



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

THE HONORABLE KENNETH WILBER, CHAIRMAN
DOUG DEMOSI, TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN
MICHAEL SKIPPER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR & SECRETARY

MPO Executive Board

Wednesday, MAY 20, 2015 @ 9:00 AM

Second Floor Conference Room of the Nashville MTA Music City Central Station
400 Charlotte Avenue in Nashville, Tennessee

1. ACTION ITEM: Approve April 15, 2015 Meeting Minutes (attachment)

2. Public Comment

3. MPO Chair's Report

- Save the Date – Power of Ten Summit – 1 PM on June 18 @ TPAC Polk Theatre

4. ACTION ITEM: Proposed Amendments to the FYs 2014-2017 TIP (attachment)

The MPO has proposed the following amendments to the *Transportation Improvement Program* (TIP). A 21-day public review and comment period and two public hearings are required prior to adoption by the Board.

More information is available at NashvilleMPO.org/plans_programs/tip/.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:

Amend#	TIP #	Project Name	Sponsor	Action
2015-028	2008-15-049	MTA-Administration Building Rehabilitation (Nestor)	MTA	Add funds
2015-029	2014-15-056	Renovate MTA Headquarters (Myatt Drive Facility)	MTA	Add funds
2015-030	2008-17-021	Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD), Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL), & Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)	MTA	Shift funds
2015-031	2013-85-211	Installation of Wi-Fi on Music City Star Train	RTA	New project
2015-032	2013-85-208	Music City Star Rail Replacement/Track Rehab	RTA	New project
2015-033	2013-85-210	Stationary Fare Collection Equipment	RTA	New project
2015-034	2011-85-127	Media Fare Purchase	RTA	New project
2015-035	2013-85-207	Music City Star Passing Siding	RTA	New project
2015-036	2013-85-209	Shore Power for Music City Star Riverfront Station	RTA	New project
2015-037	2013-85-213	Rehab/Renovate Stations	RTA	New project
2015-038	2014-85-055	RTA Operations	RTA	Add funds

SCHEDULE:

- 5/6 – TCC Endorsement
- 5/20 –XB Endorsement
- 5/22-6/17 – Public Review and Comment Period
- 6/3 – First Public Hearing (TCC)
- 6/17 – Second Public Hearing / Adoption (XB)

RECOMMENDATION: Endorse proposed amendments for public review and comment.

5. INFORMATION: Findings from Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning Activities

MPO staff will present findings from the recent update to regional bicycle and pedestrian datasets and analysis including facility inventories, level of service analysis, and latent demand modeling.

More information can be found in the technical memorandums posted on the MPO website at: http://www.nashvillempo.org/regional_plan/walk_bike/regional_study.aspx

6. INFORMATION: Update on the Regional Transportation Plan (attachment)

Staff will present an update on the development of the 2040 RTP including information about the project evaluation criteria that will be used to establish regional priorities for federal and state funding for the years 2016 through 2040.

More information is available at 2040.NashvilleMPO.org.

7. MPO Director's Report

8. Other Business

9. Adjourn until June 17, 2015

Agenda Item % 5df]`% ž&\$%`9l YW hj Y`6cUfX`A]bi HYg

MINUTES
EXECUTIVE BOARD
of the
Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
April 15, 2015

Attendees: Mayor Rogers Anderson, Mr. Andy Barlow (for Mayor Ed Hagerty), Mr. Steve Bland, Mayor Howard Bradley, Mayor Paige Brown, Mayor Ernest Burgess, Mayor John Coombs, Mayor Philip Craighead, Mr. Corbin Davis, Mayor Karl Dean, Mayor Rick Graham, Mr. Gerald Herman (for Mayor Michael Arnold), Executive Anthony Holt, Mayor Randall Hutto, Mayor Timothy Lassiter, Mr. Larry McGoogin (for Gov. Bill Haslam), Mr. Ken McLawhon (for Mayor Jimmy Alexander), Mr. Dana Richardson (for Mayor Shane McFarland), Mr. Tim Roach, Mayor Ken Wilber

Approve March 18, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Mayor Ken Wilber, Chair, opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. Mayor Howard Bradley moved to approve the March 18th meeting minutes. Mr. Tim Roach seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Ms. Margo Chamber, Nashville, said that the Board should defer approving the Prospectus and Bylaws or not designate the Metropolitan Planning Commission as the recipient of federal funding because they are not certified to receive this funding as none of the commissioners have filled out any of the federal forms and this could bring on unwanted federal scrutiny. TDOT should be designated. She said that the Davidson Transit Organization, a subsidiary of the MTA, has federal authority to access transit funds. She also said that there is no letter authorizing the DTO to receive the funds. There is no IRS form 1023 or 1024 filed.

MPO Chair's Report

Mayor Wilber said that there is a bike summit in Knoxville on April 23rd & 25th. He is planning on attending. He also said that there is a series of meeting regarding the SR-109 Access Management Study. The first one was last night in Lebanon. There is one tonight, April 15th in Portland from 5:00 – 6:30 p.m. and another one Thursday, April 16th in Gallatin from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Wilber said that Portland will have its annual Strawberry Festival on May 9th. He brought strawberry shortcake for everyone to sample.

MPO Prospectus and Organizational Bylaws

Mr. Michael Skipper, MPO director, said that all of the comments from members as well as TDOT and FHWA/FTA have been incorporated into the document. The only changes in the document from the last update are related to the MPO expansion and text changes to make the document easier to understand.

House Bill 1275, sponsored by Representative Jeremy Durham, has passed through the Local Government Committee and is at the Calendar Committee waiting to be scheduled for a floor vote. The current version mirrors in large part the Senate version. The legislation would require MPOs operating wholly in Tennessee and including 3 or more counties to include a representative from the County Highway Departments in the area. It delegates the authority to appoint that member to the Tennessee County Highway Association and prohibit the use of weighted voting which has been part of our history since 1977 which is the first time our MPO area extended beyond Davidson County.

As to adding a county highway representative, Mr. Skipper said that this is a discussion that this Board has had previously and will do without a bill requiring it. He said that the language giving the authority to appoint the representative to a lobbying group is really not appropriate however. He said that this Board should have the ability to work with the county highway departments to determine the rotation of the representative.

