

TEMPO March 23, 2023 Meeting Summary

Contents

TxDOT Transportation Planning and Programming Division Updates.....	2
Annual Project Listing.....	2
UPWP Considerations for Safety Task Force-Funded Action Plans.....	2
Census Urban Area Classification.....	3
New MPOs and TMAs Updates/PL Funding Considerations.....	5
Statewide Planning Update.....	5
Carbon Reduction Program.....	5
Statewide Resilience Plan.....	6
Connecting Texas 2050 SLRTP.....	6
Functional Classification Requests.....	7
FHWA Updates.....	10
TEMPO Subcommittee Updates.....	11
STIP Subcommittee Updates.....	11
Bylaw Committee Discussion and Consideration of Appropriate Action on Recommendations.....	12
Plans, Studies, Research, Conferences, Etc.....	12
Performance Measures.....	12
Bridge Condition (PM2).....	12
Pavement Condition (PM2).....	12
Congestion Performance (PM3).....	14
What’s next for MPOs?.....	14
Incorporating PMs into TIPs.....	14
TxDOT Database of Non-Motorized Traffic Counts.....	15
What’s Next for MPOs ctd.	15
MPOs Adopting Targets and Impacts of Potentially Missing Targets.....	15
Legislative Session Impact Items Report.....	16
Electrification NEVI Plan Updates and Next Steps for Coordination.....	16
FHWA and TxDOT TPP 2023 Training Topics Discussion.....	17
Summer Meeting Discussion and Location Selection.....	17

TxDOT Transportation Planning and Programming Division Updates

Annual Project Listing.

1. Sandra Rodriguez with TTI presented process updates on APL Process Reports.
 - a. MPO road network assignment process is now based on the CSJ
 - b. APL Report Process is now handled by TTI and TPP through an Access database.

Annual Project Listing Discussion

1. Karen Owens with H-GAC had concerns that if this is automated now, that she have some outputs to review and validate that all MPO projects are listed.
 - c. Sandra advised it's a process update that can be handled between Phillip Tindall and his Team. Phillip advised he will confirm with FHWA on the requirement.
2. Christy Gotti with NCTCOG advised she has issue exporting the PDF in prior versions or that with it information, a project wasn't included. Will MPOs be expected to validate it and if so, is there some process to make fixes?
 - d. Phillip advised there are areas where a sponsor requires edits to the PDF file. TxDOT can look into the technical aspect of making updates.
3. Christy asked if TxDOT is doing an initial verification of 579 Reports sent to NCTCOG showing obligations.
 - e. Phillip advised this is not a step in the process but he can check with Finance division to see if that is expected or not.
 - f. The intention with MPOs is to use the 2022 version thru this sorting routine and planning to prepare 2018-2021 reports for MPOs.
4. Christy advised that FeMIS doesn't list what is in the TIP.
 - g. Phillip advised he would check with TTI to ensure projects are listed.
 - h. Phillip advised it will take additional research to do comparisons but TxDOT will take that task on.
5. Luis asked when will reports be expected.
 - i. Phillip advised within the next month. There may be some more time based on this discussion.

UPWP Considerations for Safety Task Force-Funded Action Plans

1. In Phase I Phillip advised TTI is doing a safety plan for all 23 MPOs following a TxDOT template.
 - a. He advised TxDOT has a contract with TTI to determine data in use, performance measures, planned actions and initiatives, types of engagement ongoing for safety with stakeholder agencies, and next steps planned as a safety planning profile documenting each of the 23 MPO regions.
 - b. The timeline for this work is from December CY 2022-July CY 2023.
2. Phillip advised MPOs will have to formally revise their UPWP to account for all PL-funded activities supporting the TTI work in phase I, and advised the same applies to phase 2 work using the remaining funds.

UPWP Safety Task Force Discussion

1. Confusion ensued over phase 1 and phase 2 safety funds. TxDOT advised that guidance will be provided shortly to clarify how funding can be used up to \$50k in phase 2 and to what extent funding is available for MPOs in phase 1 outside of the TTI contract.

Census Urban Area Classification

1. Phillip advised that:
 - a. New MPO will be Eagle Pass MPO. Meetings will ensue with Eagle Pass MPO to go over how to create a new MPO. This involves actions with the governor's office which may lead to a delay due to the legislative session ongoing.
 - b. The Alamo Area MPO will be adding Medina County into its MAB.
 - c. MPOs will be required to adjust to align their MAB with the census in the Fall of CY 2023.
 - d. New TMAs will have congestion management plans in the summer and fall of CY 2024.
2. David Freidenfeld advised that 2023 urban area boundaries are available on the census.gov website. He provided the following highlights:
 - a. Eagle Pass and New Braunfels are north of 50,000 in population.
 - b. Amarillo and Bryan-College Station are north of 200,000 in population.
 - c. Alamo area is now within Medina county.
 - d. Corpus Christi is now beyond 181 interchange in Gregory, and is now in the city of Robbstown.
 - e. Eagle Pass is new. Phillip's team is working to make those arrangements.
 - f. El Paso has more area within New Mexico.
 - g. Killeen Temple is now above South Ridge Road near Fort Hood. The MPO is considering expanding the MAB. These are where requirements for MAB adjustments must be made.
 - h. Longview expanded into Hallsville and is expanding into Rusk County.
 - i. Lubbock expanded to Shallowater and a small rectangle on the southeast side that is expanded.
 - j. San Angelo had some potential mapping noise, near the bottom of the boundary the city urbanized area expanded beyond the MAB just slightly.
 - k. Texarkana has two locations along SH 59 north of the MAB, and one out beyond into AR.
 - l. Tyler has receded from the Bullard area which is no longer in the urban area.
3. Jeremy Rogers advised on the smoothing process for new urban area boundaries, providing timelines for the updates and details of the process itself:
 - a. Smoothing is expanding outward beyond existing boundaries as little as possible.
 - b. Adjusted boundaries will follow roadways, railroads, water bodies and county boundaries, largely ignoring city boundaries considering the expansion of UZAs.
 - c. TPP will develop a draft set of adjusted 2022 urban areas, review with FHWA and present to MPOs to adopt as they are or suggest changes.
 - d. Have working sessions then with MPOs with requested revisions. Obtain consent. Then have FHWA approval.

