

Binghamton Metropolitan Transportation Study
Planning Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 1st, 2016 1:30 PM
Broome County Office Building, 6th Floor, Legislative Conference Room

AGENDA

1. OPENING

- Roll Call
- Approval of minutes of the September 8th, 2016 meeting

2. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

4. ACTION ITEMS

- **2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program**
[Resolution 2016-17, Recommending Policy Committee approval of an amendment to the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program, adding a table and text showing planning targets for the BMTS region and confirming that the TIP is fiscally constrained.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS / UPDATES

- | | |
|---|------------|
| ○ 2017-2018 UPWP Project Solicitation – seeking approval at March meeting | Jennifer |
| ○ 2016 Pavement Condition Rating Summary | John/Scott |
| ○ Pavement Maintenance Study Follow-up | Cassandra |
| ○ Transportation Alternatives update | Pam |
| ○ Bridge NY | Pam |
| ○ Local and NYSDOT Project Updates | Pam/Ron |

6. BUSINESS OFFERED FROM THE FLOOR

Next meeting date: Thursday, March 2nd, 2017

BINGHAMTON METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION STUDY
PLANNING COMMITTEE
September 8th, 2016
MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman Vern Myers at 1:30pm.

OPENING

- ✓ Roll Call

Members Present:

Vernon Myers, Town of Vestal Engineer
Frank Evangelisti, Broome County Planning
Dan Schofield, *represented by Tom Sullivan*, BC Deputy Commissioner DPW
Greg Kilmer, Broome County Public Transportation
Elaine Jardine, Tioga County Planning
Gary Hammond, Tioga County Public Works
Ray Standish, City of Binghamton
Kent Rapp, Village of Endicott
Alex Urda, Town of Chenango Engineer
Brian Coddington, Town of Conklin
Ron Lake, Town of Dickinson
Ray Coolbaugh, Town of Kirkwood
Lou Caforio, Town of Union Public Works
Pam Eshbaugh, NYSDOT Region 9 Planning

Advisory Members Present:

Lisa McCafferty, Tioga County Health Department

Others Present:

Jennifer Yonkoski, BMTS Central Staff
John Sterbentz, BMTS Central Staff
Scott Reigle, BMTS Central Staff
Cassandra Gascon, BMTS Central Staff
Cyndi Paddick, BMTS Central Staff

- ✓ Approval of minutes from June 2nd, 2016 meeting. Motion made by R. Lake, seconded by R. Standish. Approved by consensus.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

- ✓ A representative from a local engineering firm (GPI) that recently opened an office in Binghamton came to the meeting to introduce himself because the projects his firm works on relate to the municipalities that participate on the committee.

ACTION ITEMS:

2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

TIP subcommittee approved. P. Eshbaugh told the Committee that the project is 100% HSIP funded so there is no local match. The project will look at Main Street in the City of Binghamton from Front Street to the Johnson City line and will include a study and implementation of recommendations to improve safety along the corridor for all users.

- ✓ Resolution 2016-15, Recommending Policy Committee approval of an amendment to the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program, City of Binghamton – Main Street Corridor Study, HSIP

Motion: R. Standish, second T. Sullivan. Approved by consensus.

TIP Subcommittee approved. P. Eshbaugh stated this is a NYSDOT Main Office funded HSIP study. The study will provide the region with short, medium and long term scenarios of signal phase/timing modeling in order to reduce accidents within the Vestal Parkway corridor traffic signal system, in the town of Vestal. The total cost will be \$150,000.

- ✓ Resolution 2016-16, Recommending Policy Committee approval of an amendment to the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program, NYSDOT – Rt. 434 Corridor Study, HSIP

Motion: G. Kilmer, second R. Standish. Approved by consensus.

DISCUSSION ITEMS/UPDATES:

✓ **Interactive BMTS Maps**

J. Yonkoski explained the new interactive maps on the BMTS website. The maps show the location and status of different TIP projects. When you click the project you can see different details about it and get a bird's eye view.

✓ **Pavement Maintenance Study Follow-up**

C. Gascon discussed Pavement Maintenance survey that will be distributed to municipalities in early October. The survey helps BMTS understand how local municipalities manage pavement preventive maintenance.

✓ **BC Transit Route Study Survey Satisfaction Survey Results**

G. Kilmer detailed survey results from survey administered on busses by the consultant that was hired to do a route study and follow up for BC Transit. Most survey responses met or exceeded BC Transit's acceptable level of satisfaction. Main action item from the survey is an app that will allow people to see where their bus is on their phone while waiting at a stop.

