REGIONAL BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN PLAN 2014 UPDATE

TPB – November 20, 2014
Planning Themes

• Safety/Comfort

Safety is measured through analysis of historical crash data involving persons riding bicycles or walking. This analysis allows the MPO to prioritize locations with high frequencies of crashes.

Safety also plays a role in how likely a person might be to using a particular corridor for travel by bicycle or by foot. To this regard, safety also includes an analysis of user expectations and perceptions that encourage or discourage bicycling or walking.
Planning Themes

• Connectivity

Connectivity is a measure of how well the bicycle or pedestrian networks allow for efficient travel between two points.

Increasing the connectivity of the bicycle or pedestrian networks create an environment where short trips taken by bicycle or by foot rival the speed, time, and duration of trips taken by car.
Planning Themes

• Accessibility

Accessibility is a measure of how well bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel integrate with themselves and with other modes of transportation.

Often times, the connectivity between different modes of transportation, particularly bicycle, pedestrian, and public transportation, produce a synergy that allows greater access to common destinations that when a singular mode of transportation is used.

The ability for a person using a mobility device to access the pedestrian and public transportation networks is critical to ensuring equal opportunity for all residents regardless of their ability.
Planning Themes

• Mode Shift

Mode shift refers to those programs, policies, and projects that result in fewer trips being made by automobile, and more trips being made utilizing bicycling, walking, or public transportation.

There are predictive methods of estimating how many potential users would be inclined to make a trip by bicycling or walking after a key piece of infrastructure is completed.

There may be educational or encouragement programs that tap into latent demand and produce highly visible examples of short trips being made by bicycling or walking.
Methods of Analysis

Safety/Comfort
Connectivity
Accessibility
Mode Shift
Analysis of Proposed Facilities

• Facilities included in the 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

• Facilities proposed by the Mid-South Regional Greenprint

• Facilities requested for inclusion by MPO jurisdictions during the plan’s development
Composite Results

• Every roadway and greenway segment provided a numeric score for comparison purposes

• Results indicate where bicycle and pedestrian improvements are **most likely to provide the greatest benefit** (based on the plan’s 4 themes described above)

• Bicycle project ranking separate from pedestrian ranking
Draft Review Period

- 30-day comment period began October 11, 2014
- Ended November 12, 2014
- Reviewed by:
  - The public
  - Local municipal planners and engineers
  - TDOT/MDOT
  - Federal agencies
- Comments were reviewed and the document was revised as appropriate
2014 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN (PPP)

TPB – November 20, 2014
Public Participation Plan (PPP) - Overview

• Handbook describing how the Memphis MPO involves the public in the transportation planning process.
  • Outreach Methods/ Public Input Methods
  • Participation Strategies
  • Plan Evaluation
  • State and Federal Regulations
  • Public, State and Federal Review Periods

• The PPP is updated to keep it consistent with federal transportation legislation (MAP-21) requirements.
PPP Update Process

- **July '14** - Memphis MPO Membership and Public Notified
- **July '14** – Peer PPP Review
- **August thru October '14** – Public Survey & Feedback
- **August '14** - TPB/ETC Draft Review
- **September '14** - State DOTs/Federal Agencies Draft Review
- **October thru November '14** - Public Draft Review
- **November '14** - Adoption

- Attended 13+ meetings sharing PPP update status
- 5 peer PPPs reviewed
- 45 calendar day Public Review ends Nov. 18
Survey Results  70+ Participants

1. How did you hear about today’s public meeting? (1 sticker per)

2. How would you most likely provide your input to the Memphis MPO? (2 stickers per)

3. How would you prefer to have detailed or complicated material presented to you? (1 sticker per)

4. Which of the following best describes you? (1 sticker per)
# Outreach Techniques

**Memphis MPO**
- Website
- Quarterly Newsletter
- Online Surveys
- Comment Forms
- Legal Notices
- Television interview
- Newspapers article
- Public Meetings/ Open House
- Radio
- Press Releases
- Social Media

**Peer MPOs**

**Nashville**
- Tag- On Meetings
- Exhibits at Events

**Phoenix**
- Co-Host Meetings
- Annual Report on Participation Efforts

**San Francisco**
- “Meeting in a Box”
- Say it Simple

---

**Peer Review Themes**: Cultivating Partnerships, Targeted Outreach, Presenting in the Community and Public Involvement Self-Reporting
2014 PPP Major Changes

