REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Approval of 9/16/20 Meeting Minutes (A)  
   Mary Esther Reed  
   TPB Chair

2. Public Comment

3. Action Items:
   a. Endorse Submission of Draft Regional Transportation Plan to State and Federal for Review and Comment (A)  
      Sean Pfalzer  
      Transportation Planning Manager
      Staff is preparing the initial draft of the fiscally constrained project list and corresponding technical documentation for review and comment by the TN Dept of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration. The Plan is scheduled for formal board endorsement in January 2021 with adoption anticipated on February 17.

4. Informational Items:
   a. TIP Amendments, Cycle A: Call for Cost Overruns (A)  
      Anna Emerson  
      Principal Planner
      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. FHWA/FTA Report  
      NHWA Representative
   b. TDOT Report  
      TDOT Representative
   c. Chair’s Report
   d. Staff Report
   Mary Esther Reed  
   Sean Pfalzer

6. Other Business

7. Adjourn

GNRC uses Microsoft Teams for online meetings. Meeting Links and Call-In Details available at www.GNRC.org/Calendar
Roll Call for the Transportation Policy Board will be taken at www.GNRC.org/TPBRollCall

(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 - September 16, 2020

Background

Meeting minutes have been prepared and are ready for approval.

Recommendation

Approve meeting minutes.
MINUTES
Of the
TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD
Of the
Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
September 16, 2020

Attendees: Mayor Rogers Anderson, Mr. Steve Bland, Ms. Faye DiMassimo (for Mayor John Cooper), Mayor Jeff Duncan, Mr. Preston Elliott (for Gov. Bill Lee), Mr. Gerald Herman (for Mayor Michael Arnold), Mayor Anthony Holt, Mayor Randall Hutto, Mr. Thad Jablonski (for Mayor Chaz Molder), Mayor Bill Ketron, Ms. Pam Kordenbrock, Mr. Victor Lay (for Mayor Rick Graham), Mr. Kenny Martin (for Mayor Ed Hagerty), Ms. Kealan Millies-Lucke (for Mayor Mike Callis), Mayor Ken Moore, Mayor Mary Esther Reed, Mayor Billy Vogle

Mayor Mary Esther Reed, Chair, opened the meeting at 10:20 a.m. and turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair Billy Vogle as she had a prior commitment to attend.

Approval of 8/19/20 Meeting Minutes

Mayor Anthony Holt moved to approve the August 19, 2020 meeting minutes with Mayor Randall Hutto seconding. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action Items:

a) Public Hearing: Adopt Resolution TPB 2020-06 Amending the FYs 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Amendment Cycle D

Ms. Anna Emerson, Principal Planner, presented the final TIP amendment cycle (Cycle D) for FY 2020. These amendments have gone through the required public review and comment period with no comments received.

Mayor Vogle opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Mayor Vogle closed the public hearing.
Mayor Ken Moore moved to adopt the Resolution. Mayor Holt seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

b) **Endorse Updates to the RTP Policy Framework**

Mr. Sean Pfalzer, Transportation Planning Manager, presented updates that included recommended weights for each of the six regional goals. The recommended goal weights in order of priority are as follows:

1) Improve safety (30%)
2) Maintain State of Good Repair (20%)
3) Mitigate Congestion (15%)
4) Increase Access to Economic Opportunity (15%)
5) Minimize Disruptive Impacts (10%)
6) Align with Policies and Plans (10%)

He informed members that the weights will be used to prioritize transportation needs for funding through the upcoming Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Mayor Moore moved to endorse the updates to the RTP Policy Framework to incorporate goal weights. Mayor Hutto seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

### Informational Items

a) **Regional Transportation Update**

Mr. Pfalzer gave an overview of the evaluation process and tools being used to evaluate projects submitted by TDOT, local jurisdictions, and transit agencies. He noted how the existing conditions and trends for growth and development, congestion, safety, environment, and social equity are considered at the project level, and provided an example of the staff analysis for congestion is handled by GNRC staff for each project. Mr. Ben Gramling, Environmental Planning Manager, then provided an example of the staff analysis for congestion is handled by GNRC staff for each project.

For more information, go to [https://apply.nashvillempo.org](https://apply.nashvillempo.org).

Mr. Pfalzer said that questions will be answered at the workshop on September 30th.

b) **Social Equity Considerations for the Regional Plan**

Ms. Shelly Hazel 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 introduced the importance of the topic, including that 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, and 3) multimodal infrastructure is available but unreliable and unsafe due to infrequent service and lack of connectivity.

