestion or severe congestions. You may get just as much benefit on reliability. ii

11:30 a.m. Lunch on your own

2:00 p.m. Update regarding TxDOT’s Modernize Portfolio and Project Management Project (MPPM) – Erika Kemp TxDOT

2:30 p.m. Review and Discussion regarding Pavement and Bridge Performance Measures, MPO required adoption of targets and data availability – Chris Evilia & Tom Yarborough TxDOT Bridge Division

Steven Radke-Presentation

All must be expressed as 5 yr averages. Smoothing view of what safety targets. Report as 5 year averages. Strategic Highway Safety plan- updating by Aug 1st. Highest Safety priority by state. Intersections like impaired crahes. View o how best to address. National safety plan.

Substantive Safety

Nominal- met design standards. 12 foot lane. Paved shoulder- meets nominal standards. We still expect slight difference in performance. Substantive safety helps us do our. If we can have. Reporting on targets- Temple, other MPOs, and TxDOT. Including safety targets. Safety reviews. How targets are coming into regulations in other places. Having things in your LRP- Target setting workshop. Held January18 in Austin. This workshop put on in 46 different states. Had about 70 participants- Texas reporting measures to NHTSA for a few years. Built a draft deadline- trying to figure out balance between recognizing realiy of economy and pop growth and what is goal for safety. TxDOT pulling safety data in April. Linked development targest to SHSP update. That 5 year plan set targets for 5 years and backtracked to 2018. Then distributed to tempo in June. Actual submittal to TxDOT Highways August 31st.

We want to work with PB. For state wide left it higher to show we are doing things and its already getting worse. Need more money to do more things.

Timeline for 2018 Targets

Don’t know until early 2020 that we have met targets. On MPOs set one more target. Maybe 2. Something we work thru. Goal- advance practice. MPO activities. State Targets available. Not 180 day clock submission due aug 31. Add next couple months to decide by Febr 27 2018. Then we have website with best place for resources. What is state of practice before we started this adventure. Safety.fhwa.dot/gov/hsip/spm.

Questions

Clarification- to ensure I understand this. The June 30 memo- are these the state targets.

Total number of traffic fatalities.

Steven- yes

So MPOs decide whether go with or select our own?

S- Yes

Thinking most will go with State targets.

S- you can select for each one your own or state target

Right. Are most of folks in room going to meet state targets.

-We Will

-Its difficult to get data. Total traffic fatalities- data on that is thru TxDOT

-Bike and Ped data is difficult to come by. So it’s underreported. Just because it’s a ped injury.

S- We have that issue in every state. More EMS runs- then crash data. CRIS data only injury data we have statewide. All MPOs have access to CRIS data. That haves same numbers. You can see the code for these analyses.

Killeen- you have 5 targets

S-yes

Have to have the same five measures

S- Yes. But targets can be set

-Are any of you- or how many of you all- as result of this cov on safety pm’s- have discussions programming dollars for safety improvements- especially as MPOs don’t have program dollars to program for safety improvements

Corpus Christi- safety is big priority- framework for PBPP- all things weighted equally we are inherently safety heavy in absolute number of metrics. It’s a result of our local conversation. Net result is the same. We have 3 times this number of safety PMs in our framework. We may shed some to align with state/fed requirements. Definitely its our wheelhouse.

S- I see more interest in regional safety plan; work CRIS data into local plan- TTI can help do that analysis. We will see more advanced tools roll out. Regional Safety Plans are bigger now

-When we inventory poll talk about safety- like maintenance-when it comes to programming dollars for specific improvements it usually rarely comes up- capacity is the issue everyone is focused on. Better design should inherently be safer but not seeing individual projects slated to safety

Chris- how much of impact does our programs actually have. Lots of issue gets back to driver behavior and we cant really influence that

Dan- if we separate out alcohol related accidents

CC- but you aren’t talking about relative impact of investments we make- but degree to which safety impacts our project prioritization

Dan- thing about setting up historic- how much control we have over outcome

SAMPO- answer is very little

Dan- and we have no clue about what will actually happen.

