REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Approval of 8/5/20 Meeting Minutes (A)

2. Public Comment

3. Action Items: (NO ACTION ITEMS PROPOSED FOR 10/07/2020)

4. Informational Items:
   a. Presentation of Draft Priority Project List for the Upcoming Update to the Regional Transportation Plan (A)
      Staff will present a draft priority list for the fiscally constrained portion of the upcoming update to the Regional Transportation Plan. Staff will be available to answer questions related to the overview of the project scoring methodology presented at the workshop held online on September 30, 2020.
   b. TIP Amendments, Cycle A: Call for Cost Overruns (A)
      Staff will provide an overview of Amendment Cycle A for the FYs 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which includes an annual call-for-cost overruns on current TIP projects.

5. Regular Reports:
   a. Chair’s Report
   b. Staff Report

6. Other Business

7. Adjourn

GNRC will be using the Microsoft Teams platform for the online meeting. The software works in Google Chrome and on the Internet Edge browser. You also can download the free Teams desktop client at the following link. Other browsers might be supported, but you might be required to call in for audio.

Meeting Link and Call-In Details available at www.GNRC.org/Calendar
Roll Call will be taken at www.GNRC.org/TCCRollCall

The Microsoft Teams desktop client can be downloaded for free at:
https://teams.microsoft.com/downloads

(A) Indicates an attachment is available in the packet

GNRC does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, limited English proficiency, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, religion, creed or disability in admission to, access to, or operations of its programs, services, or activities. This policy applies to applicants for employment and current employees as well as sub-recipients and subcontractors of the GNRC that receive federal funding. Complaints should be directed to Laylah Smith, Non-Discrimination Coordinator, 220 Athens Way, Suite 200, Nashville, TN 37228, phone number 615-862-8863. GNRC meetings may be audio and video recorded.
Agenda Item 1.

Meeting Minutes - August 5, 2020

Background

Meeting minutes have been prepared and are ready for approval.

Recommendation

Approve meeting minutes.
MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Of the
Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
August 5, 2020

Attendees: Mr. Andy Barlow, Mr. Russ Brashear, Mr. Tom Brashear, Mr. Felix Castrodad, Mr. Ceagus Clark, Mr. Marc Corrigan, Mr. Doug Demosi, Mr. Chuck Downham, Mr. Keith Free, Mr. Glenn Harper, Mr. Mike Harris, Ms. Gina Head, Ms. Billy Higgins, Mr. Stanton Higgs, Mr. Reed Hillen, Mr. Joe Horne, Ms. Emily Hunter Wright, Ms. Katrina Jones, Mr. Jim Kerr, Mr. Addam McCormick, Ms. Kealan Millies-Lucke, Mr. Kevin Rigsby, Mr. Jonathan Russell, Mr. Sean Santalla, Mr. Matt Schenk, Mr. Marty Sewell, Mr. Josh Suddath, Ms. Dianna Tomlin, Mr. Matt Von Lunen

Approval of 6/3/20 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Glenn Harper, Chair, opened the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Ceagus Clark moved to approve the June 3, 2020 meeting minutes. Mr. Jim Kerr seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Endorsement of Amendment to the FYs 2020-21 UPWP

Mr. Sean Pfalzer, Transportation Planning Manager and MPO Coordinator, said that an amendment to the FYs 2020-21 UPWP is out for public review and comment.

The updates consist of 1) adding new regional planning activities for FY 2021 and 2) adding related planning activities conducted by partners within the region.

To date, there have not been any comments received. The Transportation Policy Board (TPB) is scheduled to adopt the amendment at the August 19th TPB meeting.

Mr. Doug Demosi moved to endorse the amendment for consideration by the TPB. Mr. Josh Suddath seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.
Presentation of Amendments to the FYs 2020-2023 TIP