• Clearly designed document to be more legible, user friendly and easier to read
• Annual Public Involvement Reporting
• New Outreach Methods from Peer PPP Review
• Incorporate technology trends (Constant Contact, Social Media) considering preferences from the PPP Survey
• Improve Public Participation process for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
• Bring up to date with Federal Legislation – MAP-21
Public Review Closed Nov. 18th

PPP is available online @ www.memphismpo.org, at local libraries, or at the Memphis MPO Offices

Mitchell Lloyd
Transportation Planner
Memphis MPO
125 North Main St., Suite #450
Memphis, TN 38103
Office: (901) 576-7146
Mitchell.Lloyd@memphistn.gov

Peter Jenkins
Transportation Planner
Memphis MPO
125 North Main St., Suite #450
Memphis, TN 38103
Office: (901) 576-7156
Perter.Jenkins@memphistn.gov
LAND USE MODEL UPDATE

TPB Meeting
November 20, 2014
Agenda

- Model Process
- Control Totals and Allocation
- Results
Model Process

Legend
- LUM Process
- Input
- Output
- TDM Process

Carrying Capacity Analysis:
Identifies potential constraints and
determines where future growth may
occurred

Land Suitability Analysis:
Measures the attractiveness of areas
for accommodating new development

Control Totals:
- Future growth in population
  and employment for the
  region

Model Allocation:
Model will assign population and
employment growth

Population:
Number of Households

Employment:
Retail, Office, Service, Industrial
/Manufacturing, Wholesale, and
Government

Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ)
Aggregation

Place Types:
- Represents the various
development categories
- Describe, measure, and
evaluate the built
environment

Suitability Factors:
- Rate different locations
- Help measure the
appropriateness of an
area for a specific
condition or use

Transportation Facilities

Regional Travel Demand Model

Land Use Model (LUM)

Travel Demand Model (TDM)
Planning and Land Use Advisory Committee

• Standing Committee of the MPO recently formed to address regional land use planning issues
• Assisted in the development of the land use model update
  • July 31, 2014
  • September 4, 2014
  • October 9, 2014 (PLAC and ETC Work session)
• Revised model inputs based on comments from PLAC and ETC members
Land values exceed the value of the buildings:

- **High**: Building value is less than 25 percent of land value
- **Medium**: Building value is between 25 and 75 percent of land value
- **Low**: Building value is between 75 and 100 percent of land value
Allocation

• Growth determined from control totals

• Control Totals Developed as part of Travel Demand Model:
  • Historical Growth Patterns
  • US Census information
  • MPO current travel demand model projections
  • University of Tennessee's projections from their Center for Business and Economic Research + other State Projections (TN MS and AR)
  • Third party sources (Infogroup, Woods and Poole)

• Land Use Model distributes future growth based on placetypes and suitability analysis
  • Allocation constrained at the county level control totals
## Control Totals

