



MEETING NOTICE

MPOJC Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
Tuesday, January 22, 2019 – 10:30 AM
Emma Harvat Hall
Iowa City City Hall

AGENDA

1. Call to order; recognize alternates; consider approval of meeting minutes
2. Public discussion of any item not on the agenda*
3. Consider a recommendation to the MPOJC Urbanized Area Policy Board regarding Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 Transit Operating Formula funding apportionment for FY2019 and transit statistics for FY2018
4. Update on Surface Transportation Block Grant & Transportation Alternatives Program grant funding process
5. Update on the MPOJC FY20 Transportation Planning Work Program & FY20-23 Transportation Improvement Program schedules
6. Discussion regarding participation in the 'Federal-Aid-Swap' whereby State funding could replace Federal funding for local road/bridge projects
7. Update on Federal Functional Class designations for urbanized area roadways
8. Update on CRANDIC passenger rail and rails-to-trails studies
9. Other Business
10. Adjournment

**Public input is permitted on any agenda item. Please indicate to the Chair if you wish to comment on an agenda item.*

To request any disability-related accommodations or language interpretation, please contact MPOJC staff at 356-5230 or Kent-Ralston@Iowa-City.org 48 hours prior to the meeting.



PRELIMINARY

MPOJC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6- 2018 -10:30 AM
EMMA HARVAT HALL, IOWA CITY, CITY HALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Coralville:	Dan Holderness, Vicki Robrock
Iowa City:	Jason Havel, Ron Knoche, Simon Andrew
Johnson County:	None
North Liberty:	Kevin Trom
Tiffin:	Doug Boldt
University Heights:	Louise From
University of Iowa:	Brian McClatchey
RTBC:	Bob Oppliger
Iowa DOT:	Catherine Cutler
ECICOG:	Brock Grenis

STAFF PRESENT: Kent Ralston, Brad Neumann, Emily Bothell, Frank Waisath, Sarah Walz

OTHERS PRESENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER; RECOGNIZE ALTERNATES; CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

There was one alternate at the meeting; Kevin Trom for Dean Wheatley (North Liberty). Oppliger motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Holderness seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

2. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

3. CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPOJC URBANIZED AREA POLICY BOARD REGARDING SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT (STBG) AND TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM (TAP) SCORING CRITERIA FOR FUNDS ALLOCATED BY MPOJC

Ralston informed the group that staff adjusted the scoring criteria for funds allocated by the MPO. The point value for criteria 1a (economic opportunity) has been increased. Criteria 3 (quality of life) has been increased as there is an emphasis on quality of life in the recently adopted Long Range Plan. For criteria 5b (efficiency), future congestion and existing congestion points are now equal. Points for criteria 7c (safety) have been increased for projects with documented safety issues. For criteria 9b (equity), points have been decreased for ADA improvements as projects are already required to meet these

standards. For criteria 10, local commitment points have been increased for projects with more than 40% local commitment.

Total scores for the last round of STBG funded projects have changed but the rank of projects has remained nearly the same. Total points have increased from 74 to 88.

Holderness motioned to approve the recommendation. Knoche seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

4. CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPOJC URBANIZED AREA POLICY BOARD REGARDING SAFETY TARGET SETTING FOR THE MPO AS REQUIRED BY THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Ralston stated that the Federal Highway Administration now requires that the MPO set targets for five safety performance measures as part of the Highway Safety Improvement Program and report them to the DOT by February each year. For each target, the MPO must either support the state's targets or establish their own targets. The MPO must show how TIP projects attempt to meet the 5-year rolling averages outlined by the five targets and describe how projects in the next Long Range Plan will meet the five targets. Staff recommended adopting state targets.

Knoche motioned to approve the recommendation. Holderness seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

5. CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPOJC URBANIZED AREA POLICY BOARD REGARDING AN UPDATE TO THE MPOJC TITLE VI COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

Neumann informed the group that the Iowa DOT and Federal Transit Administration require the MPO to adopt a Title VI compliance program. The Title VI Program prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin. The document provides guidelines that the MPO must follow in order to comply with Title VI requirements. It also includes a Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Review. This review is used to guide the language assistance program for MPOJC. Also included is the Public Participation Plan that was approved last year.

Boldt motioned to approve the recommendation. Knoche seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

6. DISCUSSION REGARDING POTENTIAL FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION CHANGES FOR MPOJC URBANIZED AREA ROADWAYS

Bothell informed the group that requests for FFC revisions were made by North Liberty, Coralville, and Iowa City. Bothell asked the committee to review the results and to let staff know of any changes. Once the list of amendments is finalized, it will be submitted to the DOT for preapproval. Once "pre-approved", staff will bring a recommendation back to the TTAC and the Policy Board for final approval. Bothell informed the group that the MPOJC planning boundary is updated with every decennial census. The next update will occur in 2020.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Trom informed the group that the Highway 965 and Kansas Avenue projects are both nearing completion. The trail along the west side of the street will likely not be complete until spring 2019.

From stated that the owner of Graze will be opening the restaurant in the Courtyard Marriott Hotel in University Heights.