CC\_ that is a function of scale- for high res data you can see outcomes. You can validate investment you make. And you can test out what is right. But when you get to regionals cale its harder.

Steve- the uncomfortable- VMT is primary number driving injruies. But linking economic growth with more death is an uncomfortable discussion. In my MPO 40% of fatalities are intersections. Talk add more left turn lanes. SO when do targets- target regional problems- seeing more of that

-We talk about compliance with safety amtters like this. Is there any credit given when district constructs a better safety rail. Immediate reduction in fatalities not there- but building a wall- you have improved safety. There is no data to say yet. If hiher rail- weren’t a benefit to safety wouldn’t put in

S- so the improvement of rumble strips, barriers, - there is research already – rumble strip reduces 30% of fatal rashes. So you cant do rumble strip and get 30% immediate reduction. But you know over time it’s a clamable benefit. So seeing more low cost counter measures done widely. Am I going to be more effective doing 10% distributed across high crash intersections or roads with problems

HGAC- Dan appreciate your question. On capital decision nmaking no no immediate change to our behavior. Its part of framework. DUI and non motorized fatalities are getting our attention. Standing up our safety council. Having conv between that with other bike and ped subcommittee; that activity is not investment related- but its programmatic. That is pushing us. You gave this presentation to Victoria and Alamo.

S- Alamo grilled me on trends. Victoria was too much for people. Frog Lickin a hurricane.

Joint Presentation by HGAC-NCTCOG

David Wurlow-HGAC

Dan-NCTCOG

MPO Timelines and Requirements- PBPP

David- walking thru the early requirements. Get a sense as to where you are at. Spend time

What is Transportation Performance Mgmt

On highway side – ones identified in PM section. 23 USC 150- generic. National Goal Areas- Safety, Infra condition, Congestion reduction, etc.

Required Plans

LRTP-TIP

SHSP; HSIP’

TAMP

CMAQ

State Freight Plan

Transit Asset Management Plan

Implementation Timeline

Safety and Transit Asset Management is ready in Spring. Rest you need MTPs updated. For some metrics- only apply to urbanized areas over 1 million. And TMAs. Performance timeline differs. If questions follow up later. With that questions?

-Anything wrong with state standards? Is Decision lens affecting state setting targets?

HGAC- how we are coordinating the effort of the state. How we coordinate PM mgmt generally. Structures recommended to be set up. Getting MPO to accept all State targets.

-We may adopt these standards in MTP or TIP; but bridge performance measures into TIP; is the next instance in 2 years we will have a report out on PMs in the tip?

David- that is one thing. How to report measures to state. MPOs transmit targets to states- not FHWA. That said – latitude on how we do things in MTP and TIP. States can stipulate how to report targets to the state.

NCTCOG- we are going to need discussions. Between mpos. Division offices. HQ at TxDOT to ensure on same page. Because MPOs aren’t submitting targets to FHWA. Have to go thru state only mechanism is thru TIP and MTPs and requirements there. They are flexible on how that reporting can be. Encourage us to communicate with state on how all that will work.

Federal Performance Measures

NCTCOG- for each required measure- are specific calculations prescribed in FHWA fact sheets. We have these available. Will refer you to FHWA presentation throughout workshop. They went thru a lot of detail. Specifically which column- data source you go to to pull a number out of. Pavement- and Bridge- (PM1, PM2- order in which proposed rules and final rules came out. PM1 equals Safety. PM 2 is Pavement and Bridge. – National Performance mgmt.- pavement condition 4 measures- % of pavements of the IH in good condition. % in poor condition. % of IH in poor condition, etc.

Establishing thresholds. In terms of bridge condition- NHS classified as good. Classified as Poor. Bridge- NHS- pavement condition- separated. In terms of System Performance – PM3s- affects a lot of what goes into plans and TIPs- System Performance- IH Travel Time Reliability - % of

-When you say we get to decide- MPOs decide what thresholds they get to set. The metric is defined. The formula is defined. It’s the threshold. You get to define what reliable really means to you and your area. Then you decide what the PM or target is regarding that threshold.

