



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, May 21, 2018
University Park, Suite 300
3300 N. IH 35, Austin, Texas 78705
2:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Certification of Quorum – Quorum requirement is 13 members.....Chair Ed Polasek

ACTION:

2. [Approval of April 23, 2018 Meeting Summary](#)..... Mr. Ashby Johnson, CAMPO
Mr. Johnson will seek TAC approval of the April 23, 2018 meeting summary.
3. [Recommendation on Capital Metro’s Transit Asset Management \(TAM\) Performance Targets](#)..... Mr. Ryan Collins, CAMPO
Mr. Collins will request a recommendation for Transportation Policy Board approval of Capital Metro’s TAM performance targets.

INFORMATION:

4. [Discussion on PM3 Travel Time Performance Measures and Target Setting](#)
.....Mr. Ryan Collins, CAMPO
Mr. Collins will provide an overview of the Time Travel Performance Measures and Target setting
5. [Presentation on TxDOT Advanced Funding Agreement \(AFA\) Process](#)
.....Mr. Samuel Himawan, TxDOT
Mr. Himawan will provide an overview of the TxDOT and local government AFA process in project development and implementation.
6. [Update on Project Connect](#)Mr. Joe Clemens, Capital Metro
Mr. Clemens will update the TAC on Phase 2 of the engagement tracker.
7. [Report on Transportation Planning Activities](#)
 - a. [CAMPO Federal Certification Review](#)
8. TAC Chair Announcements
9. Adjournment



**Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Meeting Summary
 April 23, 2018**

1. Certification of Quorum.....Chair Polasek

The CAMPO Technical Advisory Committee was called to order by the Chair at 2:00 p.m.

A quorum was announced present.

Present:

	Member	Representing	Member Attending	Alternate Attending
1.	Stevie Greathouse	City of Austin	Y	
2.	Cole Kitten	City of Austin	N	
3.	Robert Spillar	City of Austin	Y	
4.	Tom Gdala	City of Cedar Park	Y	
5.	Edward Polasek	City of Georgetown	Y	
6.	Trey Fletcher	City of Pflugerville	Y	
7.	Gary Hudder	City of Round Rock	Y	(via phone)
8.	Laurie Moyer	City of San Marcos	N	Rohit Vij
9.	Julia Cleary	Bastrop County	Y	
10.	Amy Miller	Bastrop County (Smaller Cities)	Y	
11.	Greg Haley	Burnet County	Y	
12.	Mike Hodge	Burnet County (Smaller Cities)	Y	
13.	Jacquelyn Thomas	Caldwell County	Y	
14.	Dan Gibson	Caldwell County (Smaller Cities)	Y	
15.	Jerry Borcharding	Hays County	N	Alex Flores
16.	David Fowler	Hays County (Smaller Cities)	N	

17.	Charlie Watts	Travis County	Y	
18.	Alex Amponsah	Travis County (Smaller Cities)	Y	
19.	Bob Daigh	Williamson County	Y	
20.	Terri Crauford	Williamson County (Smaller Cities)	Y	
21.	David Marsh	CARTS	N	Ed Collins
22.	Justin Word	CTRMA	N	Mike Sexton
23.	Todd Hemingson	Capital Metro	Y	
24.	Marisabel Ramthun	TxDOT	Y	

2. Approval of the March 26, 2018 Meeting Summary Chair Polasek

Mr. Bob Daigh moved for approval of the March 26, 2018 meeting summary, as presented.

Mr. Ed Collins seconded the motion.

The motion prevailed unanimously.

3. Recommendation on Draft Program of Activities for the 2019 -2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).....Mr. Ashby Johnson, CAMPO

Mr. Ryan Collins provided a brief overview of the draft program of activities for the 2019-2022 TIP. Mr. Collins highlighted and discussed updates made to the project recommendation list after the mailout. A brief discussion of the funding distribution by county followed. Mr. Collins also highlighted information outlining the process used in developing the recommended draft program of activities.

Mr. Ashby Johnson later summarized the Transportation Policy Board’s discussion regarding the 2019-2022 TIP and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects from its April 9, 2018 meeting. Mr. Johnson reported that staff posed the inclusion of TDM projects into the 2019-2022 TIP to the Transportation Policy Board as a policy decision. The Transportation Policy Board will deliberate on the matter at its May meeting. Mr. Johnson noted that the recommendation presented did not include TDM projects.

Mr. Tom Gdala moved for approval of the recommended Draft Program of Activities for the 2019-2022 TIP, as presented.