Census Urban Area Classification Discussion

1. Craig Casper advised there is a 1-year requirement for MPOs to have the boundaries smoothed.
 2. Dan Kessler advised for larger urban areas some cities within that have recently gone to 200k and up may decide to form their own MPO. Large MPOs with agglomerations of these cities would hope to never lose a city or group of cities in an area to become their own MPO but its something to be aware of and to start those communications on the up and downside. NCTCOG hasn't had breakaways but it can happen.
-
1. A discussion ensued covering process for reducing urban area boundaries where needed.
 - a. David Freidenfeld advised there is a Lubbock case study where TxDOT starts with 2010 smoothed boundaries and then really needs to be convinced that that needs to be changed. It will be on a case-by-case judgment call.
 2. Martin Lucero with Lubbock MPO asked when will the MPOs have the opportunity to inform the case-by-case judgement call.
 3. Jeremy provided additional examples of when TxDOT smoothed boundaries.
 4. Craig inquired how adjacent urban areas get incorporated.

- e. Timeline is to smooth boundaries in may, taking 3 months in May-July period. This will send to MPOs August 1st. Once the suggestions are obtained, they will be sent to FHWA by November 1st. Then it will go into the Roadway Inventory by January 2024, and HPMS will be submitted to FHWA for June 2024 covering the DY 2023 submittal.
 - f. Boundaries have not only expanded, but they have also reduced to some extent which will require greater scrutiny in some cases.
 - a. David advised Robbstown will be included if it connects to the smoothed boundary- and this boundary may expand to Robbstown depending on the road in this case and considering whether the road is federal aid eligible.
 - i. Craig asked when will the functional classification be done in the CCMPO region?
 - 1. David advised functional classification is maintained on an ongoing basis. There are many roads in the metro area that haven't kept up. But FHWA's intention is not to do a statewide review. If an area wants to be reevaluated that is fine.
 - 2. Genevieve with FWHA advised FHWA wouldn't like to wait every ten years to update your functional classification. It needs to be approved prior to any new roads or extension of roads. So you should stay on that. We wont do a statewide update with this census.
 - ii. ReaDonna inquired about new plans to add highways and expanding a roadway if it's a frontage road.
 - 1. Genevieve advised to submit a functional classification request through TPP and work with the TxDOT District.
5. Dan applauds philosophy of starting with the 2010 smoothed boundary. When the method for new urbanized areas came out all metro areas are growing and statewide total urbanized area amount is 3% smaller than 2010 which makes no sense. These definitions don't make sense. FHWA by virtual of law uses them in our business. They aren't useful for transportation planning. Starting with 2010 smoothed heads in the right direction. The populations used in our formulas are based on urbanized area boundaries. By us smoothing it doesn't change total population going into formula allocations. On functional classification. I would hate to change what happened the last time. Don't undo those because urban areas are smaller. Got them from rural to urban and return to rural doesn't make sense. So avoid that.
6. Dan advised the new urbanized areas also affects the transit side. Urban vs. Rural boundaries can affect service areas. FTA sent a 10-page memo how boundary definitions can impact service areas and eligibility for service funding. Those are two hidden issues downstream.
 - a. David Freidenfeld advised for FTA transit service its looking at raw census boundaries and doesn't consider anything adjusted or smoothed. So the FTA transit service will be reduced in some cases with that 3% reduction.
7. Craig advised he wants interchanges included in their entirety. And smoothed 2010 boundaries didn't include that. If we can get those included. It would be helpful.
 - a. David agreed to look into it and advised it was a good catch.

New MPOs and TMAs Updates/PL Funding Considerations

1. Phillip advised PL distribution will be finalized in early May.

Statewide Planning Update

Carbon Reduction Program

1. Adriana Torcat advised about the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) that MPOs have the authority to allocate federal apportionments including federal and non-federal portions of the Carbon Reduction Program (Fed 80% - Non-Fed 20%).
 - a. A requirement is for projects to be listed individually in the STIP.
 - b. Smaller population regions (less than 50k) will be administered by TxDOT.
 - c. TPP is developing a carbon reduction strategy required by IJA and planning to submit by October 2023 and will hold coordination meetings with MPOs prior to submitting draft strategies. Tentative dates are listed here for February, April, and June 2023.
 - d. Project eligibility determined by federal program guidance with links provided.
 - e. Regarding added capacity projects, those strictly adding capacity aren't but components that relieve congestion or are eligible on the CRP project can be funded. Adding lanes isn't an eligible project, but if you have bicycle lanes it can.
 - f. Is transit operating assistance? No not under CRP. Construction of a BRT or a dedicated bus lane is.
 - g. An FAQ document will be shared shortly about the CRP program.
2. David Ford advised on TxDOT CRP guidance recently released including draft planning targets for the 2024 UTP:
 - a. MPOs should begin identifying projects for the STIP and UTP to include in August revisions.
 - b. TxDOT will help prioritize and program the projects for FY 2024.
 - c. It is not a requirement for MPOs to find new projects for cat 10 carbon reduction.

New MPOs and TMAs Updates Discussion

1. ReaDonna asked whether MPOs will obtain an increase in PL Funds.
 - a. Phillip advised IJA provided an increase in statewide distribution, but two new TMAs and one new MPO and adjusted population numbers may absorb some of those increases.
2. ReaDonna advised inflation is really beginning to bring major pressures on their budgets to be able to execute the function of the job.
 - a. Phillip advised TTI came up with an analysis for what would be a minimal funding level and can perhaps redo this analysis to make sure it's the most up-to-date.

Carbon Reduction Program Discussion

1. Several questions and comments were covered including:
 - a. Whether CRP funds will be programmed in category 10. Yes that is correct.
 - b. Lori Morel added a comment about MPOs having to add a comment in the remarks field to identify the funds.
 - c. Someone clarified that May 2023 is a suggestion and/or a goal. David advised that it's a goal for all to identify projects for funding. Its aggressive but enables TxDOT to start the process to identify in future STIP updates.
 - d. Can we use TDCs in lieu of local match on carbon reduction funds? Daniel advised MPO TDCs can be used in lieu of the non-federal match funds.
 - e. If the MPO doesn't have a TDC would it grant TDCs if allowed to manage it? Have a transit. Let FTA manage. Report TDCs.
 - i. Daniel advised he doesn't have information on transit in TxDOT lending management.
 - f. Would TxDOT be willing to have the oversight swap. There is a provision to have it handled in the FHWA process. That way FTA has oversight and opportunity to provide the 20% local match. There has been a provision.
 - g. ReaDonna asked if we have projects prioritized. Can we use TDCs for a match.
 - i. They can be used for all fed projects to replace the non-federal match. But they don't have a dollar value. You aren't getting money out. Have to increase federal amount if have 100\$ in a TDC only getting 80\$ because TDCs have zero dollar value.

