

TPO Technical Committee Minutes
October 9, 2012
9:00 a.m.
Small Assembly Room
City/County Building
Knoxville, Tennessee

The Knoxville Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Technical Committee met on October 9, 2012 at 9 a.m. in the Small Assembly Room of the City/County Building in Knoxville. Vice-Chair Leslie Johnson presided and called the meeting to order. It was determined that there was a quorum.

*Kathryn Baldwin	City of Oak Ridge
*Rich DesGroseilliers	LAMTPO
*Brian Boone	City of Maryville
*Don Brown	ETDD, for <i>Terry Bobrowski</i>
*John Hunter	City of Knoxville, for <i>Jim Hagerman</i>
*Mark Donaldson	Knoxville-Knox County MPC
*Leslie Johnson	Lenoir City
*John Lamb	Blount County
*Angie Midgett	Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT)
*Barbara Monty	Knox County Community Action Committee (CAC)
*Ted Newsom	Knoxville Commuter Pool
*Mike Patterson	ETHRA, for <i>Gary Holiway</i>
*Cindy Pionke	Knox County, for <i>Dwight Van de Vate</i>
*Melissa Roberson	Knoxville Area Transit (KAT)
*Darryl Smith	Town of Farragut
*Blake Sartin	Knoxville Airport Authority
Becky Bottoms	Cannon and Cannon
Karen Estes	Knox County CAC Transit
Monika Miller	BAC
Anne Wallace	City of Knoxville
Jeff Welch	Director, Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)
Nathan Benditz	Transportation Planning Organization Staff
Bryan Berry	Metropolitan Planning Commission Staff
Amy Brooks	Transportation Planning Organization Staff
Doug Burton	Transportation Planning Organization Staff
Dori Caron	Transportation Planning Organization Staff
Mike Conger	Transportation Planning Organization Staff
Terry Gilhula	Metropolitan Planning Commission Staff
Alan Huff	Transportation Planning Organization Staff
Kelley Segars	Transportation Planning Organization Staff
Ellen Zavisca	Transportation Planning Organization Staff
*voting members	

1. Approval of August 14, 2012 Minutes

Item Summary: Approval of August 14, 2012 TPO Technical Committee Minutes.

Attachment #1 – August 14, 2012 Minutes

Action: A Motion was made by Cindy Pionke (Knox County) and seconded by Kathryn Baldwin (City of Oak Ridge) to approve the August 14, 2012 Minutes. The Motion carried unanimously.

2. Regional Mobility Plan Updates

Item Summary: Staff has been busy with many items pertaining to the Mobility Plan update, some of this work is reflected below.

- a. Project List – The call for projects ended on September 20th. Most project applications were received by then and all were received by October 2nd. We have reviewed and scored all roadway projects and will provide those before the meeting. Staff is still reviewing the applications for bike, pedestrian, greenway, and transit projects and is working with applicants. Staff will send that list out shortly. Please review and comment by October 26th. **Handout – List of Roadway Projects Received** – This will be available at the meeting and added to the website and emailed out as soon as ready (prior to the meeting). *All Items are Draft.*

Handout A: Detailed Revenue Estimates for FY 2013

Handout B: Overview of Projected Revenues and Roadway Projects Costs, by Horizon Year

Handout C: Instances of Cost Estimates (TDOT Method) That Are Greatly Higher Than 2009 RMP Cost

Handout D: Projects That TDOT Identified to Likely Keep in 2013 Plan That Either Have No Application or an Unresolved Sponsor Issue

Handout E: Anderson County Roadway Projects

Handout F: Blount County Roadway Projects

Handout G: Knox County Roadway Projects

Handout H: Loudon County Roadway Projects

Handout I: Dropped or Completed Roadway Projects (from 2009 Plan)

Handout J: Existing or Committed Roadway Projects

Handout K: List of Roadway Projects Outside of TPO Area (Not Fiscally Restrained)

- b. Documents Available Online – TPO staff has been working on putting content on the TPO website as a part of the Mobility Plan collection of products. Staff will post a draft of Chapter 1 within the next week. Other products on the website include terms; acronyms; timeline; outreach schedule; vision, principles, and strategies; and the project application. Many more products will be posted in the weeks and months to come. Any ideas on products to clarify the process are welcome.
- c. Public Survey – TPO staff has put together a public survey, similar to the one conducted during the last Mobility Plan update. The survey collects public priorities for transportation in the region and allows prioritization based on cost. This survey will be sent out within the next week.

Discussion: Alan Huff (TPO) thanked everyone for applications that have been submitted. He noted that only a few of the submitted applications were for bike, pedestrian, and greenway projects and stated that in an effort to encourage additional applications in these areas, staff was waving the application to encourage Technical Committee members to submit more projects. Mr. Huff proceeded to discuss the above-listed Handouts with the Technical Committee.