Freight movement on the IH- use 95th percentile speed (vs. 80th for regular). 2nd PM- absolutely come sinto play- if can’t make progress to meeting measure- Freight bottlenecks. That is a good idea anyway – lots of freight reliability and congestion issues is related to bottlenecks. Looking at freight bottlenecks will help you address.

CMAQ is different on reporting period. Emissions one related to FY.

Questions

All measures have prescribed methods. FHWA gives you option to use your own data. But they have made it very easy to use the data that is available. Particularly with some of things that David a nd TTI are doing. They are going to great lengths to make sure that the data and reporting methods are great. NPMRDMS is going to be iterative in the sense that it will be able to show trends- but not completely full up yet.

Its not that hard to do these calculations.

Cameron- is it up to transit agency to report back to PB they did their TAM and report back to us?

David- this is new for them. FTA requirements are squidgy- compared to FHWA which are more prescribed. More latitude on transit side. They may not have staff resources/capacity. Noted examples across country of MPOs doing this work on behalf of providers cause they cant get it done. FTA- saying hey by the way providers- due June 1st

SAMPO- but MPOs had to go to transit authorities. We went and asked if they had set them and no surprise- they hadn’t. We aren’t on the clock cause they missed their deadlines. I encourage you to reach out to all transit providers and make sure they are aware

NCTCOG- are there any other MPOs that are designated recipients of FTA funds?

-No

NCTCOG- those MPOs housed in a city. And city is designated recipient. You as mpo may not have responsibility- but your employer may.

David- measures to target setting. Bridge question. Think where you would like this process to go. Do we just support the state? For me personally, it’s hard for me to talk about in our MTP just supporting the state’s targets. It’s our opp to talk to our public in our area about these measures. We HAVE to explain to the public what we are doing on these. If target state picks aligns with your experience that may work out. But it may not.

Chris- Peggy in terms of data, non-NHS facilities- NHS non-interstate facilities- some cases are not state facilities- TxDOT may gather data for these- especially pavement and bridges. Any additional thought on that? Early conversation we may need to have.

David- answer I got back from Kansas- includes entire NHS. Existing contract at FHWA. The Pavement collection will include all of that.BRINSAP will have to work out the bridge piece.

PBPP- Target-Setting coordination- States/MPOs shall coordinate when setting targets to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practicable. We have open dialogue about this process. I pitch this NCTCOG\_ how many MPOs have held conv with State on target setting

SAMPO- includes district/ Yes we have.

David- you are adopting states targest

NCTCOG\_ you aren’t adopting that targets definition in your area- you are adopting states target for statewide- and pledging to support whatever you have to do to support the state’s target.

David- how will your PB feel about that option. MPO actually selecting a target you report back to state, and then your MTP and your TIP

-What is Houston and NCTCOG- experience going

Dav-d not sure

NCTCOG\_ nope. Need more dialogue. It would help if we knew how the state was leaning. We don’t. as david said its derelict locally if we didn’t put thought in developing targets for our own metro areas.

David- some of these measures not an option to follow a statewide target. CMAQ – targets are same as in urbanized area. Safety targets- have planning process to support that dialogue. Is there a desire to see something not measaure specific. Do we want to see a more single group on PBPP to interact with state to hold dialogue- or is that TEMPO?

Chis- that is up for conversation tomorrow. Homework- put thought into that for tomorrow. What are next steps as organization. I don’t know that anyone can hold that.

David- Clock is ticking. We don’t have a ton of time. Other states have been advanced holding meetings on this- preparing. We have not done this. We are behind other states. WhaT support do we need. There are scope items TTI could produce. Target support documentation- existing measures for each area- general straight line trend; what percentage reductions would look like. Involved in safety as well; asset mgmt. pavement folks. They can be a resource to

-Perhaps we aren’t suffering from target setting fatigue.

NCTCOG- we had discussion about requirement PMs vs. PMs helping you do your job better. You have to make that choice as well too. We present these as if these are THE PMs- but these are just the PMs that FHWA wants you to do. You also have option to look at other PMs in your area creating targets and doing those as well

CC\_ as supplements

NCTCOG\_ as supplements. Meeting these requirements may not be good enough within your urban areas to make decisions on how you want to make program funds. Set policies. Help you understand at big aggregate picture. But not at the program level. That is why State and TTI providing data to help you localize your own reporting-.

