

# Capital Region Transportation Council

## TIP Task Force: Meeting #8

### Meeting Minutes

**Date:** February 28, 2024

**Time:** 1:00 - 2:30 pm

**Attendees:**

Name	Organization
Randy Milano	NYSDOT Region 1
Andrew Kreshik	City of Troy
John Scavo	Clifton Park
Mike Williams	CDTA
Chris Wallin	City of Schenectady
Bill Trudeau	City of Albany
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 purpose of this meeting is to finalize the discussion on programming Design-Only projects, finalizing TIP project categories, and presenting a first draft TIP Project Evaluation Methodology for initial impressions.

#### 2) Design Only Programming Criteria Discussion (Cont.)

Jacob presented a summary of the discussion held at prior meetings. In the prior TIP update, 8 design-only projects were included for a total of \$4.734 million. The expectation is that these projects would better compete for discretionary funding when design is completed, which would free up formula funding. Being funded for design is no guarantee of construction funding on future TIPs. Designs have a short shelf life, and the timing needs to be right for these projects to pursue discretionary funding. The intention is to wait and see how the 8 current design-only projects work out before funding any more.

Chris W suggested that we may not want to take a tool out of the toolbox by ruling out design-only in the next TIP update. Crane St has CON funding in year five of the TIP, which allows for design to be completed now (not just preliminary design), which is helpful. John S suggested putting a pause on new design-only until we see how the current crop plays out. Jacob added that having design on the TIP does not guarantee future CON funding, but will help improve how the project scores. Andrew K raised a concern about public communication: how do we communicate to public that CON is not funded or guaranteed? Bill T stated that he does not pursue design-only for this reason. Sandy added that there is uncertainty with federal funding available in the next TIP update,

due to carry-over projects seeing inflation increases and most of the new BIL money being non-formula. The Task Force will recommend that there be no new design-only projects in the next TIP update.

### 3) TIP Category Description Updates

Jacob continued the discussion from the last meeting on proposed TIP project categories. The proposed categories meet the TIP Policy Document recommendation to re-align with performance measure goals. The proposed categories are: Road (to be subdivided into Pavement Only and Complete Streets), Bridge, Bike & Ped, Congestion/Freight/Air Quality, and Other. The safety category is recommended to be removed so that a standalone solicitation can be conducted for safety projects following the conclusion of the Vision Zero Safety Action Plan, which will identify specific safety projects. For the TIP update, potential safety benefits will still be evaluated for each candidate project.

Andrew K suggested sub-categories for Congestion/Freight/Air Quality. Chris W asked about culverts – culverts can be applied for through the Bridges category, though we have not received many in the past. John S stated his support for the safety solicitation following completion of the Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Vision Zero study. Sandy added that it is unknown how much HSIP will be left if DOT takes some off the top. There was agreement from the group on the proposed categories.

### 4) TIP Project Evaluation Methodology Initial Discussion

Andrew T presented an initial outline of the proposed TIP Project Evaluation Methodology to be used in the next TIP program update. This initial draft is for first impressions and will be further developed and presented as a draft at the April meeting, then as final at the June meeting.

The Road category will be divided into 'Pavement Only' and 'Complete Streets'. Pavement Only projects will use a simplified scoring system, and Complete Streets projects will receive a more detailed score similar to what was used in the last TIP evaluation. Merit categories have been merged together if found to be highly correlated with one another in the prior TIP scoring. For Complete Streets projects, the 23 merit scores used last TIP have been consolidated down to 10 merit scores. The Bridge category will use a scoring system similar to what the Transportation Council used in the past two Bridge NY evaluations. The new Congestion/Freight/Air Quality category will use a system based loosely on the TAP/CMAQ/CRP scoring process. Points will be awarded for the project's consistency with state, regional, or local plans. This category will not have a quantitative component. The Bike and Ped category is largely unchanged from the prior TIP evaluation, as it was prepared by the Bike/Ped Advisory Committee and staff are still supportive of it. One member of the task force mentioned considering whether a project completes a connection to a neighboring trail system into the scoring process. The Other category will involve a qualitative assessment of each project for consistency with regional goals, plan recommendations, project scope and cost, and more.

Chris W asked what types of projects would fall into Pavement Only – CHIPS projects or more? Andrew T replied that all pavement projects eligible for one or more federal fund sources would qualify, including preservation projects. Projects involving non-multimodal elements, such as slope improvements, would also fall into Pavement Only. Andrew K asked if merit categories will have negative scores – for example, would a project with negative impacts to an EJ community receive negative points. Andrew T responded that we intend the baseline to be zero points, and that projects with potential negative EJ impacts should be discussed thoroughly outside the scoring process. Andrew K supports having the merit baseline be zero points. Chris W suggested changing the name of the Multimodal & Complete Streets merit score to Multimodal Connectivity, and the Project Delivery merit score to Project Readiness. Chris W asked if greater local match would earn more points. Andrew

T replied that the Benefit-Cost score uses federal request only, so it would indirectly be factored in for Road and Bridge projects. The Task Force concurred with evaluation outline as presented.

5) Meeting Adjourned

- The meeting was adjourned at 2:30.
- The next meeting of the TIP Task Force will held on Tuesday, April 23<sup>rd</sup>, at 1:00pm.