Statewide Resilience Plan

1. Adriana indicated that this is an overarching look at resilience on statewide level for TxDOT's multimodal system for a range of hazards and disruptors:
 - a. Focusing on climate and weather hazards and disruptors, including coastal flooding, rainfall flooding, extreme heat, extreme cold, wildfire, drought, ITS resilience, and social unrest.
 - b. Plan will be completing inventory of critical assets and assessing vulnerability as well of the transportation network. Some elements evaluating are roads, rail, maritime, bridges/culverts, border crossing, airports, ITS, ped and bike, and pipelines.
 - c. As MPOs you are part of targeted stakeholders and will be hearing from our group in the coming weeks as we schedule interviews and workshops with our targeted stakeholders to get your feedback and input on how to better look at the resilience of the statewide level.
 - d. We are planning to complete the plan to end of summer 2024 and bulk of analysis or findings will be finalized in spring of 2024 to incorporate into the SLRTP scheduled for adoption in May 2024. We are working on resilience plan and are aware that some MPOs have been involved. TxDOT will reach out to get input for this plan.

Connecting Texas 2050 SLRTP

1. Adriana advised that on this development TxDOT is currently in series 1 of public meetings with teams out visiting districts across the state.
2. The top image on the website takes you to the engagement platform to see all information related to the public meetings and you will have access to the virtual room to see opportunities and provide comments in a digital environment.
3. In fall 2023 or between September and November there is series 2 where the remaining districts will be included.
4. Once the vulnerability assessment is completed TxDOT will provide all data available online through a platform.
5. Scenario planning focus groups were held in February 2023. In June there will be a scenario planning workshop on June 13, 2023. This is the date planning for, having a

- h. Phillip advised on TDCs. We have to get a training agenda item to talk about it. TDCs – some MPOs aren't taking as much advantage on TDCs as they could. It's a recommended training or agenda item for the summer.

Statewide Resilience Plan Discussion

1. Craig inquired will the resilience vulnerability assessment be facility or systems-based? Is it down to the level of a bridge at I-37 as a vulnerable bridge?
 - a. Adriana advised TxDOT will base the analysis on a roadway system and determining criticality of roadway system level and determine other elements in that are critical as part of first filter segment of highways and then provide details for specific bridges.
 - b. She advised there will be this disaggregation of data based on the criticality assessment. We will consider sea ports, and border crossings. They may not be included in initial criticality analysis done for the highway network but we recognize they are critical and similarly for bridges if additional considerations that make bridges critical or vulnerable we will include those too.
2. Craig advised at Tampa MPO, the plan homeland security does take a different approach, but they look at this road provides access to a hospital so its critical or this bridge carries fiber optic cable so its critical even if it's a local bridge and discount interstate bridge if there is redundant service in other places. Is that a piece of the method? Is it a more unified approach or will it reflect a disparity between DHS and Transportation resilience plans?
 - a. Adriana advised they are doing a statewide analysis so scaling approach in a way. Planning to look at recently completed TTI study where completed criticality assessment for entire highway network as a base and include in as an adjustment to the highway elements.

6. hybrid meeting. It will be great if possible to attend to have more engaged conversations about scenario planning.
7. The plan will be adopted in May or June 2024.

Functional Classification Requests

1. Adriana advised TxDOT is addressing pending change requests with MPOs and districts.
 - a. TxDOT is working to improve the process to submit functional classification changes. When a new road is built or existing highway is extended around alignments or reconstruction or regarding traffic or volume changes or if land use changes significantly which causes a change in traffic patterns on an existing highway.
 - b. TxDOT is adjusting the process on how MPOs and Districts submit the changes to TPP. For MPOs you must submit complete package to TxDOT district who submits the package to TPP statewide planning branch, and after ensuring its all in place TPP submits to FHWA for consideration and approval.
 - c. The change is that the MPO FC change request goes thru the district rather than come directly to Austin. This helps us ensure we handle requests in a better way and improve our efficiency. So we created an inbox where Districts will submit FC packages the MPO puts together. The district will conduct initial review, and then submit to TPP. That is the primary change.
 - d. Required documentation was described in the presentation slides.

Functional Classification Requests Discussion

1. Do you know where the checklist is located.
 - a. Its in our internal sharepoint for districts to complete and look at after you have submitted your package. It will be shared.
2. Dan Lamers advised what triggers an FC amendment- its in the STIP. FHWA wont approve a STIP project if not on the FC system. That seems a little backwards.
 - a. Lori Morel advised it has to be in the STIP before it's approved.
 - b. Genevieve advised we like to see project in STIP when looking for FC, I will not approve a project if its not in the STIP if it's a new roadway or alignment- if its not in the STIP I won't approve. We can go ahead and lift the exception at the same time we approve FC as long as FC is the only thing stopping approval in the STIP.
 - c. Dan asked we have to expect to get a TIP exception before we can get this resolved, is that right? Meaning we submit a TIP modification, then wait to get an exception to that TIP modification before the MPO can submit the FC request?
 - i. Genevieve advised if you submit your FC and TIP modification FHWA can go thru and take action. There is coordination. NCTCOG has many FC requests.
 - ii. Lori: is that back up documentation they submit with the revision with aht project in it?
 - iii. Genevieve advised its coming thru their TPP FC group.
 - iv. Lori asked can FC be back up documentation in the STIP?
 - v. Genevieve advised she doesn't know how that works with TPP.
3. Jeff Neal advised that there are a number of MPOs needing to make these changes in order to qualify for discretionary grant opportunities with idea that thy are responding to land use changes and other reasons listed in the presentation. But if you cant demonstrate readiness by being listed in the TIP STIP we do want to demonstrate the process in which these things get done, the time period, and potential risk involved. Anything to help MPOs negotiate those areas as best we can in the interest of projects with some on system that NCTCOG is trying to do on behalf of TxDOT- we are trying as best we can to maximize opportunities and we see this process as a hang up in certain situations.
 - a. Genevieve advised that as soon as you thiknk a project is needing FC and inclusion in STIP- send to FHWA and pending the STIP we can work with you on that too.