Ms. Carson Cooper, Research Analyst, 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.

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.

c) **Roadway Safety Performance Targets**

Mr. Pfaller said that targets are set annually as part of the MPO’s performance-based planning requirements. The TPB most recently elected to support state targets for its own regional targets until a new regional transportation plan is adopted. The 2045 RTP will establish the basis for regional targets for the subsequent years.

He said that FHWA does not directly assess progress towards regional targets set by the TPB but if the state targets for safety are not met, TDOT will not be permitted to use (flex) federal safety funds on other types of projects. TDOT will be required to obligate Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds to safety projects only and TDOT must develop an Implementation Plan to improve safety outcomes.

For the 2045 RTP, GNRC staff proposed the following regional target options for consideration: 1) cap fatalities, 2) 1% annual reduction, 3) 50% overall reduction, and 4) Vision Zero (a 16% annual decrease out to 2045). Staff’s recommendation is for the 1% annual reduction option.

There is no action today but looking for support as we move forward with RTP update.

**Regular Reports**

**FHWA**

Ms. Pam Kordenbrock said that the FAST Act is going to expire on September 30th and has not reauthorized yet. A continuing resolution is likely to occur.
She also noted that FHWA is continuing to work with the MPO and TDOT on the Congestion Management Process and will be participating in a progress meeting at the end of September. She expressed appreciation to the MPO for looking at safety targets for the region and the impact on RTP.

**TDOT**

Mr. Preston Elliott said that the Transportation Alternatives Program grant applications are due October 2nd. This grant program requires an 80%/20% funding match. For more details, visit [https://www.tn.gov/tdot/program-development-and-administration-home/local-programs/tap.html](https://www.tn.gov/tdot/program-development-and-administration-home/local-programs/tap.html). He also said that the Multimodal Access Grant notices for full applications had been sent out. This grant program requires a 95%/5% funding match. He said that the Statewide Active Transportation Plan (SATP) is underway, and there is a virtual open house through October 7th.

He said that study efforts on the I-40/81 Corridor Study update is ongoing, and there will be virtual meetings announced between now and the end of the year.

Mr. Elliott announced that the new Long-Range Planning Director will be Mr. Matt Meservy, and he will begin in October.

**TPB Chair**

Mayor Vogle reminded the members of the GNRC Annual Board meeting on Wednesday, September 23rd at 10:30 a.m. It will be a virtual meeting.

**Staff**

Mr. Pfalzer said that the first RTP workshop of the month with the TCC members was held on September 2nd. It focused on the evaluation approach and tools to conduct project evaluations. The second RTP workshop on the month on September 30th will review preliminary results of project evaluations and discuss recommended changes in scope as a result of staff analysis.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Date: ______________________

___________________________
The Honorable Mary Esther Reed  
Chairman, MPO Transportation Policy Board

___________________________
Sean Pfalzer, Transportation Planning Manager  
MPO Coordinator
Agenda Item 3a.

Submission of Draft Regional Transportation Plan to TN Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration

Background

Staff will provide an overview of the draft Regional Transportation to include the initial fiscally constrained project list and technical documentation to be submitted to the TN Dept of Transportation (TDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for review and comment. State and federal comments are due by the end of December 2020.

Handouts for this agenda item will be posted online at www.GNRC.org/DraftRTPfiles

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

https://youtu.be/haBhV7OIXTg

Schedule

- Nov-December 2020 – State and Federal Review/Comment Period
- January 15-February 17, 2021 – Public Review and Comment Period
- February 3 – Final TCC Presentation
- February 17 – Public Hearing; Adoption by the Transportation Policy Board

Recommendation

Endorse Plan for submission to TDOT, FHWA, and FTA.
Greater Nashville Regional Council

Federal Requirements for the Regional Transportation Plan


Related Terms: GNRC uses the terms “Regional Transportation Plan” and “Unified Transportation Plan” to refer synonymously to the “Metropolitan Transportation Plan.” Some metropolitan areas refer to their plan as the “Long Range Transportation Plan.”

Purpose of the Plan: The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. In formulating the transportation plan, the MPO shall consider factors described in § 450.306 as the factors relate to a minimum 20-year forecast period. The transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.

Effective Date: In attainment areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be its date of adoption by the MPO.

Required updates: The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan every 5 years in attainment areas to confirm the transportation plan’s validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon.

Data and Assumptions: The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data used in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.

Highway and Transit Safety Planning: The metropolitan transportation plan should integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP required under 23 U.S.C. 148, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan required under 49 U.S.C. 5329(d).
Interagency Consultation: The MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan.