Knoche informed the group that the Public Works Facility Phase I project was awarded to American Construction of Cedar Rapids. Construction will occur at the public works site on S Gilbert Street.

Havel informed the group that paver work on the north-south portion of the pedestrian mall is nearing completion. Work on the east-west portion of the pedestrian mall will occur in the spring. The Mormon Trek Boulevard project is on hold until the spring. Overlay work on Riverside Drive will also occur in the spring. Curb ramps on Governor Street are done and the remaining overlay will be done in the spring. Myrtle Avenue is open and construction will be completed in the spring. The Burlington Street and Clinton Street intersection is scheduled to be finished this year. Remaining work on the Gateway Project including signal work, utility work, trail construction, and landscaping will be completed in the spring.

Holderness stated that the northbound section of 1st Avenue will be paved this year. Paving on Coral Ridge Avenue is done except for the Wheaton Road intersection. The trail along the west side of Coral Ridge Avenue has been paved.

McClatchey stated that bids for the CAMBUS maintenance facility renovation are open. The project should be awarded soon and work will likely start in the spring

Grenis stated that ridership on the 380 Express Bus is increasing. A Saturday option may be implemented around the holidays.

Cutler informed the group that a public information meeting was held in North Liberty regarding the I-380 corridor planning.

Boldt noted that work on Forvergreen Road, Park Road, and the trail connecting to the county are all underway.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Holderness motioned to adjourn. McClatchey seconded. **The motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:59 a.m.



Date: January 14, 2019
To: Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
From: Brad Neumann, Assistant Transportation Planner
Re: Agenda item #3: Consider a recommendation to the MPOJC Urbanized Area Policy Board regarding Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 Transit Operating Formula funding apportionment for FY2019 and transit statistics for FY2018

Iowa DOT has indicated that MPOJC has a total of \$2,587,277 available in FY2019 FTA Section 5307 operating assistance. This amount includes Small Transit Intensive Communities (STIC) funding. The funds are apportioned by MPOJC to Coralville Transit, Iowa City Transit, and University of Iowa Cambus based on the MPO's local formula of 25% operating/maintenance costs, 25% locally determined income (LDI), 25% revenue miles, and 25% fare revenue. Last year the Board changed the definition of LDI to a transit agency's operating costs minus Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funding. This allows the MPO's LDI definition to be consistent with state funding formulas and National Transit Data (NTD) reporting requirements.

The following tables show the proposed FY2019 apportionment, and for comparison, the FY2018 multipliers and apportionment. Also attached are the FY2018 Transit Performance Statistics. The local apportionment for FY2019 is based on these statistics. The FY2019 Section 5307 funds can be used for transit operating and capital expenses. Once approved, the MPO will complete and submit the required annual FY2019 FTA Section 5307 applications on behalf of each transit system.

Please be prepared to make a recommendation to the Urbanized Area Policy Board regarding apportionment of the FY2019 FTA Section 5307 operating funds.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this information, please contact me at 356-5235 or by e-mail at brad-neumann@iowa-city.org.

Proposed FY2019 Section 5307 Operating Apportionment

System	Total Operating Cost	Locally Determined Income*	Revenue Miles	Fare Revenue	FY2018** Multiplier	FY2018 Apportionment
Coralville	\$1,740,839 [.1371]	\$1,022,425 [.1199]	273,264 [.1342]	\$421,461 [.2369]	.1570	\$406,203
Iowa City	\$7,304,632 [.5755]	\$5,216,740 [.6118]	1,011,147 [.4967]	\$1,357,671 [.7631]	.6118	\$1,582,896
CAMBUS	\$3,647,419 [.2874]	\$2,288,073 [.2683]	751,506 [.3691]	\$0.00 [0.0000]	.2312	\$598,178
TOTAL	\$12,692,890 [1.000]	\$8,527,238 [1.000]	2,035,917 [1.000]	\$1,779,132 [1.000]	1.0000	\$2,587,277

*Locally Determined Income is Total Operating Cost minus FTA and STA funding

**Multiplier is an average of the percentages of the total operating costs, locally determined income, revenue miles, and fare revenue.

Following are FY2018 multipliers and apportionment:

FY2018		
System	Multiplier	Total Apportionment
Coralville	0.1638	\$409,131
Iowa City	0.5997	\$1,497,897
CAMBUS	0.2365	\$590,716
TOTAL	1.0000	\$2,497,744