As to the issue of weighted voting, this Board has always operated with each member having one vote per jurisdiction. He said that the Bylaws since 1997, given that the Board is NOT representative of the population, have always allowed a member to enact a population-proportionate weighted vote on an issue. The weighted vote has evolved over time. A weighted vote can now be called on any action pertaining to the RTP, TIP, or the Bylaws. Should a weighted vote be enacted, the vote is postponed for 30 days and any action must be approved by 2/3 of the voting members. He said that right now the largest weight is Metro Nashville which has 42% of the weighted vote based on population which is still far short of the necessary 66% majority needed to pass any action. If this Board were to remove weighed voting and enact a board membership that was representative of the population, the consequence would be a very large board, or the elimination (or rotation) of seats among smaller communities.

Mr. Skipper said that the Executive Committee will meet to discuss this bill, etc at some point following the end of session. The committee includes the Board Chair, TCC representative, TDOT representative, and a few others plus the County mayors and county highway departments to talk about the structure that needs to be implemented to accommodate that representation. Mayor Wilber reminded the members that they need to contact their State Representatives to voice concern about bill.

Mayor Ernest Burgess said that he didn't understand points made by Ms. Chambers. He didn't understand why the MPC is not qualified to sponsor the MPO. Mr. Skipper said that the MPC is the fiscal agent for the MPO and that all of the MPOs in the state are housed in a host agency. The MPC has the contractual agreement authority. The Prospectus spells out the roles of the MPC and the MPO. The funding for the MPO is through federal grants and local matches. This MPO has been housed in the MPC since the 1960s.

Mayor Burgess asked about her point that the Federal Government could pull funding due to the MPC not being certified. Mr. Skipper said that every 4 years the MPO undergoes a certification by the FHWA and FTA and that there has never been an issued raised regarding being housed in Metro. Mr. Steve Bland said that the DTO is separate issue from the MPC and has no relationship with the MPO. Mayor Wilber said that in all of the years he has been on the Board no problems have been found during any audit or certification.

Mayor Rogers Anderson said that the next hurdle will be in the Legislature and that with this MPO being so large it might be time to consider being housed independently from Metropolitan Nashville. Mayor Wilber said that this would be discussed at the Executive Committee meeting.

Mayor Rick Graham said that on page 5 of the Prospectus in the first paragraph it needs to read that Spring Hill is in Williamson and Maury County. Mr. Skipper said that he would make that change before it goes on the website. The members will get a final version with the edits prior to it being published to the website.

Mayor Burgess moved to approve the updates to the Prospectus and Organizational Bylaws. Executive Anthony Holt seconded and the motion passed with Mayor Anderson voting no.

Findings from Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning Activities

This item was deferred until the May meeting.

Report from NashvilleNext: Metro Nashville's General Plan Update

Ms. Jennifer Carlat, Metro Planning Department Special Project's Director, gave an overview of the draft of "*A General Plan for Nashville and Davidson County*". She said that with Nashville's population growing and changing, the Plan grapples with issues affected by that growth and change, such as education, workforce, development, and culture. The Plan elements are 1) land use, transportation & infrastructure; 2) arts, culture & creativity; 3) economic & workforce development; 4) education & youth; 5) health, livability, & the built environment; 6) housing; and 7) natural resources & hazard adaption. She said that this Plan has taken into consideration the region and the individual Davidson County community plans.

She said that part of the Plan, "Access Nashville 2040" (previously named *Mobility 2030*) is a comprehensive framework for the city's multi-modal transportation network to support Nashville's quality of life and manage growth, development, and preservation through the year 2040 and beyond. The eight accessibility principles are 1) create a place with efficient community form and transportation choices; 2) offer meaningful transportation choices; 3) sustain and enhance the economy; 4) increase safety and resiliency; 5) improve human health and the environment; 6) ensure financial responsibility; 7) make decisions equitably; and 8) address transportation from a regional perspective.

The draft plan is available for review at <http://www.NashvilleNext.net> including a twenty-page overview called the Guidebook at: <http://www.nashville.gov/Portals/0/SiteContent/Planning/docs/NashvilleNext/DraftPlan/next-guidebook-3.pdf>

MPO Director’s Report

Mr. Skipper thanked Ms. Carlat for her report and he thanked Mayor Wilber for bringing strawberry shortcake for the Board to enjoy.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m.

Date: _____

The Honorable Kenneth Wilber
Chairman, MPO Executive Board

Michael Skipper, AICP
Executive Director and Secretary

Agenda Item 4. Proposed Amendments to FYs 2014-17 TIP



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

FYs 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

FY 2015 Amendment Cycle A (November/ December)

Application Deadline – October 31
TCC/XB Endorsement – November 12
1st Public Hearing – December 3
2nd Public Hearing – December 10

FY 2015 Amendment Cycle B (February/ March)

Application Deadline – January 23
TCC Endorsement – February
XB Endorsement – February 18
1st Public Hearing – March 4
2nd Public Hearing – March 18

FY 2015 Amendment Cycle C (May/ June)

Application Deadline – April 24
TCC Endorsement – May 6
XB Endorsement – May 20
1st Public Hearing – June 3
2nd Public Hearing – June 17

FY 2015 Amendment Cycle D (August/ September)

Application Deadline – July 24
TCC Endorsement – August 5
XB Endorsement – August 19
1st Public Hearing – September 2
2nd Public Hearing – September 16

For more information: Anna Emerson, TIP Coordinator | emerson@nashvillempo.org

Notes:

Any project sponsor requesting an amendment not deemed to be an emergency must wait for the next amendment cycle or reimburse the MPO for the direct costs incurred to pay for the required public noticing.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-028

TIP #: 2008-15-049
2035 RTP ID: 1015-313
Project: MTA - Administration Building Rehabilitation (Nestor)
Requested By: MTA
Phase: CONSTRUCTION
Fiscal Year(s): 2014, 2015
Proposed Changes: Add funds
Total Project Cost: \$4,620,000

FROM: \$2,812,500

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2014	CONSTRUCTION	FTA 5307	625,000	500,000	62,500	62,500
2017	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	2,187,500	1,750,000	218,750	218,750
Total			2,812,500	2,250,000	281,250	281,250

TO: \$4,620,000

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2014	CONSTRUCTION	FTA 5307	625,000	500,000	62,500	62,500
2015	CONSTRUCTION	FTA 5307	3,995,000	3,196,000	399,500	399,500
2017	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	0	0	0	0
Total			4,620,000	3,696,000	462,000	462,000

Description:

Phase III of rehabilitation/renovation of administration and maintenance facilities and additional office space at Nestor.