### Population Forecasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2045</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>38,413</td>
<td>41,497</td>
<td>42,893</td>
<td>44,346</td>
<td>45,342</td>
<td>47,931</td>
<td>50,370</td>
<td>52,932</td>
<td>55,838</td>
<td>58,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>927,644</td>
<td>954,066</td>
<td>965,619</td>
<td>976,987</td>
<td>984,640</td>
<td>1,004,035</td>
<td>1,022,686</td>
<td>1,041,584</td>
<td>1,062,010</td>
<td>1,082,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>61,117</td>
<td>68,037</td>
<td>71,238</td>
<td>74,005</td>
<td>75,509</td>
<td>80,886</td>
<td>84,996</td>
<td>89,316</td>
<td>95,147</td>
<td>101,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>101,216</td>
<td>185,187</td>
<td>196,521</td>
<td>208,550</td>
<td>216,976</td>
<td>239,558</td>
<td>264,492</td>
<td>282,020</td>
<td>322,414</td>
<td>355,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crittenden</td>
<td>50,902</td>
<td>50,927</td>
<td>50,938</td>
<td>50,949</td>
<td>50,956</td>
<td>50,974</td>
<td>50,992</td>
<td>51,010</td>
<td>51,028</td>
<td>51,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>37,144</td>
<td>38,728</td>
<td>39,427</td>
<td>40,139</td>
<td>40,621</td>
<td>41,851</td>
<td>43,118</td>
<td>44,423</td>
<td>45,768</td>
<td>47,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>28,886</td>
<td>31,633</td>
<td>32,889</td>
<td>34,195</td>
<td>35,094</td>
<td>37,447</td>
<td>39,958</td>
<td>42,637</td>
<td>45,496</td>
<td>48,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunica</td>
<td>10,778</td>
<td>12,016</td>
<td>12,590</td>
<td>13,190</td>
<td>13,607</td>
<td>14,706</td>
<td>15,894</td>
<td>17,178</td>
<td>18,566</td>
<td>20,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,316,100</td>
<td>1,382,092</td>
<td>1,412,116</td>
<td>1,442,362</td>
<td>1,463,145</td>
<td>1,517,389</td>
<td>1,572,506</td>
<td>1,631,201</td>
<td>1,696,266</td>
<td>1,765,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household Forecasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2045</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>14,505</td>
<td>15,669</td>
<td>16,197</td>
<td>16,745</td>
<td>17,122</td>
<td>18,099</td>
<td>19,020</td>
<td>19,988</td>
<td>21,085</td>
<td>22,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>350,973</td>
<td>360,970</td>
<td>365,341</td>
<td>369,642</td>
<td>372,537</td>
<td>379,875</td>
<td>386,932</td>
<td>394,120</td>
<td>401,810</td>
<td>409,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>21,629</td>
<td>24,078</td>
<td>25,211</td>
<td>26,190</td>
<td>26,884</td>
<td>28,625</td>
<td>30,080</td>
<td>31,608</td>
<td>33,672</td>
<td>35,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>57,734</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>70,377</td>
<td>74,685</td>
<td>77,702</td>
<td>85,790</td>
<td>94,719</td>
<td>104,577</td>
<td>115,462</td>
<td>127,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crittenden</td>
<td>19,026</td>
<td>19,035</td>
<td>19,039</td>
<td>19,044</td>
<td>19,046</td>
<td>19,053</td>
<td>19,060</td>
<td>19,066</td>
<td>19,073</td>
<td>19,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>13,369</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>14,191</td>
<td>14,447</td>
<td>14,620</td>
<td>15,063</td>
<td>15,519</td>
<td>15,989</td>
<td>16,473</td>
<td>16,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>10,035</td>
<td>10,989</td>
<td>11,426</td>
<td>11,879</td>
<td>12,192</td>
<td>13,009</td>
<td>13,881</td>
<td>14,812</td>
<td>15,805</td>
<td>16,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunica</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>4,378</td>
<td>4,587</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>6,259</td>
<td>6,764</td>
<td>7,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>491,198</td>
<td>515,378</td>
<td>526,369</td>
<td>537,478</td>
<td>545,041</td>
<td>564,873</td>
<td>585,002</td>
<td>606,419</td>
<td>630,144</td>
<td>655,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Forecasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2045</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>8,757</td>
<td>10,332</td>
<td>11,091</td>
<td>12,059</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>14,657</td>
<td>16,996</td>
<td>19,708</td>
<td>22,847</td>
<td>26,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>516,180</td>
<td>563,624</td>
<td>585,269</td>
<td>607,583</td>
<td>622,929</td>
<td>663,013</td>
<td>702,407</td>
<td>744,141</td>
<td>785,979</td>
<td>830,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>12,181</td>
<td>13,019</td>
<td>13,396</td>
<td>13,785</td>
<td>14,051</td>
<td>14,739</td>
<td>15,463</td>
<td>16,223</td>
<td>17,016</td>
<td>17,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>55,067</td>
<td>65,583</td>
<td>70,684</td>
<td>76,142</td>
<td>80,012</td>
<td>90,571</td>
<td>101,587</td>
<td>113,942</td>
<td>126,419</td>
<td>140,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crittenden</td>
<td>19,909</td>
<td>21,700</td>
<td>22,516</td>
<td>23,476</td>
<td>24,138</td>
<td>25,877</td>
<td>27,845</td>
<td>29,962</td>
<td>32,075</td>
<td>34,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>7,111</td>
<td>8,661</td>
<td>9,103</td>
<td>9,630</td>
<td>9,998</td>
<td>10,981</td>
<td>12,115</td>
<td>13,365</td>
<td>14,649</td>
<td>16,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>6,744</td>
<td>7,575</td>
<td>7,961</td>
<td>8,422</td>
<td>8,744</td>
<td>9,604</td>
<td>10,595</td>
<td>11,689</td>
<td>12,812</td>
<td>14,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunica</td>
<td>14,399</td>
<td>16,128</td>
<td>16,951</td>
<td>17,932</td>
<td>18,617</td>
<td>20,448</td>
<td>22,559</td>
<td>24,888</td>
<td>27,278</td>
<td>29,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>640,906</td>
<td>706,621</td>
<td>736,971</td>
<td>769,028</td>
<td>791,240</td>
<td>849,890</td>
<td>908,566</td>
<td>973,919</td>
<td>1,039,074</td>
<td>1,109,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- TDOT is currently reviewing TAZ socio-economic data for all model horizon years
- Incorporate socio-economic data into Travel Demand Model
- Model Documentation
2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

