

TEMPO Notes July 25, 2018

Phone introductions: Linda de la Fuente (HCMPO), Dave Schrank (TTI), Courtney Jones (TxDOT-Waco), Dunham (?), Raymond (?), John Weber (KTMPO), Mohammed ? (TxDOT), and Shannon Hawkins (TxDOT). There were others whose names I did not get.

Thoughts on Tyler Proposal

Michael Howell – What seemed to work best was coming up with factors and assigning weights. Goal was to reduce impacts to any one MPO. This was a scenario we came up with that seemed reasonable.

Clay – Like premise of plan and we already ran it. Still agree it's the best approach even though Sherman/Denison takes a significant hit.

Dan - It's problematic to use truck VMT as criteria. Odd that all West Texas came up short in Tyler Scenario. Maybe VMT heavy.

Chris - Let's see if we can look at this on-screen. (Matt Miller working on that.)

Alfonso – We need to obtain what's best for everyone. Why not do 50% for small and 50% for large MPOs for a one-year time period. To improve necessary area/projects, we need to continue to grow and build better roads.

Dan - It's really an issue for the Commission. This formula is only for Cat 2.

Major – I think the Commission and legislature would shoot that down for not working with the UTP cycle.

Bill - The Scenario data table ON-SCREEN shows all MPOs and all Scenarios (Tyler, with revised on-system VMT). The current plan still has 87/13 split, but there are more TMAs now (83/17?) The current numbers will see a big swing when the split is updated.

Ashby - It also uses 2000 census (UTP).

Dan - Green numbers are the worst/lowest % for that MPO; red numbers are best/highest. Every year we meet with TxDOT about finance. In August, published in Texas Register. Oil/gas and sales revenue high enough to "fully fund" Cat 2 is the revenue target. Asked Peggy what the next steps/impacts are. Another Billion, but some of that is for engineering and planning.

Peggy - Impacts to regs would mean the rule change process would miss the 2020 UTP and the formula not getting approved probably until 2021, two years from now.

Bill - Is anyone still thinking about the Big 6/smaller 19 split? The majority, \$750-800K to the Big 6, and \$450K and less to smaller 19.

Alan - I would recommend we not write in code fixed percentage, but let it be census driven. MPOs populations are changing. Formulas apply but are driven by pops. Growing areas have the ability to grow funding and don't get stuck.

Peggy - Highly encourages...

Dan - Can't it be written in a way that allows data to adjust?

Alan - There's a Census only every 10 years, but that's still better.

Ashby - I thought we mentioned updating..

Peggy - Within formula, updates to population anyway.

Alan - I don't think Cat 2 is on-system program for maintaining what we have today. Off-system roads aren't taken into consideration. Disincentives built in to formula don't help us if we want to grow.

The initial proposition/Big 4 Plan got into the roots of this matter. I can defend it even though it wasn't the best for us. It hits all the right points

Some plans are shaded out – columns E,F & G
San Antonio disparity between best/worst greater 50/30/10/10

Dan - Do we want to have a different plan for split groups?

Major - We voted on the initial proposal together, but didn't push it through.

Alan - 2 classes of MPOs didn't do well, it gets away from population and VMT numbers are less.
Divided VMT and population numbers, per capita daily VMT by MPO area bar chart.

Clay - Find balance between congestion for large MPOs, on-syst lane miles/SH Syst for smaller MPOs.

Drew - If we can only include on syst miles, it hurts HC and H-GAC.

Alan - It doesn't make sense.

Bill - Alleviates needs on an-syst by helping off-syst. Smaller areas have way more traffic than people, but more weight on VMT.

That's difficult to estimate.

Alan - It's a challenge we need to meet.

Clay - Confident in total VMT, TxDOT does a good job. I have less confidence with truck VMT.

Bill – There's only total VMT on the chart.

Alfonso – What percent it used for truck VMT? HC and B'ville area, trucks go through our area. More pass through, not right on the border but we don't count Mexico.

Sid - Seems like it should be higher b/c you're not counting population (Mexico).

Bill - Through traffic is not as high a volume.

Alan - Income is inversely proportional to VMT. Less income means less individual vehicle ownership.

D. Rudge – We carried seven million passengers last year – close to Fort Worth.

Dan - All the big metro areas are close (in yellow).

Bill - Are we going to divide and set separate weights and criteria?

Major – I think that's a big mistake. We're trying to do what's best for the state as a whole. It doesn't really meet what the Commission is looking for. They want a consensus.

Clay - Don't split by population then. I thought the Big 6 had different issues than the other MPOs. If we have the same scenario, each side could set different weights.