Mr. Mike Hodge seconded the motion.

A brief question and answer with comments followed.

Mr. Robert Spillar later moved to amend the motion for approval of the recommended Draft Program of Activities for the 2019-2022 TIP excluding additional funding options for Category 2 and Category 7.

Mr. Todd Hemingson seconded the amended motion.

The amended motion prevailed unanimously.

Mr. Spillar later provided copies of a letter presenting a preferred option for funding TDM projects for the 2019-2022 TIP for the Committee’s review. The letter was signed by Mr. Andrew Hoekzema (CAPCOG), Mr. Toddy Hemingson, Mr. Spillar, and Judge Sarah Eckhardt (Travis County).

4. Recommendation on Transportation Development Credit (TDC) Requests

.....**Mr. Ryan Collins, CAMPO**

Mr. Collins provided a brief overview of the TDC Program. Mr. Collins highlighted and discussed the recommended primary TDC recipients and local match. A brief question and answer followed.

Mr. Ed Collins later moved for approval of the recommended TDC requests for Transportation Policy Board approval.

Mr. Charlie Watts seconded the motion.

The motion prevailed unanimously.

5. Update on Regional Incident Management Study

.....**Mr. Tom Fowler, Kimley-Horn & Associates**

Mr. Fowler identified and discussed the goals, objectives, and key components of the Regional Incident Management Study. Mr. Fowler later highlighted the current successes and next steps. Completion of the Draft Regional Incident Management Report is anticipated for June 2018. Question and answer with comments followed.

6. Report on Transportation Planning Activities

Mr. Ashby Johnson reported that the CAMPO will begin its federal review certification on April 24, 2018 through April 27, 2018. The Federal Highway Administration will release a report of its findings that will include recommendations and commendations on CAMPO’s planning process. There will be a public listening session held on April 25, 2018 at the Joe C. Thompson Conference Center as part of the federal certification review process.

7. TAC Chair Announcements

There were no announcements.

8. Adjournment

The April 23, 2018 meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.



Date: May 21, 2018
Continued From: N/A
Action Requested: Recommendation

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Mr. Ryan Collins, Short-Range Planning Manager
Agenda Item: 3
Subject: Recommendation on Capital Metro's Transit Asset Management (TAM) Performance Measures Targets

RECOMMENDATION

Staff requests a recommendation for Transportation Policy Board approval of Capital Metro's Transit Asset Management (TAM) Performance Measures Targets

PURPOSE AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The use of a performance-based transportation planning process is required by the federal government in the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Part of the performance-based planning process requires the adoption of performance targets in key areas by the effective date set by the FHWA and FTA's Final Rulemaking.

The Capital Metropolitan Transit Authority (Capital Metro), a direct recipient of federal funds from the Federal Transit Agency (FTA), must also comply with the FAST Act by adopting Transit Asset Management (TAM) performance measures and targets. Capital Metro adopts their TAM targets annually prior to January of each year, which are then submitted to the National Transit Database (NTD). These targets are coordinated with the MPO and incorporated into the TIP and MTP in compliance with the FAST Act.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

In order to provide more transparency in the selection and prioritization of transportation projects, federal legislation beginning with the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and continuing to the current Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), now stipulate that a performance measurement framework must be used in the development of the TIP and MTP.

The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) has been developing rules for the implementation of these performance measures. Within one year of the effective dates of the final rules from USDOT, state departments of transportation (DOT) must set performance targets for each performance area. Following FTA Direct Recipient target-setting, MPOs must set their own targets or agree with those set by the state DOT.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachment A – *FTA Primer on TAM Performance Measures*

Attachment B – *Capital Metro Performance Measures and Targets*

Planning for TAM | Roles & Responsibilities for MPOs and State DOTs

Background

FTA and FHWA published the final rule on Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning and Metropolitan Transportation Planning on May 27, 2016. FTA published the final rule on Transit Asset Management (TAM) on July 26, 2016. The rules establish new requirements for metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to coordinate with transit providers, set performance targets, and integrate those performance targets and performance plans into their planning documents by certain dates. Below are the specific requirements for MPOs.

Metropolitan Planning Agreements

MPOs should initiate discussions with transit agencies, state DOTs and planning partners to update their Metropolitan Planning Agreements, per 23 CFR § 450.314. This presents an opportunity for the MPO and its planning partners to clarify roles and responsibilities for developing and sharing performance data, setting performance targets, reporting of targets, and tracking progress towards meeting targets, through a formal agreement.