✓ **Transportation Alternatives solicitation**

P. Eshbaugh discussed training schedule handout related to the Transportation Alternatives solicitation. You must attend one of the trainings in order to apply for funding. 66 million dollars are available with TAP. Question and answer page available on website where you can ask a question and it will be posted with an answer. Small discussion of website and online application follows.

✓ **Bridge NY and Pave NY**

P. Eshbaugh detailed the program's standards. She encouraged any municipality to apply if they can. It's a new program.

✓ **Local and NYSDOT Project Updates**

P. Eshbaugh went through the handout of the list of local projects. She asks that people send the final bills for projects to her so she can close the projects out. A lot of the projects on the list are completed but are waiting for the final paperwork in order to officially close the project.

BUSINESS OFFERED FROM THE FLOOR

None.

Motion to adjourn made by R. Standish, and seconded by T. Sullivan. Meeting adjourned at 2:04pm.

**BINGHAMTON METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION STUDY
PLANNING COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION 2016-17**

Resolution recommending Policy Committee approval of an amendment to the 2017-2021 Binghamton Metropolitan Transportation Study Transportation Improvement Program.

WHEREAS the Binghamton Metropolitan Transportation Study Policy Committee has been designated by the Governor of the State of New York as the Metropolitan Planning Organization responsible, together with the State, for the comprehensive, continuing, and cooperative transportation planning process for the Binghamton Urban Area, and

WHEREAS Federal regulations (23 CFR Chapter 1, Part 450, Subpart C, and 49 CFR Chapter VI, Part 613, Subpart B) require that the urban transportation planning process shall include development of a Transportation Improvement Program, a staged multi-year program of projects consistent with the Transportation Plan, and

WHEREAS the BMTS Policy Committee approved on June 2, 2016 the 2017-2021 BMTS Transportation Improvement Program, and

WHEREAS the Transportation Improvement Program may be amended at any time to add, delete, or reflect significant changes in the scope of projects, and

WHEREAS the BMTS Policy Committee has created a Planning Committee of technical representatives to advise it on matters concerning the implementation of the urban transportation planning process, and a TIP Subcommittee thereof to monitor the Transportation Improvement Program, and

WHEREAS FHWA and FTA have requested an amendment to the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program, to reflect BMTS planning targets and fiscal constraint with the BMTS Planning Area, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the BMTS Planning Committee recommends Policy Committee approval of an amendment to the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program, as detailed in the attachment to this resolution.

C. FINANCIAL PLAN

As noted previously, Federal law requires that the TIP include a financial plan that shows that the program is fiscally constrained.

“The TIP shall include a financial plan that demonstrates how the approved TIP can be implemented, indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the TIP,...”

23 CFR §450.326(j)

“The TIP shall include a project, or a phase of a project, only if full funding can reasonably be anticipated to be available for the project within the time period contemplated for completion of the project. For the TIP, financial constraint shall be demonstrated and maintained by year and shall include sufficient financial information to demonstrate which projects are to be implemented using current and/or reasonably available revenues, while federally supported facilities are being adequately operated and maintained. “

23 CFR §450.326(k)

The first step in developing the Financial Plan is to reach agreement on what revenue is “reasonably expected”. In New York State, this was done as a cooperative effort of NYSDOT and the fourteen MPOs.

NYSDOT provides to each of the 11 Regions an allocation for each federal aid fund source for each fiscal year. NYSDOT developed formulas for each fund source, based on measures of need; these formulas were agreed to by the MPOs.

While larger MPOs receive a direct sub-allocation of FHWA STP-Large Urban funds; and MPOs serving air quality non-attainment areas receive a direct sub-allocation of CMAQ funds; MPOs serving metropolitan areas with fewer than 200,000 people receive no direct sub-allocation of Federal funds. BMTS is in this category; and also receives no CMAQ funds.

~~The following table shows the allocations received by NYSDOT Region 9. Note that Region 9 includes the entirety of the BMTS Metropolitan Planning Area; as well as the remainder of Broome and Tioga Counties, and 5 rural counties.~~

NYSDOT Region 9 works cooperatively with BMTS in the development of the MPO’s TIP and the Region’s portion of the STIP without a formal sub-allocation of planning targets to the MPO. The following fiscal constraint table shows Region 9’s entire planning target compared to the programming in the BMTS area.

