



**TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TTAC)
 SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
 Time Check Hall, First Floor – City Services Center
 500 15th Ave SW, Cedar Rapids
 Wednesday, March 4, 2020 at 8:30 a.m.**

Member	Present	Absent	Alternate
Brenna Fall – <i>Chairperson</i>	X – Arrived at 9:10 am		
Tom Peffer – <i>Vice Chairperson</i>	X		
Seth Gunnerson	X		
Nate Kampman	X – Arrived at 9:13 am		
John Witt	X		
Ron Griffith	X – Arrived at 8:34 am		
Mary Beth Stevenson	X		
Carrie Pauli	X		
Matt Myers	X		
Doug Wilson	X		Lee Tippe
Jennifer Selby	X		
Scott Pottorff	X – Arrived at 8:35 am		
Shane Wicks	X		
Matt Johnson	X		
Randy Burke	X		
Brad Ketels		X	
Kesha Billings	X		
Mike Barkalow	X – Arrived at 9:10 am		
Jon Bogert		X	
Kelli Scott		X	
Cathy Cutler (NV)	X		
Darla Hugaboom (NV)		X	
Eva Steinman (NV)		X	

Staff Present: Bill Micheel, Brandon Whyte, Hilary Hershner, Liz Darnall
 Non-MPO Staff Present: Brad DeBrower

Vice Chairperson Tom Peffer called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Action/Discussion Items

1. 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Transit Fiscally Constrained Project (FCP) List Staff Recommendation

Liz Darnall reviewed the federal regulations of the fiscal constraint requirements for LRTP. Darnall stated that they estimate the funds that are expected to be available, inflate the project costs to year of expenditure dollar, group the projects into timeframes, illustrative projects (vision projects) are to be shown separately, and then anytime that we amend them plan we have to show that it is fiscally constraint. Darnall reviewed



the anticipated project completion timeframes. She shared that the scoring criteria was approved by the MPO Policy board based on the recommendations provided by the Executive Committee and TTAC. She indicated that the scoring criteria was based off of the seven adopted goals for the plan which include; economic vitality; safety and security; sustainable development, public health, preservation and enhancement of the environment; accessibility, mobility, and connectivity for both people and freight; resiliency, efficiency, energy conversation; preservation of the transportation system; and lastly, mitigate stormwater, resiliency and reliability of the transportation system. Darnall reviewed how funding was determined and how projects were assigned. There was a question inquiring about the inflation amounts and rate followed by brief discussion regarding the inflation rate.

Darnall shared the list of Transit Fiscally Constrained Projects (FCP) and the list of Transit Vision Projects. She mentioned that they received no public comments regarding the Transit projects. She stated that the Transit fiscally constrained projects list are staff's recommendation based off of available funding.

John Witt moved to recommend Policy Board approve staff's recommendation for the Transit FCP. Seconded by Seth Gunnerson. There was a question regarding the passenger shelters and funding of non-rolling stock; Darnall stated that the funding of non-rolling stock needs to go back to Executive Committee to be further discussed. The motion carried.

2. 2045 LRTP Safe Routes to School (SRTS) FCP List Staff Recommendation

Brandon Whyte shared the list of Safe Routes to School fiscally constrained projects and the list of SRTS vision projects. Whyte mentioned that this is the newest funding source. He stated that MPO Staff has received one public comment regarding the Coolidge Elementary School and Taft Middle School project. He noted that there was a tie between seven projects who had a score of 75; five of those projects are being funded and two are not due to available funding. He explained why those five projects were selected over the other two and it was due to the least amount of funding carry over. There was questions among the Committee about "what if" scenarios; switching the Saint Joseph School project with the Pierce School project or switching out Nixon School with either Starry School or Vernon School. MPO Staff explained that due to the construction costs and the carry over amount that this list had the least amount of carry over. There was discussion regarding the types of projects that are on the FCP list and the vision list; sidewalk gaps and trail projects; Whyte replied that both types of projects are allowed. There was a question regarding what happens to the carry over funding; Whyte replied, nothing it just stays available. Committee members wanted to know if the list every gets revisited; Whyte replied, yes every five years they review the list. There was brief discussion regarding the inflation rate and design costs.

Witt moved to recommend Policy Board approve staff's recommendation for the SRTS FCP. Seconded by Jennifer Selby. The motion carried.