Establish Performance Targets for Metropolitan Planning Areas

The MPO is required to set performance targets for each performance measure, per 23 CFR § 450.306. Those performance targets must be established 180 days after the transit agency established their performance targets. Transit agencies are required to set their performance targets by January 1, 2017. If there are multiple asset classes offered in the metropolitan planning area, the MPO should set targets for each asset class.

Performance Measures in Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP) and Metropolitan Transportation Plans

MPOs are required to reference the performance targets and performance based plans into their TIPs and Metropolitan Transportation Plans by October 2018, per 23 CFR § 450.324 and 23 CFR § 450.326. The planning products must include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system, for transit asset management, safety, and the FHWA performance measures. This should also include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the metropolitan transportation plan, linking investment priorities to those performance targets.

Background

FTA and FHWA published the final rule on Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning and Metropolitan Transportation Planning, on May 27, 2016. FTA published the final rule on Transit Asset Management (TAM) on July 26, 2016. There are new transit requirements for State Departments of Transportation (State DOTs). Below are the specific requirements for state DOTs.

State DOTs and Planning Agreements

State DOTs should hold discussions with transit providers, MPOs and planning partners to update their planning agreements, per 23 CFR § 450.314. This presents an opportunity for all parties to clarify roles and responsibilities for developing and sharing performance data, setting performance targets, reporting of targets, and tracking progress towards meeting targets, through a formal agreement. Examples include how parties will develop a TAM plan and share targets such as State of Good Repair measures.

Group Plan Sponsors

Sponsors of a Group TAM plan are responsible for setting unified targets for plan participants, per 49 CFR § 625.25. Once performance targets are set, sponsors are expected, to the maximum extent possible, to share the target with the MPO or MPOs that house their participant transit agencies in their MPA, per 49 CFR § 625.45. MPOs are responsible for implementing performance based planning in their planning documents.

Statewide Planning Agencies Incorporating TAM Requirements into Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (STIP) and Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plans

State DOTs are required to reference the performance targets and performance based plans into their planning documents by October 2018, per 23 CFR § 450.216 and 23 CFR § 450.218. The planning products must include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system for transit asset management, safety, and the FHWA performance measures. This should also include, to the maximum extent possible, a description of the anticipated effect of the STIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the long-range statewide transportation plan, linking investment priorities to those performance targets. Group TAM plan sponsors will need to incorporate group performance targets in the asset management discussions for their respective planning documents.

Timeline for Transit Asset Management

By January 1, 2017:

- Provider establishes their initial targets

By 180 days after providers set and share their initial targets:

- MPO establishes regional targets

Within four (4) months of the end of the provider's fiscal year 2018 (and each year thereafter)

- Provider submits to NTD their Asset Inventory Module (AIM); and performance targets for the next fiscal year

No later than October 1, 2018

- Provider completes their initial TAM Plan that covers four (4) years
- TAM Plan can be amended at any time
- A TAM Plan update is required at least every four (4) years

October 1, 2018:

- The MPO reflects the performance measures and targets in all MTPs and TIPs updated after this date
- The State DOT reflects the performance measures and targets in all long-range statewide transportation plan and STIPs updated after this date

Within four (4) months of the end of the provider's fiscal year 2019 (and each year thereafter)

- Provider submits to NTD their Asset Inventory Module (AIM); performance targets for the next fiscal year; and
- Narrative report on changes in transit system conditions and the progress toward achieving previous performance targets

Note: Provider refers to the Tier I transit providers, the Tier II providers who choose to not be part of a Group Plan, and the Group Plan Sponsors for two or more T II providers.

TAM Performance Measures

Background

In 2012, MAP-21 mandated FTA to develop a rule establishing a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving public capital assets effectively through their entire life cycle. The TAM Final Rule 49 USC 625 became effective Oct. 1, 2016 and established four performance measures. The performance management requirements outlined in 49 USC 625 Subpart D are a minimum standard for transit operators. Providers with more data and sophisticated analysis expertise are allowed to add performance measures and utilize those advanced techniques in addition to the required national performance measures.

Performance Measures

Rolling Stock: The percentage of revenue vehicles (by type) that exceed the useful life benchmark (ULB).

Equipment: The percentage of non-revenue service vehicles (by type) that exceed the ULB.

Facilities: The percentage of facilities (by group) that are rated less than 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale.

Infrastructure: The percentage of track segments (by mode) that have performance restrictions. Track segments are measured to the nearest 0.01 of a mile.



TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT

Data To Be Reported - Optional Report Year 2017, Mandatory Report Year 2018

Rolling Stock: The National Transit Database (NTD) lists 23 types of rolling stock, including bus and rail modes. Targets are set for each mode an agency, or Group Plan Sponsor, has in its inventory.

FTA default ULB or Agency customized ULB: Default ULBs represent maximum useful life based on the TERM model. Agencies can choose to customize based on analysis of their data OR they can use the FTA provided default ULBs.

Equipment: Only 3 classes of non-revenue service vehicles are

collected and used for target setting: 1) automobiles, 2) other rubber tire vehicles, and 3) other steel wheel vehicles.

Facilities: Four types of facilities are reported to NTD. Only 2 groups are used for target setting 1) Administrative and Maintenance and 2) Passenger and Parking.

Infrastructure: The NTD lists 9 types of rail modes; the NTD collects data by mode for track and other infrastructure assets.

BRT and Ferry are NTD fixed guideway modes but are not included in TAM targets.

TAM Performance Metrics: The NTD collects current year performance data. The NTD will collect additional Asset Inventory Module (AIM) data but targets forecast performance measures in the next fiscal year.

TAM Narrative Report: The TAM Rule requires agencies to submit this report to the NTD annually. The report describes conditions in the prior year that led to target attainment status.

www.transit.dot.gov/TAM/ULBcheatsheet

TERM Scale: Facility condition assessments reported to the NTD have one overall TERM rating per facility. Agencies are not required to use TERM model for conducting condition assessment but must report the facility condition assessment as a TERM rating score.

TERM Rating	Condition	Description
Excellent	4.8–5.0	No visible defects, near-new condition.
Good	4.0–4.7	Some slightly defective or deteriorated components.
Adequate	3.0–3.9	Moderately defective or deteriorated components.
Marginal	2.0–2.9	Defective or deteriorated components in need of replacement.
Poor	1.0–1.9	Seriously damaged components in need of immediate repair.

What You Need to Know About Establishing Targets

Include:

- Only those assets for which you have direct capital responsibility.
- Only asset types specifically referenced in performance measure.

Group Plans:

- Only one unified target per performance measure type.
- Sponsors may choose to develop more than one Group Plan.

MPOs:

- MPOs must establish targets specific to the MPO planning area for the same performance measures for all public transit providers in the MPO planning area within 180 days of when the transit provider establishes its targets.
- Opportunity to collaborate with transit providers.

Example Target Calculations

Rolling Stock and Equipment: Each target is based on the agency’s fleet and age. Agencies set only one target per mode/class/asset type. If an agency has multiple fleets in one asset type (see example BU and CU) of different service age, it must combine those fleets to calculate the performance metric percentage of asset type that exceeds ULB and to set the following fiscal year’s target. The performance metric calculation does not include emergency contingency vehicles.

Asset Category	Vehicle Class/Type	Fleet Size	Vehicle age	default ULB	FY 16 Performance Metric (% Exceeding ULB)	FY17 Target
Rolling Stock	Over the road bus (BU)	10	5	14 years	0%	60%
		15	13	14 years		
	Cutaway bus (CU)	19	8	10 years	21%	21%
		5	12	10 years		
	Mini Van (MV)	5	5	8 years	0%	0%
	Van (VN)	1	10	8 years	67%	67%
2		5	8 years			
Equipment	Auto (AO)	5	4	8 years	0%	0%

This example assumes no new vehicle purchases in the calculation of targets for FY17, therefore the FY17 target for over the road bus (BU) increases due to the second fleet vehicles aging another year and exceeding the default ULB. If an agency is more conservative, then it might set higher value targets. If an agency is more ambitious or expects funding to purchase new vehicles, then it might set lower value targets.

There is no penalty for missing a target and there is no reward for attaining a target. Targets are reported to the NTD annually on the A-90 form. The fleet information entered in the inventory forms will automatically populate the A-90 form with the range of types, classes, and modes associated with the modes reported.