Ms. Anna Emerson, Principal Planner, presented amendments for the FYs 2020-23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that will be released for public review and comment prior to adoption by Transportation Policy Board on September 16. There was a clarifying question that was answered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amend #</th>
<th>TIP #</th>
<th>RTP #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-18</td>
<td>2020-47-105</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>LaVergne Advanced Traffic Management System</td>
<td>LaVergne</td>
<td>Add Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-19</td>
<td>2020-17-106</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University MoveVU Program</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Add Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-20</td>
<td>2020-67-107</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Brentwood Signal System Upgrades</td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>Add Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-021</td>
<td>2020-17-108</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Goodlettsville Traffic Flow Improvements &amp; Signal</td>
<td>Goodlettsville</td>
<td>Add Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrades – Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-022</td>
<td>2020-19-109</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Nashville Connector</td>
<td>Metro Nashville</td>
<td>Add Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-023</td>
<td>2020-17-110</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>West End Avenue (SR-1/US70S)/Broadway (SR-1/SR-24/US70) ITS Communication Upgrade</td>
<td>Metro Nashville</td>
<td>Add Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-024</td>
<td>2020-19-111</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Clean Trips to School</td>
<td>Walk Bike Nashville</td>
<td>Add Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-025</td>
<td>2008-51-032</td>
<td>1052-120</td>
<td>East-West Corridor (Albert Gallatin Ave (SR-174)/Hatten Track Rd Extension)</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>Add funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-026</td>
<td>2011-41-144</td>
<td>1041-129</td>
<td>Cherry Lane Extension with I-840 Interchange</td>
<td>Murfreesboro</td>
<td>Program CONST; add funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Quality and Social Equity Analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan

Mr. Ben Gramling, Environmental Planning Manager, presented an environmental analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan. He explained the importance of the topic and how it aligns with national goals and planning factors, supports the regional economy, and enhances quality of life.

He presented on conditions and trends that included air, water, land, and sociocultural resources. He highlighted threats and risk factors such as population growth, development patterns, policy and regulatory changes, and climate uncertainty. He also identified key findings and implications, strategies to minimize impacts, and recommended actions. Recommended actions included 1) set ambitious goals & track performance, 2) prioritize investments that have minimal impact and/or enhance opportunities for conservation/preservation, 3) implement a formal PEL framework to link regional planning and project development, and 4) expand purpose of regional environmental roundtable to establish shared vision for regional conservation/preservation.
For more information on the environmental data, visit the GNRC Data Portal: www.gnrc.org/maps.

Ms. Shelly Hazle and Ms. Carson Cooper presented a social equity analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan that will be documented in the *Equity Issues and Trends Policy Brief*. Ms. Hazel discussed the importance of access to opportunity for residents, economic competitiveness of the region, quality of life for residents, and federal requirements. She also noted the key issues and challenges in the region include population growth, development patterns, housing affordability, limited transportation options, and COVID-19. Ms. Cooper presented on the location of the nine vulnerable populations through the region and identified highly vulnerable areas in which six or more of the groups are represented. The nine vulnerable populations include: 1) racial minority population, 2) ethnic minority population, 3) families living in poverty, 4) limited English-speaking households, 5) disabled population, 6) senior (65+) population, 7) unemployed, 8) single-mother households, and 9) carless households.

Ms. Cooper highlighted the key findings of the analysis, that include the following:

1. The region’s population is growing, aging, and diversifying putting more pressure on the region’s transportation system and housing affordability.
2. Transportation outcomes are not equitably distributed across the region – vulnerable areas are disproportionately affected by costs, lack of access, and poor safety.
3. Multimodal infrastructure is available but unreliable and unsafe due to infrequent service and lack of connectivity.

The recommended actions and strategies are to 1) prioritize equity and access to opportunity in all decision-making, 2) improve and expand the transit system, especially regarding connectivity, service frequency, and reliability, 3) implement complete streets policies and designs that enhance safety and mobility for pedestrians and non-motorized users, and 4) ensure outreach and engagement to all communities for all planning efforts.

To explore the data and trends, visit [https://www.gnrc.org/dashboards](https://www.gnrc.org/dashboards).

**Present Roadway Safety Performance Targets**

Mr. Pfalzer said that the national safety goal to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, and the MPO is responsible for setting safety targets annually to make progress toward that goal as part of its performance-based planning. He said that the MPO has adopted TDOT’s targets in the past, are committed to developing regional targets as part of the update to the Regional Transportation Plan.
Ms. Ashleigh Reeves, Senior Research Analyst, presented the following scenarios for regional safety targets for traffic fatalities.

1) Support the State targets
2) Cap fatalities
3) 1% annual reduction by 2045
4) 50% overall reduction by 2045
5) Vision zero or 16% annual decrease out to 2045

Mr. Pfalzer said that the objective is to narrow down the number of target options to present to the Transportation Policy Board.

Mr. Michael Skipper, GNRC Executive Director, said the MPOs should coordinate with TDOT Highway Safety Office, transit operators, local governments, FHWA division office, and law enforcement on safety targets, but that ultimately the MPO can set its own regional targets. Mr. Sean Pfalzer stated that the MPO is not at risk of losing funding as a result of not meeting targets.