SUMMARY TABLE OF FY2018 PERFORMANCE STATISTICS

Coralville Transit ♦ Iowa City Transit ♦ UI Cambus

Performance Factor	Coralville Transit		Iowa City Transit		UI Cambus	
	Fixed* Route	Paratransit*	Fixed** Route	Paratransit**	Fixed Route	Paratransit
Ridership	464,668	11,996	1,498,470	93,082	3,689,290	9,063
Total Operating Expense	\$1,392,912	\$347,927	\$5,318,260	\$1,986,372	\$3,433,670	\$213,749
Fare Revenue	\$398,921	\$22,540	\$1,179,893	\$177,778	\$0	\$0
Revenue Vehicle Miles	198,735	74,529	704,185	306,962	699,640	51,866
Revenue Vehicle Hours	16,428	5,884	53,953	31,733	71,653	10,191
Cost Per Ride	\$3.00	\$29.00	\$3.55	\$21.34	\$0.82	\$24.03
Cost Per Revenue Vehicle Mile	\$7.01	\$4.67	\$6.93	\$6.47	\$4.73	\$4.33
Cost Per Revenue Vehicle Hour	\$84.79	\$59.13	\$98.57	\$62.60	\$45.94	\$21.87
Farebox/Expense Ratio	0.29	0.06	0.22	0.09	0.00	0.00
Average Fare	\$0.86	\$1.88	\$0.79	\$1.91	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Deficit Per Trip	\$2.14	\$27.12	\$2.76	\$19.43	\$0.93	\$23.58
Riders Per Revenue Vehicle Mile	2.3	0.2	2.1	0.3	5.3	0.2
Riders Per Revenue Vehicle Hour	28.3	2.0	27.8	2.9	51.5	0.9

* Includes North Liberty service

** Includes University Heights service

Source: FY2018 Iowa DOT Statistical Reports



Date: January 15, 2019
To: Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
From: Kent Ralston; Executive Director *KR*
Re: Agenda Item #4: Update on Surface Transportation Block Grant & Transportation Alternatives Program grant funding process

Typically, the MPO conducts our competitive grant process for both Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds in the spring every other year. This biennial process has historically reflected the desire of both the TTAC and the Urbanized Area Policy Board to allow two years of funding to be allocated at once – thereby allowing projects to receive larger funding awards.

However, due to uncertainty regarding changes in federal transportation legislation, the Iowa DOT was not prepared to allow us to proceed with our local TAP application process in 2017. Therefore, we now have two years of STBG funding available for allocation and four years (rather than the typical two years) of TAP funding available for our forthcoming grant process.

The grant process will follow this tentative timeline:

- February 1, 2019 – STBG & TAP applications distributed
- February 22, 2019 – Application submittal deadline (3 weeks to submit applications)
- March 12, 2019 – RTBC meets to provide recommendation on TAP projects
- March 26, 2019 – TTAC meets to provide recommendations on STBG/TAP projects
- April 3, 2019 – Policy Board meets to approve funding of STBG/TAP projects
- May 2017 – TTAC / Policy Board approve draft Transportation Improvement Program
- July 2017 – TTAC / Policy Board approve final Transportation Improvement Program

Staff anticipates that a total of approximately \$6.7 million in STBG funds will be available for allocation in FY23-24 and a total of approximately \$1.45 million in TAP funds will be available for FY21-24.

I will be at your January 22nd meeting to answer any questions you may have.



Date: January 14, 2019
To: Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
From: Brad Neumann, Assistant Transportation Planner
Re: Agenda Item #5: Update on the MPOJC FY20 Transportation Planning Work Program and FY20-23 Transportation Improvement Program schedules

FY20 Transportation Planning Work Program

The *Transportation Planning Work Program* is a document developed each year to identify projects which will be addressed by MPOJC the following fiscal year. The Work Program is developed in a coordinated effort involving the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee, Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT), and Urbanized Area Policy Board. Annual Work Program items include all state and federally required planning processes and documentation, ongoing and routine projects, and special projects requested by member entities.

We will begin soliciting for FY20 Work Program projects in February. If you have special projects in mind for the FY20 Work Program, please feel free to discuss them with any MPO staff person. The draft Work Program must be submitted to the Iowa DOT, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) by April 1. The Urbanized Area Policy Board will approve the final Work Program in May.

FY20-23 Transportation Improvement Program

The MPOJC *Transportation Improvement Program* (TIP) is the programming document for federally funded transportation improvements within the Iowa City Urbanized Area. This document includes federally funded transportation projects for all modes of transportation such as streets, highways, bicycles, transit, and pedestrians.

The importance of the TIP is that it formalizes the specific projects to receive federal funds, and the year in which the projects receive funding. The MPOJC Urbanized Area Policy Board considers approval of the annual TIP after receiving a recommendation from the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee. MPOJC will be allocating new Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding in 2019. MPOJC anticipates allocating approximately \$6.7 million in STBG funding to be programmed in FY23-24 and \$1.45 million in TAP/TAP Flex funding to be programmed in FY21-24. The TAP/TAP Flex funding amount is higher than normal due to not having apportioned these funds since 2015. Due to changes in federal transportation legislation the Iowa DOT made changes to the TAP program and did not allow any apportionments to take place during our last funding project cycle in 2017.

In July, the Urbanized Area Policy Board will adopt the FY20-23 TIP. In preparation for public review of the draft TIP, staff will work with member entities to ensure projects are programmed in the appropriate fiscal year.

Feel free to contact me at 356-5253 or brad-neumann@iowa-city.org. I will be at your January 22 meeting to answer any questions you have.

cc: Kent Ralston



Date: January 15, 2019
To: Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
From: Kent Ralston; Executive Director
Re: Agenda Item #6 Discussion regarding participation in the 'Federal-Aid-Swap' whereby State funding could replace Federal funding for local road/bridge projects

Last year, House File 203 was signed into law permitting the Iowa Transportation Commission to allow what's commonly referred to as a "Federal-Aid-Swap". The swap (generally) is a process whereby road and bridge projects that would normally be funded with federal transportation dollars allocated by the MPO are instead 'swapped' for state funding – with the goal of minimizing federal regulations and streamlining local projects.

