

TEMPO Notes June 5, 2018

Phone introductions: David Jones, Lubbock; Robert, Laredo; and reps from HGAC and NCTCOG

Pavement/bridge update targets – 180 days to action

Peggy – Techs sent to admin for approval, maybe this week, will distribute to everyone,  
then it will be 180 days

Chris – Any news from Federal partners?

Ind performance measures 10 yr. window

Planning process has one year to catch up

Current has general (term)

PM3 and 2 will be actions after May 20, 2019

Ashby – requirements for setting targets (Dan Koske, FHWA)

All transit agencies must set asset management targets

Multiple agencies must submit to MPO even if they go thru state

Each MPO adopts regional tam targets

Bob – statewide targets

Divisions will have draft by end of July and formal (final?) by end of September

NCTCOG – will we also expect public to review all asset management at the same time?

? – TAM plan due to submit by Oct. 1

? - Over next 3 days if you have agencies not forthcoming, let him know.

Chris – What action does MPO take when they receive a plan?

Don – Should be reflected in TAM plan. Additional changes in Regional plan?

Prioritize for TIP, etc. are actions that should reflect TAM standards.

PM3 – Tim Lomax – FastAct Performance Measures (FAPM)

Presented in a series of WebExes

Presentation – Reliable vs. Unreliable data

Why unreliable? Inconsistencies due to different processes for gathering travel time / speed

Recommended target setting basics: conservative, trending, amount of “close to bad” sections may include “barely good?”

How to set targets in Texas? TTI advises stay calm

Use these measures to try and create better targets and understand the target setting process

TTI will help you with the number crunching

Chris – Took to board, who noted I-35 reliability - reliable 100%. Reliability is still a problem.

Caller – More sensitivity can be set: 1.45 vs 1.5 as unreliable b/c of areas growing faster.

Category 2 Formula

6 scenarios (pie chart) best / worst %

Challenge is to achieve the least disparity between best and worst

Dan – running scenarios for 2 years; no immediate action is necessary today

If anyone feels strongly that we do, speak up, or we’ll just have conversation and agree to be “equally dissatisfied.” We should thank Peggy for all her work amid all her other responsibilities.

Alfonso – List MPOs by weight by category to see what needs to be adjusted.

Joel (SAT) – Sid wants to withdraw

Victoria – We need to consider the State Network b/c we’re at a major crossroads.

Major Hofheins – Sampo has had a hard struggle for 2 yrs and were back to trying to reach neutrality.

“Who gets hurt the least” seems to be the tack we take most often.

San Antonio seems to be the most neutral so far.

Clay – Agrees with Major. Objection of small MPOs; continue with initial proposal

Ashby – Alan’s (HGAC) plan to redistribute gains to the biggest losers.

Peggy – No one really programmed for Cat 2 has project impact.

Ashby – Could go with the San Antonio scenario. The initial proposal is decent, but congestion not the highest when the Commission said to give it the most attention.

? - The Minority report used congestion at 50% and came up with a table that redistributed gains to Losers.

Joel – What can we eliminate?

David – Updates current formula to Population split of 90/10 and helped more non-TMAs

Joel made a motion to drop, Drew seconded.

Chris – None of these plans will provide all the funding you need. Regarding transportation funding in

General, are we better off than before Props 1 and 7? Because of all the toll roads, how can we keep them operating?

? – Where does it make sense to have toll facilities and not?

Drew? – Look on Peggy's spreadsheet to see David's Lubbock plan.

? – We have passed the window for TAC changes this year, so no chance of this happening for another year (2021).

? – Population and congestion numbers change every year. Say we are going to update less frequently.

Alfonso – 10 years ago, we brainstormed for a week in Austin, working together.

David – Is there a motion on the floor to keep and update population?

Dan – HGAC's numbers were not correct before. The current plan still does not give them even close to their population share. We have got to be sensitive to that. They have much greater congestion than even DFW.

Chris – The current plan is based on the 2000 Census.

David – The Lubbock concept was to update the populations.

? – Houston has 28% of the State's population, and that scenario only gives them 26% of the funding.

Vote: 18 yes; 5 no; 1 abstain

Vote passed to remove Lubbock plan

Dan moved to further Alan's plan

Ashby moved to remove and Drew seconded

Dan – We need to look at dollars.

Drew and others – It is too complicated

Vote to remove Alan's idea from consideration

Vote: 16 yes

Drew – I suggest getting district people at the table.

Chris – They are welcomed, but leave that up to each MPO to decide.

Drew – As an organization, we should engage them.

Chris agreed.

? – Bryan/College Station has tons of meeting space.

Mike (Tyler) – I suggest the first thing we should do is split between big and small MPOs, and then divide and discuss as two groups.

Drew – We already split out into two groups. Is there any chance we can update the population data?

Peggy has the split and formula-based scenarios. If we have another workshop we need to spend more time. Chris agreed.

Alfonso – We could have a July meeting, have the leaders come, and 2-3 tech people from TTI. Just have

A few people lead the discussion, not open to everyone. We could have an unbiased facilitator; maybe Bill? Chris agreed.

Chris will do a doodle poll to determine a date for a meeting later in July.

Send him any scenarios to be distributed for consideration before the meeting.

Discussion for the Fall meeting.

AAMPO meets in SAT September 25-28, let Chris know if the 24<sup>th</sup> would work for everyone.

Roger Beall – NHS Review Study presentation

Meeting the original needs and requirements

18,623 miles in Texas

Used to monitor performance of the system, not reviewed since 1996.

Performance driven process...how is it performing?

Out of date and funding potential affected.

Purpose: update the network thru evaluation and modification so it meets NHS criteria.

Multi-phase process: new added, obsolete removed, and correct classifications

Fall 2018 Draft Study begins, and needs MPO input thru winter 2019, stakeholders thru spring 2019, and complete by end of 2019.

Chris – Classification? May be looked at and done as a separate process.

Ashby - Portions “turned back” – how will that be handled?

Roger – it is part of the process. Is it a “gap” that should still be included? Whatever makes sense.

Barbara Maley – Environmental Justice Workshop, Second Level - Pilot locations in DC and Texas.

September 18-19 at TxDOT Riverside in Austin – Peggy hosting

Mix of participants, MPOs to attend and provide valuable feedback to change/develop course



## FastAct Requirements Progress

Where are we on these? Reach out if you need help, especially by the time TIP approvals are required.

TIP submission deadline for STIP is June 18 with “wiggle room.”

Contact Lori if you have questions.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

Spreadsheets with Category 2 Projects - Peggy needs feedback as soon as possible.

HB20 Compliance

TDM today 1 pm.

Follow up to today's meeting late July, before Commission meeting on July 26.

Barbara Maley EJ Workshop Sept. 18-19

Fall TEMPO Meeting September 24, San Antonio