**Presentation of 2045 RTP Goals Weights**

Mr. Daniel Capparella, Active Transportation Planner, stated the initial results of the pairwise activity to weigh the priority of the six goals established by the RTP policy framework. The initial results show that the goal to improve safety was the top priority, followed by (in order of priority) maintain state of good repair, mitigate congestion, increase access to economic opportunity, minimize disruptive impacts, and align with policies and plans.

Mr. Pfalzer said that the staff is working with the TPB members to complete the same exercise.

**Regular Reports**

1) **Chair’s report**
   
   Mr. Harper reminded the members of the Power of 10 Conference on August 13th from 9 a.m. to noon. It will be held virtually.

2) **Staff report**
   
   Mr. Pfalzer thanked the members for participating in round one of the county workshops. He said that updates are needed by August 7th. The second round of workshops will be mid to late August from 10 a.m. to noon.

   Mr. Pfalzer said that the CMP update link was distributed that contains tech memos on steps 4, 6, and 8.

   The IMPROVE Act Transit Capital Grant has $21 million available in FY2021 with max award of $3 million. Eligible applicants include public transit
providers currently receiving FTA 5307 or 5311 funds. The notice of intent is
due on August 21. Mr. Jonathan Russell said he was not sure how long funds
are allocated for or how long it will continue.

Mr. Sean Santalla said that if the state does not reach their safety target,
they are required to use their obligation authority in an amount equal to
their HSIP apportion. There are no consequences to the MPO on setting their
own targets. Mr. Skipper said the MPO needs to make sure that we are
spending money on safety goals. Mr. Russell said that TDOT supports the
MPO setting its own targets.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Date: ____________________________

Glenn Harper, Chair
Technical Coordinating Committee

Sean Pfalzer, Transportation Planning Manager
MPO Coordinator
Agenda Item 4a.

Priority Projects for the Regional Transportation Plan

Background

**Apply.NashvilleMPO.org** is the online platform being used by MPO members to submit applications for funding and by GNRC staff to conduct their evaluation of proposed projects. The results of the evaluation will be used to prioritize and schedule proposed projects for approximately $10 billion in federal transportation grants and matching funds between the years 2021 and 2045.

Staff will provide an update the draft priority list of projects that are in position to be included in the fiscally constrained portion of the Plan.

For a review of the scoring methods and preliminary results of the prioritization process, please review the video of the online workshop held on September 30, 2020 posted at:

[https://youtu.be/haBhV70iXTg](https://youtu.be/haBhV70iXTg)

Slides from the presentation are included in this agenda packet.

**As a reminder**, GNRC staff is awaiting input from each local community in order to finalize the regional prioritization exercise. Specifically, we are asking each local community to identify the one project that they consider their top local priority. This project will receive additional weight in the overall scoring process.

**Recommendation**

For information only.
Workshop #6 on the Regional Transportation Plan

September 30, 2020 Online Workshop
Please sign-in for today’s workshop:
www.GNRC.org\SignIn
Workshop Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Regional Transportation Plan Development
   a. Overview Scoring Methods and Preliminary Results
   b. Documentation of Project-Level Analysis
   c. Cost Verifications and Year of Expenditure Calculations
Project Scoring Methods & Preliminary Results
Project scoring is not the end goal. It is a way to thoughtfully organize hundreds of projects in order to identify the top priorities for achieving a set of regional goals that often have competing objectives.
Policy Framework for the Plan

Call-for-Projects and General Framework for the Development of the Regional Transportation Plan

Call-for-Projects
The current transportation plan, adopted in 2016, allocates more than $4 billion in anticipated federal grants and matching funds to transportation projects through 2040. A major update is scheduled for release in mid-2020 with adoption by early 2021. A call-for-projects is one of the first major acts by the Transportation Policy Board to engage DOT and other participating jurisdictions in finding specific solutions to solve Middle Tennessee’s transportation challenges. Interested parties may contact at info@MidTNTPP.org by December 31, 2019.

Decision-making Authority of the Transportation Policy Board
The Transportation Policy Board (TPB) is empowered by federal law to serve as the primary forum for collaboration among local elected officials, public transit operators, DOT, and other state and federal agencies in order to negotiate a mutually beneficial plan to invest in roads, bridges, public transit, and other transportation facilities across the greater Nashville area.

Purpose of the Regional Plan
Direct the investment of public funds to provide for a safe and reliable transportation system that helps local communities thrive and contributes to the economic productivity of the region and state.

