

MEETING MINUTES

Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, February 17, 2011

1:30 p.m.

Room 113, County/City Building

Members Present: Randy Hoskins, Roger Figard, Public Works/Utilities/RTSD; Marvin Krout, Nicole Fleck-Tooze, David Cary, Planning; Don Thomas, Doug Pillard, County Engineering; Brian Praeuner, StarTran; Rick Thorson, Health Department; Brand Zumwalt, Tom Goodbarn, Nebraska Department of Roads;

Others Present: Kaine McClelland, Nebraska Department of Roads; John Perry, Justin Luther, FHWA; Rick Haden, Felsburg, Holt & Ullevig; Thomas Shafer, Roger Ohlrich, Susie Filipi, Public Works Engineering Services; Mike Brienzo, Sara Hartzell, Michele Abendroth, Planning.

The meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m. The Nebraska Open Meetings Act was acknowledged.

1. Review and action on the draft minutes of the January 20, 2011 Technical Committee meetings

Hoskins moved approval of the January 20, 2011 Technical Committee meeting minutes, seconded by Figard. The motion carried unanimously with Fleck-Tooze and Cary abstaining.

2. FHWA Briefing by John Perry, FHWA Safety Engineer, on the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and Highway Safety Improvement Program.

Perry began by stating that a top priority of FHWA has been the integration of safety in the transportation planning process. We are currently operating under SAFETEA-LU of 2005. There are several reasons to incorporate safety in the transportation planning process including travel safety is affected by changes to the transportation system; safety is identified by Congress as a national issue that needs to be considered; motor vehicle crashes are a leading public health problem; and effective safety programs involve a wide range of stakeholders.

Perry noted that the HSIP Projects in Nebraska are crash data-driven with benefit/cost analysis where feasible. Typical projects include intersection improvements, roundabouts, adaptive control signals, countdown pedestrian signals, shoulder and center-line rumble strips and anti-icing spray systems. In order to obligate HSIP funds, states must develop and implement a State Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).

The goal of the 2007-2011 Nebraska SHSP is 1.0 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled by 2011. This goal was reached in 2010 with 0.94 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled. The goal for 2016 is to have 0.5 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled. Countermeasures for distracted driving and speeding related crashes may be built in.

Current statewide campaigns include "Click It or Ticket"; "You Drink, You Drive, You Lose"; and intersection safety.

Perry stated that the LRTP should discuss reasons for including a safety element; focus on goals for 2012-2016 Nebraska SHSP; include information on HSIP program; and discuss how the LRTP will interface with the SHSP and HSIP program. Staff should work with the Nebraska Department of Roads Traffic Engineering on integrating safety in the LRTP.

Figard asked what the biggest factors have been in reducing the crash rate. Perry stated that he believes the biggest factors are seatbelts, safer cars and the economy.

Krout asked how Nebraska compares to other states in terms of safety. Perry stated that the national crash rate was 1.1 last year, so we are ahead of the national average. In terms of seatbelt usage, we are right at the national average.

3. Briefing on the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) activities.

a) Results from the Mobility and Transportation Goals and Objectives Survey.

Hartzell reviewed the results of the Mobility and Transportation Goals and Objectives Survey conducted from January 28 through February 9 of this year. There were 291 total responses received.

Respondents were asked to rank seven goals from highest to lowest priority. She briefly reviewed the responses received for each of the goals. These results will be given to the LPlan Advisory Committee who will weight the goals. The weighted goals will then be used in the prioritization of transportation projects and the development of a fiscally constrained transportation plan.

b) Land Use Map and Priority Growth Area Phasing.

Garrett presented the draft growth tiers for the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. There are three Tiers with Tier I broken into Priority Areas A, B & C. Tier I Priority A is the developing area, Priority B is the first phase of new edge growth beyond the existing city limits, and Priority C is new growth to the year 2040. The growth areas include infill of 3000 dwelling units in downtown/Antelope Valley, 4000 dwelling units in commercial nodes and corridors, and 1000 units of residential infill. Tier II is new growth to the year 2060 and Tier III is beyond 2060.

c) Initial 2025 and 2040 Traffic Projections on the Existing & Committed Network.

Brienzo stated that the travel model is a land-use based model. The traffic model has been validated. He presented several maps that are developed from the traffic model. There is a land use connection with household growth and employment growth. They also look at existing and committed projects. The process begins with the 2009 existing land use network and is modeled using the 2025 land use and the 2040 land use.

Brienzo stated that the preliminary travel model data shows average seconds of delay in 2010 at 7 seconds, 12 seconds in 2025 and 24 seconds in 2040. This data is based upon the initial assumption that if improvements were not made to the transportation system. He also presented a map showing the 2040 forecast with the 2030 street and roadway improvements.

d) Fiscal Constraint and Future Funding Issues.

Cary stated that fiscal constraint helps staff identify what projects we can and cannot do. The Long Range Transportation Plan needs to be in compliance with federal regulations. We need to be very clear about funding assumptions and inflating costs throughout the Plan. Inflation was not factored in the 2030 Plan, and so the costs will be significantly higher in this Plan.

There are different types of projects that are under fiscal constraint in the Plan. These include streets, transit and trails; funding has been identified in each category.

Cary noted that the inflation rate has been determined to be 3%. This means that a \$1 million project in 2011 will cost \$2.36 million in 2040.

Cary then reviewed the sources of revenue for streets. Total revenue for streets is about \$43 million per year today and is projected to be about \$82 million per year by 2040. Over 30 years, estimated revenues would be \$1.8 billion. Sixty-seven percent of this would go towards Operations and

Maintenance, and the remainder would be available for capital projects. Costs are projected to be \$4 billion which would be a funding gap of \$2.2 billion. Cary also reviewed the revenue streams for transit and trails.

In conclusion, Cary stated that we need to be as efficient as possible while keeping our costs down; maintain and sustain our current system; find additional funding; decrease the amount of funded projects from the 2030 LRTP; and prioritize projects and be smart with our funding.

4. Briefing on the Lincoln Pavement Conditions and Projections based upon various annual funding amounts spent on rehabilitation.

Hoskins stated that a pavement management system has been in effect for about 5 years. Annual revenue for street maintenance is \$43 million with total revenue over 30 years calculated at \$1.8 billion. Annual operations and maintenance costs are \$10.5 million. Costs are increasing at approximately 3% per year. Rehabilitation/maintenance funding needed to maintain the current pavement conditions is \$475 million over the next 30 years; traffic signals, ITS, sidewalk maintenance, and bridges costs are \$225 million; and operations and maintenance is \$500 million. The total costs over the next 30 years are calculated at \$1.2 billion.

The prognosis of \$1.8 billion in revenue and \$1.2 billion in operations and maintenance costs will allow the City to maintain the street system at its current pavement condition.

5. Other topics for discussion

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

*** Please note that these minutes will not be formally approved until the next meeting of the Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee. ***

ma/mb

Q:\MPO\Technical Committee\Minutes\2011\Technical Committee_Feb 17 2011.doc