Referencing Handout A, he noted that these figures were staff's best estimate of FY 2013 revenues, based on the new funding categories expected from MAP-21. He further noted these figures are projected based on past figures and the apportionments to the state identified in MAP-21. In Handout B, the estimated revenue dollar amount from the *Major Funding Categories, \$129,000,000, in Handout A* has been inflated 1% annually for 5 years and 3% annually after that, as was approved at a previous meeting. These adjusted figures have also been clustered into Horizon years, which match those used for air quality conformity, to project what funds may be available during each time period. Then noting the next column containing estimated costs, Mr. Huff stated these numbers reflect the costs of all of the roadway projects for which staff have received applications. These estimated costs figures have also been inflated up to their Horizon year costs, at 1.25% for the first 5 years and 3.60%, again based on previously approved figures. The third column in Handout B is the amount where those costs are under or over projected revenues.

Mr. Huff then referenced several comments received by staff from jurisdictions who when filling out the applications, noted concerns about the TDOT methodology used to project costs. It was noted that those numbers were significantly higher than expected based on numbers in the old Plan. He stated that some jurisdictions have used different methodologies to estimate costs. Mr. Huff pointed to Handout C which lists projects where the cost estimates were based on TDOT methodology and whose numbers were drastically higher than in the 2009 Plan. John Lamb (Blount County) expressed concern that use of inflated figures, as well as use of differing methodologies, may result in future misallocations. Cindy Pionke (Knox County) stated that after working with County Capital Projects staff and using their methods to calculate costs, she came up with cost figures approximately one-half of those from TDOT.

Concern was noted that the projections in Handout C reflected a one billion dollar surplus in the 2034 horizon year. Mr. Huff clarified that these numbers are estimates and staff have tried to translate them into local dollars based on past years, and that we need to see exact dollar amounts as they are released. The actual numbers may be quite different. He also noted that these estimates do not include any alternate modes (bike, pedestrian, greenway, transit, etc). It was further clarified that these cost estimates do not reflect projects that were dropped from the previous Plan, and it may be that some of these projects can be added back.

It was discussed that ideally, jurisdictions should be using the same methods to calculate costs. It was also requested that TDOT provide information on how the cost figures were calculated. Angie Midgett (TDOT) noted she would ensure that more detailed information would be provided. Ms. Midgett stated she had not received similar feedback from other MPO's. Jeff Welch (TPO) recommended jurisdictions use methods that they are comfortable with and feel accurately calculate estimated costs. Ms. Midgett also encouraged everyone to use methods that they feel are more accurate. She further noted Ronnie Porter (TDOT) would be able to tell everyone when actual revenue numbers would be released.

Mr. Huff then moved onto the next Handout (D) which reflects projects TPO staff have identified as ones that they assume should stay in the 2013 Plan but either they do not have an application on file or there is unresolved conflict with identification of the sponsoring entity. Mr. Huff noted staff wanted to bring these to the attention to the Committee. Concern was also noted that there is still confusion as to who should be completing application paperwork on many of the projects identified on Handout D. Staff has been in contact with Rick Pack at TDOT for clarification which is noted in the far right column.

Angie Midgett (TDOT) noted that projects listed here as “Not funded or Scheduled” may simply not be in their scope of projects for the next 3 or so years and recommended jurisdictions use local funds if available for those projects they feel need to be completed sooner.

She further noted that these projects may be funded in the future. It was further clarified that the current TDOT funding was for short term projects. It was also noted that some of these projects came from corridor studies. Ms. Midgett stated that although they may not be of particular current interest to TDOT, it was fine to include them in the Long Range Mobility Plan. Ms. Midgett stated she would take the Project Lists back to TDOT and ask that additional information/clarification be provided back to the Technical Committee and its member jurisdictions.

Mr. Huff, noting Handouts E-H, which list projects by county, asked that they be reviewed individually as appropriate and asked for feedback and/or corrections. He further requested staff be notified if there are any projects currently identified for completion in the 2015-2029 horizon years that will be completed by the end of calendar year 2015 as they will update the Horizon Year for them to 2015. This is reflective of the air quality conformity need for a 2015 horizon year.

Referencing Handout I, Mr. Huff again requested that each jurisdiction review this list of Dropped or Completed Projects and notify staff of any corrections. Regarding Handout J, staff clarified that they were still working to finalize the E + C list for the Plan Update. Lastly, he briefly noted Handout K, a list of Roadway Projects that are outside the TPO area and are not fiscally constrained.

Mr. Huff noted that staff were continuing to add documents to the website and will soon be releasing an online public survey.

