

## ARC COMMITTEE MEETING FOLLOW-UP

### TRANSPORTATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

#### January 22, 2016 Meeting Notes

##### TCC Members or Alternates Present: 13 total

<i>ARC</i>	John Orr	<i>Forsyth</i>	---
<i>Atlanta</i>	Jonathan Lewis	<i>Fulton</i>	--
<i>Barrow</i>	---	<i>GDOT</i>	Matthew Fowler
<i>Bartow</i>	---	<i>GRTA</i>	Jamie Fischer
<i>Cherokee</i>	Geoff Morton	<i>Gwinnett</i>	Vince Edwards
<i>Clayton</i>	---	<i>Henry</i>	Stacey Jordan
<i>Cobb</i>	---	<i>MARTA</i>	---
<i>Coweta</i>	Tavores Edwards	<i>Newton</i>	---
<i>DeKalb</i>	Patrece Keeter	<i>Paulding</i>	---
<i>Douglas</i>	---	<i>Rockdale</i>	Miguel Valentin
<i>EPD</i>	Gil Godzinsky	<i>Spalding</i>	---
<i>Fayette</i>	Phil Mallon	<i>Walton</i>	Joe Walter

##### Advisors (Non-voting):

<i>CBMPO</i>	---	<i>FHWA</i>	---
<i>GHMPO</i>	Sam Baker	<i>FTA</i>	---
<i>GDOT I'modal</i>	---		

##### Other Attendees

Chris Haggard, Johns Creek	Michelle Wright, City of Douglasville
John Cocker, Roswell	Jim Brooks, Evermore CID
Kristen Berry, Atlanta Aerotropolis CIDs	Karen Winger, GCT
Cristina Pastore, Kimley Horn	Garth Lynch, HNTB
Carol Kalafut, Fayette County	Cathy Mesick, MARTA
Shawn Green, Atlanta Beltline, Inc.	Maggie Maddox, VHB
Kaycee Mertz, GDOT	Kristen Wescott, Sandy Springs
Julia Billings, GDOT	Larry Kaiser, CIS, Inc.
Megan Weiss, GDOT	Mark Dana, Roswell
Quinton L. Spann, GDOT	Brian Gist, SELC
Kenyata Smiley, MARTA	Helen Barnes, SELC

**Actions Taken:** None

## **1. Welcome, Acceptance of 11/20/15 TCC Meeting Summary, Public Comment Period**

John Orr, ARC, called the meeting to order. Orr asked if there were any comments on the draft 01/08/16 TCC Meeting Summary and hearing none, declared the summary accepted as previously distributed. No public comments were made.

## **2. Transportation Funding Act of 2015 (HB 170) Update**

David Haynes presented on the outcomes of the recent Governor's press conference, announcing a 10-year transportation plan as part of the Transportation Funding Act of 2015. There are 2 tracks of projects, the first will be those that are coming up in the next 18 months. Most of these projects will be bridges, widenings, and repair projects. Also, LMIG will be increased by 20-30%. The second track is a 10 year vision for new projects. The funding is to be determined. [Garoads.org](http://Garoads.org) hosts the proposed project lists.

Work will continue to determine which projects will remain under federal funding and which will switch to state funding. The list on the website does not state which funding source they will come from.

Discussion –

- Of the projects to be let in the next 18 months, how many have been identified?
  - The vast majority have already been vetted. Most are existing projects that are being accelerated due to the additional funding availability.
- When does GDOT anticipate to see the projects moving through the PDP process? What is the timing for GEPA to be notified?
  - GEPA is involved now but the formal work will start after the funds are appropriated by the general assembly. This is most likely to happen during the summer.

## **3. Project Prioritization**

Kofi presented on how the 2015 TIP recommendations were constructed by project type and by project phase. The existing recommendations are not final until the board approves them next month with the RTP. Most projects recommended for funding in this solicitation are for PE and Scoping Phases.

TIP amendment #1 will likely be completed this summer (adoption in August). It is not likely that there will be a CMAQ call for projects until 2017.

Looking ahead – the TIP will be implementing ARC Policies, FAST Act's performance based plan guidelines, and Georgia's SWTP/SSTP's smart investment focus. Supplemental criteria will come from the Walk. Bike. Thrive! Plan, the ongoing LCI program, existing CTP's, the ASTRoMaP, and the Regional Freight Plan Update, and the Strategic Regional Thoroughfare Plan.