TPB Meeting November 20, 2014

Consultant Team: Cambridge Systematics, The Corradino Group, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Younger Associates, New West Public Relations and Dalhoff-Thomas Design Studio
Agenda

• Project Status
• Public Outreach Round 1 Results
• Preliminary Goals and Objectives
## Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 - Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 – Baseline Data and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 – Goals, Objectives,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 – Existing and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5 – SWOT Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6 – Scenario Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7 – Revenue Projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8 – Project Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Prioritization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9 – Financially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10 - Final RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETC/TPB Meetings**

**Public Meetings**

**Drafts**

- Draft 1
- Draft 2
- Draft 3
How Does Everything Fit Together?

Regional Land Use Model → Travel Surveys → Regional Travel Demand Model → Congestion Management Process → Greenprint, other regional studies

2040 Regional Transportation Plan

Public/Stakeholder Outreach

Performance Measures Reporting
Public Outreach Round 1 Results

- Public Meetings
  - Turning Point, Survey Monkey: Survey/Live Polling
  - Presentation
  - Q&A
- Other Special Stakeholder Meetings
Public Outreach Round 1 Results

- Public Meetings
- Community and Tag On Meetings
- Livable Memphis
- MEMfix Event
- Westwood Community
- Center for Independent Living
- LatinoMemphis (upcoming)
Outreach Activities

• Public Meetings
• School Visits
• Transit Bus Ads
• Press Releases
• Radio Interviews
• Email Blasts
• Community Meeting Tag-Ons
• Elected Officials Meetings
• More, More, and More…..
Interactive Opportunities

LIVABILITY 2040 Homepage [www.Livability2040.com](http://www.Livability2040.com)


Facebook search “Memphis Urban Area MPO”

Twitter search @MemphisMPO

Make your voice count. – 560 survey responses.
Initial Survey Results

Q5 For my day to day travel I use the following transportation modes: (Please select all options which apply to you).

Answered: 512  Skipped: 52

- Drive my own car: 95.31%
- Carpool: 4.88%
- Transit bus or trolley: 7.03%
- Bike: 13.28%
- Walk: 14.26%
Q7 If you don’t bike, walk, or take transit the primary reason for NOT TAKING this mode is: (Please select one).

Answered: 474   Skipped: 90

- **Distance**: 21.52% (102)
- **Not convenient**: 17.72% (84)
- **Doesn’t get me where I need to go**: 11.81% (56)
- **Other (please specify)**: 12.66% (60)
- **Not Applicable**: 14.98% (71)
- **Safety/Security**: 9.28% (44)
- **Speed or reliability**: 12.03% (57)
Q11 Are there any times of the day where you experience delay? If yes, please select the time of day you experience the MOST delay.

Answered: 494  Skipped: 70
Q16 My top THREE issues with transportation in the Greater Memphis Area are:

Answered: 449  Skipped: 115

- Frequent congestion
  - First (Most Important): 82
  - Second (Second Most Important): 51
  - Third (Third Most Important): 55

- Unpredictable travel times
  - First (Most Important): 33
  - Second (Second Most Important): 81
  - Third (Third Most Important): 71

- Condition and quality of transportation infrastructure
  - First (Most Important): 103
  - Second (Second Most Important): 102
  - Third (Third Most Important): 85

- Difficulty of using transportation options besides driving
  - First (Most Important): 148
  - Second (Second Most Important): 95
  - Third (Third Most Important): 55

- Impact to the environment
  - First (Most Important): 14
  - Second (Second Most Important): 28
  - Third (Third Most Important): 50

- Unsafe travel conditions
  - First (Most Important): 38
  - Second (Second Most Important): 46
  - Third (Third Most Important): 55

- Negative community impacts
  - First (Most Important): 21
  - Second (Second Most Important): 39
  - Third (Third Most Important): 53

- Other
  - First (Most Important): 8
  - Second (Second Most Important): 5
  - Third (Third Most Important): 10
Q21 How would you prioritize the following? Please evaluate and select the most applicable response for each item (Higher average rating number indicates higher priority.)