Background:

MTA is proposing to advance the project schedule and add \$3,196,000 (federal) in FYs 2014 and 2015 FTA 5307 funds shifted to the project from TIP #2008-17-021. Projected FY 2017 funding amounts will drop from the project.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-029

TIP #: 2014-15-056
2035 RTP ID: Consistent
Project: Renovate MTA Headquarters (Myatt Drive Facility)
Requested By: MTA
Phase: CONSTRUCTION
Fiscal Year(s): 2014, 2015
Proposed Changes: Add funds
Total Project Cost: \$4,100,000

FROM: \$1,015,797

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2014	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	1,015,797	812,637	101,580	101,580
Total			1,015,797	812,637	101,580	101,580

TO: \$4,100,000

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2014	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	1,015,797	812,637	101,580	101,580
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	3,084,203	2,467,362	308,420	308,420
Total			4,100,000	3,279,999	410,000	410,000

Description:

Rehab/renovate the existing MTA Headquarters at Myatt Drive to complete the section of the building previously occupied by the Metro Police Department.

Background:

MTA is proposing to add a total of \$2,467,362 (federal) to the project in FY 2015: \$2,330,152 (federal) in previously unobligated FY 2013 FTA 5307 funds and \$137,210 (federal) in FY 2015 FTA 5307 funds shifted from TIP # 2008-17-021. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-030

TIP #: 2008-17-021
2035 RTP ID: 1015-312
Project: Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD), Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) & Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)
Requested By: MTA
Phase: IMPLEMENTATION
Fiscal Year(s): 2014, 2015
Proposed Changes: Shift funds
Total Project Cost: \$152,362

FROM: \$4,318,876

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2014	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	2,318,876	1,855,100	231,888	231,888
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	2,000,000	1,600,000	200,000	200,000
Total			4,318,876	3,455,100	431,888	431,888

TO: \$152,362

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2014	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	0	0	0	0
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	152,362	121,890	15,236	15,236
Total			152,362	121,890	15,236	15,236

Description:

Intelligent transportation equipment is being installed at MTA HQ operations centers and downtown Nashville’s Music City Central, and on all fleet vehicles which travel throughout Davidson County and surrounding areas to track bus location.

Background:

MTA is proposing to shift \$3,196,000 (federal) in FYs 2014 and 2015 FTA 5307 funds to TIP #2008-15-49 and \$137,210 (federal) in FY 2015 FTA 5307 funds to TIP #2014-15-056. This project will be implemented using other funding sources.

**FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015****TIP Amendment # 2015-031**

TIP #: 2013-85-211
2035 RTP ID: Consistent
Project: Installation of Wi-Fi on Music City Star train
Requested By: RTA
Phase: IMPLEMENTATION
Fiscal Year(s): 2015
Proposed Changes: New project
Total Project Cost: \$3,000

TO: \$3,000

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	3,000	2,400	300	300
Total			3,000	2,400	300	300

Description:

This project is for installation of Wi-Fi on the rail cars for passenger convenience.

Background:

This is a new project for inclusion in the FY 2014-2017 TIP. It was in the FY 2011-15 TIP, but was not carried forward. RTA is proposing to add \$2,400 (federal) in previously unobligated FY13 FTA 5307 funds. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-032

TIP #: 2013-85-208
2035 RTP ID: Consistent
Project: Music City Star Rail Replacement/Track Rehab
Requested By: RTA
Phase: IMPLEMENTATION
Fiscal Year(s): 2015
Proposed Changes: New project
Total Project Cost: \$3,600,000

TO: \$3,600,000

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	3,600,000	2,880,000	360,000	360,000
Total			3,600,000	2,880,000	360,000	360,000

Description:

This is for phase II of track rehabilitation. Details of the project include adding additional ties, spikes, ballasts, culverts and welding of rail needed to improve safety, ride comfort, and increase speed allowances on Music City Star rail line.

Background:

This is a new project for inclusion in the FY 2014-2017 TIP. The project was in FY 2011-2015 TIP, but was not carried forward. RTA is proposing to add \$2,880,000 (federal) of previously unobligated FY13 FTA 5307 funds to the project. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-033

TIP #: 2013-85-210
2035 RTP ID: Consistent
Project: Stationary Fare Collection Equipment
Requested By: RTA
Phase: IMPLEMENTATION
Fiscal Year(s): 2015
Proposed Changes: New project
Total Project Cost: \$1,300,000

TO: \$1,300,000

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	1,300,000	1,040,000	130,000	130,000
Total			1,300,000	1,040,000	130,000	130,000

Description:

Details of this project include the purchase and installation of Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs) at Music City Star train stations to sell tickets and passes for Music City Star operation.

Background:

This is a new project for inclusion in the FY 2014-2017 TIP. It was in FY 2011-2015 TIP, but not carried forward. RTA is proposing to add \$1,040,000 (federal) in previously unobligated FY13 FTA 5307 funds. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-034

TIP #: 2011-85-127
2035 RTP ID: 1085-328
Project: Media Fare Purchase
Requested By: RTA
Phase: IMPLEMENTATION
Fiscal Year(s): 2015
Proposed Changes: New project
Total Project Cost: \$320,500

TO: \$320,500

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	302,500	242,000	32,050	32,050
Total			302,500	242,000	32,050	32,050

Description:

Details of this project include the purchase of mobile fare collection and validation equipment for RTA.