3. Federal Legislation Update

Item Summary: Congress passed a new 2-year transportation bill called Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). Staff will provide an updated overview of the new legislation. Complete information is available at www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21

Attachment #2a – MAP-21 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)

Attachment #2b – MAP-21 Surface Transportation Program (STP)

Attachment #2c – MAP-21 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

Attachment #2d – MAP-21 National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)

Discussion: Jeff Welch (TPO) referenced the 4 Attachments under this Agenda Item which identify major funding programs for highway and other transportation improvements under MAP-21. Under MAP-21 the state of Tennessee will receive approximately \$818 million for FY 2013 and about \$845 million in FY 2014 for the highway side of transportation. Overall, he noted MAP-21 is leaning towards performance based measurement of programs and projects, and these would be developed by the states working with the MPOs and the secretary of USDOT. The performance measures should be developed over the next 18 months. Mr. Welch briefly reviewed 4 major programs under MAP-21. Mr. Welch discussed the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ); Tennessee will receive about \$35 million statewide.

He then discussed the Surface Transportation Program (STP). Tennessee’s share is approximately 225 million dollars. The eligible list of activities under STP remains basically the same.

Next Mr. Welch discussed the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). He noted approximately \$53 million dollars will come to Tennessee for this program. HSIP is centered on the states’ ability to create, implement, and support a strategic highway safety program. This program looks at high risk roads and will also be emphasizing safety with regards to older drivers.

Lastly, Mr. Welch discussed the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP). This program will provide support to the National Highway System. Previously, the NHS consisted of primarily interstates and a few critical links throughout the country.

4. Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary

Item Summary: The Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) Boundary must be updated based on the newly designated 2010 Census Urbanized Area prior to the adoption of the Mobility Plan update. The TPO staff will review the process to update the MPA boundary and present a few preliminary options for discussion.

Discussion: Mike Conger (TPO) began the discussion noting that we are under a shorter timeline than a lot of other areas in the country. He stated that regulations mandate that the MPA is updated within 4 years or by the first Long Range Mobility Plan Update scheduled after October 1st of this year. Mr. Conger noted we fall under the latter category and need to have our planning area updated, as well as the bylaws reflecting new membership prior to the time of the adoption of the Long Range Mobility Plan Update. He noted that minimally, we need to include what the 2010 census defines as the Urbanized Areas. Next, Mr. Conger stated, was the process of adjusting or “smoothing” of those boundaries. The census defined lines are based on census block geography and can be very jagged. The adjusting is done by the state with cooperation from the local areas which are then submitted to the Federal Highway Administration for their approval. Mr. Conger discussed the criteria for adjusting the boundaries. The area must encompass the entire urbanized area (UZA) or urban cluster (UC). It must be one, single contiguous area, it must include areas outside of the boundaries with urban characteristics, and further can include all large traffic generators that are within a reasonable distance from UZA, which may not have an actual residential population. Mr. Conger stated that staff will also look at the functional classification of a roadway and when it goes in and out of an urban area as it may make sense to smooth out the boundary to include it as one continuous roadway link.

He stated that after the smoothed boundary is delineated the next step is to determine the MPA boundary. He noted that staff is mandated to look at contiguous areas that are likely to become urbanized in the next 20 years. He further stated these adjustments do not include additional funding dollars for planning. He stated that in setting the MPA boundary, we also set the MPO area of responsibility for planning, programming, and overall governance

Staff has developed 2 MPA boundary options for review and discussion. Option 1 would include the balance of Knox County, maintaining historic consistency. Additionally in Option 1, if any area’s city limits was touched at some point, staff has included the entire city limits of that area, for example, including all of the cities of Oak Ridge, Loudon, Friendsville, and Louisville. Discussion had touched on including the Walland area and the City of Townsend. These areas are the gateways to the Smoky Mountains and generate significant tourist traffic so it would make sense to include them.

MPA Option 2 looks at filling in larger areas to complete geographic gaps. This would include the Greenback area between Blount County and the Tellico Village area. Mr. Conger further noted this Option would include adding the urban clusters of Norris and Strawberry Plains, as well as expanding further into Sevier County. Mr. Conger also noted the final MPA boundary could be a hybrid of these Options as they are not yet finalized.

As noted above, the smoothing criteria state that staff also needs to look at areas likely to become urbanized in the next 20 years. Mr. Conger stated that for the Long Range Plan Update and Travel Demand Forecasting Model, staff developed a new Land Allocation Model which forecasts population out to 2040.

He noted he evaluated population at Horizon year 2034, roughly 20 years from now, and used that to identify areas that meet the definition of “urbanized” or 500 people per square mile. Option 1 covers most of these areas and Option 2, all of them.

