TDOT Revenue Sources

Budget FY 2015

|$826 Million

|$976 Million

|$38 Million

State  Federal  Local
How We Spend Our Money

FY 2013

- Construction Projects: 68%
- Maintenance & Preservation: 15%
- Grants: 8%
- Field Operations: 2%
- Equipment & Facility: 2%
- Other State Agencies: 2%
- Administration: 2%
- Other: 1%
The Good News

Tennessee 4th in “America’s Top States for Transportation and Infrastructure”

Tennessee ranks fourth best in America in the category of Transportation and Infrastructure. Tennessee is also the only state topping the list that has no transportation debt.
Last in Revenue & Vehicle Miles Travelled

$0.028 Revenue per VMT

$312 Revenue per Capita
Top Ranked Priorities over next 25 years

**Residents**

1. Maintaining Existing Highways
2. Relieving Congestion
3. Commercial Truck Traffic
4. Expanding Public Transportation
5. Addressing Mobility Needs for Seniors

**Elected Officials**

1. Maintaining Existing Highways
2. Building New Highways
3. Relieving Congestion
4. Expanding Public Transportation
5. Adding Shoulders
Estimated End-of-Month Cash Balances

for Highway Trust Fund

FY13-14

Billions of Dollars

Actual
Projected
Shortfall anticipated
State Transportation Funding Plans [2013-2014]

- **Enacted** (Orange)
- **Pending** (Blue)
Transportation Funding

What’s Next?
Thank you

COMMISSIONER JOHN SCHROER
Memphis MPO TPB Meeting
August 21, 2014

• Administrator’s Report
  • 2014 Public Participation Plan Update
  • MS LPA Meeting at the DeSoto County Administration Building, Hernando – August 25th at 9am
  • TDOT Accelerated Delivery Pilot Program Webinar – August 27th
  • MDOT Quarterly Meeting, Jackson, MS (September 18th – September 20th)
  • 2015 TDOT Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) - application deadline November 3, 2014
FY 2014-17 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) PROJECT TRACKING

TPB Meeting August 21, 2014
**Allocation vs. Obligation**

- **Allocation** – Similar to appropriation
- **Obligation** - Funds are considered “promised” by the federal government however no money is transferred, Obligation time varies between DOTs

- Periodically, Congress **rescinds**, or cancels unspent transportation funds from State DOTs. These rescissions are essentially a bookkeeping measure that allows the USDOT to take long unspent funds off the books.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligated Funds</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Funding Type</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
<th>Fed Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 / 02.25.14</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>PE-N</td>
<td>STP-M</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>PE-D</td>
<td>STP-M</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>STP-M</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Project Tracking Sheet Overview