At your March 2018 meeting, the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) unanimously recommended participating in the swap. However, after lengthy discussion, the Urbanized Area Policy Board ultimately voted to 'opt-out' of the swap by a vote of 11-4. Of the Board's many concerns, Davis-Bacon wages, worker safety, and lack of data supporting the benefits of the swap were central to the discussion. MPOJC is currently the only MPO in the state opting-out of the swap.

Similar to last year, unless our MPO chooses to 'opt-out' of the swap program, the Iowa DOT will assume we wish to participate. Due to the timeline regarding development of the MPOJC Transportation Improvement Program, a decision on swap participation will need to be made in March. Unfortunately, since the swap policy did not take effect until October 2018, the DOT was unable to provide details on project cost savings as a result of the swap. The DOT did however indicate that the project development timeline has been reduced by six months for most projects.

I have attached meeting minutes from the Policy Board's March 2018 meeting as well as the DOT's final swap policy language for your reference. Please review the attached information and be prepared to discuss your organizations' stance on this issue. The goal is to (again) have a discussion about the potential pros/cons of the policy with the limited information available and then be able to make a recommendation to the Urbanized Area Policy Board no later than our March meeting. Please keep in mind that this policy would only affect Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding. Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funding cannot be swapped at this time.

I will be at your January 22nd meeting to answer any questions you may have.

Federal-Aid Swap Policy

- **Planning and Programming**
 - Participation in federal-aid swap - Each Regional Planning Affiliation (RPA) and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is assumed to be a participant in the swap program unless their policy board decides otherwise. If participating in swap, all eligible projects must be swapped. In rare circumstances, an exception may be considered.
 - Federal funding will be swapped with Primary Road Funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis.
 - Funding eligible to be swapped – eligible road and bridge projects from the following federal funding programs
 - Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)
 - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ): Projects awarded to cities and counties through the Iowa's Clean Air Attainment Program (ICAAP)
 - Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) - Secondary: County projects allocated through the HSIP – Secondary program
 - Programming
 - STBG funds are allocated based on FAST Act Implementation Policies adopted by the Commission in September 2016.
 - With the exception of dedicated county and city bridge funds, RPAs and MPOs will continue to develop a program based on their available STBG funding. Programmed road and bridge projects will be swapped with Primary Road Funds and non-road/bridge projects will move forward as federal-aid projects.
 - Dedicated city and county bridge program funds will not be programmed by RPAs or MPOs. However, they will still need to be entered into the project tracking database (TPMS).
 - The full amount of accumulated STBG balances will not be fully available to be swapped in the first year due to Primary Road Fund cash flow constraints. It is expected the full draw down of those balances can be accomplished within four years of swap implementation. Therefore, the RPA/MPO development of their program of projects should take this into account. Iowa DOT will work with each RPA and MPO during the program development process to effectively drawdown the STBG balances. **In order to do this successfully, it is critical that the projects included in the first year of the program are expected to be developed and let in that year.**
 - Match requirements
 - Unless specifically required by the grant program (see below), Iowa DOT will not require match and will reimburse funds at 100 percent up to the programmed amount.
 - For county Highway Bridge Program projects, the Iowa DOT will not require match and will reimburse funds at 100 percent up to the contract amount.
 - Match requirements for ICAAP, HSIP-Secondary, and city bridge program projects continue to apply based on program guidance.
 - Individual MPOs and RPAs can require match but Iowa DOT will not monitor those requirements.
 - System Eligibility (STBG)
 - Road projects must be on roads with a federal functional classification of Minor Collector or higher in rural areas, all Farm-to-Market routes, and Collector or

higher in urban areas. Individual MPOs and RPAs can be more restrictive with system eligibility.

- Bridge project eligibility remains the same as exists today for federal-aid bridge projects. This is to assure consistency required for meeting the Off-System Bridge Waiver verification.
 - Projects cannot already be “federalized” (e.g. any federal authorization, any environmental concurrence, any other federal action) and then swapped. Once a project is “federalized” it must continue to follow the federal-aid project development process. A project is typically not “federalized” just by having been included in a Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); however, in limited situations based on the level of federal involvement, a project could be federalized. This will be determined on a project-by-project basis as draft programs are developed.
 - Implementation date – Swap will be implemented with the Federal Fiscal Year 2019 program year that begins October 1, 2018.
- **Environmental**
 - Local public agencies participating in the Federal-Aid Swap shall continue to follow all necessary and applicable state and federal requirements, including but not limited to permitting and consultation as needed with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Iowa Department of Cultural Affairs/State Historic Preservation Officer, Native Sovereign Tribes and Nations, and Office of the State Archaeologist. The Iowa DOT will continue to assist these local public agencies in achieving compliance or acquiring a permit, as staff and technical expertise are available.
 - Environmental and cultural resource oversight shall be verified through the local public agency providing a project development certification and all applicable documentation to ensure that identification, evaluation, avoidance, and mitigation actions have been taken.
- **Project Development/Construction**
 - All swapped projects will continue to be let through the Iowa DOT.
 - Swap funds can only be used on road and bridge construction projects.
 - Preliminary engineering and construction engineering are eligible for swap as part of a construction project. However, the use of swapped funds for these activities is not encouraged.
 - Project funds will be provided to the local public agency on a reimbursement basis.
 - The Iowa DOT will review contract documents for conformance to the Department standard for letting.
 - The Iowa DOT reserves the right to review projects during construction.