Community and Stakeholder Involvement: The MPO shall provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under § 450.316(a).

Online Access: The MPO shall publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.

State and Federal Copies: The MPO shall approve the transportation plan (and any revisions) and submit it for information purposes to the Governor. Copies of any updated or revised transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.

The Plan must include:

1. The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan
2. Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities (e.g., pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities), and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan
3. A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with § 450.306(d). Assess capital investment and other measures necessary to preserve the existing transportation system (including requirements for operational improvements, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of existing and future major roadways, as well as operations, maintenance, modernization, and rehabilitation of existing and future transit facilities) and make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and enhance the mobility of people and goods;
4. A system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in § 450.306(d), including progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data
5. Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods;

6. Consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs that meet the requirements of this subpart, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide.

7. Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters. The metropolitan transportation plan may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestion threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area's transportation system.

8. Transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(a), as appropriate.

9. Design concept and design scope descriptions in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates;

10. A discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The MPO shall develop the discussion in consultation with applicable Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation.

11. A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented:
   a. For purposes of transportation system operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain the Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53).
   b. For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO(s), public transportation operator(s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under § 450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.
   c. The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan...
transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. The financial plan may include an assessment of the appropriateness of innovative finance techniques (for example, tolling, pricing, bonding, public private partnerships, or other strategies) as revenue sources for projects in the plan.

d. In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 or with other Federal funds; State assistance; local sources; and private participation. Revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect “year of expenditure dollars,” based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s).

e. For the outer years of the metropolitan transportation plan (i.e., beyond the first 10 years), the financial plan may reflect aggregate cost ranges/cost bands, as long as the future funding source(s) is reasonably expected to be available to support the projected cost ranges/cost bands.

f. For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.

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 in early 2021. Call-for-projects is one of the first major acts by the Transportation Policy Board and to engage TTI and other participating jurisdictions in finding specific solutions to solve Middle Tennessee’s transportation challenges.

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, TDOT, 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 welfare, 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 prioritizing 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 workforce 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
- Unacceptable traffic congestion
- Intractable prosperity

Endorsed by the Transportation Policy Board on October 16, 2018, Updated December 11, 2019

- Purpose
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- 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%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Good Repair</th>
<th>Roadway Safety</th>
<th>Congestion Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Objective is Maintenance or Repair</td>
<td>Primary Objective is to Improve Safety</td>
<td>Primary Objective is to Mitigate Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Routes on the National Highway System and STRAHNET</td>
<td>High Crash Areas</td>
<td>Congested Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>Routes with Crashes involving Fatalities</td>
<td>Active Transportation Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Volumes</td>
<td>Routes with Crashes involving Bike/Ped Users</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Conditions</td>
<td>Routes with Crashes involving Trucks</td>
<td>BPAC Priority Areas for Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Features related to Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>Proposed Features to Improve Safety</td>
<td>Proposed Features to Mitigate Congestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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

**Application Submissions**
- Project description, location, and proposed scope of work
- Project history and anticipated cost estimates
- Project purpose, goals, and objectives

**Conditions & Trends Indicators**
- System demand for daily volume, freight movement, and active transport
- Levels of congestion and related indicators
- Roadway safety and crash characteristics
- Population and employment densities and growth
- Environmental factors
- Vulnerable populations

**Staff Qualitative Assessments**
- Potential for addressing regional goals and objectives
- Potential for causing disruption to vulnerable communities or environmental assets
- Opportunities to enhance outcomes through improved project design/scope

GNRC - GREATER NASHVILLE REGIONAL COUNCIL
# Project Scoring Dashboard

![Project Scoring Dashboard Image](image)

## Greater Nashville Regional Council (GNRC)

[Logo: GNRC - Greater Nashville Regional Council]
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)