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

| Project Area                          | Project Name                                  | Type   | FY 16 | FY 17 | FY 18 | FY 19 | FY 20 | FY 21 | FY 22 | FY 23 | FY 24 | FY 25 | FY 26 | FY 27 | FY 28 | FY 29 | FY 30 | FY 31 | FY 32 | FY 33 | FY 34 | FY 35 | FY 36 | FY 37 | FY 38 | FY 39 | FY 40 | FY 41 | FY 42 | FY 43 | FY 44 | FY 45 | FY 46 | FY 47 | FY 48 | FY 49 | FY 50 | FY 51 | FY 52 | FY 53 | FY 54 | FY 55 | FY 56 | FY 57 | FY 58 | FY 59 | FY 60 | FY 61 | FY 62 | FY 63 | FY 64 | FY 65 | FY 66 | FY 67 | FY 68 | FY 69 | FY 70 | FY 71 | FY 72 | FY 73 | FY 74 | FY 75 | FY 76 | FY 77 | FY 78 | FY 79 | FY 80 | FY 81 | FY 82 | FY 83 | FY 84 | FY 85 | FY 86 | FY 87 | FY 88 | FY 89 | FY 90 | FY 91 | FY 92 | FY 93 | FY 94 | FY 95 | FY 96 | FY 97 | FY 98 | FY 99 | FY 100 | FY 101 | FY 102 | FY 103 | FY 104 | FY 105 | FY 106 | FY 107 | FY 108 | FY 109 | FY 110 | FY 111 | FY 112 | FY 113 | FY 114 | FY 115 | FY 116 | FY 117 | FY 118 | FY 119 | FY 120 | FY 121 | FY 122 | FY 123 | FY 124 | FY 125 | FY 126 | FY 127 | FY 128 | FY 129 | FY 130 | FY 131 | FY 132 | FY 133 | FY 134 | FY 135 | FY 136 | FY 137 | FY 138 | FY 139 | FY 140 | FY 141 | FY 142 | FY 143 | FY 144 | FY 145 | FY 146 | FY 147 | FY 148 | FY 149 | FY 150 | FY 151 | FY 152 | FY 153 | FY 154 | FY 155 | FY 156 | FY 157 | FY 158 | FY 159 | FY 160 | FY 161 | FY 162 | FY 163 | FY 164 | FY 165 | FY 166 | FY 167 | FY 168 | FY 169 | FY 170 | FY 171 | FY 172 | FY 173 | FY 174 | FY 175 | FY 176 | FY 177 | FY 178 | FY 179 | FY 180 | FY 181 | FY 182 | FY 183 | FY 184 | FY 185 | FY 186 | FY 187 | FY 188 | FY 189 | FY 190 | FY 191 | FY 192 | FY 193 | FY 194 | FY 195 | FY 196 | FY 197 | FY 198 | FY 199 | FY 200 | FY 201 | FY 202 | FY 203 | FY 204 | FY 205 | FY 206 | FY 207 | FY 208 | FY 209 | FY 210 | FY 211 | FY 212 | FY 213 | FY 214 | FY 215 | FY 216 | FY 217 | FY 218 | FY 219 | FY 220 | FY 221 | FY 222 | FY 223 | FY 224 | FY 225 | FY 226 | FY 227 | FY 228 | FY 229 | FY 230 | FY 231 | FY 232 | FY 233 | FY 234 | FY 235 | FY 236 | FY 237 | FY 238 | FY 239 | FY 240 | FY 241 | FY 242 | FY 243 | FY 244 | FY 245 | FY 246 | FY 247 | FY 248 | FY 249 | FY 250 | FY 251 | FY 252 | FY 253 | FY 254 | FY 255 | FY 256 | FY 257 | FY 258 | FY 259 | FY 260 | FY 261 | FY 262 | FY 263 | FY 264 | FY 265 | FY 266 | FY 267 | FY 268 | FY 269 | FY 270 | FY 271 | FY 272 | FY 273 | FY 274 | FY 275 | FY 276 | FY 277 | FY 278 | FY 279 | FY 280 | FY 281 | FY 282 | FY 283 | FY 284 | FY 285 | FY 286 | FY 287 | FY 288 | FY 289 | FY 290 | FY 291 | FY 292 | FY 293 | FY 294 | FY 295 | FY 296 | FY 297 | FY 298 | FY 299 | FY 300 | FY 301 | FY 302 | FY 303 | FY 304 | FY 305 | FY 306 | FY 307 | FY 308 | FY 309 | FY 310 | FY 311 | FY 312 | FY 313 | FY 314 | FY 315 | FY 316 | FY 317 | FY 318 | FY 319 | FY 320 | FY 321 | FY 322 | FY 323 | FY 324 | FY 325 | FY 326 | FY 327 | FY 328 | FY 329 | FY 330 | FY 331 | FY 332 | FY 333 | FY 334 | FY 335 | FY 336 | FY 337 | FY 338 | FY 339 | FY 340 | FY 341 | FY 342 | FY 343 | FY 344 | FY 345 | FY 346 | FY 347 | FY 348 | FY 349 | FY 350 | FY 351 | FY 352 | FY 353 | FY 354 | FY 355 | FY 356 | FY 357 | FY 358 | FY 359 | FY 360 | FY 361 | FY 362 | FY 363 | FY 364 | FY 365 | FY 366 | FY 367 | FY 368 | FY 369 | FY 370 | FY 371 | FY 372 | FY 373 | FY 374 | FY 375 | FY 376 | FY 377 | FY 378 | FY 379 | FY 380 | FY 381 | FY 382 | FY 383 | FY 384 | FY 385 | FY 386 | FY 387 | FY 388 | FY 389 | FY 390 | FY 391 | FY 392 | FY 393 | FY 394 | FY 395 | FY 396 | FY 397 | FY 398 | FY 399 | FY 400 | FY 401 | FY 402 | FY 403 | FY 404 | FY 405 | FY 406 | FY 407 | FY 408 | FY 409 | FY 410 | FY 411 | FY 412 | FY 413 | FY 414 | FY 415 | FY 416 | FY 417 | FY 418 | FY 419 | FY 420 | FY 421 | FY 422 | FY 423 | FY 424 | FY 425 | FY 426 | FY 427 | FY 428 | FY 429 | FY 430 | FY 431 | FY 432 | FY 433 | FY 434 | FY 435 | FY 436 | FY 437 | FY 438 | FY 439 | FY 440 | FY 441 | FY 442 | FY 443 | FY 444 | FY 445 | FY 446 | FY 447 | FY 448 | FY 449 | FY 450 | FY 451 | FY 452 | FY 453 | FY 454 | FY 455 | FY 456 | FY 457 | FY 458 | FY 459 | FY 460 | FY 461 | FY 462 | FY 463 | FY 464 | FY 465 | FY 466 | FY 467 | FY 468 | FY 469 | FY 470 | FY 471 | FY 472 | FY 473 | FY 474 | FY 475 | FY 476 | FY 477 | FY 478 | FY 479 | FY 480 | FY 481 | FY 482 | FY 483 | FY 484 | FY 485 | FY 486 | FY 487 | FY 488 | FY 489 | FY 490 | FY 491 | FY 492 | FY 493 | FY 494 | FY 495 | FY 496 | FY 497 | FY 498 | FY 499 | FY 500 | FY 501 | FY 502 | FY 503 | FY 504 | FY 505 | FY 506 | FY 507 | FY 508 | FY 509 | FY 510 | FY 511 | FY 512 |