Kofi led a discussion on what new criteria might look like with examples from DRCOG (Denver Regional Council of Governments) and Los Angeles County MTA.

### **DCOG Example**

- Two phased project selection process – similar to ARC. (75 % of available federal funding allocated to new projects).
- Minimum request must be \$100,000 - \$300,000 (no more than 10 to be awarded at a time)
- Board adopted eligibility criteria
- Project types have different criteria
- Roadway projects are not awarded unless NEPA disclosure document is signed within the previous 5 years.
  - The NEPA disclosure document is not common. This is most likely a document that identifies risk assessment results and outlines intended environmental process for a project.
- New roadway capacity submittals can only be for the next meaningful phase. This is a more iterative approach than ARC.
- Reconstruction projects:
  - pavement index score must be 40 or lower
  - rehabilitation and resurfacing are ineligible (projects must replace sub-base, base, etc)
- Bicycle + Pedestrian Project criteria is driven by an network completion
  - Multi-use facilities must be minimum 8 feet
  - Facility must achieve connectivity criterion

### **Los Angeles County MTA Example**

- Overview
  - Each project competes within a modal category and is evaluated against similar projects
  - Criteria applies to all modal categories
- Project/Modal categories include:
  - Regional Surface Transportation
    - Recurring maintenance projects are not eligible
    - Multimodal - 60% of cost must be dedicated to RSTI component
    - Applications will be considered if they include a construction element
    - Applications must include before and after bike/ped counts
    - Comply with CA Complete Streets Act
    - Incorporate sustainable design elements
  - Signal synchronization
  - Travel demand management improvements
    - Must meet CMAQ requirements
  - Transit Capital Improvements
    - Regional focus over urban rail
- **Discussion Questions**
  - Which types of projects are best for certain federal funding programs?

- How should policies of the Atlanta Region's Plan influence project selection and prioritization?
- Should we maintain the existing program areas, and should there be corresponding funding levels or target areas for each area?
- Should there be any restrictions on federal eligibility?
- Could there be different local match requirements, based on the program areas?
- Should there continue to be an emphasis on regional significance? How should that be defined?
- Should there be a more streamlined approach to project solicitation?
- How do local governments prioritize projects in their CTPs?
- **Discussion**
  - How were funding buckets created?
  - What happens to managed lanes and CMAQ funding if managed lanes funding shifts to the Transportation Funding Act?
    - Future Managed lanes will not rely on CMAQ funds.
  - Regional equity should be a focus as any the technical process is developed.
  - Pipeline approach to project calls has support because it may take the competitive approach out of and better manage the process while easing the burden on local government staff.
  - Incentivizing overmatching does not make sense if we want to be smart about using federal dollars. Also, counties without SPLOSTs would be at a huge disadvantage.
  - How is the LA County MTA organized?
    - California has a different set up from ARC. Two separate entities exist for air quality management and project management.
  - Each of the examples prioritize different steps in the process. We need to work towards deciding what is right for the Atlanta Region.
  - Programs and phase prioritization will be a continued discussion based on need and effect to the rest of the phases.
  - Performance Metrics – we will need to decide on how many metrics to hold ourselves to. Based on capacity and influence.
  - In regards to setting up funding source buckets, should they be only by project type or also by density areas?
    - Whichever approach is decided upon, the development of the buckets should be iterative and not very prescriptive from the beginning to allow for adaptation to how project needs develop. Perhaps with years not addressed but rather 5 year targets.
  - How will prioritization of future TFA projects be set?
    - It will be a cooperative process. MPOs have a role in project selection but ultimately the GDOT Board will approve the project list. Most selected projects have come from existing project lists (CTPs, TIA, etc).

Kofi closed the discussion by noting that the goal is to develop ARC's project criteria by the end of this calendar year. A sub-committee will be established to work through the criteria.

#### **4. Announcements**

- The Atlanta Region's Plan- TCC adoption scheduled for February 5th- quorum needed.

**Handouts supplied at meeting:**

- Transportation Funding Act Handouts

**Handouts supplied in advance on ARC website ([www.atlantaregional.com/tcc](http://www.atlantaregional.com/tcc))**

- Agenda + Presentations