

**Montgomery MPO - Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Working Meeting
Minutes**

May 5, 2010 – 10:00 am – Montgomery Intermodal Transportation Facility

TCC Members

Mr. Robert Smith (MPO Staff)
Mr. Richie Beyer (Elmore County)
Mr. Kleob Loflin (City of Wetumpka)
Mr. David Bollie (ALDOT)
Mr. Jerry Peters (City of Millbrook)
Mr. Patrick Dunson (City of Montgomery)
Mr. Tommy Tyson (City of Montgomery)
Mr. Joel Duke (City of Prattville)
Mr. George Speake (Montgomery County)
Mr. Kelvin Miller (MATS)
Mr. Stuart Peters (Town of Coosada)
Mr. James Kelley (Montgomery County)
Mr. John McCarthy (City of Montgomery)

Guests

Mr. Kevin Boone (Elmore County)
Mrs. Holly Oleson (City of Montgomery)
Mr. Stan Cauthen (Johnson & Associates)
Mr. Rod Wilburn (JR Wilburn & Associates)
Mrs. Jennifer King (Jacobs)

MPO Staff

Mr. James Askew
Mrs. April Delchamps
Mr. Kindell Anderson
Mrs. Lisa Walters

At the specially called meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) on May 5, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. at the City of Montgomery Intermodal Transfer Facility in the conference room, 495 Molton Street, Montgomery, AL 36104, the aforementioned members were present. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Robert Smith. Mr. Smith announced that a quorum was present. The meeting attendees introduced themselves and Mr. Smith formally introduced Mrs. Lisa Walters, the newest MPO Staff member.

Mr. Smith moved to Agenda Item 2: 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan Status Update. Mr. Rod Wilburn commented on Mrs. Jennifer King's recently completed work on the Long Range Transportation Plan for Gadsden, AL and is currently wrapping up the Long Range Transportation Plan for Dothan, AL. She is replacing Mr. Richard Fangman as project manager for the 2035 LRTP project with Jacobs. Mr. Wilburn detailed the current status of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan. The modeling

work is currently complete for 2005, so the comparison of 2035 analysis work against the 2030 projects from the previous Long Range Transportation Plan, against the TIP, and against the existing plus committed is being completed. Today a lot of information is going to be disseminated to the TCC members because the expertise of the TCC is needed. First, the results of the modeling analysis need to be trusted. Since the TCC members deal with the transportation issues and problems daily, we believe you will better understand the possible solutions to individual transportation problems based on the modeling analysis. The TCC members have a special understanding of the volume and complexity of the data. The TCC members are key to reviewing the methodology of choosing projects for the financially constrained LRTP. The understanding and knowledge of the TCC is also key to ensuring the MPO members are comfortable adopting a financially constrained LRTP.

A methodology has been determined to try to move from a needs plan to a financially constrained plan. The process will be tough due to the lack of funds. Different projects are eligible for different funding categories. The ALDOT with FHWA guidance has given the MPO budgets funding forecasts to work against by funding category. There is some flexibility in defining a project and what that project actually ends up being that allows access to more than one funding category. That issue may need to be discussed and guidance from the state may need to be sought. Last LRTP a methodology to determine a financially constrained plan was a lump sum amount. The idea was that the ALDOT when they moved into project development would work with local MPO and jurisdiction to refine and determine exactly which funding category was available and adaptable and had funding. For that reason the ALDOT allowed us to do lump sums of money. For example last time, we simply said we think we will get X millions for capacity, Y millions for operations projects, and in many cases capacity projects can become operations projects like intersection improvement type projects. It is foreseen that the MPO will have to sit down with the ALDOT and explain how we are defining certain projects and explain why we believe the project is eligible for a certain funding category. In today's work session, we will not be discussing any transit suggestions in regards to solutions. We are planning on incorporating transit solutions at the corridor level. It could include possibly expanding transit routes to possible express routes. Transit is being explored for some of the longer trips from Prattville, Wetumpka, and others to the main employment centers in Montgomery County. We will be looking at transit solutions as well as road improvements to see how each affects how severe the need is. This will aid us in moving towards a financially constrained plan. Last time, a detailed array of factors was used to determine project status. It was useful in determining a rough order of which projects warranted the funding first. The TCC participated in that process last time. This time when we start talking about projects, we need to again consider various factors from community impact to feasibility. The monetary gap is going to force us to carefully consider the projects selected. This LRTP we need to figure out how to determine which 2030 LRTP projects we hold on to, how to consider new projects, how to deal with bicycle/pedestrian issues, and how to consider transit solutions.

Mr. Smith gave the TCC the remaining timeline for the 2035 LRTP. To remain in compliance, the 2035 LRTP needs to be adopted by mid to late June 2010.

Mr. Wilburn moved to Agenda Item 3: Discussion of Funding Constraints. Mr. Wilburn handed out two tables detailing the capacity and O&M budget by funding category annually and over the 25 year LRTP period. Table 1 is federal only and the second table is federal and local share. Mr. Smith explained that the ALDOT and FHWA will not allow the probable affects of the 2010 U.S to be calculated into the funding forecast, knowing fully that we estimate being 200,000 + in population. At this point, it is not clear whether the 2035 LRTP will need to be amended to include the additional funding that results when Montgomery reaches or tops the 200,000 mark. Mr. Jerry Peters explained his belief that the ALDOT distributes funds based on the population for MPOs under the 200,000 mark. Mr. Smith said that ALDOT does apportion funds to areas under 200,000 in population based on population. He said that prior to 2003, when the last census came out, the Montgomery MPO was receiving the allocation that ALDOT gave us plus an amount we were entitled to for being 200,000 and above. He further said that MPO Staff is anticipating again receiving those funds around 2011 to 2012 because of the Montgomery Urbanized Area reaching 200,000 + once again. The amount would go from 4.2 to 8.4 million that we would have to program. The answer to the ALDOT funding formula for MPOs under 200,000 will be researched and the answer decimated to the TCC members. Mr. Kleob Loflin asked how the funding tables detailing the capacity and O&M budget by funding category was derived. Mr. Wilburn explained that it is based on a procedure that ALDOT and FHWA agreed on and it is essentially an analysis of historical annual averages of funding authorizations/obligations. The understanding I have of the process is that ALDOT and FHWA were not completely satisfied with how it is working and the difficulty in working with the process. It is based on average authorization. Mr. Jerry Peters asked about the tables and whether the table included 100% State money. Mrs. Jennifer King explained that the table is 80/20 except safety which is 90/10. Mr. Wilburn explained that the projects completed with 100% state funding were not considered for the trend analysis. Mr. Jerry Peters gave the example of the work completed on HWY 14 in Millbrook a couple of years previous. The four-laning of HWY 14 was completed with 100% state money even though it was part of the MPO plan. Projects like this do affect the 2035 financially constrained plan. If any projects are projected to be funded 100% by the state, then the information needs to be calculated for the financially constrained project list. The project funding categories needs to be analyzed and we need the State sign-off that we will not lose any of our category funding. We need to develop the project descriptions and ensure the projects are eligible for the designated category. Mr. Wilburn suggested that the MPO take a conservative approach to whether additional funding sources will be available, whether local, state, or federal.

Mr. Kleob Loflin expressed worry over issues with the congressional special project funds listed in the funding forecast table. The 12 million is basically the outer loop road. The outer loop road is going to be about 500 million dollars total. The question becomes where is the rest of the money going to come from? We need to be direct in a refusal to spend other funding categories on that project. Mr. Smith stated that the proposed

Montgomery Outer Loop has a designation of National Highway System and said that funds from that particular program can be spent on the Outer Loop if desired.

Mr. Jerry Peters asked what operations and maintenance projects indicate? Mr. Wilburn said that refers to resurfacing. Mr. Peters asked if that is based on how historically the Montgomery MPO has put tons of money into resurfacing. Mr. Smith indicated that it is based on historic authorizations. Mr. Smith said last LRTP update O&M was not factored in, but it is required to be factored in this time. Mr. Smith said that even though a state project may not be reflected in this, they still have a category in the TIP that is just for state funded projects. Mr. Loflin asked about a comment on the bottom of the tables indicating that the starred features include STP (Urban >200,000) funds. Mr. Smith indicated that the note in on the table only applies the first category. Mr. Wilburn indicated that a write-up of the process given to the MPOs from DOT and FHWA is available.

Mr. Wilburn passed out a table comparing the current TIP to the 25 Year funding. Mrs. King analyzed the TIP and the categories against the budget amount by funding category. In the table, there are a couple of things in this table that will not be in your adopted TIP. There were a couple of project segments including the outer loop where the current TIP period did not take it all the way out to construction. We wanted to establish a base were if the only thing we did in the next 25 years was finish thru construction all projects in the current TIP. What would the situation be? The numbers are a little higher because we included everything thru construction. On page two, the total capacity projects currently in the TIP (again all projects thru construction) is \$441,506,583. The budget is \$395,562,000. The difference of \$45, 944,583 is what we added in to finish all projects. In terms of capacity project funding, we have enough in 2035 LRTP to complete TIP only. This number does not include any overruns, which unfortunately are a reality. The high priority list has a negative balance, which is what is putting us over. We ask that each TCC member look over the list of projects in the TIP. Mr. Loflin asked why the outer loop road projects are included. Mr. Smith said the reason is that they are congressional projects, so they stay there but are completed only if congressionally designated funding becomes available. Mr. Wilburn reiterated that this is a wake-up call to the available funding. With the available funding the MPO can complete the TIP. Most of these projects were identified in the 2030 LRTP and now 2035 LRTP. A way must be discovered to redefine some of these projects as an improvement type project to access some of these funds. The only other option is convince the state to put additional funds in the capacity categories. The HPP projects have usually been identified in the needs plan. Mr. Smith also indicated that NHS funds could be spent on the outer loop due to its NHS designation.

Mr. Richie Beyer asked to sum it all up to fund all the projects in the TIP between the capacity projects and the operation & maintenance projects; we are talking about \$670 million. Page three and four is a list of the operation and maintenance projects from the TIP. The total amount needed to complete all types of projects in TIP is \$628,864,177. Mr. Jerry Peters asked if the MPO could make attempt move the split to go from 30% capacity and 70% O&M to 50/50. Both Mr. Wilburn and Mr. Smith said no most likely

the split is pretty set in stone. The split was obtained by comparing historical actions of all Alabama MPOs and non MPO areas. A write-up of the ALDOT and FHWA actions is available. The TCC members proceeded to discuss operation and maintenance and capacity historical funding by the Montgomery MPO and other MPOs in the state.

Mr. Richie Beyer asked why the list included completed projects? We need to ask ALDOT why if something is finished and closed, we have to fund it. But the question is whether the decision makers come back and say that the calculations are as a certain date. Are we double counting it? We need each of the TCC members to go thru this list and make comments on each project. Is it finished? Are there any other comments on each project?

Mr. Wilburn moved to Agenda Item 4: Proposed Methodology for Developing Financially Constrained Plan. Mr. Wilburn provided a handout regarding the Project Assessment Methodology. We have so far covered: this is how much we have to spend, here is how it is related to the TIP, here is how much money we have, and here is how much we have already spent. We have more budget available in the O&M categories than we generally have committed in the TIP. If we have money to spend, it generally shows up much better in the O&M categories. Mr. Wilburn proceeded to discuss some steps that were used to go thru projects in the 2030 LRTP and in the 2035 LRTP as projects that fit the needs identified in the 2035 LRTP. Mr. Wilburn handed out a couple of maps to illustrate the steps.

Step 1: Remove any projects that are showing as green (minor operational improvements needed) AND

Step 2: Continue any projects designated as orange or red (minor/major capacity) through construction.

A total of nine projects were removed for a total of \$32.5 million. All of the projects fell within the first level of improvements, green. The green identified projects had less than 100 vehicles per hour during the peak period over capacity, we are not going to put another lane out there in each direction there are other things that can be done. The middle category (orange) in terms of the severity of the deficiency is between 150 and 400 vehicles per hour during the peak period over capacity. Some capacity improvements will need to be completed. Instead of doing a full lane addition in each direction, you may be able to get an improvement by doing a string of major intersection improvements or something like that. The red segments will need a major widening of some sort to get an improvement. For some reason the nine green projects did not warrant a major capacity project based on the described methodology. Mr. Jerry Peters asked if any of the nine removed projects were current TIP projects. Mr. Wilburn explained they do not include any current TIP projects and at this point no current TIP projects have been dropped. Mr. Peters asked if a TIP project showed up green would it be dropped? Mr. Wilburn said it would be case by case. The E+C is usually the TIP, and we do not usually go back over those projects. The question was asked about the outer loop projects in the tables previously discussed. They are all state funding and Mr. David Bollie said they will end up affecting obligation authority. Anything in yellow in the table is from the 2030 LRTP. In the 2030 LRTP, we had all the outer loop segments in

financially constrained plan assuming it was HPP funds. The decision must be made whether the outer loop projects should remain a priority. If the HPP funds run out then the NHS funds will need to be accessed. Table two was discussed. Every project highlighted yellow were in the 2030 LRTP financially constrained plan and appear to be warranted by the 2035 LRTP (orange or red). To finish the current TIP and 2030 LRTP projects in the financially constrained plan, a total of \$878,865,680 is needed for capacity projects. The budget for capacity projects is \$395,562,000.

Step 3: Identify any orange or red segments that do not have a project define
AND

Step 4: Estimate number of additional lane miles of orange and red segments. 62.6 miles of orange = 438.2 million. 17.7 miles of red = 124 million. For a rough estimate, a cost of \$7 million per mile was used.