Shared Responsibilities of Participating Jurisdictions
- Work cooperatively across political boundaries, levels of government, socioeconomic groups, and economic sectors to identify a shared vision for the region.
- Be willing to prioritize transportation needs according to the known constraints, fiscal or otherwise.
- Identify strategies and resources to overcome anticipated obstacles to success.
- Consider future generations and long-term trends while determining short-range priorities.
- Think comprehensively about the relationship between transportation decisions and those related to housing, the economy and jobs, land use and community design, conservation and preservation, social services, among others.
- Measure performance to monitor progress and improve the effectiveness of future decisions.

Guiding Principles (Proposed)
A philosophy that encompasses a set of values that guide the decisions of the TPB to ensure that its plans and programs contribute to a broad array of community benefits:
- **Livability**: Enhance quality of life by pursuing initiatives that increase opportunities for housing, learning, employment, recreation, and civic involvement while maintaining affordability.
- **Prosperity**: Contribute to the region’s economic productivity by prioritizing solutions that connect workers with jobs, improve access to markets, and leverage additional investment.
- **Sustainability**: Encourage growth and prosperity without sacrificing the health, natural or historical assets, or financial viability of this or future generations.
- **Diversity**: Find solutions that balance the variety of perspectives across Middle Tennessee and ensure local context, community character, and cultural identity are respected in the process.

Emerging Issues and Related Concerns
- Rapid pace of change
- Affordability of housing
- Growing traffic congestion
- Unsettled prosperity

Endorsed by the Transportation Policy Board on October 14, 2019, Updated December 11, 2019

- **Purpose**
- **Shared Responsibilities**
- **Emerging Issues and Concerns**
- **Guiding Principles**
- **Goals**
- **Objectives & Measures**
- **Strategies**
- **Actions or Tactics**
- **Evaluation & Prioritization Factors**
- **Priorities**
Scoring Categories & Weights

- **State of Good Repair**: 20%
- **Roadway Safety**: 30%
- **Congestion Management**: 15%
- **Economic Opportunity**: 15%
- **Minimize Disruption**: 10%
- **Alignment with Plans**: 10%
## Scoring Categories & Elements

### State of Good Repair
- Primary Objective is Maintenance or Repair
- Priority Routes on the National Highway System and STRAHNET
- Traffic Volumes
- Freight Volumes
- Bridge Conditions
- Proposed Features related to Repair and Maintenance

### Roadway Safety
- Primary Objective is to Improve Safety
- High Crash Areas
- Routes with Crashes involving Fatalities
- Routes with Crashes involving Bike/Ped Users
- Routes with Crashes involving Trucks
- Proposed Features to Improve Safety

### Congestion Management
- Primary Objective is to Mitigate Congestion
- Congested Conditions
- Active Transportation Demand
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Level of Service
- BPAC Priority Areas for Improvement
- Proposed Features to Mitigate Congestion

---

**GNRC**  
GREATER NASHVILLE REGIONAL COUNCIL
Scoring Categories & Elements

**Economic Opportunity**
- Primary Objective is to Increase Economic Access
- Planned Growth Areas
- High Growth Areas
- Employment Centers
- Commercial Vehicle Activity
- Proposed Features related to Improved Access and Capacity

**Minimize Disruption**
- Primary Objective is to Minimize Disruption
  - Overlap with Environmental Conflicts
  - Proximity of Environmentally Sensitive Areas
  - Proximity of Vulnerable Communities

**Alignment with Other Plans**
- Primary Objective is to Align with Other Plans
- Programming and Obligation History
- Anticipated Scheduling
- Association with IMPROVE Act of Study Recommendation
- Local Priority
- Overlap with Environmental Challenges

GNRC GREATER NASHVILLE REGIONAL COUNCIL
## Sources of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Submissions</th>
<th>Conditions &amp; Trends Indicators</th>
<th>Staff Qualitative Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project description, location, and proposed scope of work</td>
<td>System demand for daily volume, freight movement, and active transport</td>
<td>Potential for addressing regional goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project history and anticipated cost estimates</td>
<td>Levels of congestion and related indicators</td>
<td>Potential for causing disruption to vulnerable communities or environmental assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project purpose, goals, and objectives</td>
<td>Roadway safety and crash characteristics</td>
<td>Opportunities to enhance outcomes through improved project design/ scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population and employment densities and growth</td>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td>Vulnerable populations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Scoring Dashboard
5-Tier Project Ranking System

Consensus priorities per regional policy

Existing projects with programming history

New Starts scoring in the top 1/3

New Starts scoring in the middle 1/3

New Starts scoring in the bottom 1/3
Preliminary Results

Sample from 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2016)
### Remaining Work and Next Steps

- **Finalize Project Details:** Additional information is still being received by GNRC to clarify project locations and scope of work.