Mr. Conger stated the next steps in this process are to finalize the adjusted UZA and MPA boundaries. These go before TDOT and FHWA for their Review. He then noted that the TPO Bylaws need to be updated/amended to reflect the changes and that this needs to be done over the next several months with adoption of the amended Bylaws formally adding new members ideally by February 2013. Lastly, there will be adoption of the new Regional Long Range Mobility Plan in April of 2013. Mr. Conger noted that inclusion of the new jurisdictions would not add additional voting members with the exception of the city of Sevierville, though their current preference is that they not be included in the TPO planning area. He also noted that Sevier County is represented on The Technical Committee and Executive Board. Committee members were asked for feedback over the next 30 days. Jeff Welch (TPO) stated that this would be an Action Item on the November 2012 Technical Committee Meeting Agenda.

5. Bicycle Advisory Committee and Bicycle Program Update

Item Summary: The TPO Bicycle Advisory Committee was formed in 2001 to advise the Technical Committee and Executive Board on bicycles issues. Monika Miller, BAC Chair, will give an update on what the BAC has been working on recently and next steps, including a draft Bicycle Program Work Program. One success story of the Bicycle Program has been the presentation to driver’s education classes and TPO staff will update the Technical Committee on this program.

Attachment #3 – Draft Bicycle Program Work Program

Discussion: This Agenda Item was moved to the November 2012 Technical Committee Meeting.

6. Freight and Safety

Item Summary: TPO Staff hosted a meeting to engage the freight community on Friday, September 14th. At that meeting existing and future freight conditions were presented and how these conditions will impact the update to the Mobility Plan.

Attachment #4 – Freight Survey

Discussion: Nathan Benditz (TPO) noted there was limited attendance at the last Freight Advisory Committee Meeting in September. Mr. Benditz noted staff was working to engage the freight community prior to the final Update to the Long Range Mobility Plan. Staff sent out a survey to the Freight Advisory Committee members. Rich DesGroseilliers (LAMTPO) also sent them out to his TPO members. Mr. Benditz stated they have received approximately 30-35 completed surveys and they are in the process of compiling the data from them. He is planning another FAC meeting for late October- early November to discuss the results and ask for further feedback. It was identified that statewide, drivers do not feel there are a sufficient number of truck stops to handle the amount of trucks that need to pull off the road to meet federal regulations for maximum drive time/required rest. Mr. Benditz noted that Tennessee will be getting twice the amount of funding for safety under MAP-21, upwards of 52 million dollars. He noted that the TPO will be participating in more “Spot Safety” programs which are effective and done quarterly.

7. Annual Obligations of FHWA funds for FY 2012

Presenter: TPO Staff

Item Summary: TDOT has provided to the TPO a list of obligated highway projects for fiscal year 2012 (October 1, 2011, to Sept. 30, 2012). Approximately \$31,867,669 was obligated in our TPO area. This does not include transit obligations.

Attachment #5 - List of Obligated Projects for Fiscal Year 2012.

Discussion: Jeff Welch (TPO) briefly discussed the projects identified by the TPO and FHWA for the Knoxville MPO for FY 2012.

8. Other Business

TDOT Update - Commissioner Schroer's Bus Tour for Region 1 will take place October 15th through the 18th. TPO is hosting a kickoff breakfast on Tuesday, October 16th at 8:30 at Outdoor Knoxville. Invitations have gone out to regional interested parties and elected officials.

PlanET Update – **Attachment #6** Jeff Welch (TPO) noted that staff has engaged over 4000 community members to date through face to face meetings in individual, small and large group formats.

PlanET Working Groups: Next meeting is from 9 a.m. to noon on October 23rd at the East Tennessee History Center. Participants at this meeting will play a Chip Game and in representing the 5 focus areas, identify how we want to accommodate the additional 300,000 people that our area is projected to grow over the next 20 years. He noted staff will take the information from this activity to develop trend scenarios for the 4 overall themes the games will target.

Requests for Qualifications have been sent out for 3 Regional Greenway Studies to take place over the next 3 years. RFQ notices have been posted on the TPO website and advertised in 7 regional newspapers. An updated list of consultants were emailed directly.

Executive Board Meeting Wednesday, October 24, at 9 a.m. in the Small Assembly Room of the City County Building

Technical Committee Meeting Tuesday, November 13, at 9 a.m. in the Small Assembly Room of the City County Building

Mr. Welch referenced a handout from Teresa Estes at TDOT which states that the Department has enacted a new policy where it will no longer provide assistance to local agencies in the development of projects located in federally eligible non-state highways.

Mike Conger (TPO) highlighted an invitation sent out for a workshop to be held on October 31, 2012 at the Cansler YMCA in Knoxville. The workshop will focus on how to use the recently completed Regional ITS architecture. FHWA is bringing in instructors. It starts at 8:30 a.m. and ends at 4:30 p.m. He noted it would be very hands on event.

9. Public comment

Members of the public may address the Technical Committee with a five-minute time limitation for each person.

10. Adjournment There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned.