TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE (TPC) MEETING
WICHITA FALLS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

October 30, 2013

Present:

Glenn Barham, Mayor, City of Wichita Falls	♦ **Members**
Dennis Wilde, North Texas Reg. Planning Commission	♦
Jeff Watts, City of Pleasant Valley, Representative	♦
Kevin Hugman, Proxy for Tim Ingle, City Council Representative	♦
Larry Tegtmeyer, TxDOT, District Engineer	♦
Michael Smith, City Council Representative	♦
Russell Schreiber, City Public Works Director	♦
Sam Bownds, Proxy for Jim Henson, Lakeside City, Mayor	♦
Woodrow (Woody) Gossom, Wichita County Judge	♦
Jaimie Lee, WFMPO, Transportation Planner II	♦ **Staff**
Lin Barnett, WFMPO, Transportation Planning Director	♦
Barbara Maley, FHWA, Texas Division	♦ **Visitors**
David Rohmer, TxDOT, Area Engineer	♦
Joe Gambill, NORTEX RPC	♦
Lori Davidson, AMD Engineering	♦
Richard Jenkins, AMD Engineering	♦
Tammy Marlow, TxDOT, North Region Support Center	♦

I. Welcome & Introduction

Mayor Barham, the TPC chairperson, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance.

II. Public Comment on Agenda and Non-Agenda Items

Mayor Barham asked for any public comments on agenda and non-agenda items. There was none.

III. Review and Approve the Transportation Policy Committee's July 17, 2013 Meeting Minutes (p. 5)

Mayor Barham asked for any comments or corrections to the July 17, 2013 minutes. There was none. He then asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Tegtmeyer made the motion to approve. Mr. Schreiber seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

IV. Review and Comment Regarding the Technical Advisory Committee's October 2, 2013 Meeting Minutes – *No Action Required (p. 13)*

Mayor Barham asked for any comments or corrections to the October 2, 2013 Technical Advisory Committee's meeting minutes. Mr. Barnett stated that the TAC committee spent the majority of its time reviewing the LRPRP survey tool developed by Crane West Media. There were no comments from anyone else. The committee moved on to the next agenda item.

V. **Presentation of the Long-Range Project Readiness Plan, the 2013 Prioritized Project List, and the 2013 LRPRP Project Location Map (See Project List Enclosure)**

Mr. Richard Jenkins, engineer with AMD Engineering, presented the policy board with a summary of how AMD and WFMPO developed and completed the Long-Range Project Readiness Plan. He stated the driving purpose for the LRPRP was a desire to develop a uniform and consistent approach to prioritizing the consideration and development of projects within the MPO boundary. Mr. Jenkins stated the project list began by combining all projects from existing plans and eliminating projects that were completed and let for construction. He stated the final condensed list included mobility, rehabilitation, bicycle/pedestrian, and railroad projects.

Mr. Jenkins created a decision matrix to satisfy local needs and preferences, as well as to ensure that it met comprehensive federal planning requirements. The Local Criteria contained a set of 19 statements and the Federal Planning Requirements contained a set of eight statements. MPO staff asked each individual TAC board member to score all the projects in the LRPRP list. Each project received a score for each criterion according to how well the project satisfied the planning requirement. Scores ranged from zero to three, indicating the TAC Member's agreement or disagreement with the statement. Zero indicated the member "Disagreed", while one indicated "Somewhat Agree", two indicated "Agree", and three indicated the member "Strongly Agreed" the project satisfied the requirement of the criterion. Through MPO staff, AMD asked each TAC board member to rank each individual criterion in order of importance. Through the compilation of these rankings, AMD was able to assign each criterion a relative point value based on how strongly the TAC board members voted for it. AMD distributed the points by a weighted average based on an arbitrary desire for a perfectly scored project to have a 100-point value.

After AMD completed the development of the LRPRP decision matrix, MPO staff worked with Crane West Media to migrate the matrix into a web based survey tool. MPO staff supplied Crane West with the LRPRP Excel spreadsheet of 92 projects. Crane West imported the list into the online database developed specifically for use with the survey tool. The online survey tool allows TAC board members to go through each of the projects in the list and rank them. The database records all TAC board member scores for each project, averages them, and assigns a final score to each project. After everyone completed their project rankings, MPO staff compiled the results via the report function incorporated in the web based survey tool. The MPO Director presented the results to the TAC committee at the project-vetting meeting.

In regards to the project-vetting meeting, Mr. Barnett stated the TAC committee met on October 17, 2013 to address issues and make corrections and adjustments to the projects. The result was a comprehensive prioritized project list of short, medium, and long-range projects. The web-based survey tool proved capable of fair and consistent ranking of a wide variety of projects and needs within the MPO. Mr. Jenkins concluded

his portion of the LRPRP presentation and Mr. Barnett then came forward to present his part.

In his presentation, Mr. Barnett outlined the major milestones achieved over the 16-month period needed to complete the LRPRP plan process. He reiterated the steps taken by TAC and AMD to create the 27 criteria used for objectively ranking all of the projects. Mr. Barnett talked about how MPO staff created the LRPRP Scoring Criteria Definitions and the Project Information Binders to aid TAC board members during the project-ranking phase. He demonstrated how the TAC committee identified nine of the twenty-seven criteria as "difficult to rank" and how the committee reached a consensus that TAC board members familiar with their agency's projects should pre-score those projects. Mr. Barnett illustrated how the TAC board members used the web based survey tool to rank all of the projects. He then showed everyone present how the TAC committee utilized the Advocacy Charts, created by MPO staff from comments received during the ranking process, to vet all of the projects in the list. Mr. Barnett concluded his presentation by pointing out to the Policy Board that the prioritized project list located inside their meeting packet was the final product of much time and effort on the part of MPO staff and the TAC committee. Mr. Barnett talked about lessons learned and his plans to improve the process for next year. He then asked for any questions and for approval of the list.

Mr. Tegtmeyer commented that he was under the impression that the LRPRP would contain a mechanism for identifying medium and long-range projects within the list instead of just a numerical identifier. Ms. Davidson commented that early in the process, the TAC committee had identified medium and long-range projects through an opinion based voting process that classified projects as either "MR" or "LR". However, as work progressed on the plan, the TAC committee felt it was important to focus more on the weighted criteria in order to produce an objectively ranked list of projects. Mr. Barnett stated that the "MR" and "LR" data remained in the list and that it was a simple matter to include an additional column to reflect this information. Mr. Barnett also stated that MPO staff could group together projects of similar type in order to see the top projects within their categories.

Although pleased with the work done by AMD Engineering and MPO staff, the Policy Board decided to table the approval of the prioritized list until the January 2014 TPC meeting. Mayor Barham directed Mr. Barnett to prepare the MR and LR rankings and the rankings by category type for Policy Board review at the January meeting. This would also give the Policy Board more time to review the rankings of the projects within the prioritized project list.

Mayor Barham asked for any more comment on the Long-Range Project Readiness Plan. Hearing none, Mayor Barham moved on to Item VI.

VI.   **Review and Approve Amendments to the 2010-2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project List for October 2013 (See Enclosure)**

Mr. Barnett directed the committee's attention to the enclosed 2010-2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan project list for October 2013. He explained that changes to the MTP project list did not include adding any new projects to the list but instead focused on moving projects around within the list in order to show fiscal constraint. Mr. Barnett stated that MPO staff used the current TxDOT Unified Transportation Program to ensure

the fiscal constraint of all TxDOT short-range and long-range projects. MPO staff identified TxDOT's short-range projects as years 2010-2020 and the long-range projects as years 2021-2035. Any projects listed after 2035 were placed into the long-range un-met needs schedule where, if a future UTP identifies available funding, the project can move up into the 2021-2035 Long-Range or 2010-2020 Short-Range project list.

Mr. Barnett asked for any comments or questions regarding the 2010-2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan project list. Mayor Barham asked what is meant by "fiscally constrained." Mr. Barnett explained that "fiscal constraint" is a forecast of money that can expect to be reasonably available for a project. Mr. Barnett also stated that all of the City of Wichita Falls, Lakeside City, Pleasant Valley, Archer, and Wichita County projects fell into the un-met needs category where they would remain fiscally un-constrained until it became reasonable to expect funding availability.