- i. Jeff clarified to provide documentation for the grant opportunities or anything else.
 - 1. Genevieve advised don't wait to put in the STIP for FC, so go ahead and put the project in the STIP- don't wait for FC to
 - 2. get the project in the STIP- Barbara Maley and Genevieve process the FC requests as a team separately.
- 4. Dan Kessler advised aren't we caught in a vicious circle? Its not clear the link between FC and the TIP/STIP. These are two separate processes as designed.
 - a. Barbara Maley advised that Dallas got a lot of comments on FC, having used the SWPE and SWRO category and dropped a lot of federal moneys into E&R and dropped much into new roadways, extended roadways, and new on new location, and new frontage roads on new locations. The frontage roads have to be classified and don't come with that class as facility they support. It will catch up on itself, but a move away from not having those as federal moneys, and then suddenly being funded weith federal money. The rule is for us to allow Federal Aid Money to be used on a facility, its got to be calssified at a certain level and above. As soon as we see federal aid money to be used, and our indication of that is the STIP, that they will be used on a facility of a certain class ification when it's a new facility on a new location, and we can tell that in the description, that is what caused the flag. So, in November revision there were quite a few brought to light in that. It will catch up in itself. But there were so many in those two iterations.
 - i. Dan responded that NCTCOG put two years of staff work to revise the FC, and never was there a criteria that it be included in the TIP/STIP.
 - 1. Genevieve advised in the FC review in 2013-2014 it was a criteria that the project had to be funded, and that it had to reasonably expected to be built. We tried to work with MPOs if it wasn't in the TIP and that came back to bite us a few times. In the FC guidance it requires the project be in the STIP for construction and so that is what we are sticking with ensuring proposed roads get built- don't want a bunch of proposed roads on the FC that aren't being built. Many proposed roads were put on the system that were never built.
 - a. Dan asked for this guidance and Geneveive agreed to send the information.

2. Genevieve further advised that we don't want to change FC of a road due to funding. There needs to be a mobility, an access reason for why the road is being built- its not JUST to get federal funding. If its for updating to get federal funding it won't be approved. It needs a deeper reason.
5. Cameron Walker asked does a facility widening from four to six lane- already an IH- does it cause any break?
 - a. Genevieve advised no. If adding frontage roads to it that weren't there before, you do.
6. Converting a frontage road from 2 way to one way is that a factor?
 - a. If they are already classified as frontage road is fine.
7. Dan Kessler wants follow-up on the point Genevieve made about simply changing the classification of a road to get it federally funded. He wants additional discussion at future TEMPO or in a side meeting. Some MPOs are getting extremely rapid growth in areas where taxpayers are paying gas taxes and deserved to have roads built.
 - a. Genevieve responded that MPOs have access and mobility needs for those roads and that they aren't just changing it because they received 2 million from federal highway. You have land use changes and people using those roads supporting that road being built. Not because of the federal dollars. Rationale can't be because I have a grant I am building this road or changing the FC.
 - b. Barbara Maley advised originally it wasn't the case that TxDOT put federal money on E&R. Would be non-issue for phases E&R. Now, TxDOT has put federal money on E&R, so federal aid request comes in earlier than in the past. That may be some of the changes you'd have seen.
8. Dan advised as challenging as it is to get roads built. When we finally get them funded, and went thru a project selection and evaluation process of need to establish that- getting them held up because of FC issue needs to be addressed. It doesn't make sense.
9. Jeff Neal added that MPOs are seeing off system roadways, bridges funded thru bridge investment program formula or discretionary grant funds. These are areas where its going to be more than the FC or even some changes listed here that might go into all of that. Districts trying hard to get locals on board with that Much of that work might also go into things MPOs can do to address performance targets

and performance measurement based planning and programming. Whatever can be done to speed this up we certainly would like to do that. Its more than just funding. If that information needs to be provided as part of the packet coming in for consideration NCTCOG will certainly do that.

10. Charles Airiohuodion asked if we add or update the FC when we conduct the urban boundary adjustment when adding a roadway that is being brought in due to growth with shifting urban areas?
 - a. Genevieve, advised FHWA won't revisit FC in 2013-2014 after the census and going forward asked everyone to work with TxDOT to make requests when there are new roads or when you see a need due to the criteria listed above. Houston did a good job working with Catherine McReight. Genevieve advised she hasn't received anything from Houston as of late.
11. Charles advised there are roads based on 2020 census that need to be upgraded. H-GAC will do the comprehensive FC updates.
 - a. Genevieve encouraged TxDOT Houston district to work with H-GAC on a regular basis.

FHWA Updates

1. Michael Leary advised Border freight job is filled by Genevieve Bales. Two new planners will be hired shortly.
2. FHWA is looking at reducing the TIP/STIP review process timeline and at data processes and quality review.
3. Kirk advised that a complete street workshops will commence in Austin at TxDOT Stassney campus on June 22nd.
4. Jack advised pre-BIL fund reconciliation- CFO office disabled pre-BIL funding caused by a discrepancy between Fiscal Management information system and Delphi which is the USDOT accounting system. The discrepancy is \$3.5 billion dating back to 2005. In the interim, FHWA allowed limited use of pre-BIL funding for IJA funding. Allowed to use it if the funds are going to lapse. For Texas that means 29.5 million will be allowed to be obligated. To do that TxDOT has to come up with a plan to let us know how those funds will be used. Two phases is 11 million in project modifications for existing projects.

FHWA Updates Discussion

1. Ashby asked for that 29.5 million which category would be used.
 - a. Jack indicated a majority will be STPMM, CMAQ, and rail safety. Focused on getting CMAQ and STPMM for projects that are active. The rest will be funded thru AC conversions on the rail safety program because it also has a lapsed component.
2. Ashby asked what is the timeline for reconciliation.
 - a. No timeline is available.
3. Genevieve Bales asked for MPOs to get their functional classification requests in as soon as possible.

