

TEMPO Notes September 25, 2018

Two members whose office expires. 2 TMAs. and one non tma position joel garza. terms of office are two years. Open it up for nomination. Are there other nominations. Elect Joel and ashby by inclination. 2nd by major. So a third from alfonso. Any discussion on nominations. Close Nomination. Aye.

Next Item of Business.

So statewide level. Are we consistent. Substantially different. Chip seal gets job done but cause of courseness comes in at highest with fare ratings. So it affects road ratings on non IHS miles.

IHS conditions we should be good-66.4% of lane miles good. 0.3 poor. On non targets we recommended something less like 48% for good percentage on non IHS. So on bridges- this is just looking at percent of deck area in good condition vs poor condition. that deck area is important not all bridges equal. box culvert aint port of corpus bridge.

Makes it a challenge communicating this to public especially since condition of deck area itself is one of metrics to consider if good is bridge or poor

When we calculate out as bridge area have it as a higher percentage. more important bridges part of ihs system. look at break out of non ihs portion- waco has tiny percent. Its more significant percent as far as deck area. Adds interesting wrinkle. Not looking at entire system- look at all bridges in McLennan county we are at all bridges.

McLennan bridges aren't all good shape. Bottom line- good deck area- total NHS 46%. Interstate 57%, Non-HIS 37.9%, Statewide target is 50%, we are at 46%. The state maintained bridges are in better shape compared to state and city of Waco. Tom mentioned if starting from scratch pushing bridge replacement thru process, it's not open to traffic to affect targets till year 2022. Worth emphasizing here but we have some significant projects in pipeline getting started. I-35 recon project, 30 bridges with major rehab or replacement as part of it. Kicks off in December. That project adds to making assumption bridge is not getting more deck area. Even with more capacity. The interstate percent would go from 46 to 93 and raise overall 46% good deck area to 55%- which is beyond state target for NHS bridges.

Other question to ask'For other bridges not doing work to - rate of deterioration- what is it for those? My staff arent engineers. we need a better idea of the rate that bridges deteriorate. Tom indicated that from statewide level things arent changing fast- but a slight downward trend associated. So how does it equate to what bridges are doing in each region. There are significant differences in how freight and truck impacts rate of deterioration. We rec to follow state targets for bridge condition.

We didnt go thru exercise of establishing barely good or poor analysis for bridges. We dont know how significant for a score of 7 to 6 represents. Is that a significant number Is it a not so significant number No good feel for that as planners.

aSHBY - On portion of your system that was city of waco portions-were any roads acting as city streets. could they be turnback program prospects

Chris- those are acting as primary arterials. Some on state system havin that conv. Its mainly for facilities not part of NHS system. Jeff indicated this is only a subset of entire system There are other facilities not part of this reporting process. I recommend for folks- dont end the process t those

Ashby - On roughness index- my experience its a subjective metric. how much time should we worry about it

Chris - reason we use roughness- most states only have that data. Fed gov missed opp to collect other metrics for that portion of NHS system. but right now only collecting IRI And it does seem subjective. But it leads us to make not the best decisions in terms of project prioritization

Ashby - Re bridge portion- some of them looked at different target.

Chris-we will follow state targets. but seeing what work moved the needle significantly enough to get okay with state targets. it seems to be the case. We are currently below that state target but we are going to be above.

Michael Howe, Tyler - seems like def of nhs is that its designated as highway =0 that ncludes FM roads, spurs, and loops

Chris- Fast Act or Map 21 made change that arterials got wrapped into NHS system. That added a wrinkle to that. prior to that there were formal designations on which facilities are NHS. It happens that our region includes interstate and principle arterials

Jeff- in Dallas Ft Worth region we have many significant state highways, FM roads, and loops on TxDOT system - major facilities but not on the NHS. It's important for MPOs to understand what comprises the NHS in their region b/c it varies. TxDOT is conducting an eval of state NHS facilities, which is a good opp to evaluate which facilities are on NHS and determine if any changes need to be made, and certainly how it will affect targets and percentages going forward.

Chris- that is important conversation. Our map shows how NHS system dead ends at places that dont make much logical sense. So be aware we aren't going to look at facilities in best condition and say those aren't NHS facilities.

Clay- How do we determine pavement on non-state roads or NHS?

Chris waco colelcts pavement data on network. Txdot began collecting that info as of 2017 for off system NHS facilities. At some point Peggy will make that data available.