Followed by TN Groupings, MS Road Projects, MS Groupings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY14 Allocated</th>
<th>FY14 Obligated</th>
<th>Funds Percentage</th>
<th>Projects Total</th>
<th>Projects With Some Obligation</th>
<th>% Projects With Some Obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All FY14 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$138,523,758</td>
<td>$18,596,924</td>
<td><strong>13.43%</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$12,302,163</td>
<td>$6,141,223</td>
<td><strong>49.92%</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Road Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$59,863,985</td>
<td>$11,236,675</td>
<td><strong>18.77%</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$10,857,159</td>
<td>$6,121,001</td>
<td><strong>56.38%</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Resurfacing Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$23,349,128</td>
<td>$338,768</td>
<td><strong>1.45%</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$1,248,336</td>
<td>$20,222</td>
<td><strong>1.62%</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 TAP Grouping</strong></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><strong>0.88%</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$196,668</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Signalization Grouping</strong></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><strong>1.60%</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Bike and Ped Grouping</strong></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><strong>6.56%</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Bridge Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$9,151,600</td>
<td>$1,058,800</td>
<td><strong>11.57%</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 CMAQ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$20,631,327</td>
<td>$4,813,000</td>
<td><strong>23.33%</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 SRTS Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$224,125</td>
<td>$208,291</td>
<td><strong>92.94%</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Total Obligations for FY 14 in TIP (to date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>May 2014</th>
<th>August 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TN Obligations</td>
<td>$11,240,997 (8.12%)</td>
<td>$18,596,924 (13.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Obligations</td>
<td>$0 (0%)</td>
<td>$6,141,223 (49.92%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obligation Tracking

• Several Examples of Projects that Have Received Obligation in last Quarter

  ➢ Memphis- Cobblestone Landing – (Earmark)
  ➢ Shelby County- Countywide Signal Project – (CMAQ)
  ➢ Memphis- Shelby Farms Greenline Bridge- (STP)
  ➢ Bartlett- Kirby Whitten Resurfacing Project (STP)
  ➢ Arlington- Highway 70 and Jetway Intersection Improvement (STP)
  ➢ Southaven – Getwell Road – (STP)
  ➢ Hernando- West Commerce Resurfacing Project- (STP)

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

• Continue to Work towards Obligation for Project Phases in TIP (FY 2014)

• Next Quarterly Update will be at November ETC and TPB Meetings
  
  ➢ TDOT and MDOT obligation reports will be incorporated into reporting to determine projects that had obligations before September 30, 2014.
  
  ➢ ETC Members will provide updates on project status before the meetings
  
  ➢ Discussion on projects that were not obligated in FY2014
MID-SOUTH REGIONAL TRAVEL SURVEYS & MODEL UPDATE

TPB Meeting August 21, 2014

Prime Consultant: Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Sub-consultants: Abt SRBI, Dikita Engineering and Neel-Schaffer
Project Overview

**Purpose:** To conduct travel surveys and use findings to update MPO’s travel model

1. Project Management
2. Travel Demand Model Consultation
3. Survey Design/Pretest
4. Household Survey Data Collection
5. Freight Survey
6. Transit Onboard Survey
7. Bicycle and Pedestrian Survey
8. Data Weighting and Expansion
9. Survey Report/Data Delivery
10. Travel Demand Model Update