TEMPO Subcommittee Updates

STIP Subcommittee Updates

- a. Lori Morel with TxDOT advised that project inconsistencies between documents remains the biggest pain point.
 - a. She advised this is overall problem in any STIP revision.
 - b. Need more QAQC on the documents prior to submittal. And on the checklist, asked MPOs to have their Districts' review as well to ensure more inconsistencies are caught.
 - c. TxDOT TPP tries to review TIP and STIP together when we go thru the review but it's a bit late in the process at that time.
 - d. She solicited for any proposed solutions to help reduce these inconsistencies.
 - e. Numbers have come down, many responded to FHWA exceptions and some have been lifted.
- b. The February 2023 schedule was posted, with earliest date for FHWA approval being April 18th, 2023.
- c. The May revision schedule has a final FHWA approval by June 13, 2023.
- d. Lori indicated the August schedule will have everyone programming to the 2024 UTP if possible.
- e. Lori advised TxDOT is hiring another person coming to join the team. For upcoming initiatives the STIP/UTP timeline for synchronization.
- f. There will be a biannual STIP workshop in June 2023 to communicate consistency needs across documents, communicate common challenges and exceptions, and reduce project changes in the last few months before letting.
- g. Lori will have team work on a STIP guidance manual approved by FHWA, districts, MPOs, Divisions, and FTA in 2024.
- h. Lori will have the team develop recorded and live training for districts, divisions, and MPOs in 2024.
- i. eSTIP business rules and email notifications will be developed.

STIP Updates Discussion

1. Christy Gotti commented about exceptions and inconsistencies- advised they were dramatic because conformity determination had not been finalized. NCTCOG submitted projects in a new TIP/STIP, but FHWA had to review those projects against the old plan. That skews the numbers a bit. She advised FC is underrepresented because FHWA has limited options to choose. So, the FC exception may be lower.
2. Christy asked about TIP development and upcoming 25-28, and whether NCTCOG can let the STIP last 3 years. Peggy found you couldn't at the time, but now that the state rule is updated, can NCTCOG ask the question again.
 - a. Lori advised it's a good question. Usually its due to fiscal constraint. And TxDOT is looking into different options, because with the STIP and the UTP, TxDOT is trying to line those up. Not sure how it would impact NCTCOG, if that is something that could work out. It is a discussion item for the STIP subcommittee.
 - b. Christy advised it would be good to last longer.
3. Casey reiterated about importance of QAQC documents, and reviewing eligibility. From November revision looking at 75% of exceptions are inconsistencies between document and eligibility as the type of exception. Three folks working on 48 of these things.
 - a. Barbara Maley advised on exceptions, for NCTCOG there is a lot of STBGP money and this is reflected in the UPWP. So, one thing we agreed to on those is to use the UPWP project description because NCTCOG includes STBG non-planning type projects in their UPWP. Rather than waiting till the scope of work is developed, which NCTCOG advised is too late, FHWA agreed to base their eligibility call on what was listed in the UPWP since they put all funds in there. Often these aren't straight forward highway projects. They pretty much never are. This may skew it a bit because eligibility call isn't on the highway projects, but in fact on non-highway projects run through the UPWP- perhaps housing, AI, parking structures- they are not typical highway projects. That is why that eligibility number may be such a large exception type.
 - b. Jose followed up advising on the issue of project consistency, its easy to fix. QAQC takes time. Its an emphasis area, certainly. But its an inconsistency between documents. And that can be fixed with QAQC.
4. Lori advised all documents should match your TIP, STIP and the MTP should be consistent all throughout.
5. Casey advised on procurement for consultant support to invest in resources for the STIP team and process for TxDOT to improve these business processes.

Bylaw Committee Discussion and Consideration of Appropriate Action on Recommendations

1. Cameron Walker advised that there were expanded purpose statement.
 - a. In number 2 added definitions under membership had new definitions.
 - b. On number 3 added some language in the dues section.
 - c. Number 4 changed the position to executive director.
 - d. On number 6 expanded the section on meetings.
 - e. On number 7, combined the adoption and amendment portions into number 8.
 - f. And finally added a new section on the TEMPO website. It takes 2/3 of the members present to approve the recommended changes. But thanks for committee and subcommittee members with assistance on these updates.

Plans, Studies, Research, Conferences, Etc.

Performance Measures

Bridge Condition (PM2)

1. Bernie Carrasco with TxDOT Bridge Division provided an update on NHS Bridge Targets.
 - a. TxDOT performed worse in the % of bridge decks in poor condition. 2 bridge deck areas were huge that had an outsized impact on targets.
 - b. The adjusted target is to account for poor condition bridges which moves from 0.8% to 1.5% poor condition to account for those bridge conditions in poor conditions.
 - c. 49.2 in good, 1.1 in poor and 49.7 in fair is the 2022 performance. This acknowledges a downward trend. TxDOT is building new bridges, but those that already have continue to deteriorate.
 - d. Texas has large bridge deck areas. A number of bridges with really large deck areas of over 10k square feet. That can increase the % in poor condition.
 - e. There is a steady trend decreasing general bridge conditions. The only thing keeping it from falling quicker is the amount of new bridges being built.

Pavement Condition (PM2)

2. Jenny Li with TxDOT Pavement Asset Management Section of the Maintenance Division provided an update on pavement performance measures and targets.
 - a. TxDOT uses good, fair, and poor ranges of IRI, cracking, faulting, and rutting as the metrics of choice.
 - b. Pavement is classified as good when three pavement measures are considered good. Poor conditions occur when two or more of the IRI, cracking, faulting or rutting measures are considered poor.
 - c. Whatever is left in between is considered fair.
 - d. In previous years, TxDOT only used IRI for non-interstate NHS, but now FHWA requires all distress measures to be used this time around for interstate and non-interstate NHS.
 - e. The 2019-2022 years showed relative stability for both measures that include IRI only on non-interstate NHS and for all measures on non-interstate NHS. The same applies to interstate roads as well.
 - f. In terms of targets, much variation from year to year, even though on pavement side a lot of work goes into seal coat and overlay maintenance. Since the network is so big we still see variations. We

