This agenda is subject to revision up to 72 hours prior to the meeting.

To: All Members, Transportation Policy Board
From: Kevin Wolff, Chair and Sid Martinez, Director
Subject: Transportation Policy Board Meeting Notice and Agenda

The next meeting of the MPO Transportation Policy Board is scheduled for Monday, December 9, 2019 at 1:30 p.m.

at the VIA Metro Center Community Room located at 1021 San Pedro.

The following agenda items will be discussed and action will be taken as appropriate. Items may be taken out of the order shown.

Citizens to be Heard: Speakers will be allowed up to three (3) minutes each to address the Transportation Policy Board on any one specific agenda item. While speakers who have signed up may donate their time to another speaker, the maximum time allowed for any individual speaker will be nine (9) minutes. Speakers who wish to address the Board on multiple items or on items not listed on the agenda must do so under Citizens to be Heard. All speakers must sign the register and state their names and any organizations they represent.

Agenda:

1. Roll Call
2. Director’s Report – MPO (Martinez)
   a. The Texas Transportation Forum will be held on February 10-11, 2020 in San Antonio at the Grand Hyatt Hotel at 600 East Market Street, San Antonio, TX 78205. More information can be found at: https://events.tti.tamu.edu/conference/2020-texas-transportation-forum/
   b. The next Transportation Policy Board meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 27, 2020 at 1:30 p.m. at the VIA Metro Center located at 1021 San Pedro, San Antonio, Texas 78212
   c. The MPO Office will be closed on Wednesday, December 25; Wednesday, January 1; and Monday, January 20, 2020
3. Citizens to be Heard
Consent Agenda: All items under the Consent Agenda are acted upon collectively unless opposition is presented, in which case, the contested item will be considered, discussed and appropriate action taken separately.

4. Approval of the October 28, 2019 Meeting Minutes

5. Action on the Contract Award for Subtask 4.2 Mobility 2050 Demographics and Travel Demand Model Updates – MPO (Geiger)

Items for Individual Discussion and Appropriate Action:

6. Discussion and Appropriate Action on the Fort Worth to Laredo High Speed Transportation Study Presentation – AECOM (Duong)

7. Discussion and Appropriate Action on an Update on the New Braunfels Transit Study – KFH (Hosen)

8. Discussion and Appropriate Action on Air Quality Presentations
   a. Ozone Attainment Master Plan Update – CoSA (Ambriz)
   b. Subtask 3.3 Air Quality Planning – AACOG (Smeltzer)

9. Discussion and Appropriate Action on a Traffic Incident Management Update – TxDOT (Sneed)

10. Discussion and Appropriate Action on Safety Performance Measures, Target Setting and Dashboard Demonstration – MPO (Blazosky)

11. Discussion and Appropriate Action on a Status Report on the FY 2021 Unified Transportation Program Project Scoring and Prioritization – MPO (Geiger)

12. Discussion and Appropriate Action on Transit Amendments to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the FY 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program – MPO (Geiger)
13. Monthly Status Reports
   a. Alamo Regional Mobility Authority/Bexar County (Renee Green)
   b. Air Quality Issues (Diane Rath)
   c. City of San Antonio (Art Reinhardt)
   d. San Antonio Mobility Coalition (Vic Boyer)
   e. Texas Department of Transportation (Mario Jorge)
   f. VIA Metropolitan Transit (Jeff Arndt)
   g. Others

14. Executive Session - Pursuant to Chapter 551, Subchapter D, Texas Government Code

At any time during the meeting of the MPO Transportation Policy Board, the Board reserves the right to adjourn into executive Session at any time to discuss any of the matters listed on the posted agenda, as authorized by Texas Government Code Section 551.071 (consultation with attorney), Section 551.072 (deliberations about real property), Section 551.074 (personnel matters), and Section 551.086 (economic development)