- **Complete Staff Qualitative Assessments:** The analysis will be used to finalize project scores and to document issues and suggestions for project development.

- **Identify the Top Local Priority:** Each community is provided an opportunity to identify their top local priority. The project will receive additional points within the “Alignment with Other Plans” category.

- **Calibrate Scoring Model:** Once all data is compiled and QC’d, staff will make final adjustments to the scoring model to produce a rank order list of regional priorities.
Documentation of Project-Level Analysis
## Staff Analysis Questions

### Evaluate transportation problems/needs

- Review and assess proposed improvements

### Identify opportunities to enhance the project

#### Staff Analysis Questions for the 2045 Unified Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>SAF-1: To what extent is the project located in an area with known roadway safety issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAF-2: Are there identifiable causes of the known roadway safety issues in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAF-3: (PDO) Did this project address known roadway safety issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAF-4: (SDW) Can the project scope be modified to address or prevent roadway safety issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>CNG-1: To what extent is this project located in an area with recurring traffic congestion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNG-2: (SDW) Are there identifiable causes of recurring traffic congestion in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNG-3: (SDW) Did this project address known traffic congestion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNG-4: (SDW) Can the project scope be modified to help manage current or future traffic congestion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>ECO-1: To what extent does the implementation of the project create jobs or spur private investment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECO-2: To what extent does the project support the regional movement of workers to their employers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECO-3: (SDW) Does the project serve employees in key regional sectors identified in the CSSP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECO-4: (SDW) Does the project support any of the objectives or proposed actions in the CSSP that “need to be built”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECO-5: (SDW) Does the project support access to workforce development opportunities and training (educational initiatives)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECO-6: (SDW) Is the project conducive to improved planning for the community and region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plans</td>
<td>LO-1: To what extent will this project contribute to or enhance the planned growth for the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LO-2: (PDO) Can the project be scaled/designed to be complementary to existing uses or planned growth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Good Repair</td>
<td>SGR-1: To what extent is this project located in a corridor with assets that are in poor condition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGR-2: (SDW) Does the project improve the physical condition of the transportation network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGR-3: (SDW) Can the project scope be modified to include (additional) improvements to network conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transport/Health</td>
<td>ACT-1: Is the project located on a route with proposed active transportation facilities or in an area of high priority?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT-2: To what extent does this project improve safety for non-motorized users?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT-3: (PDO) Can the project be modified to improve the safety for cyclists or pedestrians?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT-4: To what extent does this project provide opportunities for a net increase in active transportation, particularly for areas of concern or in areas of high potential?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT-5: To what extent does the project improve connectivity of the active transportation network?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Analysis Objective

Identify opportunities to enhance project to:

- address or prevent **roadway safety** issues?
- improve the safety for **bicyclists or pedestrians**?
- help manage current or future **traffic congestion**?
- improve **transit** options?
- incorporate **managed lanes** or other alternatives?
- support efficient **freight movement**?
- extend the **life of infrastructure**?
- be complementary to existing uses or **planned growth**?
- minimize **environmental impacts**?
- ensure **equitable and healthy** access to opportunity?
- minimize **freight-related impacts** to the community?
### Summary of Staff Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Common Considerations</th>
<th>Example Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Congestion             | • Support shift to alternative modes  
                          • Improve operations  
                          • Manage travel demand                                      | • Increased transit service, dedicated transit lanes, or transit signal priority  
                                                        • Pedestrian and bicycle facilities, especially to access transit stops  
                                                        • Access management  
                                                        • Traffic signal coordination or ITS improvements  
                                                        • New transit stations or park and ride facilities              |
| Freight                | • Support truck movement  
                          • Ensure roadway safety                                                  | • Appropriate design standards for truck turning radii and roadway composition  
                                                        • Separation between truck and other users                         |
| State of Good Repair   | • Upgrade outdated/inadequate infrastructure  
                          • Ensure ADA compliance                                           | • Intersection improvements  
                                                        • Bus stop improvements                                        |
### Summary of Staff Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Common Considerations</th>
<th>Example Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Active Transportation| • Improve active transportation options  
• Ensure safe access for users  
• Enhance connections                      | • Sidewalks, pedestrian signalization, signage, etc.  
• Physical separation from vehicles (multiuse path, buffered bike lanes, median, planting strip, etc.)  
• Continuation of greenway                   |
| Equity               | • Improve active transportation for vulnerable populations  
• Ensure safe access for users  
• Engage vulnerable populations             | • Pedestrian crossing improvements (medians, pedestrian islands, ped signals, minimize driveways, etc.)  
• Connections to transit stops  
• Stakeholder engagement opportunities       |
| Environment          | • Minimize environmental impacts to land, water, and habitat                          | • Avoidance of floodplain areas, drainage problems, and water quality concerns  
• Further environmental analysis for large projects  
• Further community and environmental stakeholder engagement  
• Ensure operability during high precipitation storm events |
| Planned Growth       | • Coordinate land use  
• Ensure access to nearby destinations                                              | • Manage access for future growth and development  
• Work with existing landowners ensure connections  
• Incorporate streetscaping when consistent with character area |
Next Steps to Document Considerations