**Lead Partners**
Project Schedule/Status

Tasks

1. Project Management
2. Travel Demand Model Consultation
3. Research Design, Pretest, and Refinement
4. Household Travel Survey Data Collection
5. Freight Survey
6. Transit Onboard Survey
7. Bicycle and Pedestrian Survey
8. Data Weighting and Expansion
9. Travel Surveys Final Report/Data Delivery
10. Travel Demand Model Update

Approximate Month

2013

2014

Interim Findings

Deliverable

Project Oversight Steering Committee Meetings
How Data from the Surveys Will Be Used in Model Development and Validation

• **Model Estimation** – Estimate how travelers behave
  • **Example**: How much do travelers of different income levels travel?
  • **Example**: How sensitive are travelers to congestion?

• **Model Validation** – Check model results against sample of travelers
  • **Example**: For what types of activities do travelers use transit?
  • **Example**: How far do travelers from different segments of the population travel for various activities?
Household Travel Survey

- Data retrieval complete
  - Data delivered to CS
  - Nearly 4,900 households
  - Corrective actions to maximize completes from “hard to reach” households

- Diary data undergoing QA/QC
  - Identify “usable” records
  - Prepare for survey expansion
  - Use expanded data in model estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Households in Sample Region (2007 5-year ACS)</th>
<th>Recruited Households</th>
<th>Retrieved Households (Processed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelby County</td>
<td>340,394</td>
<td>7,584</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto County</td>
<td>56,641</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton County</td>
<td>21,578</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette County</td>
<td>13,825</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County</td>
<td>12,735</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate County</td>
<td>9,982</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunica County</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>459,147</td>
<td>9,913</td>
<td>4,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Household Travel Survey Results

- **GPS analysis underway**
  - 50 household sample
  - Convert GPS traces into stops
  - Differentiate between trip ends and traffic stops
  - Use speed measures to identify stops

- **Diary vs. GPS comparison**
  - Are short trips under-represented in diary survey?
  - Is the GPS database missing some trips?
  - Can we identify mode and purpose?
  - How can we best use land-use files?
## Transit Onboard Survey

### Survey expansion complete
- Usable record: 3,227
- Expanded totals: 28,781
- Avg. expansion weight: 8.82

### Developing analytical reports
- Identify key variables to highlight
- Support modeling + Title VI
- Data visualization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TripPurp</th>
<th>AM Early</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>PM Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JTW</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBO</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSch</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBU</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHB-W</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSShop</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSRec</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHB-NW</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBAir</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bike-Pedestrian Data

- Online bike-ped survey monitored by Abt-SRBI
  - HTS Recruits providing email addresses (~5400)
  - Choice sample provided by MPO
- Data collection closed in mid-June
- 1,150+ online completes
  - 650 from MPO mailing list
  - 500 from HTS participants
- Update bike-ped plan
  - Support model validation

Welcome to the Mid-South Bicycle and Pedestrian Survey!

The goal of this survey is to understand bicycle and walking activities in the region. The public’s behavior and attitudes regarding bicycling and walking in the region inform decision makers about the needs of persons using bicycles or walking in our community.

The Memphis Urban Area MPO is working with Cambridge Systematics, a transportation consulting firm, and the Memphis MPO’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) to update the Memphis MPO’s Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for 2014.

As a token of our appreciation, we are inviting all participants who complete this survey to enter a sweepstakes for a chance to win $500. If you would like to participate in this sweepstakes, you will be prompted to enter your contact information at the conclusion of this survey.
Socio-Demographic Data

- Base year socioeconomic data being finalized
  - ACS data – population and household
  - InfoGroup data – employment by NAICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>“No Worker” HHs</th>
<th>“No Auto” HHs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crittenden</td>
<td>50,902</td>
<td>19,026</td>
<td>5,495</td>
<td>1,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>161,216</td>
<td>57,734</td>
<td>10,219</td>
<td>1,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>38,413</td>
<td>14,505</td>
<td>4,235</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>37,144</td>
<td>13,369</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>927,644</td>
<td>350,973</td>
<td>84,225</td>
<td>32,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>28,886</td>
<td>10,035</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>61,117</td>
<td>21,629</td>
<td>5,173</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunica</td>
<td>10,778</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,316,100</td>
<td>491,198</td>
<td>116,990</td>
<td>40,108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population Density