Drew - I asked Peggy about analysis of what it looks like for smaller and larger when we merge. It will affect Alfonso and Joel.

Peggy - Yes, but that was a while ago. Potentially, our TAC will affect, so I advise careful wording.

Drew - It changes on/off-system picture as well as population.

Ashby – Are you saying there will be two MPOs coming out of smaller MPO group? Split will be 6/17? But what came out of the 17 will get lumped in with the Big 6. 5.18% of State Pop. (?)

Alfonso – Why did we remove straight pop?

Chris and Rea Donna – Because it was the absolute worst for more MPOs, especially the smallest ones.

Alfonso – Can we add freight or something to try and reach more of a balance?

Bill - We did that on the initial proposal.

Cameron – We have a lot of transient population in Permian Basin, so pop hurts us.

Alan - Should see it as ACS numbers. But that's not always done well.

D. Rudge – We have the same issue in B/CS with the college population.

E'Lisa - On the revised Tyler scenario, I'm OK with criteria, but not weights.

D. Rudge – I'm not OK with truck VMT being part of it.

Bill - Anyone in favor of revised Tyler weights: 30% congestion, 10% truck VMT, 10% safety and 50% total VMT?

Michael – Maybe we have population and VMT split.

Major - Why are we counting VMT twice in some?

Alan - Disparity of impact on system/ add weight.

E’Lisa - What was San Antonio scenario? Answer: 50% pop, 30% congestion, 10% truck VMT and 10% safety.

Alfonso – Motion to remove initial proposal. No second.

Bob - We should consider the initial proposal b/c it has the least negative impact than any other scenario. Moved to accept. Motion seconded.

Chris - Let’s have a vote to approve the initial proposal and send.

Drew - If we vote on as initial proposal it won’t come out until 2021, 2 more years. Things are changing by then.

Dan - Add to proposal this verbage: “if anything changes in MPO make-up in Texas; it will be dropped in.

Bob - Amend my motion to include that statement. Ashby accepted (a second).

Dan - Reiterate criteria and weights.

Chris - Read off: Big 6 Initial: 35% pop, 35% congestion, 15% safety and 15% truck VMT
Smaller MPOs Initial: 25% pop, 22% truck VMT, 16% congestion, 15% total VMT, 12% lane miles and 10% safety.

Alan - Does this motion include updated census, etc.?

Peggy - Everything in the formula is updated every year as the data is available.

Chris - Discussion ended, vote taken (Matt Miller may have a more accurate count in his notes): Vote passed with 19 yes, 3 no and 3 abstentions.

Drew - We will see, at Peggy’s convenience, how this will shake out?

Chris - We’ll get it all typed up and submit a letter.

Alan - When TxDOT does sat counts, they don’t identify vehicle types (or speeds). The resources TxDOT expends puts personnel in a time crunch, causing data to be critical. If we could actually upload our data and TxDOT could accept, it could help this issue, with a small amount of Commission

support. Could include in the proposal to improve truck VMT. I could draft something to circulate to MPOs and send to Commission in a separate report/submission.

Chris - Yes, that would be very helpful.

Alan - If we're going to be data driven, we need to have really good data.

Pavement and bridge

Chris - Date on letter relevant.

Peggy - We got it to you July 19. What's important is State TIP/STIP revision by next May.

Clay - What about three with no IHs?

Chris - Just affects your IH payments?

D. Rudge – PM3 target only relevant.

Clay - We don't vote on IH if we don't have any. Can we get something our Policy Board can adopt?

Peggy - PM3, etc., all done and went out last Thursday.

Dan - Deadline? 180 days from the date of letter. Conservative.

Alan - Amendments to Regional Hwy Plan – FHWA has been following up.

Peggy - May 2, 2017 – 2 years to reflect on planning process PM2 and PM3.

E'Lisa - 2020 target – don't have same for all of these? Can we get these?

Dan - We're all suffering with this.

E'Lisa - We set the same targets as State if we approve.

Dan/E'Lisa – We can all 25 do with Pavement & Bridge guys.

Peggy - Will set up a WebEx.

Chris - Safety targets review sometime this year. Needs to be on everyone's radar. Reporting element for current target 2019.

Dan - Planning contracts? Peggy addressed changes, should be done by early September, current agreements expire Sept. 30.

Peggy - AAMPO joined non-attainment crew. Added in for PL funding.
Sent email NPNRDF (?) powerpoint TTI can facilitate if you have questions.

Next TEMPO Meeting Tuesday, September 25, prior to begin of AMPO Conference at Westin in San Antonio. Will have Webex.