Background:

This is a new project for inclusion in the FY 2014-2017 TIP. It was in the FY 2011-2015 TIP, but was not carried forward. RTA is proposing to add \$242,000 (federal) in previously unobligated FY13 FTA 5307 funds to this project. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-035

TIP #: 2013-85-207
2035 RTP ID: Consistent
Project: Music City Star Passing Siding
Requested By: RTA
Phase: CONSTRUCTION
Fiscal Year(s): 2015, 2016
Proposed Changes: New project
Total Project Cost: \$1,055,000

TO: \$1,055,000

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	750,000	600,000	75,000	75,000
2016	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	305,000	244,000	30,500	30,500
Total			1,055,000	844,000	105,500	105,500

Description:

Project details include matching track with the curve length thus allowing the switches to be placed on the tangent at each end of the curve. This allows the siding to be situated closer to the station, which is lengthening the amount of track and placing the switches as needed. Passing siding will improve operational efficiency.

Background:

This is a new project for inclusion in the FY 2014-2017 TIP. It was in the FY 2011-2015 TIP, but was not carried forward. RTA is proposing to add \$844,000 (federal) in previously unobligated FY13 FTA 5307 funds. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-036

TIP #: 2013-85-209
2035 RTP ID: Consistent
Project: Shore Power for Music City Star Riverfront Station
Requested By: RTA
Phase: IMPLEMENTATION
Fiscal Year(s): 2015
Proposed Changes: New Project
Total Project Cost: \$50,000

TO: \$50,000

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	50,000	40,000	5,000	5,000
Total			50,000	40,000	5,000	5,000

Description:

Details of the project include installation of 480v electrical power at Riverfront Station in downtown Nashville.

Background:

This is a new project for inclusion in the FY 2014-2017 TIP. It was in FY 2011-2015 TIP, but was not carried forward. RTA is proposing to add \$40,000 (federal) in previously unobligated FY13 FTA 5307 funds for the project. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-037

TIP #: 2013-85-213
2035 RTP ID: Consistent
Project: Rehab/Renovate Stations
Requested By: RTA
Phase: IMPLEMENTATION
Fiscal Year(s): 2015
Proposed Changes: New project
Total Project Cost: \$610,000

TO: \$610,000

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2015	IMPLEMENTATION	FTA 5307	610,000	488,000	61,000	61,000
Total			610,000	488,000	61,000	61,000

Description:

Details on this project include rehabilitation at the Music City Star rail stations, including upgraded security features.

Background:

This is a new project for inclusion in the FY 2014-2017 TIP. It was in FY 2011-2015 TIP, but was not carried forward. RTA is proposing to add \$488,000 (federal) in previously unobligated FY13 FTA 5307 funds to this project. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

DRAFT

FY 2014-2017 TIP Amendment – June 2015

TIP Amendment # 2015-038

TIP #: 2014-85-055
2035 RTP ID: Consistent
Project: RTA Operations
Requested By: RTA
Phase: OPERATIONS
Fiscal Year(s): 2015, 2016
Proposed Changes: Add funds
Total Project Cost: \$2,179,600

FROM: \$681,125

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2014	OPERATIONS	FTA 5307	681,125	544,900	68,112	68,112
Total			681,125	544,900	68,112	68,112

TO: \$2,179,600

<i>FY</i>	<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Funding</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
2015	OPERATIONS	FTA 5307	1,089,800	544,900	272,450	272,450
2016	OPERATIONS	FTA 5307	1,089,800	544,900	272,450	272,450
Total			2,179,600	1,089,800	544,900	544,900

Description:

Operation of regional express bus services.

Background:

RTA is proposing to add \$544,900 (federal) in previously unobligated FY13 FTA 5307 funds for the project for FY16 and correct the required match amount to 50% (25% State/25% Local) of the total project amount. Older funds have been confirmed to be available.

Agenda Item * . FY[]cbU`D`Ub!`Dfc`YVwDf]cf]h`U]cb



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

2040 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Framework

Endorsed by the MPO Executive Board on November 12, 2014

Mission

The Nashville Area MPO facilitates strategic planning for the region's multi-modal transportation system by serving as a forum for collaboration among local communities and state leaders. The vision of the MPO is to develop policies and programs that direct public funds to transportation projects that increase access to opportunity and prosperity, while promoting the health and wellness of Middle Tennesseans and their environment.

Core Values

Inclusive, Transparent, Accountable, Innovative

Guiding Principles

Livability

Enhance quality of life by prioritizing initiatives that increase opportunities for housing, learning, employment, recreation, and civic involvement while maintaining affordability.

Sustainability

Encourage growth and prosperity without sacrificing the health, natural environment, historical and cultural assets, or financial stability of this or future generations.

Prosperity

Contribute to the region's economic well-being by targeting solutions that attract talent, connect workforce with jobs, reduce the cost of doing business, and leverage additional investment.

Diversity

Respect the multitude of backgrounds and the variety of perspectives of Middle Tennesseans by pursuing an array of strategies that are customized to local community needs and character.

Regional Goals & Objectives

Maintain a Safe and Reliable Transportation System for People and Goods

- Integrate a "fix-it-first" mentality to keep existing infrastructure in a state of good repair.
- Reduce the number and severity of crashes by designing roadways to accommodate all users.
- Incorporate information technologies to improve traffic operations and help optimize traveler decisions.
- Manage the negative impact of traffic congestion by providing alternatives to driving.

- Designate and implement a regional freight network to efficiently move goods and minimize negative impacts to local communities.

Help Local Communities Grow in a Healthy and Sustainable Way

- Align transportation decisions with economic development initiatives, land use planning, and open space conservation efforts.
- Integrate healthy community design strategies and promote active transportation to improve the public health outcomes of the built environment.
- Encourage the deployment of context-sensitive solutions to ensure that community values are not sacrificed for a mobility improvement.
- Incorporate the arts and creative placemaking into planning and public works projects to foster innovative solutions and to enhance the sense of place and belonging.
- Pursue solutions that promote social equity and contain costs for transportation and housing.
- Minimize the vulnerability of transportation assets to extreme weather events.