You can get PMIS data from Peggy for that. For bridges, national bridge inventory is wealth of info on bridges- each bridge inspected every 2 years regardless who owns it. bridge division passed out spreadsheet with all information for entires tate of texas.

Alfonso - Re international process on border- we have to consider bridges

Chris- no answer for that.

Drake - for the performance measure targets any briege on teh border you have to consider that. its the whole bridge

Drew- half of that bridge resides in another country- how do we get that data.

Drake- for international bridges- its entire bridge. Whatever dataset available for national bridge inventory

Dan - Observations- re this and PM in general. stress this PM thing is a marathon. Keep plugging away. reiterate jeffs point- about austin district division pavement guys helpful. The big thing to turn focus on- is circling back and working with districts. sorting thru role for MPO. particularly on PMs. trying to get to how does all this manifesting itself in better planning decision. we map all deficient bridges. Getting convo with txdot on improving this- where you have money on projects and dont. Last thing- our staff is doing lots of work -- jeff has lots of input. happy to stand up template or share what we did.

Sondra Johnson-TxDOT Freight Section

Updates to Freight Mobility Plan.

Approved by FHWA. 2 studies - truck statewide parking study resulting from that. Truck parking is a national issue. Makes sense for our section to stay engaged on this topic. Our goal- improve safety, reduce congestion, improve economic competitiveness. Feedback is same- truckers want reliable and safe parking. So from goal standpoint we support this study. hope to address these concerns. we will collect data, ID best practices. COLlect inventory. Do analysis for what is needed for our state. and then make recommendations. Engaging thru number of workshops- coming to a city near you. San Antonio, Laredo, El Paso, Fort Worth Dallas, Rio Grande Valley, Corpus, Texarkana, Midland, Lubbock, Amarillo, Beaumont, and Tyler. FOCUS groups in some areas and then full workshops. This is a format that worked well for us in Developing freight mobility plan. We need you MPOs at table to get feedback from truckers. our contractor Cambridge Systematics will help Freight trucker guidelines. Truckers moving goods across state need wide lanes, high bridge clearance, good turning radius, less steep inclines. these are things we can have impact on if we can get recommendations. We are talking to ask about recons and rebuilds - building in those considerations for freight cause movement of goods in state keeps us number 1. We will also do surveys and workshops and focus groups to cover this topic area as well.

What is timeline for these workshops - starting in November and going thru January for first round. 2n round start in Feb and end in march.

Dan - Great that state is on this initiative. finished freight parking study. presented to PB last week. he had more questions about that study than anything he had done. lots of conversation and elected officials keenly aware of this issue. Our project is out online. Trying to move out some strategies. we have a huge shortage of parking for trucks. Idea of land banking is raised.

Chris - CDL drivers have limits on how long can operate vehicle. now digital logbooks track them and hours of driving- many truckers spending 1 hour or longer just trying to find a legal place to park. Eats into amount of time it takes to go from point a to point b. Eats into their bottom line and is a huge issue. Chris is MPO advisor on FAC for all texas MPOs

Karen and Laurie-TIP STIP

FHWA has 19-22 approved. End of this week. Making sure all know when look at projects already have some projects not approved cause they are being let in 17-20. When we get letter from FHWA and their comments- i want you to know there is a process to respond to FHWA's comments. A chart of comments will be shared. The process to respond should be based on keeping track of responses you give. when you respond to your comments upload them within revisions of STIP and 17s revisions- upload it in your

revision. When you do upload these documents- please put MPO name, district name. FHWA will normally number their comments. Let them know

Jose- Clarification on new TAM plan- requirement is TAM plan done by October 1. Adoption of state good repair targets. State of good repair targets need to be adopted by MPOs- and a statement about how process in TIP includes new state of good repair targets. If not included, they need to be included in the new STIP revision

Frawley - need a narrative on how MPO is to achieve targets

Jose- a narrative of how projects in TIP will address or achieve state of good repair targets. Similar comments on how TIP will achieve new targets. Targets will take a while. SOGR targets many are number of vehicles with lifespans, conditions of facilities. when you buy buses you immediately move that needle. You will see some of that action quickly- compared to building new bridges. FTA expects narrative in TIP of how TIP projects make their way to achieving those SOGR targets -Will there be something required in MTP about process followed

Jose-yes. Checklist is good ref point. 12 items will come into play with update of MTPs- or amend the MTP plans with each stip amendment- expect PM planning requirements and checklist items are addressed