Mr. Richie Beyer asked whether the \$878,865,680 is on state or local routes. Mr. Wilburn said there has currently not been any breakdown by road type. If the goal is to ensure the entire TIP was paid for and then look at the needs which include mostly 2030 LRTP identified projects. There are several options. First, we could decide to do all the projects in red. Find a way to move some of the O&M funds to capacity, then maybe enough funding can be found to complete the red projects. We are trying to give an overview approach. The TCC members know more about the identified deficiencies that you can feed back to us. For example you can look at a project and say that maybe we take that project and instead of doing a four lane widening, devise some other solution like improving key intersections. The maps are based on the E+C network, so a part of the outer loop project is in and part out. Mr. Joel Duke asked if it was conceivable that the outer loop could be removed from the LRTP and then brought back in when funding obtained. Mr. Wilburn indicated it must be in at least the needs plan but not necessary in the financially constrained plan. Mr. Duke indicated that this may make more sense since the amending the LRTP is not that difficult. Mr. Smith indicated he has not been advised that we will not include the outer loop road in the financially constrained list. Mr. Wilburn indicated that the outer loop project has been consistently funded by HPP funding of which there are not enough. Mr. Duke indicated that this was a question for the policy committee. There was further discussion on the outer loop in financially constrained plan vs. the needs plan, the possibility of using NHS funds, and other issues associated with the outer loop.

Step 5: Define projects for red segments not covered by existing projects.

- SR 53/SR 9/SR 21 from Coliseum Blvd to Old Wetumpka Hwy—4.7 miles
- US 31/SR 3 from CR 40 to proposed new road—4.8 miles
- US 31/SR 3 from US 82 to West Blvd—2.4 miles
- SR 271 from I-85 to 1.7 miles north of US 231—2.5 miles
- Emerald Mountain Expressway from CR 64 to Rifle Range Rd—1.8 miles
- Marler Rd from I-85 to 1.5 miles south of I-85

The projects in blue on the map handed out are projects included in the TIP and 2030 LRTP. The above roads are the ones not covered in blue and are red on the map. Some of the red were determined to have adequate lanes already and were left off. One section of the red is the toll bridge and is not listed. Mr. Beyer asked why the lanes would be widened up to the toll bridge if the bridge cannot be widened. Mr. Smith said that he agreed with that assessment due to not being allowed to spend Federal funds on the toll bridge and portions of the toll bridge road. He said that that project would be taken off and people will have to live with the Emerald Mountain Express as it currently is. Mr. John McCarthy also questioned portion of Chantilly Pkwy between I-85 and Vaughn Rd. He said that City Traffic Engineering has installed new traffic signals that will satisfy future traffic in that corridor and didn't understand why it shows up as being congested. Mr. Smith explained that the corridor for the forecast year of 2035 takes into account land uses that weren't there before 2005 such as Walmart, Brunos shopping center development, Lowes, Home Depot, and other developments that have been put in place and projected to be in place. He said that this one needs to be studied further to determine what needs to be done.

Step 6: If funds remain, assess crash rates on orange segments to determine safety needs.

Agenda Item 5 was not completed.

Mr. Wilburn moved to Agenda Item 6: Next Steps. Mr. Wilburn requested that the TCC members review the Tables handed out and comment on the projects within. Whether they are possible, whether they are actually complete, and any other comment you think we need to know. Also look at the funding category of each project. There was brief discussion on the segment of Chantilly Pkwy from I-85 to Vaughn Rd. We discussed needs vs. financially constrained. If you believe a widening can be deleted in favor of an O&M solution, or conversely if you believe a capacity project is essential, make sure to make that comment. Mr. Beyer asked the following: you are asking the TCC members to review Table 1 and comment on them; then on Table 2 you are requesting comments on those projects, specifically ones that can be collectively pulled; what about projects that are not in here that show up on your maps as needed, do we comment on those. Mr. Wilburn said if you see a link on the map that we missed, please let us know. We are asking three things. First look at the capacity projects and see if any of them do not make sense to you as capacity projects. If you think you can get by with something short of a lane widening in each direction. Second we are asking is if you think the project does not make sense at all or cannot be done, make that comment. An example is a link where widening is necessary, but because of right-of-way it cannot be done. Lastly, if you know of something that we did not pick up on, then this is close to the last chance to add a need to this list. Mr. David Bollie asked for guidance on whom to request at ALDOT to comment on Tables. Mr. Smith said go to the top. It is requested that the TCC members get their comments to the MPO staff by the end of business on Friday, May 14, 2010. The plan needs to be adopted by the end of June. A draft plan needs to be complete in May. Some further discussion on the various handouts, the projects and the necessary next steps continued. Notes will be sent out on this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.