Region 9/BMTS Fiscal Constraint

DRAFT STIP

FHWA

	Rollover	2017			2018			2019			2020			2021			Total		
	Ending Projected Balance*	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance
CMAQ	\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000
HSIP	\$2.840	\$2.490	\$2.727	\$2.603	\$2.490	\$2.652	\$2.441	\$2.490	\$1.971	\$2.960	\$2.490	\$3.393	\$2.057	\$2.490	\$2.637	\$1.910	\$12.450	\$13.380	\$1.910
NHPP	\$1.193	\$45.275	\$30.469	\$15.999	\$45.275	\$24.168	\$37.106	\$45.275	\$26.382	\$55.999	\$45.275	\$25.218	\$76.056	\$45.275	\$39.087	\$82.244	\$226.375	\$145.324	\$82.244
STP FLEX	\$39.946	\$29.718	\$16.845	\$52.819	\$29.718	\$21.618	\$60.919	\$29.718	\$22.133	\$68.504	\$29.718	\$21.354	\$76.868	\$29.718	\$23.083	\$83.503	\$148.590	\$105.033	\$83.503
STP LG URBA	\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000	\$0.000		\$0.000
STP-OFF	-\$0.028	\$4.499	\$0.225	\$4.246	\$4.499	\$0.251	\$8.494	\$4.499	\$3.573	\$9.420	\$4.499	\$0.441	\$13.478	\$4.499	\$0.803	\$17.174	\$22.495	\$5.293	\$17.174
Regionally Funded	\$43.951	\$81.982	\$50.266	\$75.667	\$81.982	\$48.689	\$108.960	\$81.982	\$54.059	\$136.883	\$81.982	\$50.406	\$168.459	\$81.982	\$65.610	\$184.831	\$409.910	\$269.030	\$140.880
Main Office Funded	\$0.000	\$0.302	\$0.302	\$0.000	\$0.302	\$0.302	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.302	\$0.302	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.906	\$0.906	\$0.000
Total	\$43.951	\$82.284	\$50.568	\$75.667	\$82.284	\$48.991	\$108.960	\$81.982	\$54.059	\$136.883	\$82.284	\$50.708	\$168.459	\$81.982	\$65.610	\$184.831	\$410.816	\$269.936	\$140.880

** There is no sub-allocation of funds to the BMTS Urbanized Area.

FTA

	2017			2018			2019			2020			2021		
	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance	Planning Target	Program	Balance
FTA 5307	\$ 3.494	\$ 3.494	\$0	\$ 3.494	\$ 3.494	\$0	\$ 3.494	\$ 3.494	\$0	\$ 3.494	\$ 3.494	\$0	\$ 3.494	\$ 3.494	\$0
FTA 5339	\$ 0.302	\$ 0.302	\$0	\$ 0.302	\$ 0.302	\$0	\$ 0.302	\$ 0.302	\$0	\$ 0.302	\$ 0.302	\$0	\$ 0.302	\$ 0.302	\$0
FTA 5310	\$ 0.214	\$ 0.214	\$0	\$ 0.214	\$ 0.214	\$0	\$ 0.214	\$ 0.214	\$0	\$ 0.214	\$ 0.214	\$0	\$ 0.214	\$ 0.214	\$0
Total	\$ 4.010	\$ 4.01	\$ -	\$ 4.01	\$ 4.01	\$ -	\$ 4.01	\$ 4.01	\$ -	\$ 4.01	\$ 4.01	\$ -	\$ 4.01	\$ 4.01	\$ -

NYS DOT has fiscal management tools available such as the use of Advanced Construction and the availability of fund source balances that gives them flexibility to accommodate some variations in fund source usage, and federal fund usage between years. NYS DOT has determined that the **BMTS** TIP is fiscally constrained to reasonably available revenues.

YEAR OF EXPENDITURE:

Another relevant portion of federal law addresses project cost:

“...revenue and cost estimates for the TIP must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect “year of expenditure dollars,” based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s).”
23 CFR §450.324(h)

This addresses what had been a common problem, which was using cost estimates in current dollars when projects were added to the TIP. By the time they were ready to be let, inflation had often increased the costs substantially, leading to unintentional over programming of the TIP.

BMTS has agreed to use inflation factors provided by NYS DOT. Based on cost estimates in 2015 dollars, the following factors were applied to all projects:

SFY 2015-2016	0.0%
SFY 2016-2017	2.0%
SFY 2017-2018	4.0%
SFY 2018-2019	6.00%
SFY 2019-2020	8.00%
SFY 2020-2021	10.00%

PROGRAMMING v ACCOUNTING

A final note on the TIP Financial Plan is warranted. While the importance of fiscal constraint is recognized as the best way to prevent a TIP from becoming a bloated wish list of projects that may never be financed and built, when interpreted too strictly there is the risk of turning the TIP into a ledger book.

When projects are programmed, costs for each phase are determined by preliminary engineering estimates based on the project scope in the Initial Project Proposal. Some project sponsors, like NYS DOT, use standard factors to estimate the cost of engineering and inspection as a percentage of the estimated construction cost. It is understood that as projects move through the design phase, and