Vote results

1. Unanimous support for the bylaw updates.

Performance Measures Discussion

1. Maggie Bergeron advised the MPO will be required to determine whether they will adopt the state performance targets within 180 days of when TxDOT adopts the targets. Does anyone know when TxDOT formally adopted these pavement and bridge performance targets?
 - a. Jenny advised that TxDOT submitted the target in December.
 - b. Casey advised that TxDOT formally adopted the performance targets in early March. That means MPOs will have to August 9th to adopt these targets.
2. James McLane leads GIS data solutions at NCTCOG. On the raw data, trying to understand better what the pavement and bridge data means. On the pavement data, NCTCOG obtained a 2021 data set. The last data is 2019. Is there a 2020 data set available.
 - a. Jenny advised there is no problem to provide the 2020 data. Please refer this question to TPP. We load the data into pavement management system. FHWA uses HPMS data and that data goes through iterations and is merged with other data. There could be inconsistency between TxDOT pavement management data and what gets submitted to FHWA. So, please work with Jeremy Rogers to send you 2021 HPMS data and he will be resource you can follow up with to get the 2020 data.
3. James asked Bernie what are the differences between the bridge dashboard excel work book provided to MPOs, there is bridge data set on the TxDOT open data portal, and the MBI all which gives us information on good, fair, poor conditions of bridges. Any insight on when to use those three data sets and for what purposes they might be appropriate.
 - a. Bernie advised the dashboard already has done analysis on the raw data, in classifying bridges as good, fair, poor. We classify each with deck and substructure ratings and classify as GFP. Then we classify the deck area, and so dashboard is a good tool when looking at the break up of good-fair-poor for all MPOs. The GIS portal is pure raw data. It is the NBI data published for all to see. The MBI published on FHWA website be aware that its just a snapshot in time. We just submitted 2022 data to FHWA March 10th. TxDOT submitted to FHWA for the prior year. That is bridge data as of march 10th 2023. FHWA wont publish that data until late this coming fall. So when it is published on the FHWA website it is over one year old.

use 3 to 4 year moving average in the past. Now that we have automated data from tenth-mile intervals it is much easier to determine pavement condition spatially and temporally.

- g. 2020 TxDOT adjusted targets because the automated data did not agree with visual data. So now we use 3 year moving average using laser technology and automated ways to collect.
- h. The four-year target TxDOT adjusted higher compared to what they had before. Maintaining interstates in good condition, TxDOT missed the target by 2 percentage points.
- i. In the next performance target performance period TxDOT will consider variations of the data over the past four years because if only using the average to set the target, there is a 50% chance to miss the target. The FHWA target is not inspirational- it's a target they expect all states to meet.
- j. Variations will use standard deviations 1 and 2 when setting the target. For good, TxDOT looks at one standard deviation +/- and to see if they cover the historic variations or not. Final targets were set using two standard deviations.
- k. Because it trends downward for the interstate, the target is now 63.9% in 2 years and 63.6% in four years as a steady decline in condition, while with non-IH the condition will improve from 45.5% in two years having good condition to 46% in four years having good condition.

- b. James replied that NCTCOG wants to use the exact data to replicate the measures that TxDOT came up with and to repeat the method. So, at what time did you make the statewide targets setting.
 - i. Bernie advised then to use the MBI that FHWA publishes cause that is what TxDOT is mimicking as much as possible- the snapshot published by FHWA. We do that, but we also look at it a lot more segmented- and instead of once per year, we do every half year. And what I showed is that there is a lot more volatility in there. There is a lot more movement in the data.
- 4. Karen Owens with HGAC asked Jenny to speak to the variations a bit more and how they came about?
 - a. Jenny advised that there is a data collection with equipment variations inherent to the equipment. TxDOT does good data quality checks and certification with the vendors. We have the vendors using ten vehicles to collect the entire on and off-system network.
 - b. Jenny advised they allow 6 point variations in the data +/- . That 6-point variation can cause the IRI measurement to go from good to fair or fair to poor. If that equipment measurement is in the border line, and triggers the jump across categories it adds to the variation in data we record each year. We hope it averages out in a large network, but in reality because of the boundaries FHWA sets, it is a little sensitive and is impacted by the ranges.
 - c. Also, understand the pulse processing of the data which identifies the cracking and measures the rutting is imperfect. TxDOT is still working to improve how to measure the rutting, where to start and where to end. We are still improving this process with the vendor. Also how to do post-processing it can add to the variation.
 - d. Another factor is construction. We have a four-year pavement program, and funding allocated each year, and those projects aren't fitting within one year so the programming can impact through the typical project development process the planned improvement of conditions and estimated progress. The vendor will still travel shoulders and lane diversions in work zones that may not conclude in a neat four-year period which also is recorded and impacts the reported road condition.
 - e. Metro areas have signal lights where vehicle stops and starts. If below 12mph the IRI tends to be higher due to equipment restrictions. Urban areas can cause jumps in the IRI measurements.
- 5. Jeff Neal with NCTCOG asked for language to explain the performance targets to policy boards to ensure we are on the same page and to find ways to work in explaining these methods and assumptions and what the targets really mean in terms of road and bridge conditions.
- 6. Jeff Neal asked if the need to update transportation asset management plans addressing extreme weather per IJJA, if that will affect bridge and pavement targets.
 - a. Bernie advised extreme weather risk has not been seen to affect targets on bridges. They are resilient to extreme weather. A few had issues in central Texas which is flash flood alley. Those events aren't something TxDOT can design for. For most part statewide these impacts on a few local bridges get averaged into the total network asset condition.

- b. Jenny advised from pavement perspective they check the part 667 to see how resilient pavement structure is and the data indicates very few structures are subject to extreme weather with the exception of hurricane Harvey. Most damage TxDOT has seen on pavements is where coastal highways are right next to the ocean. The plan is for district to relocate bridges because sea level is expected to rise. We did look at indented pavement structure after Harvey. An IH underwater a few hours or days. Didn't see any damages caused by the flooding. Our current pavement design method works well for TxDOT. We don't expect there will be significant change on target setting. There may be change in TAM and how life cycle planning is done. There is a research project starting September 1st looking at the mitigation and impact to vulnerability and how to incorporate in the next round of TAM.

Congestion Performance (PM3)

3. David Schrank provided a presentation on System Performance Measures Congestion Performance (PM3).
 - a. TTI pulls data on PM3 measures from RITIS / UMD CATT Lab.
 - b. Speed limit data is being updated to CATT Lab to make necessary PHED speed limits in the large metros. April 28th, CATT lab will cut it off to collect this data. And then the new 2022 NPMRDS data and stats will export at that time.
 - c. By mid-May all these numbers will show up in MPO inboxes and by mid-June with HPMS submittal, the PM3 update is required for submittal at that time.
 - d. 2022 NPMRDS data will match with HPMS data from 2020. Speeds coming out of the pandemic, and volume data going into the pandemic mixing. So that will likely create some softness and uncertainty in this data. New census urban area boundaries will be used and so the new boundaries and 2022 speeds and 2020 volumes will come out. TTI will provide spreadsheets and graphics to each MPO.
 - e. TTI helps TPP with the speed limits, and will provide historic information and trends and targets. TTI can help with questions about the PM3 and obtaining the raw data if you like and how to make use of it. TTI will be updating those.
 - f. TTI has provided estimated regional PM3 targets in addition to statewide targets, with the 2020-2022 years being the first cycle of targets and with new targets set for the 2024-2026 time periods.