Enhance Economic Competitiveness to Attract Private Investment

- Recognize major shifts in demographics and market preferences for transportation and housing and respond with solutions that keep Middle Tennessee an attractive place to live and do business.
- Improve the connectivity between workforce and jobs by offering a range of options to manage commuting distances and travel times.
- Improve mobility within and between centers of commerce across the region by providing a diversified transportation system, rather than relying solely on roadway capacity.
- Keep the region connected to national and global markets by improving travel times on US Interstates, upgrading intermodal connections to water, air, and rail freight systems, and by ensuring Middle Tennessee is included in plans for national high speed passenger rail.

Spend Public Funds Wisely by Ensuring a Return on Investment

- Increase public ownership in the planning process to help identify the most significant problems.
- Foster regional interdisciplinary collaboration to prioritize the most effective solutions.
- Evaluate the full costs and benefits of public investment in infrastructure.
- Strive for quality over quantity by implementing all elements of priority projects to maximize value.
- Consider public-private partnerships to encourage innovative approaches to project design and delivery.
- Accelerate project delivery schedules by involving the public early and often, minimizing bureaucratic delay, and ensuring that funding is available to implement projects once designed.
- Monitor and track the performance of public investments to demonstrate accountability.
- Find ways to bridge the gap between revenue shortfalls and the growing cost of transportation needs.

Major Strategies to Achieve Goals

Fund and Implement the Regional Vision for Mass Transit: Expand and modernize the region's mass transit system in preparation for an increasingly competitive global economy, and to proactively address growing concerns about traffic congestion, increasing energy costs, public health outcomes, and encroachment upon the area's rural countryside.

Develop Active Transportation Options for Walkable Communities: Improve connectivity between people and places to improve the health of Middle Tennesseans, and to serve as the backbone of investments in mass transit.

Reinvest in Strategic Roadway Corridors: Repair aging roadways and bridges to ensure the safety of the traveling public and freight carriers, improve operations through the integration of new technologies, and implement complete streets to provide a balanced system that works for all users.

General Project Evaluation Criteria

System Preservation & Enhancement

How well does the project make use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system? How can the project be scoped to include features that make the facility more efficient (e.g., ITS, design, materials, etc.)

Quality Growth, Sustainable Land Development, & Economic Prosperity

How well does the project encourage infill/ redevelopment? Do area plans call for mixed-used, higher density development? If so, how does the project complement these plans? Is the project encouraging growth in areas where growth is planned or desired? Conversely, is the project encouraging growth in areas where additional growth is not planned or desired? Does the project enhance or contribute to the form, function, and quality of the surrounding place?

How well does the project support or stimulate the local/ regional economy? How well does the project support freight movements? To what degree does the implementation of the project create jobs? How well does the facility connect people with opportunities to engage in economic activity? To what degree does the project aid in the region's economic competitiveness with other metro areas of the nation? Is the project supported by business leaders?

Expansion of Multi-Modal Options

How well does the project introduce, support, or reinforce multiple transportation choices for people to access homes, jobs, schools, fresh food, retail, etc? How can the project be scoped to incorporate facilities for and/or connections to non-motorized modes and transit?

Roadway Congestion Management

What are the root causes of congestion in the vicinity of the project location (e.g., traffic volume, physical design, crashes, regulations, behavioral, freight, etc.)? Given the land uses, urban design and community goals for the project vicinity, what level of congestion is appropriate for the project and vicinity (i.e. some commercial centers/Downtowns need greater congestion for visibility/economic development)? How well does the project address those causes? How could the project be scoped to include congestion management solutions to optimize its benefit?

Safety and Security

How well does the project address safety concerns for all users? Is the project on a high-crash corridor? How can the project be scoped to increase safety of all users? How well does the project address security concerns? Does the project aid/ harm important evacuation routes? How can the project be scoped to features that help secure citizens and regional resources?

Freight & Goods Movement

How well does the project support or harm the movement of freight and goods through the region? How can the project be scoped to incorporate facilities that aid in the safe and efficient movement of

freight? How can the project be scoped to balance the movement of freight and goods with other community goals?

Health & Environment

Does the project aid/ harm in the preservation of the region's natural or socio-cultural resources (e.g., open space, animal habitat, historic structures, places of worship, community centers, etc.)? How can the project be scoped to mitigate the negative impacts to valuable resources? How well does the project support efforts to reduce dependency on fossil fuels, particularly foreign oil? How well does the project support efforts to improve air and water quality? Does the project include facilities that provide opportunities for active transportation/ physical activity? Does the project aid/ harm the advancement of social justice and equal opportunity to destinations throughout the region? How can the project be scoped to mitigate any negative impacts to predominately low-income or minority communities or persons with a disability?

Project Support & History

Is the project consistent with local, state, or other regional plans for growth and preservation (economic development, land use, natural features preservation, etc.)? Has the project been endorsed locally through the adoption of official instruments such as, but not limited to, a local major thoroughfare plan, transportation element of a comprehensive plan, or by resolution of the local governing body? If on a state-route, is the project endorsed or supported by TDOT?

Project Scoring Factors

System Preservation & Enhancement

- Project improves an existing route
- Project upgrades route to context sensitive or prescribed designed standards
- Project address major maintenance needs (e.g., bridge repair)
- Project integrates Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology
- Project includes sustainable operations & maintenance plan

Quality Growth, Sustainable Land Development, & Economic Prosperity

- Project improves accessibility and or connectivity to existing development
- Project located in a locally or regionally defined “preferred” or “planned” growth area
- Project supports infill or redevelopment opportunities
- Project incorporates streetscaping or other quality of place enhancements
- Project located near mixed-use, high density areas
- Project corrects poor storm water drainage
- Project improves utility placement or minimizes utility disruption
- Project contributes to transportation grid development or connectivity
- Project located near existing job centers
- Project located near high job growth areas
- Project improves multi-modal access between jobs, housing, and retail
- Project endorsed by local chamber of commerce or economic and community development

Expansion of Multi-Modal Options

- Project improves existing or proposed transit route
- Project improves existing or proposed pedestrian route
- Project improves existing or proposed bicycling route
- Project provides pedestrian or bicycle facility in BPAC high priority area