Worker Density
Socio-Demographic Data

- Future year data required to study impact of highway/transit studies
  - TDOT growth percentages assigned to county-level totals
  - Allocations from land-use model for TAZ adjustments
- Update data on a regular basis to capture impact of changes in patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crittenden</td>
<td>20,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>56,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>9,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>8,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>516,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>7,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>12,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunica</td>
<td>15,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>645,647</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Prepare household survey datasets for model estimation
  • Share results with TDOT and MDOT for review and approval
• Prepare transportation networks to assign traffic flows
  • Key input for model estimation
• Analyze freight transportation data provided by TDOT
  • Supplement with few personal interviews
• Update travel demand model using latest survey data
  • Where do trips start? Where do they go? What mode? When? What route?
• Coordinate with MPO & provide data/input for other efforts
  • Land use model update
  • Congestion management plan
  • Regional transportation plan
REGIONAL LAND USE MODEL UPDATE

TPB Meeting August 21, 2014

Sub-consultant: Gresham Smith and Partners
Land Use Model Update - Scope of Work

- **Updating the Land Use Model**
  - Expand, Update, and Improve existing Model (e.g. include redevelopment)
  - Integration with Regional Travel Demand Model and Future Long Range Planning Efforts
  - Process guided by the planning and land use advisory committee (PLAC)

---

**Data Collection**

**Study Design**

**Model Development**

**Model Validation**

- **PLAC Meeting #1** (July)
- **PLAC Meeting #2** (September)
- **PLAC Meeting #3** (October)
- **Transportation Policy Board Approval** (November)

- **ETC and TPB Meeting** (August)
Land Use Model Update Expanded Boundary

- Shelby County
- DeSoto County
- Crittenden County
- Tunica County
- Tate County
- Fayette County
- Tipton County
- Marshall County
CommunityViz Model

- **Land Use Planning Modeling Tool**
  - Evaluates different land use scenarios
  - Environmental, economic, and social impact analysis

- **Data Driven Process**
  - Model is only as good as the data used in its development

- **Allocation of Future Growth**
  - 2017, 2020, 2030, and 2040 Horizon Year
  - Place Types – Defines the character
  - Land use, density, building height, street pattern, etc.
  - Suitability – Factors that help predict where growth occurs
    - Positive and Negative Factors
Place Types

Legend

- Agriculture
- Airport
- Business Center
- Estate Residential
- Institutional Campus
- Medical Campus
- Mixed Use Center
- Mobile Home Community
- Open Space
- Rural Crossroads
- Rural Residential
- Suburban Commercial
- Suburban Mixed-Housing Neighborhood
- Suburban Single-Family Neighborhood
- Town Center
- Urban Downtown
- Urban Neighborhood
- Warehouse and Industrial

Memphis MPO
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Strengthening Regional Transportation
Next Steps

• Work with the Planning and Land use Committee in the land use model update
• Data Collection
• Update at the next ETC and TPB meetings
• Integration of the model with travel demand model
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS UPDATE

TPB Meeting August 21, 2014

Prime Consultant: Gannett Fleming, Inc.
Project Overview and Timeline

**Purpose:** To identify strategies aimed to address current and future congested networks within the Memphis MPO boundary.
General CMP Strategies

- Traffic Management And Operations Strategies
- Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Demand Management Strategies
- Improving Public Transportation
- Land Use Planning
- Access Management
- Improving Bike/Ped Facilities
- Employing HOV/HOT Lanes
- Congestion Pricing
- Freight Management
- Road Network Capacity Strategies
- Motorist Information Systems
Input Process

Mobility Summit:
- To define congestion and mobility in the region
- Identify bottlenecks and congested corridors
- Identify mobility breakers and makers
- Summit would include transportation stakeholders and general public
- Scheduled for October 2014

Interactive web forum (Mind Mixer)
- Online tool that leverages the power of the Internet and social media to gather input about mobility issues in the Region
- Offers a large suite of engagement tools such as surveys, blogs, idea probes, mapping and other queries.
- Alternative formats (phone, print) would still be provided for those in need.
- Anticipated release date is early November 2014.
Next Steps

• Best practices peer review (10 MPOs) - Complete
• Continue review of Best Practices
• Coordination with RTP and Travel Demand Update Project
• Preparation for Mobility Summit + Interactive web forum
• Development of Strategy Toolbox to address mobility issues in the Memphis Region
• Approval by ETC and TPB in 2015
2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
OUTREACH