SGR Performance Measures & Targets			RY 2017	RY 2017	RY 2018	RY 2018
Asset Category	Performance Measure	Asset Class	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Rolling Stock - All Revenue Vehicles	Age - % of revenue vehicles that have met or exceed their ULB	Articulated Buses	0%	0%	0%	
		Buses	20%	23%	20%	
		Cutaway Vans	10%	0%	0%	
		Minivans	0%	0%	0%	
		Railcars- RS - Commuter Rail	0%	0%	0%	
Equipment - Non Revenue Vehicles	Age - % of Non-Revenue vehicles have met or exceeded their ULB	Automobiles	25%	72%	50%	
		Trucks & other rubber tire vehicles	5%	28%	16%	
Facilities - All Buildings/Structures	Condition - % of facilities have a condition rating below 3.0	Passenger /Parking	0%	0%	0%	
		Administrative/Maintenance	5%	0%	0%	
Infrastructure - Fixed Rail Guideway, tracks, signals & systems	Performance - % of rail track segments, signals and systems with performance restrictions.	YR -Hybrid Rail	25%	3%	3%	



Date: May 21, 2018
Continued From: N/A
Action Requested: Information

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Mr. Ryan Collins, Short-Range Planning Manager
Agenda Item: 4
Subject: Discussion on PM3 Travel Time Performance Measures and Target Setting

RECOMMENDATION

None. This item is for informational purposes only.

PURPOSE AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The use of a performance-based transportation planning process is required by the federal government in the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Part of the performance-based planning process requires the adoption of performance targets in key areas by the effective date set by the FHWA and FTA's Final Rulemaking.

In February, CAMPO adopted the statewide targets for safety (PM1). Currently the state and MPOs are collaboratively developing the targets for infrastructure condition (PM2) and the system performance (PM3) measures. The metrics for PM3 are listed below:

Performance Measure Three (PM3)	
Measure	Metric
Travel Time Reliability	Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR)
Freight Reliability	Level of Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR)
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita	Total Peak Hour Excess Delay (PHED)

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

In order to provide more transparency in the selection and prioritization of transportation projects, federal legislation beginning with the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and continuing to the current Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), now stipulate that a performance measurement framework must be used in the development of the TIP and MTP.

The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) has been developing rules for the implementation of these performance measures. Within one year of the effective dates of the final rules from USDOT, state departments of transportation (DOT) must set performance targets for each performance area.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

None.



Date: May 21, 2018
Continued From: N/A
Action Requested: Information

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Mr. Samuel Himawan, TxDOT Austin District
Agenda Item: 5
Subject: Presentation on TxDOT Advanced Funding Agreement (AFA) Process

RECOMMENDATION

None. This item is for information purposes only.

PURPOSE AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of the TAC and in support of the CAMPO Call for Projects TxDOT District staff is providing a summarized presentation of the Advance Funding Agreement (AFA) process.

In order for TxDOT to spend funds or other resources on a transportation project with a local government, both parties must first execute a written contract. An Advance Funding Agreement (AFA) in which TxDOT and the local government allocate participation is the most frequently used contract for project development. TxDOT and a local government negotiate an agreement that determines which party is responsible for conducting work, providing funding or contributing items in-kind.

A more detailed discussion of the AFA process will be provided as part of the Local Governments Project Development Process Workshop which is being co-hosted by TxDOT District and CAMPO staff in early June.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

None.



Date: May 21, 2018
Continued From: N/A
Action Requested: Information

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Mr. Joe Clemens, Capital Metro
Agenda Item: 6
Subject: Update on Project Connect

RECOMMENDATION

None. This item is for information purposes only.

PURPOSE AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of Project Connect is to improve existing high-capacity transit and develop new high-capacity transit that provides efficient travel options to, from, and within Central Austin from the surrounding region. The current process for Project Connect began in March 2016 and is estimated for completion by December 2018. The process includes three phases:

- Phase 1 – Identify Top Performing Projects and Corridors
- Phase 2 – Detailed Analysis of Projects and Corridors
- Phase 3 – Select Technically Preferred Alternatives

The outcome of the process will include a program of preferred alternatives and implementation priorities over a 20-year, financially-constrained time period. Capital Metro is the lead agency for Project Connect with cooperating agency support from CAMPO, TxDOT, CTRMA, and City of Austin. CARTS, local municipalities, and county jurisdictions within the five-county MSA are participating agencies. Project Connect is being conducted per FHWA/FTA's Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) process.

An update on Project Connect was presented to the CAMPO TAC on July 24, 2017 at the end of Phase 1. Since Phase 2 is nearly complete, Capital Metro would like to provide another update on Project Connect and promote the public engagement survey prior to the end of June.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Financial scenarios and impacts will be evaluated in Phase 2 and finalized in Phase 3.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Project Connect: CAMPO Technical Advisory Committee, Powerpoint Presentation (May 21, 2018)



Date: May 21, 2018
Continued From: N/A
Action Requested: Information

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Mr. Ashby Johnson, Executive Director
Agenda Item: Item 7
Subject: CAMPO Federal Certification Review

This page is intentionally blank.