- Project reduces multi-modal conflict (e.g., traffic control, grade separation, dedicated lanes)
- Project includes transit accommodations or customer amenities
- Project includes pedestrian or cyclist accommodations or amenities

Roadway Congestion Management

- Project addresses MPO base year congestion
- Project addresses MPO future year congestion
- Project corrects bottleneck
- Project incorporates ITS/ traffic operations improvements
- Project improves a parallel route to a congested corridor
- Project provides transit capacity
- Project incorporates signage/ wayfinding

Safety and Security

- Project improves safety in a high crash area
- Project addresses safety-related design standards
- Project enhances safety for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Project enhances safety near a school
- Project improves incident response or emergency management
- Project improves an evacuation route

Freight & Goods Movement

- Project improves a route to an intermodal facility or major logistical hub
- Project improves capacity for trucks on a designated truck route
- Project addresses a known safety problem related to truck movements
- Project improves general safety on a designated truck route
- Project includes design considerations to accommodate freight movements on truck routes

Health & Environment

- Project improves accessibility/ mobility for traditionally underserved communities
- Project improves accessibility/mobility in a health priority area
- Project provides improvements for active transportation
- Project reduces or minimizes air pollution from vehicle emissions
- Project corrects a known ADA non-compliance issue
- Project improves general accessibility for persons with disabilities
- Project minimizes impact to socio-cultural resources and assets
- Project minimizes impact to natural resources and environmentally sensitive lands

Project Support and History

- Project is consistent with local and regional plans
- Project has documented support from TDOT and local community (resolution, plan, etc.)
- Project has prior or current investment through the MPO's TIP
- Project has completed a feasibility study or preliminary engineering phase
- Project has local or state funding in place
- Project sponsor has satisfactory record of implementing federal-aid projects

Nashville Area MPO
2040 Regional Transportation Plan | Initial 25-Year Revenue Forecast
October 1, 2014 TCC Workshop

Funding Source	TENNESSEE	MPO SHARE	MPO MATCH	TOTAL MPO	25-YEAR
FEDERAL PROGRAM FUNDS	\$ 804,788,357.00	\$ 227,370,255.60	\$ 56,842,563.90	\$ 284,212,819.50	\$ 7,105,320,487.50
Federal Highway Administration Grants	\$ 779,617,135.00	\$ 196,532,742.25	\$ 49,133,185.56	\$ 245,665,927.81	\$ 6,141,648,195.31
National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)	\$ 435,983,034.00	\$ 108,995,758.50	\$ 27,248,939.63	\$ 136,244,698.13	\$ 3,406,117,453.13
Surface Transportation Program (STP)	\$ 217,091,932.00		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UZAs over 200K	\$ 46,566,783.00	\$ 16,584,150.00	\$ 4,146,037.50	\$ 20,730,187.50	\$ 518,254,687.50
UAs 5-200K	\$ 23,725,060.00	\$ 5,931,265.00	\$ 1,482,816.25	\$ 7,414,081.25	\$ 185,352,031.25
Areas < 5K	\$ 38,254,123.00	\$ 9,563,530.75	\$ 2,390,882.69	\$ 11,954,413.44	\$ 298,860,335.94
Any Area	\$ 98,951,866.00	\$ 24,737,966.50	\$ 6,184,491.63	\$ 30,922,458.13	\$ 773,061,453.13
Off-System Bridges	\$ 9,594,100.00	\$ 2,398,525.00	\$ 599,631.25	\$ 2,998,156.25	\$ 74,953,906.25
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$ 47,353,993.00	\$ 11,838,498.25	\$ 2,959,624.56	\$ 14,798,122.81	\$ 369,953,070.31
Railway-Highway Crossings Program (RHCP)	\$ 4,711,953.00	\$ 1,177,988.25	\$ 294,497.06	\$ 1,472,485.31	\$ 36,812,132.81
Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$ 35,428,639.00	\$ 8,857,159.75	\$ 2,214,289.94	\$ 11,071,449.69	\$ 276,786,242.19
State Transportation Alternatives	\$ 18,369,228.00		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Recreational Trails	\$ 1,640,613.00	\$ 410,153.25	\$ 102,538.31	\$ 512,691.56	\$ 12,817,289.06
UZAs over 200K	\$ 3,588,331.00	\$ 1,277,937.00	\$ 319,484.25	\$ 1,597,421.25	\$ 39,935,531.25
UAs 5-200K	\$ 1,828,200.00	\$ 457,050.00	\$ 114,262.50	\$ 571,312.50	\$ 14,282,812.50
Areas < 5K	\$ 2,947,776.00	\$ 736,944.00	\$ 184,236.00	\$ 921,180.00	\$ 23,029,500.00
Any Area	\$ 8,364,308.00	\$ 2,091,077.00	\$ 522,769.25	\$ 2,613,846.25	\$ 65,346,156.25
PL (FHWA Section 112 Metropolitan Planning)	\$ 4,553,673.00	\$ 1,201,502.00	\$ 300,375.50	\$ 1,501,877.50	\$ 37,546,937.50
SPR (FHWA State Planning & Research)	\$ 16,124,683.00	\$ 273,237.00	\$ 68,309.25	\$ 341,546.25	\$ 8,538,656.25
Federal Transit Administration Grants	\$ 25,171,222.00	\$ 30,837,513.35	\$ 7,709,378.34	\$ 38,546,891.69	\$ 963,672,292.19
FTA 5303 Metropolitan Planning	\$ 1,402,506.00	\$ 691,151.00	\$ 172,787.75	\$ 863,938.75	\$ 21,598,468.75
FTA 5307 Urban Transit			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UZAs > 1M		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UZAs 200K-1M		\$ 21,287,264.00	\$ 5,321,816.00	\$ 26,609,080.00	\$ 665,227,000.00
UZAs 50K-200K		\$ 1,815,367.00	\$ 453,841.75	\$ 2,269,208.75	\$ 56,730,218.75
FTA 5309 Fixed Guideway Capital Investment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
FTA 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors/ADA			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UZAs over 200K		\$ 697,597.00	\$ 174,399.25	\$ 871,996.25	\$ 21,799,906.25
UZAs 50K-200K	\$ 1,255,194.00	\$ 188,279.10	\$ 47,069.78	\$ 235,348.88	\$ 5,883,721.88
Areas < 50K	\$ 1,861,991.00	\$ 279,298.65	\$ 69,824.66	\$ 349,123.31	\$ 8,728,082.81
FTA 5311 Rural Area Transit	\$ 18,458,481.00	\$ 1,845,848.10	\$ 461,462.03	\$ 2,307,310.13	\$ 57,682,753.13
FTA 5337 State of Good Repair		\$ 2,401,787.00	\$ 600,446.75	\$ 3,002,233.75	\$ 75,055,843.75
FTA 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UZAs over 200K		\$ 1,301,964.00	\$ 325,491.00	\$ 1,627,455.00	\$ 40,686,375.00
UZAs 50K-200K	\$ 943,050.00	\$ 141,457.50	\$ 35,364.38	\$ 176,821.88	\$ 4,420,546.88
Areas < 50K	\$ 1,250,000.00	\$ 187,500.00	\$ 46,875.00	\$ 234,375.00	\$ 5,859,375.00