TPB Meeting August 21, 2014

Prime Consultant: The Corradino Group
Sub-consultants: New West Public Relations and Dalhoff-Thomas Design Studio
Increasing Awareness

- Advance meeting notices/materials on Web sites
- Facebook, Twitter, and Blogspot;
- E-Blasts;
- Provision of materials in multiple languages to all
  - appropriate local groups and use of their
  - mailing/emailing lists at selective times;
- Public service and paid announcements on local TV/and radio stations;
- Multi-lingual newspaper advertisements; Robo calling;
- MPO’s established community meeting outreach process.
Community Remarks

- Uses Google maps, good for outreach purposes due to familiarity

- At the bottom of the page, a language can be selected, and the site will be translated into that language
Community Remarks Mobile – Tutorial (Target Time 15 minute or less)

• Community Remarks does not need an app to access – simply use the web browser on your phone.
• The MPO’s Community Remarks site is here: http://www.communityremarks.com/Me mphisMPO
• Entering or clicking on the link above will direct your web browser to the screen, as seen to the right.
• Here, you can access other comments, the map, or create a new comment. Scrolling down will allow you to see existing comments by category.
Additional Techniques

- SurveyMonkey
- Stakeholder interviews – Including minority communities
- Open houses/Public forums
- Keypad polling
- Project website
- Media Outreach
2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

TPB Meeting August 21, 2014

Prime Consultant: Cambridge Systematics
Sub-consultants: Parsons Brinckerhoff and Younger Associates
How Does Everything Fit Together?

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

2040 Regional Transportation Plan

Performance Measures Reporting
Integrated Planning Process

2015-2040 Performance-based Planning and Reporting Process

- Congestion Management Process (CMP)
- System Preservation
- Connectivity
- Economic Vitality
- Safety
- Security
- Accessibility and Mobility
- Efficient System Management and Operation
- Environment, Energy, and Quality of Life

Related MPO and Transit Plans and Initiatives

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Architecture

Freight Planning

Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
Other Studies

- **Small Area or Corridor Studies/Plans**
  - Aerotropolis plan
  - Lamar Avenue Corridor
  - Port development

- **Multimodal Investment**
  - Mid-South Regional Greenprint – incl. Bus Transit to Workplace Study for the region (Shelby, Fayette, Desoto and West Memphis Area)
  - Bike-Ped studies
  - Transit plans (MATA short-range, DeSoto County, CHSTP for the region)
Key Themes

- **Livability** - Core theme
- Performance-Based Plan
- MAP-21 Compliance
- Inclusive
  - Outreach
  - Underserved Communities Considerations
  - Access to jobs, economic development
- Using data to help inform decisions: trade-offs
Performance-Based Planning to Support RTP Development

- Goals/Objectives
- Performance Measures
- Target Setting
  - Evaluate Programs, Projects & Strategies
- Allocate Resources
  - Budget and Staff
- Measure, Evaluate, and Report Results
  - Actual Performance Achieved
- Quality Data

- Measure, Evaluate, and Report Results
- Allocate Resources
- Target Setting
- Performance Measures
- Goals/Objectives
MAP-21: What it Means for Memphis Urban Area MPO

• Regional plan must use a performance-based approach to decision-making that supports the national goals

• MPOs must establish targets for national measures

• Plans must include measures, targets, and a performance report comparing actual performance to target values

• Measures and targets must be considered when developing policies, programs and investment priorities

• Coordination with the DOTs and transit operators on measures and targets

• MPOs must link projects in the TIP to their targets
National Goals and Performance Measures for Highways

• Safety
  • Fatalities and serious injuries—both number and rate per vehicle mile traveled--on all public roads

• Infrastructure condition
  • Pavement condition on the Interstate System and on remainder of the NHS
  • Bridge condition on the NHS

• Congestion reduction
  • Traffic congestion

• System reliability
National Goals and Performance Measures for Highways (continued)

- Freight movement and economic vitality
  - Freight movement on the Interstate System

- Environmental sustainability
  - On-road mobile source emissions

- Reduced project delivery delays

- Additional measure:
  - Performance of the Interstate System and the remainder of the NHS
Transit Performance Measures

- FTA will define State of Good Repair (SGR) standards for measuring the condition of capital assets
  - Equipment
  - Rolling stock
  - Infrastructure
  - Facilities
- FTA will develop corresponding SGR performance measures
- Grantees are required to set the targets
- Must be incorporated into the metropolitan plan and TIP
- Submit an annual performance report
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 Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Feasible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Meetings

ETC/TPB Meetings
Questions