



MEETING MINUTES

Project: Livability 2050 Regional Transportation Plan Update
Meeting: Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee (RTPAC) Meeting #3
Date: July 26, 2018
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: Shelby County Training Conference Room, 6463 Haley Road, Building 10,
Memphis, TN 38134

Attendees Present:

Eddie Brawley, West Memphis MPO
Angelica Carey, City of Memphis (Memphis 3.0)
James Collins, Kimley-Horn and Associates (KHA)
Jessica Dilley, Mississippi Department of Transportation, (MDOT)
Kevin Eason, Shelby County
Allison Fluitt, KHA
Tim Gwaltney, City of Germantown
Antoine Hawkins, Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT)
Kate Horton, Memphis Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Sajid Hossain, MPO
John Lancaster, Memphis Area Transit Authority (MATA)
Jennifer Marshall, TDOT
Rick McClanahan, City of Bartlett
Kenneth Monroe, KHA
Sonja Owens, Shelby County Health Department
Randy Richardson, Memphis and Shelby County Port Commission
Darren Sanders, Shelby County
Alvan-Bidal Sanchez, MPO
Pragati Srivastava, MPO
Robert Tworek, KHA

-
1. Mrs. Allison Fluitt and Mr. Kenny Monroe gave an update to the Livability 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee (RTPAC).
 2. Mrs. Fluitt opened the meeting by displaying a timeline of the RTP, which included key milestone dates and the current phase of the planning process.
 3. Mrs. Fluitt explained the two funding scenario concepts that were considered during the Livability 2040 RTP planning phase: Regional Roadway Connections and Expanded Travel Options. She recapped what each concept entailed, as well as how each concept addressed various FAST (Fixing America's Surface Transportation) Act goals. Concept Two, which is the Expanded Travel Option, was selected as the preferred scenario. She also gave highlights of plans and projects that have been undertaken since the 2040 RTP was adopted and explained that these initiatives are supportive of concept two.
 4. Mrs. Fluitt opened the floor to anyone who had any comments regarding whether or not Concept Two was still the preferred approach of the RTPAC. A member of the committee stated the need for two more bridges over the Mississippi River, one to the North and one to the South. The member said that the bridges need to be



- identified, located, and put into the plan, if possible. These bridges would relieve congestion on the functionally obsolete I-55 bridge and on the I-40 bridge. There is a study that shows that a project that includes a new bridge has one of the highest benefit-cost ratios in the entire country. The Southern Gateway project is currently in the RTP as a study, but since there are no funds available for the project, construction of the project is not included in the financially constrained portion of the RTP. Other members of the committee acknowledged the need for another bridge over the Mississippi River, but it further stated that it needs to be a national level effort. Overall, no concerns were raised with concept two moving forward as the preferred approach.
5. Next, Mrs. Fluitt went over the various sources of funding for the RTP. For Tennessee, she listed the sources of funding and explained how the Improving Manufacturing, Public Roads, and Opportunities for a Vibrant Economy (IMPROVE) Act contributed to both state transportation projects and county and municipal revenue. The estimated revenues for 2017-2020 are \$19.5 million for MPO municipalities, \$3.5 million for counties (Shelby and part of Fayette), and \$515 million for state-level projects. More information about the IMPROVE Act can be found in the attached presentation.
 6. Mrs. Fluitt then discussed the funding for Mississippi. She explained that the funding for Mississippi had been restructured since the last cycle and that the funds for transportation projects has decreased. A representative from MDOT clarified that funds may have not actually decreased, but rather MDOT has changed its planning process to only lay out projects that they have the funds to commit to. As of now, MDOT can only commit to debt services and maintenance.
 7. Mrs. Fluitt presented that total funding for the life of the plan. The total expected funding is \$9.7 billion for Tennessee and \$3.3 billion for Mississippi, for a grand total of \$13 billion.
 8. Mr. Monroe discussed the project review process. He explained that the 2050 RTP is an update to the 2040 RTP and described the review of the current plan projects. He discussed the process of coordination with MPO member agencies to identify whether projects need to stay in the plan or be removed, and if there are any new projects that need to be included. Current operations and maintenance costs were also obtained from each agency to accurately reflect these in the plan. Based on preliminary analysis, it appears that not all identified project can be funded within the horizon of the plan.
 9. A committee member raised a question regarding how operations and maintenance costs were being accounted for. The member explained that the costs that are given to the MPO are strictly what the member agency has budgeted for maintenance when, in reality, more money is needed to better account for the maintenance that needs to be done. The member suggested looking for a better way to capture these costs. This will be looked into by the planning team.

A follow up comment was made by a committee member regarding the level of scrutiny in maintenance projects. The member discussed including in the plan recommendations to streamline these projects because maintenance projects are costing more than they should and are taking longer to complete due to the scrutiny and overall review process. By streamlining these projects, it would free up funds to complete more maintenance.



10. Mrs. Fluit discussed the prioritization scales and the prioritization process for the plan. The scales include Interregional, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Neighborhood Communities, and Undeveloped. The process includes first assigning a project to an investment context type based on a combination of the project's need and purpose, its location and proximity to regional, community or environmental assets, and its functional classification. Then the projects were evaluated relative to one another within each investment context category for each of the ten prioritization criteria. Projects were then assigned a rank tier based on the scores from the evaluation process. In total, 4 tiers were developed for use, with Rank 1 being the top 25% of projects.
11. Mrs. Fluit presented the ten prioritization criteria, which are listed in the attached presentation. An issue was raised by a committee member about the "requires minimal ROW" criteria. The member asked how this criterion worked with phasing road construction. Mr. Monroe stated that the phasing of the project should be included in the project description so the year of expenditure cost can more accurately be captured. Another committee member suggested to reword or rephrase the criterion to include minimal ROW, NEPA approval, strong public support, and the constructability of the project instead of just minimal ROW.

A follow up question was raised by a committee member regarding the new road alignments and this same criterion. The member was concerned with whether a road with a new alignment will be treated equally as with a widening project. Mr. Monroe and Mrs. Fluit explained that other criteria will balance this out in the end.
12. Mrs. Fluit presented the guiding principles of the plan: Connections and Choices, Economic Vitality, Safety and Security, Sustainable Growth, and System Preservation. She, as well as members of the MPO, explained that each of the ten criteria stems from these five guiding principles. A committee member suggested that the guiding principles be presented first and then go into detail of the selection criteria.
13. Mrs. Fluit presented the next steps of the planning process, which include ETC and TPB adopting the funding scenario, consolidating draft recommendations, creating draft prioritization, and the next RTPAC meeting. More information about the next meeting will be sent out when the date and agenda has been finalized.
14. Final notes: A meeting with the Port Commission was requested to discuss their project needs. Shelby County needs to be informed about projects that the City of Memphis removes from their plan due to deannexation.
15. Please email all feedback, questions, and comments to kenny.monroe@kimley-horn.com and/or allison.fluit@kimley-horn.com.