MPO Share of Statewide Programs:

- NHPP 25%
- STP 25%
- HSIP 25%
- RHCP 25%
- CMAQ 25%
- TA 25%
- 5310 15%
- 5311 10%
- 5339 15%

Other Assumptions:

- (1) Level funding per year based on FY 14 Apportionments
- (2) No assumptions made re: source of matching funds

Realities:

- (3) MPO share of statewide funds are based on many factors
- (4) MPO share of national formula programs will vary based on regional characteristics of the UZAs within region relative to others.

Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
2040 Regional Transportation Plan
Indicator Key for Apply.NashvilleMPO.org

Indicator	Definition	Significance	Source	Staff Expert
Congestion Management				
Year Congested	The first year in the MPOs model than a link within the project limits becomes congested. A segment is defined as congested if its modeled speed drops below 70% of free flow or if its volume to capacity ratio is 1.0 or greater during any time period of day.	The earlier the year, the more pressing the problem. Its important to remember that this is a modeled value. Local partners are encouraged to submit other evidence that congestion exists.	Travel demand model (TDM) output for 2010 base year, 2015 E+C, 2020 E+C, 2030 E+C, 2040 E+C	Hary
Speed/Free Flow	Lowest modeled speed along the project length as a percentage of that facilities expected free flow speed.	70% is generally the threshold for identifying congestion. The lower the value, the slower the modeled speed indicating increased traffic congestion.	Travel demand model (TDM) output for 2010 base year, 2015 E+C, 2020 E+C, 2030 E+C, 2040 E+C	Hary
Volume:Capacity	Worst volume to capacity ratio along the project length.	Values of 1.0 mean that the roadway has reached its designed/intended capacity and is likely failing with a LOS of F. Values over 1 mean the roadway is over capacity.	Travel demand model (TDM) output for 2010 base year, 2015 E+C, 2020 E+C, 2030 E+C, 2040 E+C	Hary
High Crash Area	Composite crash score, weighted by severity, per centerline mile for each grid cell.	Crashes contribute to roadway congestion.	MPO Calculation	Mary
Intersections/Mile	Number of intersecting roadways per center line mile (not lane mile)	The higher the number, the more likely there will be delay caused by turning movements.	TDOT TRIMS	Hary
Freight Intensity	The amount of daily commercial truck traffic using this roadway relative to the average amount of truck traffic carried on roadways of the same functional classification.	Values of 1.0 mean that the roadway carries the typical amount of truck traffic for a roadway of its functional class. A value of 1.20 means that the roadway carries 20% more truck traffic compared with roadways of similar class.	MPO Calculation	Hary/Mary
Contributors	Staff summary of the possible contribution factors to congestion including roadway volumes, crashes, intersection density, freight movement, or others identified by the local project sponsor or community.		Staff analysis, project application	Staff/Sponsors
System Preservation				
Functional Classification	Federal functional classification.	Major collectors and higher classes are included on the federal-aid network and eligible for federally-funded capacity improvements.	TDOT TRIMS	Hary
Avg Daily Vehicles	Weighted average of daily volumes of all motorized vehicles		Travel demand model (TDM) output for 2010 base year, 2015 E+C, 2020 E+C, 2030 E+C, 2040 E+C	Hary

**Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
2040 Regional Transportation Plan
Indicator Key for Apply.NashvilleMPO.org**

Indicator	Definition	Significance	Source	Staff Expert
Class Index	The amount of daily traffic using this roadway relative to the average amount of traffic carried on roadways of the same functional classification.	Values of 1.0 mean that the roadway carries the typical amount of traffic for a roadway of its functional class. A value of 1.20 means that the roadway carries 20% more traffic compared with roadways of similar class.	MPO Calculation	Hary
Standards/Safety	Not used.		Staff analysis, project application	Sponsor
Age Related Repairs	Not used.		Staff analysis, project application	Sponsor
ITS Integration	Indicates if the project includes an ITS element.		Staff analysis, project application	Sponsor
Multi-Modal Upgrades	Indicates if the project includes multi-modal element.		Staff analysis, project application	Sponsor
Safety + Security				
Crashes / Mile	Annualized crashes per mile (all crashes) based on last 10 years of data.		Tenn. Department of Safety Crash database	Mary
Fatal Crashes	Total number of crashes with fatalities over the last 10 years.		Tenn. Department of Safety Crash database	Mary
Non-Motorized Crashes	Total number of crashes involving a pedestrian or cyclist over the last 10 years.		Tenn. Department of Safety Crash database	Mary
Truck Crashes	Total number of crashes involving a truck over the last 10 years.		Tenn. Department of Safety Crash database	Mary
High Crash Area	Composite crash score, weighted by severity, per centerline mile for each grid cell.		MPO Calculation	Mary
Strategic Highway Network	Project is located on a route designated as part of the national Strategic Highway Network.		TDOT TRIMS	Hary
National Highway System	Project is located on a route designated as part of the National Highway System.		TDOT TRIMS	Hary
Bridges & Overpass	Total number of bridges/overpasses along the project length.		TDOT TRIMS	Hary
Structurally Deficient Bridges	Number of bridges along the project length designated as structurally deficient.		National Bridge Inventory	Hary
Functionally Obsolete Bridges	Number of bridges along the project length designated as functionally obsolete.		National Bridge Inventory	Hary
Freight + Goods Movement				

**Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
2040 Regional Transportation Plan
Indicator Key for Apply.NashvilleMPO.org**

Indicator	Definition	Significance	Source	Staff Expert
Heavy Trucks or Commercial Veh/Day	Average daily volume of heavy (multi-unit) trucks or commercial vehicles per day along the project route.		Travel demand model (TDM) output for 2010 base year, 2015 E+C, 2020 E+C, 2030 E+C, 2040 E+C	Hary/Mary
Share of Flow	Percent of all daily traffic that is classified as heavy truck/ commercial.		MPO Calculation	Hary/Mary
Class Index	The amount of daily truck or commercial traffic using this roadway relative to the average amount of truck or commercial traffic carried on roadways of the same functional classification.		MPO Calculation	Hary/Mary
Truck Route	Indicates if the project location is designated as part of either the National Freight Route or a local truck route network, or if the route is considered a potential regional freight route pending the outcome of the regional freight study.		FWHA, TDOT, MPO	Mary
Bicycle/ Pedestrian				
LOS	Composite level of service measure of various roadway attributes including presence of facility, traffic volumes, posted speeds, width of outside lane, shoulders (bicycle).	A (best) through F (worst)	RPM Bike/Ped Study	Leslie
Existing Facility	Indicates if there is a sidewalk, bicycle lane, sharo, or multi-use path along the project length.		RPM Bike/Ped Study	Leslie
Latent Demand	Potential for bicycling or walking based on surrounding land uses and associated trip rates		RPM Bike/Ped Study	Leslie
Demand Quartile	Indicates the relative significance of the latent demand in the project location compared with other areas of the region.		MPO Calculation	Leslie
Regional Plan	Indicates if a regional plan calls for bicycle accommodations on the route.		Staff analysis, project application	Leslie
Local Plan	Indicates if a local plan calls for bicycle accommodations on the route.		Staff analysis, project application	Leslie
BPAC Score	Composite score which represents the relative priority for investments in the project area based on BPAC formula which includes demand, LOS, congestion, health, etc.		MPO Calculation	Leslie
BPAC Ranking	BPAC score placed into one of four tiers to indicate the general priority of the project area compared to all other areas.		MPO Calculation	Leslie

Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
2040 Regional Transportation Plan
Indicator Key for Apply.NashvilleMPO.org

Indicator	Definition	Significance	Source	Staff Expert
Public Transit				
Service Area	Indicates with transit agencies serve the project area.		Transit GIS	Mary/Michael
Existing Fixed-Route	Indicates if there is an existing fixed-route service along project route.		Transit GIS	Mary/Michael
Average Frequency	Average headway during peak travel times along the route.		MPO Calculation	Mary/Michael
Ridership Potential	Potential for ridership compared with other areas of the region based on MPO Transit Competitive Index model.		Transit Competitive Index Tool	Mary/Michael
Desired LOS	Not used.		Staff/Sponsors	Mary/Michael
Planned Improvements	Not used.		Staff/Sponsors	Mary/Michael
Planned Development				
Within Municipality	Indicates if the project is located entirely, partially, or not within current municipal boundaries.		State GIS	Sam
Urban Growth Boundary	Indicates if the project is located entirely, partially, or not within official urban growth boundaries.		State GIS	Sam
Households/Sq Mile	Household density within 1/4 mile of the project.		MPO Land Use Model	Sam
Employment/Sq Mile	Employment density within 1/4 mile of the project.		MPO Land Use Model	Sam
2010-40 Growth Rate	Percent increase in households or jobs within 1/4 mile of project between 2010 and 2040.		MPO Calculation	Sam
Urban Density Ratio	Ratio of density (people and jobs) within 1/4 mile of project to the overall density of all urban areas within the region.		MPO Calculation	Sam
Rural Density Ratio	Ratio of density (people and jobs) within 1/4 mile of project to the overall density of all rural areas within the region.		MPO Calculation	Sam
Environment				
Environmental Conflict	Percent of project length that overlaps with environmentally sensitive areas that may be harmed by the proposed improvement.		MPO Calculation	Wes
Environmental Challenge	Percent of project length that overlaps with environmentally features that may make the proposed improvement more difficult to implement.		MPO Calculation	Wes
Environmental Factors	List of specific environmental features that the project overlaps		State GIS	Wes
Degree of Disadvantage	Number of disadvantaged populations present in close proximity to the project (out of 8).		MPO Calculation	Nick

Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
 2040 Regional Transportation Plan
 Indicator Key for Apply.NashvilleMPO.org

Indicator	Definition	Significance	Source	Staff Expert
Disadvantaged Populations	List of specific disadvantaged populations within close proximity to the project.		U.S. Census Bureau	Nick
Schools	Number of schools within a 1/4 mile of the project.		InfoUSA/Local GIS	Sam
Religious Centers	Number of religious centers within 1/4 mile of the project.		InfoUSA/Local GIS	Sam
Public Health				
Health Priority Area	Project is located in an area of the region identified as vulnerable for health disparities.		MPO Calculation	Leslie
Health Factors	List of specific populations with anticipated health disparity.		U.S. Census Bureau	Leslie
Active Component	Indicates whether the project includes pedestrian, bicycle, or transit elements.		Staff analysis, project application	Leslie
Safety Improvement	Indicates if improving safety is a primary or secondary objective of the project.		Staff analysis, project application	Mary
Emissions Impact	Indicates if the project will have a negative impact on air quality. Projects adding vehicular capacity are assumed to have a negative impact on air quality.		Staff analysis, project application	Hary/Nick
Health Clinics	Number of health clinics/hospitals within 1/4 of the project.		InfoUSA/Local GIS	Sam