

MEETING MINUTES

Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, April 28, 2011

1:30 p.m.

Room 113, County/City Building

Members Present: Greg MacLean, Public Works/Utilities; Randy Hoskins, Roger Figard, Public Works/Utilities/RTSD; Marvin Krout, David Cary, Planning; Don Thomas, Doug Pillard, County Engineering; Lynn Johnson, Parks & Recreation; Brian Praeuner, StarTran; Brad Zumwalt, Tom Goodbarn, Nebraska Department of Roads; Justin Luther, Federal Highway Administration; Barb Fraser, Pedestrian & Bicycle Advisory Committee.

Others Present: Kaine McClelland, Nebraska Department of Roads; Mike Brienzo, 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 March 24, 2011 Technical Committee meetings

Cary moved approval of the March 24, 2011 Technical Committee meeting minutes, seconded by Pillard. The motion carried unanimously with Zumwalt abstaining.

2. Review and action on a revision to the FY 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program to add the Bison Trail Bridge Replacement.

Brienzo stated that this is an amendment to the current TIP. The Parks and Recreation Department has been allocated funds from the recreation trail program and they want to apply those funds to the Bison Trail Bridge replacement.

MacLean moved approval of the revision to the FY 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program to add the Bison Trail Bridge Replacement; it was seconded by Car. The motion carried unanimously.

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

Cary stated that two open houses on the transportation alternatives were held in April. He wants to update the committee on the recent activities concerning the Long Range Transportation Plan. He reviewed the current population and projected population growth. This information was used to develop a draft land use plan as well as the traffic model. The transportation discussion has been centered on the seven transportation goals. A list of projected needs has been identified for roads. There is a \$15 million gap in funds. We must have a fiscally constrained plan, so we will have a list of funded programs and projects and a list of needs based programs. There are two financially constrained plans, which are the capital emphasis plan and the maintenance emphasis plan. In the capital emphasis plan, funding continues in a similar fashion as today with emphasis placed on building new roads and trails. In the maintenance emphasis plan, there would be reduced funding toward capital, with funding shifting toward maintenance. The needs based program would require additional funding.

Total needs for roadway maintenance, operation and rehabilitation are \$29 million annually. Current funding is not adequate. Money invested in rehabilitation today saves money in the future. Costs for trails and sidewalks maintenance will increase as the system expands and ages. In order to meet our

needs, we need more funding. Using our current funding, the question to answer is whether we concentrate more on maintenance at the expense of new projects.

In looking at new roads projects, in the needs based plan, only those improvements that are needed to mitigate unacceptable 2040 congestion were identified. In the capital emphasis plan, a prioritized list of projects based on traffic modeling and project evaluation using transportation goals was used. In order to fit into the available funding, the lowest priority projects were not included. When comparing congestion between these two plans, there is not a significant difference. In the maintenance emphasis plan, about \$9 million of roadway capital was shifted toward improved maintenance and projects were further reduced to include only those with highest priority. When comparing congestion in the capital emphasis and maintenance emphasis plans, you start to see more congestion in the maintenance emphasis plan.

Funding for maintenance is well below what is needed for trails and sidewalks. Currently there is no dedicated funding for anything but off-street trails. Coordination is currently done by three different departments, but a single coordinator is recommended.

Cary then reviewed the funding needed for each of the three plans. It would take an additional \$15 million annually to fully fund the Needs Based Plan. This equates to about 12 dollars per household per month.

Hoskins reviewed the Transportation Operations and Management elements of the LRTP beginning with Intelligent Transportation System (ITS). ITS uses technology in transportation to save lives, time and money. ITS investments have a 9:1 return on investment. In order to promote ITS, they are developing partnerships with other public private sector entities, communicating with elected officials and other administrators to secure funding, and ensuring ITS is considered in every project. The identified ITS projects include regional communication improvements, multi-agency joint operations center, Automated Vehicle Location, traffic signal response improvements, 25 total project and estimated \$57 million cost over the planning period.

The Transportation System Management (TSM) elements include intersection and signal improvements, bottleneck removal programs, data collection to monitor system performance and special events management.

Congestion Management projects include the following: identify congested locations, determine the cause of congestion, develop alternative strategies to mitigate congestion, evaluate the potential of different strategies, propose alternative strategies. Congestion Management relies on previously agreed to community standards, largely uses data already being collected, fits within existing CIP/TP process and relies heavily on "non-construction" activities like ITS and TDM.

In working on the Freight elements for the plan, Hoskins notes that staff has been meeting with the Nebraska Trucking Association which has provided us with access to names and addresses of 11,500 trucking firms. We are developing a survey to provide us with a great deal of information to be applied locally. This will be followed with meetings with members from the freight industry to directly involve them in the transportation planning process. We hope to have a report on this at the next meeting.

Krout asked the State about the status of the South Beltway and if they would comment on any funding activity for this project. Zumwalt stated that he has not heard that the funding has changed. Fischer noted that the state roads bill has passed.

Cary reviewed the upcoming schedule in terms of the public hearings and approval dates. Brienzo stated that the plan is expected to be distributed the first part of July for public comment and

distributed to the Technical Committee at the same time. The Technical Committee review and comment meeting for this is set for August 2, 2011.

Fraser stated that the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee is recommending the Needs Based Plan. They are working on a letter to submit to LPAC and the Technical Committee.

4. Other topics for discussion

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2: 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_Apr 28 2011.doc