MINUTES

MPOJC Urbanized Area Policy Board
Wednesday, March 28th, 2018 – 4:30 PM
City of Coralville – Council Chambers
1512 7th Street, Coralville, IA

APPROVED

MEMBERS PRESENT: Coralville: Tom Gill, Meghann Foster
Iowa City: Susan Mims, Mazahir Salih, Pauline Taylor,
Rockne Cole, Kingsley Botchway II, John Thomas
Johnson County: Lisa Green-Douglass, Mike Carberry
North Liberty: Terry Donahue, Chris Hoffman
Tiffin: Steve Berner
University Heights: Louise From
University of Iowa: Jim Sayre
ICCSA: Lori Roetlin

STAFF PRESENT: Kent Ralston, Brad Neumann, Emily Bothell, Sarah Walz, Kelly Brockway

OTHERS PRESENT: Stuart Anderson (Iowa DOT), Cathy Cutler (DOT District 6), Dan Holderness (City of Coralville)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Berner called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM.

a. Recognize alternates

All members were present.

b. Consider approval of meeting minutes

Motion to approve was made by Donahue; Gill seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

c. Set date of next meeting

The next meeting was set for Wednesday, May 30th, hosted by Iowa City.

2. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA*

No public comment was presented.

3. TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

a. DOT staff presentation and consider action on whether to participate in the Federal-Aid-Swap whereby State funding could replace Federal funding for local road/bridge projects

Ralston stated that for several months staff has been updating both the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) and the Board regarding the pending swap. It was highly encouraged after the last meeting for members to have discussions with their respective city staff to gain a stronger understanding of how the swap might affect their respective entities. Unless the Board specifically chooses to opt-out of the swap program, the MPO will automatically participating in the Federal-Aid-Swap.

Ralston introduced Stuart Anderson from the Iowa DOT (Director of Programming, Planning, and Modal Division), to provide the Board with a presentation with an overview and to answer questions about the swap.

a. Presentation

Anderson stated that many other states, Midwest included, have already implemented Federal-Aid-Swap programs. The swap helps small local jurisdictions, with smaller staffs, complete projects faster by minimizing the additional regulations and requirements attached to Federal funding. The concept of the swap is to have the same amount of federal funding exchanged for state funding at the DOT level. The reduced project development requirements in this swap process can reduce the project development cycle by at least six months for local projects.

Anderson addressed that in previous discussions others did express concern about the swap bypassing federal aid requirements. The swap will not change the amount of funding for projects nor the number of upcoming projects in the state of Iowa. Anderson proceeded to open the floor to any questions of concerns from the Board members.

Douglass asked for clarification on which federal regulations the swap would circumvent. Anderson mentioned State requirements would replace the federal requirements. Anderson stressed the time savings component of the project development process. Federal oversight requirements that would be replaced include the review of material certification, Davis-Bacon, financial record oversight, and By-American certification.

Salih asked for clarification of the employment requirements under swap projects. Anderson stated while Davis-Bacon would not be required, that the leading process would remain the same.

Carberry asked for more information regarding environmental review. Anderson mentioned that most federal and state requirements apply to projects regardless the funding source. The shift in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation process will allow other Federal organizations besides the DOT to take the lead in documentation, such as the Core of Engineers. Otherwise environmental review will not change.

Cole asked what the new wage standard the State will apply to projects, if the Davis-Bacon is not applied. Cole also asked what the expectation for wages will be on these swapped projects. Anderson stated that swap projects would have the same wage requirements associated with state and local funding the current projects have. At this time, there is not a prediction for an increase or decrease in future wages.

Donahue asked if the Board could set their own wage requirement. Anderson stated that wages would defer to the local council requirements.

Gill expressed his concern about growth potential for Coralville and the potential that wages could increase with the increased number of projects within the area.

Botchway II asked how many projects, statewide, would qualify for the swap within the next year. Anderson stated that at this moment there could not be a definite answer until the final programs from each RPA and MPO are summited. Typically, this MPO averages one federal aid project a year. Ralston clarified that there has been at least one project a year for the past 5 -10 years. A draft of the Transportation Improvement Document (TIP), which programs all federal and state funding for projects within the

urbanized area, will be presented to the Board at the next meeting.

Taylor also expressed concerns about safety requirements, such as OSHA, and how speeding up projects could bypass safety requirements on these projects. Anderson stated that safety requirements have not been an expressed concern. OSHA and jobsite requirements will still exist on all projects within the state, regardless of the funding source. There are strict design standards and guidance for all projects that are development.

Ralston clarified that the Board could not set their own prevailing wage requirement for MPO projects within the area. This determination came from a supreme court case with Polk County.

Douglass expressed concerns about missed classification and subcontractors oversight when regulations are taken away. Anderson stated that most projects are currently developed with state and city funding. The swap allows the county/city to administer a federal project in this way. The DOT has not heard concerns of local administration on state funded projects.

Carberry asked for a quantifiable number of savings the swap would save on federal projects. Hoffman stated that staff would save time, which saves tax payer dollars. The unemployment rate is very low in Johnson County and the State of Iowa, which helps hold contractors accountable to complete projects by the expected deadline. Hoffman asked if there is any evidence to show the difference in wage rates between what would happen under Davis-Bacon and the current prevailing wage.

Salih asked Anderson how much time would be saved on the federal projects. Anderson responded that the project development process has shortened by six months for swapped projects.

Berner asked if there were any statistics on whether other MPOs or RPAs have opted-in or opted-out. Anderson responded there the DOT does not have statistics for other states; but in the 27 organizations in Iowa, this is the only MPO that discussing opting-out.

Gill asked Anderson if the opting-in or -out process was annual. Anderson responded that the swap process would be an annual renewal program for each organization. The DOT is intending to quantify and track cost savings, benefits, and any issues of the swap program.

Sayre asked for clarification in which every federal dollar that comes to the state, the same amount will be subject to the Davis-Bacon act even if we do not participate in the swap. Anderson responded with yes.

Ralston did clarify that all the other MPOs and RPAs in Iowa were planning on opting-in to the swap program. The TTAC committee had unanimously recommended that the Board participate in the swap.

Thomas stated the Davis-Bacon has been in place since 1931.

Berner asked if there were any public comment regards to this agenda item. There were three public comments.

Bill Gilhart stated that without Davis-Bacon, the only other form of wage protection workers have is minimum wage regulations. Contractors are also required to have a certified payroll under Davis-Bacon that stops misclassification of workers and wage

theft. Gilhart presented the Board with two documents. The first of the prevailing wage literature what is included in projects with Davis-Bacon. He stated that the fringe benefits can be used only for health insurance, retirement, and training. The second document included information pertaining to the results of states removing their individual state Davis-Bacon laws.

Douglass asked Gilhart to further explain what misclassification means and how it happens. Gilhart stated that misclassification is when a worker is titled as an independent contractor and not an employee. The original contractor is not obligated to pay social security, workers compensation, or unemployment.

Cole pointed out on page 3, from the second document from Gilhart, the fatality rate and wage labor laws correlation. Cole asked Gilhart if his organization had any numerical statistics for safety rates without the prevailing wage standard within Iowa. Gilhart did not have a numerical prediction on safety implications of the swap in Iowa.

Eric Schmidt presented his support for the Board to opt-out of the swap process. The swap is avoiding federal environmental regulations for secondary roads and bridges, Davis-Bacon, and the By-American act.

Dale Ballsinger expressed his support for keeping Davis-Bacon and By-American regulations for future projects within the area.

b. Board action

Berner closed public comment. Motion to opt-out of the Federal-Aid-Swap was made by **Carberry**; **Douglass** seconded. Sayre accused himself from the vote.

From stated she supports the TTAC and University Heights' staff recommendation and for opting-in to the program.

Hoffman expressed his concern between the time savings for his city staff and the consequences for removing the federal requirements.

Cole stated that there has not been any imperial data on the savings presented to the Board about the swap, health and safety standards, or wage standards. While changes to safety and lower wages might not be seen immediately, over time these built up standards can become reduced. Also, the Board cannot set project wage agreements or standards.

Botchway II expressed his support in opting-out for one year to see the data from the rest of the state before we make the decision to join as well. While city staff stress the time savings the swap would produce, there is typically only one eligible project a year.

Carberry stated his support in opting-out due to concerns of the safety and wages for the construction workers. Carberry did mention that his county engineers and staff had shown support for opting-in to the swap.

From and Berner expressed their support in opting-in to the swap for the benefits smaller communities would experience. The swap would save significant time on projects, reduce costs for city staff, and save tax payer dollars. Both communities' city staff supported opting-in to the swap as well.

Gill stated his support for opting-in due to the reduction in time for major projects, faster completion, and minimizing the safety hazards for dangerous projects. The reduction in time would significantly increase public safety on I-80, I-380, and HWY 965.

Taylor expressed concerns about expediting major projects and allowing them to be under local and state regulations.

Cole asked Ralston if the MPO had an estimate of delay on projects if the Board chooses to opt-out of the swap. Ralston stated that the MPO does not at this moment. The TIP document is currently being drafted. However, any project that has already been deemed federalized by the DOT, would not be eligible for the swap, like the current I-80/I-380 project. But, the associated auxiliary projects, that will be in upcoming TIP, could qualify for the swap.

Salih stated her support in opting-out due to worker implications. This included current conditions of misclassification and treatment of workers and the consequences of removing the federal requirements of future projects.

Mims asked Anderson if the DOT was planning on consolidating the federally funding into a few larger projects across the state under the swap program.

Anderson responded that the federal funding would still be spread across the state to multiple regions and projects. The swap would allow some small and medium sized projects, like bridge replacements, to now be funded with federal funds.