3. 2045 LRTP Trails FCP List Staff Recommendation

Brandon Whyte shared the list of Trail fiscally constrained projects and the lists of Trail vision projects. Whyte mentioned that there was a lot of public comment that was received for a variety of different projects. Public Comments were identified to specific project ID numbers that are listed on the 2045 Trail FCP list and the 2045 Trails Vision Projects list in the agenda packet. Public Comments were received on project id number 20. Additionally, several comments were received from the Grant Wood Trails Meeting; comments on removing project id numbers 40 and 67; comments were made both for an against project id numbers 2 and 16; comments on liking project id numbers 63, 41, 55, 49, and 11; and lastly one comment question on project id number 4.



Whyte further went on to explain the MPO Staff suggestions of removal of specific projects on the FCP to the Vision list; those project id numbers are as follows 9, 20, and 52. Whyte specifically discussed project id number 47 (Highway 100 Trail North). Project 47 was submitted by Linn County. He discussed the specifics as it related to the project score of a 22; he mentioned that this project scored low for connectivity because neither ends has connections, and scored low due to less green features. Linn County made the comment that it seems like they will always score low on population and that this specific trail will connective the entire SW to the Cedar Valley Nature Trail.

There was a question on project id number 20 and why MPO Staff are suggesting removal of that specific project. Whyte shared that project id number 20 (Sac & Fox Trial Extension – Segment 1) is currently applying for the TIP and if awarded will be able to receive additional funds, so it is best to move this project to the vision plan.

There was a question concerning the negative public comments associated with project 2 and 16. Whyte shared that for both projects that the concerns were that there was not a lot of development out there and it was not a priority at this time. There were comments in favor of the two projects; that local schools students would be able to utilize those projects. He shared that specifically for project id number 2 there was a serious accident involving a mother and her son were rear-ended on the road.

There was discussion about the scoring that was used. Darnall reviewed that projects that had major destinations received more points; projects that connected to existing systems also received more points; and lastly projects had were longer due to more connections scored higher.

Randy Burke mentioned that Linn County has other priorities above project id number 52 (Prairie Creek Trail West) and requests that it be removed from the FCP and added to the Vision Plan list.

MPO Staff suggested that Committee members remove the following projects from the FCP and add them to the Vision plan; project id numbers, 9, 20, 28, 40, and 52. MPO Staff also suggest that project id number 47 be removed from the Vision plan list and be added to the FCP list. Whyte pointed out that MPO Staff's recommendation is to always go by the scoring of projects; however, they did want to provide a suggestion to the Committee in which that project id number 47 was included for Linn County.

There was discussion among Committee members regarding project id number 20 and project id number 47. Committee members who are associated with those projects provided insight into those questions related to the projects. There was additional questions regarding project id number 1.

Lee Tippe moved to recommend Policy Board approve staff's suggestions for the Trail FCP. Seconded by Mary Beth Stevenson. The motion carried.

4. 2045 LRTP Road FCP List Staff Recommendation

Hilary Hershner shared the list of Roads Fiscally Constrained Projects and the list of Roads Vision Projects. She mentioned that one public comment was received and that it covered project id numbers 36 and 37, both of which are on the Roads Vision Plan. The public comment indicated that they feel that these two projects are a high priority as the road is terrible on vehicles and very unsafe for bicycle traffic. There suggestion is to add a bike lane or preferably a side path. Hershner went on to mention that currently these two projects are not in the Roads FCP plan.



She quickly reviewed the Roads FCP and how the list was determined. She stated that the FCP is based on 3 things: 1) Year of Construction, then 2) Score, and 3) least amount of carry over in FFY35-45 timeband. She asked the Committee for their input on the lists.

A Committee member asked to review the scoring criteria and asked if the scoring has slightly changed recently. Hershner replied that the consultants scored these so the MPO could remain unbiased. She reviewed some of the categories of the scoring; safety features, maintenance, road network, and green design features etc. There was additional questions regarding project id number 83, as to why they were not included in the FCP but are on the Vision plan; and when could they possibly be moved to the FCP; and what happens if they do not get money from the TIP; and what funding sources would be available. MPO Staff reassured that there would be an opportunity in 2021 to apply for an amendment and that this project is guaranteed to receive \$823,000.

Witt moved to recommend Policy Board approve staff's recommendation for the Road FCP. Seconded by Selby. There was a question regarding project id number 48 and whether or not that this project would still be able to get additional outside funding that is being requested. MPO Staff stated yes, it would be able to do so. The motion carried.

Report Items/Member Updates

There were no items to report or member updates.

Adjournment

Tom Peffer adjourned the meeting at 9:53 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Amy Cannon
Administrative Assistant II