Chris0 Ased TTI to doublecheck to ensure checklist is on the website for all MPOs

Chris- Dan, Ashby, Joel- nothing out of ordinary. One thing on radar- funding coming thru over past couple years related to prop 1 and 7. 1 is rainy day fund. 7 is realignment of state and motor vehicle sales tax. both go away after FY25. So its temporary bump and its entering our radar screen. Projects do take multiple years to get thru pipeline. Making you aware -havin convos on your end. Other thing coming out of that- we have TRENDS as a financial forecast model jointly developed between TEMPO TxDOT and TTI. TxDOT uses it to estimate what revenues look like in long term past the current UTP. Also fuel efficiency forecasts, population forecasts. Dan brought up vexing- question- if got commission discretionary dollars- how does it impact future awards out of prop 1 and 7 pot of money. We had a group of MPO development directors help out in this model. May need to get that group together again to review the model along with TTI folks. I want to get 5-6 of you together to dig into the model. Bart you may be a good person to help us out. You are familiar with models. If have interest in that we want to hear back and get into it in next month.

One of things that bubbled up in this conversation on target setting. We have been thru one iteration of this process now. One conversation we want to start having- how does TxDOT set its targets- and process and inputs for that development. Perhaps have another TEMPO meeting to explore the topic over next month or two or perhaps next year. So we are thinking to throw out- a date- around post-thanksgiving-december time frame. Other topics for discussion- most of us have transportation plans due in next 12-15 months. And issues with FAST act requirements Some folks have asked me on how to factor in tourism as factors in this process of target setting.

Cameron - Tagging onto comment you just made. we did a decent job of doing that. we have 20 criteria considering in your scoring. tourism is one we feel solid about. a bunch of others in that twenty with words you cant apply data to. That is a situation real, and in middle of our wheelhouse. have 30 day call

for projects now. Eventuall we will get that list. All different scoring criteria. Is tehre something available now on best business practices

Chris - I am not sure its out there. perhaps that is a conversation topic to raise in this next meeting. also explore venue. during last tpp- how did you evaluate projects that went into utp. given not enough time to respond to it.

Ashby - An email went out under my name. went out friday about a pooled fund study with TTI. Ask you all to discuss potential opps to do pooled fund. We have a lot of festivals in austin. stacking up on after another- at some point cease to be a special event nd almost more a part of model. havin convo with Tim Lomax. Could lend itself to something you just brought up Cameron. Some pooled fund- for large an small MPOs. Issues may notbe same but need is there to leverage each others funding.

Dan - Is there consensus about another TEMPO meeting during FY 18 about PMs. Executive committee looking for some feedbck. Early december if we do do it.

Frawley- You want what from that

Dan - We spend lots of time understanding PMs, data, and targets. Had big gap in communication of 90-day period where TxDOT set targets- not lots of convo on approaches and considerations from TxDOT on those target setting processes. Understanding from wht data tells us about current year and what we shoudl assume about targets. A lot of us- NCTCOG- have Jeff present early Nov to PB. Does it matter if we wait till early January.

Clay- I think methodology is important. Help MPOs develop our methodology. Adopting a second standard just for our district with major roads passing thru rural districts- and with terrible soil. We have no basis to work from. Establish for our own MPO.

Dan - We did ourselves a horrible disservice making these PMs complicated. It is amazing. Which of these measures are state comparisons on? What are deadlines? One PM reads one way, one another way. If you have to explain to elected officials why charts change so dramatically b/c of different sources of data. That isn't flying well. SOV vs. Non-SOV issue. Occupancy from TxDOT shows Non-SOV declining over time. We spend billions on trains. Our targets should be less today given money we spend on transit. It's not showing up in the TRENDS data from TxDOT though. So that is a cause of concern and elected officials could balk in future.

Chris-sounds like consensus.

Cameron - I want to know more about the reporting environment too.

Dan-And if Waco, Temple Killeen, Austin and Laredo could hang around- Mike is launching HSR feasibility study involving these MPOs on the I-35 corridor.

Ashby- If we move in December- another opp to visit as well on the topic.

Dan- Sandy West is our lead-consultant with her own deal. Now working with us part time, taking lead on HSR feasibility on procurement perspective. Asked her if valuable to attach the next study meeting to a TEMPO meeting. If we can do it in Arlington, we can get you caught up on procurement processes.