Mr. Barnett asked for any other comments. Receiving none, Mayor Barham asked for a motion to approve the amendments to the MTP project list. Councilor Smith made the motion to approve the document. Mr. Watts seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VII. Review of the Administrative Revisions to the 2014-2015 Unified Planning Work Program (p. 21)

Mr. Barnett directed the committee's attention to page 21 of the meeting packet. He explained that he received notification from our partners at the TxDOT North Region Support Center (NRSC) that our 2014-2015 Unified Planning Work Program received FHWA approval upon first review. Mr. Barnett went over the administrative revisions in the 2013-2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) with the Policy Board. Revisions included adding a disclaimer to the front of the document, adding information about the transportation reauthorization laws in the introduction, and updating the "Definition of Area" in Section B. Mr. Barnett informed the board that the administrative revisions did not require approval because there was no change in scope of work or in financing any of the Subtasks. He stated Item VII was for informational purposes only.

Mayor Barham asked for any questions regarding the administrative revisions to the 2014-2015 Unified Planning Work Program. Receiving none, the committee moved on to the next agenda item.

VIII. Review of the Administrative Revisions to Section VI of the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program: Federally Funded Transit Projects (p. 26)

Mr. Barnett directed the committee's attention to page 26 of the meeting packet. He stated the revisions included a notification from the Federal Transit Administration regarding the actual funding amounts available for the programming of the FY 2013 annual transit-operating grant. Mr. Barnett stated the grant was currently in the process of creation and was awaiting approval of a Texas Transportation Commission Minute Order concerning a request for Transportation Development Credits. With that, and approval from FTA, the City of Wichita Falls' City Manager can execute the transit grant.

Mr. Barnett informed the committee that the administrative revisions did not require approval because there was not a 25% increase or decrease in FTA funding received by the City of Wichita Falls. He stated Item VIII was for informational purposes only. Mayor

Barham asked for any questions regarding the administrative revisions to Section VI – Federally Funded Transit Projects for the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program. Receiving no further comments, the committee moved on to the next agenda item.

IX. **Other Business:**

A. **Discussion & Overview of Progress on Local Transportation Projects-City and TxDOT staff (Quarterly Review)**

TxDOT Report: Mr. Rohmer reported on the Safe Routes to School projects stating they were complete and in the cleanup phase of the project. He reported that US 82/287 Galveston to McKinney Road, awarded to the Zack Burkett Co., would receive a mill and overlay. That project should begin construction next spring.

City Report: Mr. Schreiber reported on the Kemp Street mill and overlay project. He stated the City was working with TxDOT for funding on the portion of Kemp Street under Kell Freeway due to it being TxDOT's right-of-way. He reported on the McNiel drainage project stating the city would be adding box geometry.

B. **MPO Quarterly Financial Report (3rd Quarter FY 2013-April, May, June)**

Mr. Barnett reported on the third quarter expenses for the MPO. He stated that the MPO had spent 65.91% of its allocation for FY 2013. He commented that the MPO should reach the 75% minimum expenditure requirement once the final billing has been received.

Mayor Barham asked for any other questions or comments about the first quarter report. Receiving none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

C. **Grouped TxDOT CSJ Projects Report**

Mayor Barham directed the committee's attention to page 42 of the meeting packet. Mr. Barnett reported to the committee that MPO staff had no new projects on the grouped CSJ report for this quarter. He commented that the majority are preventive maintenance and rehabilitation type projects. Mayor Barham asked for any comments on the Grouped TxDOT CSJ project report. Receiving none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

D. **MPO Director Report: Transit Oriented Development Study (p. 43)**

Mayor Barham directed the committee's attention to page 43 of the meeting packet. Mr. Barnett informed the Policy Board that Freese and Nichols (FNI) reviewed data provided by WFMPO and began creating maps in GIS. Freese and Nichols packaged written descriptions with the maps and sent them out to WFMPO for initial reviews and comments. FNI conducted a City demographic profile for baseline analysis and gathered information from US census and American Community Surveys that included historic populations, growth charts, compound growth rates, race and ethnicity, age distribution, education attainment, incomes, commute times, household types, housing types, and employment industry. Mr. Barnett stated WFMPO would continue with monthly conference calls to review progress of work.

Mayor Barham asked for any comments or questions from the committee. Receiving none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

E. Other Items

Mayor Barham asked for any other business needing discussion or for any other announcements. Councilor Smith wanted an update on the proposal to look at the congestion on the Lawrence/Kell intersection where vehicles turn west onto Kell. Mr. Hugman stated Mark Beauchamp, Traffic Superintendent, would look at the timing of the signals for that area for improved traffic flow.

There were no other comments or announcements.

X. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

_____
Honorable Glenn Barham
Mayor Wichita Falls