Mims asked Anderson how the DOT plans to allocate the federal funding under the swap process. Anderson stated that decision will be at the individual MPO and RPA level. The road and bridge projects that are included within each developed TIP program would be considered eligible. The transit projects, that receive federal funding, would not be eligible for the swap program because the state does not have allocated funds for transit projects.

Cole asked Ralston if the swap would be applicable and speed up the 6-lane expansion of I-80 and I-380. Ralston stated those projects have already been federalized and would remain under the federal requirements and processes.

Donahue asked the public union representatives if they could provide an estimate of how many union workers identify as a minority. Gilhart estimated that out of the 16 unions, minorities make up approximately 20% of the union labor force. Donahue expressed his concern on the conflict of supporting unions against providing ample opportunities for minorities to advance as well.

Gilhart stated under the Davis-Bacon, the workers do not have to be union to receive the livable wage requirement. When Davis-Bacon is applied to a project, it includes all workers on the project. In Iowa, the heavy highway industry market share of union construction is approximately 15-20%. The bulk of Iowa construction workers that are receiving the benefit of the Davis-Bacon wage requirement are open shop contractors and open shop workers.

Mims stated her support for opting-out of the swap to gain a better understanding of the rules, savings, and implications the swap. Mims acknowledged the complexity of this agenda item and indicated her decision between following staff recommendations and considering the removal of federal requirements. The repercussions of cost savings, local wage impacts, safety, and quality of constructions are all unknown.

Foster stated her support for opting-out for one year to make sure this economic impact is beneficial to everyone involved on projects, to see the impact of overall safety, if other areas are still supporting livable wages, and environmental regulations are still in place.

Thomas expressed his support in opting-out. Reasons included that a majority of other states do not have a swap program, Davis-Bacon legislation has been around for over 87 years, and opting-out will provide more comparative data about the swap for Iowa.

Donahue called for the vote on the previous motion made by **Carberry**. Ralston clarified that the motion was to opt-out of Federal-Aid-Swap. **The motion was approved with four descending votes made by Berner, From, Donahue, and Gill and one accused vote by Sayre.**

b. Consider approval of the Locally Determined Projects list for the FY2019 MPOJC Transportation Planning Work Program

Ralston stated that MPOJC compiles a list of projects for the upcoming fiscal year each spring in the Transportation Planning Work Program. This is required by the Federal Highway Administration and the Iowa DOT. We utilize the program to schedule and plan ahead for data collection and research necessary to complete the projects. Attached in the agenda packet is the list of work program projects that have been received to date from TTAC members and other respective staff.

The MPO is aware that other projects and data collection needs come up during the year. While the MPO usually is able to fit smaller unscheduled projects into our work program. More significant projects proposed during the year may not be able to be completed and would be brought to the Board at the time.

Ralston asked the Board to review the list of the attached projects. TTAC had unanimously recommended approval of the projects list at their March 20th meeting. The full work program will be presented to the Board at the next meeting for consideration.

Motion to approve was made by **Botchway II**; **From** seconded. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

c. Consider approval of FY2019 MPOJC Transit Program of Projects

Neumann informed the Board that Coralville Transit, Iowa City Transit, and University of Iowa Campus have programmed projects for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds in FY2019. The Transit Program of Projects includes all the anticipated federally funded projects for all three transit systems, and is a federal requirement. Not every project will be funded. In order to be eligible for funding, projects must be included in the Program of Projects. The MPO has published a public notice regarding the FY2019 Transit Program of Projects and is requesting public comment from the community.

The FY2019-2022 TIP will include the FY2019 Iowa DOT's Consolidated Transit Funding applications, for each transit system, in the Transit Program of Projects. This information is being distributed to the Board for review. It will be included in the draft FY2019-2022 MPOJC TIP in May. The final TIP will be prepared for Board approval in late June or early July. Neumann stated TTAC had unanimously recommended approval of the FY2019 MPOJC Federal Transit Program of Projects.

Motion to approve was made by **Gill**; **Cole** seconded. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

d. Update on CRANDIC passenger rail study

Neumann provided the Board with the previously requested IOWA DOT methodology for forecasting autonomous vehicle and passenger rail ridership along the I-380 corridor.



Date: January 15, 2019

To: Transportation Technical Advisory Committee

From: Emily Bothell, Sr. Transportation Engineering Planner

Re: Agenda item #7: Update on Federal Functional Classification (FFC) designations for MPOJC Urbanized Area roadways

Over the last few months, MPO staff has been working with the Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT) to update the Federal Functional Classification system map for the Iowa City Urbanized Area. The functional classification system is a hierarchy of five roadway classes and identifies which roads are Federal-Aid Routes. The functional classification system's significance to MPO activities is that federal funding can only be spent on roadways functionally classified as collector, or higher, in the classification system. Only 35% of the total road mileage in the Iowa City Urbanized Area can be listed on the Federal Functional Classification System.

Following the November 20th, 2018 Transportation Technical Advisory Committee meeting, MPO staff submitted 8.70 miles of roadways to the Iowa DOT for 'pre-approval' as requested by member entities. As shown in **Table 1**, approximately 3.20 miles of roadways were 'pre-approved' and 5.50 miles were 'denied'. **Table 1** details Iowa DOT's comments for each project and the proposed classification.