Staff will:

- Summarize responses to analysis questions across topics by project
- Upload summary of staff analysis to project form in Apply App
- Be available to discuss incorporation of considerations into proposed scope during the state and federal review period

Applicant or Implementing Agency will:

- Have an opportunity to modify project scope based on staff analysis and considerations
- Have an opportunity to consider staff analysis as the project advances through the project development process, especially NEPA
http://apply.nashvillempo.org/

Project Database (Apply App)
Cost Verifications & Year of Expenditure Calculations
# Cost Estimate Verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Targeted Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Project Proponent</td>
<td>Based on initially submitted or updated project cost estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a) Estimation Tool</td>
<td>Based on project type, length, travel lanes, intersections, etc.</td>
<td>Projects with no estimates or rough planning estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b) Comparable Projects</td>
<td>Based on cost per mile of recently let or completed projects by type</td>
<td>Projects with cost estimate that appear low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All cost estimates will be in current dollars
## Year of Expenditure Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Horizon</th>
<th>Year of Expenditure</th>
<th>Cost Estimate (Current Dollars)</th>
<th>Year of Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Inflate to programming year, or 2025 if unknown</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
<td>$10-12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Inflate by 4% a year to midpoint of time horizon (2030)</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
<td>$14.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>Inflate by 4% a year to midpoint of time horizon (2040)</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
<td>$21.9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reminders
Transportation Alternatives Program

- Accepting applications through October 2, 2020
- Local match requirement of 20%
- More details are available at https://www.tn.gov/tdot/program-development-and-administration-home/local-programs/tap.html
Agenda Item 4b.

Proposed Amendments to the FYs 2020-2023 TIP

Background

Applications for amendment to the FYs 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program are due to GNRC staff by October 21 in order to be considered for Amendment Cycle A. Those amendments are scheduled for adoption on December 16. As part of this cycle, staff is requesting project sponsors to provide an update on the status of their programmed projects in order to 1) identify projects that will not request funding obligation as currently scheduled and 2) identify projects seeking additional funds as a result of cost-overruns related to Right-of-Way Acquisition or Construction.

Schedule

- Oct 21 – Application Deadline
- Nov 4 – Initial Presentation to the TCC
- Nov 18 – Initial Presentation to the Transportation Policy Board (TPB)
- Nov 20-Dec 16 – Public Review and Comment
- Dec 2 – Final TCC Presentation
- Dec 16 – Public Hearing; Adoption by the Transportation Policy Board

Recommendation

For information only.
2020 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Cycle</th>
<th>(FY20)</th>
<th>(March Adoption)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline – January 22, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC Presentation – February 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPB Presentation – February 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC Endorsement – March 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing/TPB Adoption – March 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Cycle</th>
<th>(FY20)</th>
<th>(June Adoption)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline – April 22, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC Presentation – May 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPB Presentation – May 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC Endorsement – June 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing/TPB Adoption – June 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Cycle</th>
<th>(FY20)</th>
<th>(September Adoption)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline – July 22, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC Presentation – August 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPB Presentation – August 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC Endorsement – September 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing/TPB Adoption – September 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Cycle</th>
<th>(FY21)</th>
<th>(December Adoption)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline – October 21, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC Presentation – November 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPB Presentation – November 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC Endorsement – December 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing/TPB Adoption – December 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any project sponsor requesting an amendment that is not deemed to be an emergency outside of these cycles must either wait for the next amendment cycle or reimburse the MPO for the direct costs to pay for the required public noticing.

For more information:
Anna Emerson
615.862.8838
aemerson@gnrc.org