David- is there additional support for TTI and folks

Peggy- yes. We will throw in TTI on that.

-Will be difficult from small MPO perspective not to accept states PMs. Will help

SAMPO- you have too many people we don’t have enough.

HGAC\_ fair enough.

- These are too aggressive. Not Aggressive enough.

David- there are options for revision.

NCTCOG- lets assume for time being- you calculated your PMs. Calculated your data. Now have measures. Separated targets. That all is separate from reporting requirements. You have to report what targets are. There are two different times to report. Biennial and every 4 years. Reporting every 2 years your progress to meeting goals. You have option- at first biennial reporting period to adjust your four year targets. You are setting a four year target. Reporting progress every two years. And depending on how you are doing at that time, the state can adjust their targets at that time.

Cameron- are your targets all part of MTP?

David- by statute report targets thru MTP. And In prior reporting period in achieving those reported targets. In TIP must show how your selection helped achieve your targets.

Cameron- The incentive to do something different. Realize you may not get to where you want to go. Get back into world of amending MTP. That incentive isn’t very good.

David- this is less onerous on MPO side. State has a reporting schedule. MPOs have to set targets on schedule. But less framework by Feds on how you do everything else. Your context in your area is all you to define. There are no penalties for any MPOs failing to meet targets for any of these. Penalties are all on states or providers. Generally on flexibility of losing funds.

NCTCOG- USDOT will eventually submit a report to congress. This is timeline we have to understand. These green boxes are the first report ing period. 2018-2022. First reporting period.

Cameron- IN January 2018- that is beginning of Data Collection. But what are PM targets are. You are collecting a whole bunch of data. How do you report 2 years later you have done something.

NCTCOG- PM 2 and 3 is right. May Target is correct. Setting targets. You report targetse. Separate target setting from performance. You know what measures area. set targets. In TIPS and MTP according to schedule established. Any time you adopt new plan- you report your target. And you report th data you collected. The baseline data in 2018 aas well. If you adopted your plan tomorrow you don’t have to have your targets in them. So separate out two discussions on target setting and reporting. When you make your report you have to report your targets. The reporting periods are

-This slide applies to pavement and bridge

NCCOG and reliability system and CMAQ congestion and CMAQ emissions.

NCTCOG- in your plan- when you adopt new plan- getting clarification when make amendment to plan. Anytime have action on plan- after you set targets- you have.

Jose- folks in congress- talking about using in operations manual

NCTCOG- they had specific ops manuals they had established in Kansas.the MTP will be a description of progress. You are describing plan projects- and on meeting of targets. Essentially same thing on TIP and STIP. Describe to max extent practicable how those projects help achieve target. Talked about agreements as well. There are those points Jose Mentioned-

Reporting and Planning Integration Discussion

David- This gets messy. First 2 years- some measures are required to assess now. Some not required to be assessed now.

NCCOG- if adopting a new MTP between now and May 2018- if you adopt MTP between now and 2018- no worries. Any plan after May 2018 you are reporting on wherever you are on this and the status of al lof this.

David- that is why we raised amendment question- silly adopting a plan and rule before- deadline if you cant amend the plan

Chris- we can run thru this exercise after SAFETEALU came out- well you cant adopt a TIP if MTP hasn’t adopted it

David- and plan says FHWA will approve an MTP and STIP- as long as plan is compliant

NCTCOG\_ other hard date is May 2019- whatever you adopt after May 2019- MUST be compliant. Between now and May 2019- it’s a little hazy 

3:00 p.m. Review of SB 312 requirements and status of associated rulemaking – Chris Evilia & Ashby Johnson

3:15 p.m. Review regarding tentative February TEMPO meeting

 Workshops on TRENDS model and MTP development

3:30 p.m. Updates / Announcements from Federal Partners

3:45 p.m. Announcements regarding other upcoming training / workshops

4:00 p.m. Adjournment