Answered: 431  Skipped: 133

- Maintenance Improvements: 3.96
- Intersection Improvements: 3.73
- More frequent bus service: 3.68
- Improve Timing of Signals: 3.61
- Rail Transit Service: 3.45
- More Sidewalks: 3.30
- Widen Major Roads: 2.96
- More Bicycle/Pedestrian: 2.88
- More bike lanes: 2.71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP-21 National Goal</th>
<th>2040 RTP Planning Emphasis Area</th>
<th>2040 RTP Update Goal</th>
<th>2040 RTP Update Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Condition</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td><strong>GOAL 1.1</strong> MAINTAIN EXISTING TRANSPORTATION ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 1.1</strong> Maintain existing assets as a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 1.2</strong> Prioritize strategies to better manage travel demand on existing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 1.3</strong> Promote construction/maintenance techniques and materials that minimize future maintenance needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td><strong>GOAL 2.1</strong> INCREASE THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR ALL USERS</td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 2.1</strong> Support projects that address an existing, identified safety or security need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 2.2</strong> Support projects, programs and policies that advance safe and secure travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 2.3</strong> Initiate crash data management system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MAP-21 National Goal | 2040 RTP Planning Emphasis Area | Goal 3.1  
MINIMIZE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT ON THE SOCIAL, NATURAL, AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT; IMPROVE AIR QUALITY; AND IMPROVE PUBLIC HEALTH | OBJECTIVE 3.1  
Provide multimodal, active transportation options |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Environmental        | Environment                    | Goal 4.1  
ADVANCE CORRIDOR AND COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE | OBJECTIVE 4.1  
Encourage context sensitive solutions derived from integrated transportation/ land use planning efforts |
| Sustainability       |                               |                                                                      | OBJECTIVE 4.2  
Support complete streets implementation |
| Land Use             |                               |                                                                      | OBJECTIVE 4.3  
Encourage access management planning and design |
|                      |                               |                                                                      | OBJECTIVE 4.4  
Identify and mitigate freight/residential community conflict |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP-21 National Goal</th>
<th>2040 RTP Planning Emphasis Area</th>
<th>2040 RTP Update Goal</th>
<th>2040 RTP Update Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality/Freight Movement</td>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td><strong>Goal 5.1</strong> ENSURE THE REGION IS WELL POSITIONED TO REMAIN A LEADER IN GLOBAL LOGISTICS AND FREIGHT MOVEMENT</td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 5.1</strong> Reduce truck delay on critical freight corridors and within key freight hubs <strong>OBJECTIVE 5.2</strong> Reduce intermodal conflict and delay <strong>OBJECTIVE 5.3</strong> Advance an Airport/Aerotropolis TMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility/Accessibility</td>
<td>Goal 6.1 IMPROVE MULTIMODAL ACCESS TO COMMUNITY AND EMPLOYMENT RESOURCES</td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 6.1</strong> Improve bicycle and pedestrian access to employment, educational, health, and recreational opportunities <strong>OBJECTIVE 6.2</strong> Expand transit service to unserved regional employment markets <strong>OBJECTIVE 6.3</strong> Improve existing transit service <strong>OBJECTIVE 6.4</strong> Focus complete streets upgrades in underserved regional markets with latent demand <strong>OBJECTIVE 6.5</strong> Expand rural human services transportation services into areas not currently served <strong>OBJECTIVE 6.6</strong> Improve system access for all system users <strong>OBJECTIVE 6.7</strong> Advance TDM strategies to support last mile connections for key employment origins and destination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP-21 National Goal</td>
<td>2040 RTP Planning Emphasis Area</td>
<td>2040 RTP Update Goal</td>
<td>2040 RTP Update Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Reduction</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>GOAL 7.1 REDUCE TRAVEL DELAY FOR PEOPLE AND GOODS</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE 7.1 Address critical highway bottlenecks as a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OBJECTIVE 7.2 Focus capacity investment on corridor connections to regional employment centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery</td>
<td>Addressed via agency business practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>OBJECTIVE 7.3 Improve system operations through technology applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Finalize Performance Framework
• Continue Analysis of Baseline and Forecasted Conditions
FY 2014-17 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) PROJECT TRACKING
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## Project Tracking Sheet Overview