| ID  | County | Applicant   | Proposal                      | Project Name                                                                 | TIER | PRV | QG | MUL | CNG | SFE | FGM | EMV | HST | $ M |
|-----|--------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1185| Davidson| Brentwood   | Roadway Traffic Operations    | Brentwood-Metro Nashville I-40/65 Regional Signalization Implementation     | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 4.20|
| 1143| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Interchange Modification | I-65 @ Vietnam Veterans Pkwy (I-446) Interchange Modification            | ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 55.00|
| 1149| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Interchange New              | I-65 @ Springfield Hwy (SR-11) Interchange                                   | *    |     |   |     |     |     |     |     | 22.00|
| 1138| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Intersection Improvements    | Rivergate Pkwy @ Moss Trl, Old Two Mile Intersection Improvements            | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 0.75|
| 1137| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Multi-Modal          | Conference Drive Multimodal Upgrades from Long Hollow Pk to SR-306          | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 0.41|
| 1154| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Multi-Modal          | Main Street Pedestrian Walkway from Williamson Rd to Campbell Rd           | ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 7.50|
| 1148| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway New                  | Conference Drive Extension from Long Hollow Pk to US 41                      | **  | =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 2.00|
| 1105| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Reconstruct          | Rivergate Parkway Upgrades from Gileades Ave to Main St                    | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | -   |
| 1133| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Reconstruct          | Main Street Upgrades from Sheval Dr to Norris Ave                         | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 11.69|
| 1156| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Reconstruct          | Vietnam Veterans Pkwy (SR-306) @ Conference Dr Interchange Modification    | ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 0.53|
| 1157| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Reconstruct          | Main St Reversible Lane @ C&X Railroad Bridge (Alternative to C&X widening)| ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 1.25|
| 1150| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Reconstruct          | Old Brick Church Pk Reconstruction from Main St to New Brick Church Pk      | **  | +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 1.90|
| 1156| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Safety               | Vietnam Veterans Pkwy @ Conference Dr Interchange Lighting                 | ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 0.35|
| 1145| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Safety               | I-65 Interchange Lighting @ Rivergate Pkwy, Long Hollow Pk, US 31W          | ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 1.48|
| 1134| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Safety               | Long Hollow Pk Signal Synchronization                                      | ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 0.37|
| 1140| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Widening             | Rivergate Parkway Widening from Dickerson Pk to Gallatin Rd                 | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 12.14|
| 1144| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Widening             | Main St Widening @ C&X Railroad Bridge                                      | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 8.85|
| 1151| Davidson| Goodlettsville| Roadway Widening             | I-65 Widening from Long Hollow Pk to US 31W                                 | ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 20.00|
| 2549| Davidson| Metro Planning| Roadway Reconstruct          | Complete Streets Implementation on BRT Lite Corridors - Murfreesboro Pike from 2nd/4th Ave to Global Mail PkR | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 3.90|
| 2548| Davidson| Metro Planning| Roadway Reconstruct          | Complete Streets Implementation on BRT Lite Corridors - Gallatin Pk from Alto Loma Rd to Liberty Ln | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 5.38|
| 1241| Davidson| Metro Public Works| Interchange Modification    | I-40 @ McCory Lane Interchange (Phase 1)                                      | ****| =   | = | =   | =   | =   | =   | =   | 6.74|
| 1209| Davidson| Metro Public Works| Intersection Improvements    | Jefferson St Corridor Intersections Improvements from 21st Ave N to 26th Ave N | ****| +   | + | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | 1.41|
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 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
Project Database (Apply App)

http://apply.nashvillempo.org/
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>Projects with no estimates or rough planning estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a) Estimation Tool</td>
<td>Based on project type, length, travel lanes, intersections, etc.</td>
<td>Projects with cost estimate that appear low</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>
Agenda Item 4a.

Proposed Amendments to the FYs 2020-2023 TIP; Call for Cost Overruns on Active TIP Projects

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>FY</th>
<th>Cycle Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B FY20          |    | March Adoption | Application Deadline – January 22, 2020  
                 |    |             | TCC Presentation – February 5  
                 |    |             | TPB Presentation – February 19  
                 |    |             | TCC Endorsement – March 4  
                 |    |             | Public Hearing/TPB Adoption – March 18 |
| C FY20          |    | June Adoption | Application Deadline – April 22, 2020  
                 |    |             | TCC Presentation – May 6  
                 |    |             | TPB Presentation – May 20  
                 |    |             | TCC Endorsement – June 3  
                 |    |             | Public Hearing/TPB Adoption – June 17 |
| D FY20          |    | September Adoption | Application Deadline – July 22, 2020  
                 |    |             | TCC Presentation – August 5  
                 |    |             | TPB Presentation – August 19  
                 |    |             | TCC Endorsement – September 2  
                 |    |             | Public Hearing/TPB Adoption – September 16 |
| A FY21          |    | December Adoption | Application Deadline – October 21, 2020  
                 |    |             | TCC Presentation – November 4  
                 |    |             | TPB Presentation – November 18  
                 |    |             | TCC Endorsement – December 2  
                 |    |             | Public Hearing/TPB Adoption – December 16 |

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