What's next for MPOs?

Incorporating PMs into TIPs

1. Phillip Tindall provided a presentation on including PMs into the TIP. He covered 23 CFR 450.326 discussing in the TIP describing the affect of programmed projects on performance targets. It's a narrative discussion within the TIP. And it conveys to public and stakeholders how investments improve performance targets.
2. Discussion in the TIP should also be integrated into public outreach and engagement.
3. How this impacts letting schedules, is that the same requirement is that this narrative is included in the STIP. FHWA when reviewing the STIP will look at other QAQC issues like consistency with the MTP, but also that the STIP holds the same type of performance measures discussion.
4. How do MPOs and TxDOT go about this? We covered best practices and SETRPC provides a great example.
 - a. SETRPC provides a discussion in an appendix of their TIP conveying how investments help improve performance targets.
 - b. Phillip indicated that the appendix has a table that crosswalks how a project along with ID connects to various PM1-3 and TAM along with paragraph length descriptions on pages prior addressing how the investments connect to performance targets.

PM3 Discussion

1. Clay Barnett asked if the performance measures are available for all MPOs.
 - a. David advised those MPOs without interstates won't get all the same measures. It depends on the roadway network. Each MPO will see the numbers historically and where they are performing currently.
 - b. TTI spends more time in larger MPOs because of PHED, non-SOV, and other things that only fit the large metros but we will have all of it.
2. Clay asked if you will have specific PM3 measures for each MPO region, separate from the state target and target recommendations for each measure to go along with it?
 - a. David advised to stick with conservative figures. Traffic was non-existent on trips to the medical center because it is Friday and everyone is working from home. So, with the impacts to telecommuting it will look more like status quo until the patterns.
 - b. David advised each MPO will have their own recommended targets. So yes, each measure and each MPO.

Discussion on Incorporating PMs into TIPs

1. Maggie asked if there is a template for setting a crosswalk or integrating PMs into the TIP?
 - a. Phillip advised TxDOT doesn't have that, but could work on that for future support needs.
2. Craig asked about maintenance and safety projects that are grouped many times- should the effects of those collective projects be included in the TIP? And if so how would we do that given that we don't see them until we get the APL?
 - a. Cameron advised that the Odessa district provide MPO staff and policy board a monthly report of what is going on in the entire ten year UTP. So in 2026 I can give you what they are spending, and what is the scope of that project. Collectively \$32 million improving roads from point a to point b- that is known in monthly report to TxDOT along with PM2 and bridge and pavement- so in my case the answer is at my fingertips. I think if you

work with your district to provide this level of reporting, you can avoid having to wait on the APL.

TxDOT Database of Non-Motorized Traffic Counts

1. Robert Benz presented on the bicyclist and pedestrian count data in Texas.
 - a. This data is used for planning and demand estimation, along with tools to estimate and project demand. The raw data informs the models in this aspect.
 - b. Travel patterns indicate where people are coming from and going to. The counts help with that too.
 - c. Robert provided various use case examples.
 - d. Recommended putting a bike counter into larger projects with bicycle and pedestrian components.
 - e. He advised on the type of counters and technology and advantages/disadvantages and costs.
 - f.
2. Robert advised of the Texas bicycle and pedestrian count exchange. <https://mobility.tamu.edu/bikepeddata>
 - a. The darker the region the more counts available can see different count locations view graphs on time of day and day of week.
 - b. There are various report functions associated along with visualizations as outputs of the data exchange.
 - c. There are various pre-calculated metrics: aadt, madt, awkdt, awddt, adowdt.
 - d. There is an ArcGIS online being created.

What's Next for MPOs ctd.

MPOs Adopting Targets and Impacts of Potentially Missing Targets

1. Jose Campos with FHWA advised the following with regards to target adoption by MPOs and impacts of missing targets:
 - a. New PM2 and PM3 targets were provided on February 10th to all MPOs and that February 10th date starts the 180 day timeframe. That date is August 9th, 2023 for the FY22-FY26 performance period.
 - b. MPOs can establish their own targets or adopt State DOT targets.
 - c. PM1 safety targets for 2023 were previously made available by Phillip Tindall had a due date of February 27th.
 - i. Unlike PM2 and PM3 targets, the PM1 targets are updated annually and should be addressed February 27th of each year.
 - d. Once MPOs adopt second performance period targets, we expect those get reflected in the MPO MTP and TIP at next opportunity- so when you are updating the TIP or MTP or when you amend them.
 - e. At the MPO level PM 1,2,and3 targets don't have federal consequence of missing the targets.
 - f. On state targets PHED for PM 3 and non-SOV and emissions measures don't have significant progress determinations made on those either for MPOs.

Discussions for TxDOT Database on Non-Motorized Traffic Counts

1. Craig Casper asked if any thought was given for GB8 on land use context that the road has.
 - a. Robert advised we have researched this bike and ped data for relations to land use. No real definable patterns were determined. Higher usage is around low-moderate income. LMI information see higher use in those locations. But specific land use patterns there is no clear pattern yet. With greater data perhaps.
2. Craig asked if larger data providers have data to distinguish bike and ped in their data set?
 - a. Robert advised yes, and these are based on speed. TTI has begun looking them. Strava tend to be high income primary athletics. Wejo, Streetlight are currently being evaluated along with a host of other service providers and they all have their own use and quality issues.

Discussion for MPO Adopting Targets and Impacts for Missing

1. Maggie Bergeron asked if the MPO is not bringing a formal amendment to the TIP but if its just an administrative update to the STIP do performance measures it need to be included in the update?
 - a. Jose advised that yes it would need to be included since an update to the STIP reflects updates from the MPOs TIP.
2. Matt Miller asked whether missing a state target impact TIPs at the MPO level as a natural consequence.
 - a. Jose advised he would need to look into that question. If significant progress determination was made and targets were missed, how would that impact MPO TIPs. That is the question?
 - b. Matt advised yes.
 - c. Jose advised in regards to Transit related targets- TAM, Transit Asset management plans, and PTASP- with regards to FHWA these are updated annually. But the significant progress determinations will need to coordinate with FTA on those.