### Memphis MPO FY 2014-17 TIP: TN Local Projects - Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PE-N</th>
<th>PE-D</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>Germantown Rd/Wolf River Blvd Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>February 26 2014</td>
<td>PE-NEPA underway. PE-D budgeted in City's FY15 CIP (Obligation in FY 2015 for PE-D). ROW budgeted in City's FY16 CIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>Gateway Median Germantown Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>On hold indefinitely due to major development planned on east side of Germantown Road north of Neshoba. Proposed driveway locations may be in conflict with proposed median.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland</td>
<td>New Canada Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>City is in ROW Acquisition Phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Poplar/Sweetbriar Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$2,896,000</td>
<td>March 21 2014</td>
<td>Bids closed and construction starting soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>North Second Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE-D</td>
<td>$2,951,785</td>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>Full obligation estimated January 2015. Public meeting held 10/7/14. TDOT managed project will change to city managed after environmental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Walnut Grove Rd Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE-D</td>
<td>$4,284,000</td>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>Design going through approval. ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Walnut Grove Rd East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Holmes Rd - West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$10,397,280</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Winchester/Perkins Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$9,600,000</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Plough Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$2,249,751</td>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>In the process of accepting an amendment from TDOT transferring management of the project to City of Memphis. The transfer includes PE-N/D funds for 2015 and ROW funds for 2017, reflected in a November 2014 TPB meeting amendment. City is checking with TDOT to make sure that programmed funds will still meet needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Holmes Rd - East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE-D</td>
<td>$2,496,720</td>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Kirby/Whitten Parkway (Shelby Farms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$593,000</td>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>Awaiting NEPA decision that was expected in early fall. Project is being transferred from TDOT management to City of Memphis once the NEPA phase is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>I-40/Riverside Drive Gateway Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$65,600</td>
<td>January 31 2014</td>
<td>Awaiting more information from HCD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Elvis Presley Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE-DROW/CONST</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>September 2, 2014</td>
<td>Project divided into 3 segments. North section awaiting NEPA re-evaluation by TDOT. Middle section currently under design. South section beginning preliminary design work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>U of M Railroad Pedestrian Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/CONST</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>July 9 2014</td>
<td>Awaiting information from lead agency, University of Memphis. Project design being revised after consultation with railroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>FY14 Allocated</td>
<td>FY14 Obligated</td>
<td>Funds Percentage</td>
<td>Projects Total</td>
<td>Projects With Some Obligation</td>
<td>% Projects With Some Obligation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All FY14 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$143,123,758</td>
<td>$27,462,508</td>
<td>19.19%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$12,202,409</td>
<td>$11,620,885</td>
<td>95.23%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Road Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$64,463,985</td>
<td>$10,136,000</td>
<td>15.72%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$10,709,159</td>
<td>$10,328,705</td>
<td>96.45%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Resurfacing Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$23,349,128</td>
<td>$2,150,768</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$1,296,582</td>
<td>$1,292,180</td>
<td>99.66%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 TAP Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$2,312,609</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$196,668</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Signalization Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$11,842,750</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Bike and Ped Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$11,148,234</td>
<td>$730,990</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Bridge Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$9,151,600</td>
<td>$1,097,184</td>
<td>11.99%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 CMAQ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$20,631,327</td>
<td>$12,933,000</td>
<td>62.69%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 SRTS Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$224,125</td>
<td>$204,166</td>
<td>91.09%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Obligations for FY 14 in TIP
(Comparison to last quarter Review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>August 2014</th>
<th>Total FY 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TN Obligations</td>
<td>$18,596,924 (13.43%)</td>
<td>$27,462,508 (19.19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Obligations</td>
<td>$6,141,223 (49.92%)</td>
<td>$11,620,885 (95.23%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obligation Tracking

• Several Examples of Projects that Have Received Obligation in last Quarter
  - Memphis- Elvis Presley Blvd – (STP)
  - Shelby County- Countywide Signal Project– (CMAQ)
  - Bartlett- Kirby Whitten Resurfacing Project – (STP) **Full Obligation**
  - Memphis- Bridge Grouping (STP)
  - Olive Branch- Craft Road - (STP) **Full Obligation**
  - Horn Lake- Tulane Road Connector - (STP) **Full Obligation**

*STP – Surface Transportation Program Funds
CMAQ- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Funds*
Next Steps

• MPO contact Jurisdictions - Projects did not meet obligation in FY 2014

• Next Quarterly Update will be at February 2015 ETC and TPB Meetings
  ➢ ETC Members will provide updates on project status before the meetings
  ➢ Discussion on projects that were not obligated in FY2014
  ➢ Obligation for FY 2015 projects