

Capital Region Transportation Council

TIP Task Force: Meeting #6

Meeting Minutes

Date: October 18, 2023

Time: 1:00 - 2:30 pm

Attendees:

Name	Organization
Megan Quirk	CDTA
Andrew Kreshik	City of Troy
Randy Milano	DOT Region 1
Greg Wichser	DOT Region 1
John Scavo*	Clifton Park
Kim Lambert*	Saratoga County
Susan Barden*	Saratoga Springs
Lisa Ramundo*	Albany County
Jen Dunn*	Saratoga Springs
Steve Feeney*	Schenectady County
Andrew Tracy	Transportation Council
Jacob Beeman	Transportation Council
Sandy Misiewicz	Transportation Council

*Attended Virtually

1) Welcome and Introduction

Jacob began the meeting with introductions and a review of the meeting agenda. The primary purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Congestion Management Process (CMP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Guidelines.

2) Congestion Management Process

Andrew Tracy presented the Programming & Implementation portion of the Congestion Management Process. Federal regulations require that the CMP include: "Identification of an implementation schedule, implementation responsibilities, and possible funding sources for each strategy (or combination of strategies) proposed for implementation." Andrew added that the FHWA CMP Guidebook recommends two approaches: "Use the CMP in criteria for prioritizing projects in the MTP and/or TIP", and/or "Explicitly set aside funding for congestion management projects". Andrew also showed a list of federal funding sources for which CMP strategies are eligible.

Sandy stated that there is uncertainty with future federal funding, and that the CMP competes with other regional priorities. Greg stated that, in terms of funding, applicants can be pointed toward the TAP/CMAQ solicitation. Greg continued that core funds are definitely needed for activities like signals, timing, and TSMO. Greg added that roundabouts are costly, and are a tough sell for core funds, but can see the value in using core funds on cost-effective projects such as signal timing. Congested locations are the second biggest complaint to Region 1 (#1 is potholes), so the appetite is there for strategies that treat congestion.

Sandy suggested adding language to the CMP to the effect of 'as funding allows, fund cost-effective strategies, and find resources in the next TIP update for implementation'.

John Scavo stated that he supports funding congestion mitigation tied to specific performance measures, as it would benefit regional transportation.

Susan Barden asked if Carbon Reduction Program funding was used to fund project overages. Sandy responded that some of the current year funding was used for this, but new CRP funding could be used in the coming years through the TIP. Kim Lambert added that the CMP updates look good.

3) TIP Evaluation Update Process

Jacob presented the revised TIP Amendment Guidelines. The guidelines were discussed at the prior TIP Task Force meeting and the group recommended changes to be made. Jacob presented slides showing each change. 'Project Selection' is now 'Administrative Modification' to avoid confusion with TIP project selection. Amendments are now noted as either 'Minor' or 'Major' amendments. Cost Changes and Scope Changes have been split into their own categories. Jacob presented the list of changes by category.

Regarding project additions or deletions: Sandy asked when 1c would apply, given that 1a and 1b are also minor amendments. Jacob replied that a footnote clarifies that when a change triggers two or more criteria, the one with the higher level of approval applies. Sandy suggested adding "regardless of project cost" to 1a and 1b for clarity, instead of having it as a footnote.

Greg stated that he is okay with removing 1b (Addition of projects from statewide program solicitation) entirely and using 1c (Addition or deletion of a project less than or equal to \$1.000M) and 1d (Addition or deletion of a project over \$1.000M) instead so that new projects from a statewide solicitation are evaluated only by cost.

Regarding the 'Other' category: Jacob recommended keeping this in for all categories except 'Cost Changes' as a contingency for unique project change requests.

Regarding the 'Cost Changes' category: the Task Force was supportive of using the "cumulative up to 500k" footnote for 2a (Cost change less than or equal to \$0.500M). The cumulative threshold may apply when a project asks for extra funding for a new ROW phase, and then another amendment for additional construction funds, for example.

Jacob presented the changes to the 'Scope Changes' category. Sandy added that, for 3f (Combining two or more existing preservation projects) and 3g (Combining a non-preservation project with any other), the 'preservation' language would need to be re-visited if the preservation vs. beyond preservation is modified.

Jacob presented the changes to the 'Fund Source' category. The only change was eliminating the 'Title I' and 'Title III' language and replacing it with FHWA and FTA instead for 4(d) and 4(e) respectively.

Greg asked if 4(e) "Change between any Federal Transit Administration fund source" could require an administrative modification instead of Planning Committee approval since it would only be relevant to other CDTA projects. There was agreement from the group.

Jacob will finalize the guidelines document and bring back to the TIP Task Force at the December meeting for final review, and then to the Planning Committee and Policy Board for approval in early 2024.

4) Meeting adjourned

- The meeting was adjourned at 2:40.
- The next meeting of the TIP Task Force will be scheduled for December 2023