- g. Whether missing a target.

Legislative Session Impact Items Report

1. Terry Martinez with TxDOT Legislative Affairs Office advised on current legislative session impacts on transportation.
 - a. TxDOT will receive a total budget of \$35.56 billion- 39% of which goes to maintenance, 29% to project delivery, and 18% to project development.
 - b. Bills of interest focus on extending prop 7 deposits for ten years (SCR2), and repealing sunset dates for prop 1 (SB225) or extending another 8 years (HC 2230).
 - c. Other bills being tracked delve into (HB1259) UTP reports, feasibility studies for P3s and CDAs, (HB3805) including border security and international trade corridor projects in UTP, and (HB3270 and SB 1129) establish cat 12 allocation requirements for border transportation master plan.
 - d. Other bills being tracked include HB 2745 and SB 2338 sets the membership of HGAC
 - e. HB 4846 requires MPOs to consider the transportation needs of individuals who receive services from the health and human Services Commission or the Texas Workforce Commission in developing the 10-year transportation plans, and submit evidence the MPO considered the needs of those individuals.
 - f. HB 5156 requires MPOs to develop and implement a policy for fair decision making in the organization's planning process.
 - g. Legislative Affairs office develops annual updates for resources on funding brochures with a section on MPOs.

Electrification NEVI Plan Updates and Next Steps for Coordination

1. Michael Chamberlain advised the following points on the current status of the NEVI Plan and next steps:
 - a. NEVI is a federally funded program over next five years, and Texas received 407 million for EV charging
 - b. Broken up into two phases
 - i. Alternative fuel corridors (interstates)
 - ii. Alternative fuel corridors (off-interstate) and inside MPOs and inside your areas
 - c. It will be split 50/50 between urban and rural so that \$407 million plus 20% (about \$80 million more) from the private sector.
 - d. The timeline is 6-18 months to finish the phase 1 alternative fuel corridors.
 - e. Anything the MPOs plan to do with alternative corridor fuel plan funds is on hold until this initial deployment phase 1.
 - f. Michael advised within a year of building out the alternative fuel corridor phase 1, TxDOT will begin coordinating directly with MPOs on plans, programs, and investment selection processes as it relates to the funding available in phase 2.
 - g. This is a new process and much coordination is required between FHWA and TxDOT to ensure it rolls out smoothly.
 - h. Important notes: February 15th final rules for EV charging were released. Go out and find those in the federal register- read them and get acclimated with regulations which will impact MPOs in phase 2.

Legislative Session Discussion

1. Matt Miller asked what are the likelihood of these bills passing?
 - a. Terry advised that a watchlist at Texas Legislature Online.
 - b. Its likely that HB 2745 on H-GAC and HB 2338 by Senator Middleton are most likely to move ahead and pay attention to these.
2. Craig asked about bills related to electric or alternative fuel vehicles. We want to get assumptions for next LRTP. If we do get to 50% by 2035 what does that do to funding?
 - a. Terry advised they track those bills, and she has staff in office working on those bills. For electrification she is unsure what those bill numbers are but they can be found on TLO.

Electrification NEVI Plan Discussion

1. Cameron Walker asked if there will be any requirement that someone who constructs a fossil fuel truck stop also be required to have EV charging stations, sharing the wealth?
 - a. Michael advised that there is no federal requirement for that, though there is interest among the private sector to do just that and leverage existing station real estate to expand into this market.
2. Kirk Fauver advised of informational webinars on charging and fuel infrastructure grants that have passed, and likely have recordings attached.
3. Cameron advised sale taxes for EVs and registration will ultimately come to MPOs for additional funding on investments tied to EV.

- i. Released March 15th was the charging and fueling infrastructure discretionary grant program available to MPOs now. Different from formula funds, its competitive for all fuels for states, counties, cities, MPOs and will accept applications until May 30th this year.
- j. All pass through final rules in the NEVI apply to the charging and fueling infrastructure program.
 - i. That means Level 2 charging, the data reporting, the power chassis, the number of units are all in the rules and all will apply.
- k. On the Texas EV plan website there is a new dashboard showing you the status of phase 1 and a story map taking you from day 1 to where we are.

FHWA and TxDOT TPP 2023 Training Topics Discussion

1. Phillip Tindall advised the following on training topics:
 - a. In May TxDOT is having air quality conformity training with assistance and support and presentation with FHWA.
 - b. In June we are working with Genevieve for congestion management process training
 - c. Lori is working to organize STIP training in June with district representatives involved to cover quality control issues over the past few days.
 - d. The summer meeting TEMPO uses that as training and opportunity so one thing TxDOT is working on is an upgraded MPO 101 presentation. It could be recorded and made available for Policy Board and other people.
 - e. We are working on PMDIS training
 - f. The plan is to open this up for other suggestions on training opportunities.
 - g. Please send Matt any ideas for training you would like to see moving forward.

Summer Meeting Discussion and Location Selection

1. David Jones advised there has been discussion from El Paso who are interested in hosting a quarterly meeting. There is interest in DFW area as well. Is there any other discussion about whether to move the meeting around?
2. Maggie advised that if we move it around in the summer that would be fine, while retaining Austin as the primary destination for all other quarterly meetings.
3. David advised that if we continue to meet at a TxDOT facility it makes it as if TEMPO is a TxDOT group which it is not. So it is his feeling that its good to move this around to other non-TxDOT facilities.
4. Clay Barnett advised its easy to get anywhere in the state by Southwest Airlines so he is fine with moving this around.
5. The group agreed to have it in El Paso if there is space that aligns with the June or July timeframe.

6. Phillip advised he will talk to Lori on a more specific date as far as training on STIP and tacking this onto the summer meeting.
7. Matt advised the survey preference is the 3rd Thursday extending into Friday.
8. El Paso has a policy board meeting on the 3rd Thursday in June which is bad timing in that case.
9. Carol advised that TTI is going to move its offices in June from Arlington to Fort Worth. The location they selected has a large meeting room and so there is space there as well.