Please be prepared to make a recommendation to the Urbanized Area Policy Board regarding the 3.20 miles of 'pre-approved' roadways.

I will be available at the January 22nd meeting to answer any questions you may have.

Table 1: Federal Functional Classification Amendment Request 2018-2019

NO.	ENTITY	STREET / ROUTE DESCRIPTION	IOWA DOT COMMENTS		FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION CHANGE			
					MILES	FROM	REQUESTED	APPROVED
1	North Liberty	Kansas Avenue - W Penn Street to Forevergreen Road	Deny	The roadway is currently functioning as a local street.	2.10	LOCAL	U-COL	No Change
2	North Liberty	Saint Andrews Drive - Kansas Avenue to Jones Boulevard	Deny	The roadway is currently functioning as a local street. Cannot be classified until Kansas Ave is a collector.	1.00	LOCAL	U-COL	No Change
3	Coralville	Forevergreen Road - I-380 to 12th Avenue	Deny	The roadway is currently functioning as a collector.	2.40	U-COL	U-MA	No Change
4	Coralville	Coral Ridge Avenue - US Hwy 6 to James Street	Approve	Approve change to Urban Collector. The road is not functioning as a Major Arterial.	0.10	LOCAL	U-MA	U-COL
5	Coralville	10th Street - 22nd Avenue to 25th Avenue	Approve	Approve change to Urban Collector. This road is being used as a collector route to Coral Ridge Mall from 12th Ave.	0.50	LOCAL	U-COL	U-COL
6	Coralville	25th Avenue - Coral Ridge Mall Entrance to US Hwy 6	Approve	Approve change to Urban Collector with the potential to extend route to Coral Ridge Mall entrance.	0.20	LOCAL	U-COL	U-COL
7	Coralville	James Street - Coral Ridge Avenue to Camp Cardinal Boulevard	Approve	Approve change to Urban Collector. This road is being used as a collector route between US 6 and Camp Cardinal Blvd.	0.90	LOCAL	U-COL	U-COL
8	Iowa City	Kirkwood Avenue to S Capitol Street*	Approve	Approve change to Urban Minor Arterial to coincide with Urban Minor Arterial classifications in the area.	0.2	LOCAL	U-MA	U-MA
9	Iowa City	Taft Avenue - American Legion Road to Herbert Hoover Highway	Approve	Approve change to Urban Collector for southern 1.3 miles. Northern .5 miles is considered Rural FFC.	1.30	LOCAL	U-MA	U-COL

*In the Community's Capital Improvement Program

Total 'Pre-Approved' Mileage 3.20

U-MA: Urban Minor Arterial
U-COL: Urban Collector

Classified Miles Available 11.97



Date: January 15, 2019

To: Transportation Technical Advisory Committee

From: Brad Neumann, Assistant Transportation Planner

Re: Agenda item #8: Update on CRANDIC Passenger Rail and Rails-to-Trails Studies

Phase III - Iowa City to North Liberty Passenger Rail Conceptual Feasibility Study:

After reviewing the results of the Phase II Passenger Rail Study, several MPOJC entities chose to move forward with a Phase III study. The intent of the Phase III study is to focus on ridership, revenue forecasts, financial strategies, benefits to the community, and conceptual station design. Funding for this study comes from the City of Iowa City, the City of Coralville, Johnson County, the University of Iowa, CRANDIC Railroad, and the Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT).

Currently, MPOJC staff is working with the Iowa DOT, CRANDIC, and HDR Consulting to resolve differences with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regarding the proposed ridership model and methodology used for the study. Accurate ridership projections are essential in developing financial forecasts and preparing future FTA passenger rail development grants. MPO staff hopes to have the issues resolved soon. The Phase III study was scheduled to be completed by December of 2018. However, with the model issues unresolved the completion date of the study is unknown at this point.

Rails-to-Trails Study:

In early 2018, several MPOJC entities directed MPO staff to work with HDR Consulting in developing a scope and a cost estimate for a rails-to-trails study in the CRANDIC corridor between Iowa City and the University of Iowa's Research Park (Oakdale). Iowa City, Coralville, Johnson County, and the University of Iowa are provided funding for this study.

The intent of this study is to provide an additional option that could be used to preserve the existing CRANDIC rail corridor for future use if passenger rail service is not implemented. The study includes:

- A description of the federal regulations and process of railroad abandonment, railbanking, permissible uses, and the potential reactivation of the corridor for future passenger rail service.
- Typical rails-to-trails characteristics and the feasibility of the CRANDIC corridor to accommodate a rails-to-trails conversion.
- A description of the connectivity of a trail in the CRANDIC corridor with existing trails and connections to known future trails.

- A description of potential liability issues that railroads typically consider when converting from rail usage.
- Estimate probable conceptual costs to develop trail infrastructure on the CRANDIC corridor. The cost estimate includes removal of the existing rail infrastructure, bridge and culvert improvements, roadway crossings, trail construction, and professional services.

The draft study has been completed and submitted to the MPO for review. Once finalized, staff will forward the study to stakeholders for reference. I will be at the January 22 meeting to discuss this item.

cc: Kent Ralston