15. Adjourn
1. **Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Kevin A. Wolff</td>
<td>Bexar County</td>
<td>210-335-2613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jordana Matthews</td>
<td>Advanced Transportation District</td>
<td>210-362-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael J. Lynd, Jr.</td>
<td>Alamo Regional Mobility Authority</td>
<td>210-335-7065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Tommy Calvert</td>
<td>Bexar County</td>
<td>210-335-2614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Sergio “Chico” Rodriguez</td>
<td>Bexar County</td>
<td>210-335-2611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Renee Green, P.E.</td>
<td>Bexar County</td>
<td>210-335-6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Pro Tem Wayne Peters</td>
<td>City of New Braunfels</td>
<td>830-221-4215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilwoman Shirley Gonzales</td>
<td>City of San Antonio, District 5</td>
<td>210-207-7043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilwoman Melissa Havrda</td>
<td>City of San Antonio, District 6</td>
<td>210-207-7065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Clayton Perry</td>
<td>City of San Antonio, District 10</td>
<td>210-207-7276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilwoman Ana Sandoval</td>
<td>City of San Antonio, District 7</td>
<td>210-207-7044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Art Reinhardt, P.E.</td>
<td>City of San Antonio</td>
<td>210-207-8022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bridgett White</td>
<td>City of San Antonio</td>
<td>210-207-0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Don Keil</td>
<td>City of Seguin</td>
<td>830-303-7333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Kevin Webb</td>
<td>Comal County</td>
<td>830-221-1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Chris Riley [Leon Valley]</td>
<td>Greater Bexar County Council of Cities</td>
<td>210-684-1391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Kyle Kutscher</td>
<td>Guadalupe County</td>
<td>830-303-8857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Christina Bergmann</td>
<td>Kendall County Geographic Area</td>
<td>830-331-8254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Kevin Hadas [Selma]</td>
<td>Northeast Partnership</td>
<td>210-651-6661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mario Jorge, P.E.</td>
<td>Texas Department of Transportation</td>
<td>210-615-5803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ezra Johnson</td>
<td>VIA Metropolitan Transit</td>
<td>210-362-2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ex-Officio Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kirk Fauver</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nick Page</td>
<td>Texas Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jeff Arndt</td>
<td>VIA Metropolitan Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Diane Rath</td>
<td>Alamo Area Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Vic Boyer</td>
<td>San Antonio Mobility Coalition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Director’s Report

a. The Texas Transportation Forum will be held on February 10-11, 2020 in San Antonio at the Grand Hyatt Hotel at 600 East Market Street, San Antonio, TX 78205. More information can be found at: https://events.tti.tamu.edu/conference/2020-texas-transportation-forum/

b. The next Transportation Policy Board meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 27, 2020 at 1:30 p.m. at the VIA Metro Center located at 1021 San Pedro, San Antonio, Texas 78212

c. The MPO Office will be closed on Wednesday, December 25; Wednesday, January 1; and Monday, January 20, 2020
3. Citizens to Be Heard
4. Approval of the October 28, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Issue

The October 28, 2019 meeting minutes are attached for your review.

Action Requested

A motion to approve the October 28, 2019 meeting minutes.
Transportation Policy Board
Meeting Minutes
October 28, 2019

1. Roll Call

Members Present:
Mayor Louis Cooper Advanced Transportation District
Commissioner Kevin Wolff (Chair) Bexar County
Mayor Pro Tem Wayne Peters City of New Braunfels
Councilwoman Melissa Cabello Havrda City of San Antonio
Councilwoman Shirley Gonzales City of San Antonio
Councilman Clayton Perry City of San Antonio
Mr. Arthur Reinhardt, P.E., C.F.M. City of San Antonio
Councilwoman Ana E. Sandoval City of San Antonio
Mr. Rudy Nino City of Seguin
Ms. Betty Ann Matthies City of Seguin
Commissioner Kevin Webb Comal County
Mayor Chris Riley Greater Bexar County Council of Cities
Commissioner Christina Bergmann Kendall County Geographic Area
Councilman Kevin Hadas Northeast Partnership
Mr. Ezra Johnson VIA Metropolitan Transit

Members Absent:
Mr. Michael J. Lynd, Jr. Alamo Regional Mobility Authority
Commissioner Tommy Calvert Bexar County
Ms. Renee Green, P.E. Bexar County
Commissioner Sergio “Chico” Rodriguez Bexar County
Judge Kyle Kutscher Guadalupe County
Mr. Mario Jorge, P.E. Texas Department of Transportation

Others Present:
Ms. Diane Rath Alamo Area Council of Governments
Mr. Frank Garza Davidson Troilo Ream & Garza
Mr. Isidro “Sid” Martinez Metropolitan Planning Organization
Mr. Vic Boyer San Antonio Mobility Coalition
Mr. Jeff Arndt VIA Metropolitan Transit

Chair Kevin Wolff called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.
2. Director's Report

a. MPO Chair Kevin Wolff to receive AMPO Award
b. The November and December Transportation Policy Board meetings are combined into one meeting that will be held on Monday, December 9, 2019
c. A calendar of 2020 and 2021 Transportation Policy Board meetings is provided
d. A joint Bicycle Mobility Advisory Committee and Pedestrian Mobility Advisory Committee evening meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 30, 2019, beginning at 6:00 p.m. at VIA Metropolitan Transit at 800 W. Myrtle, San Antonio, TX 78212
e. Proposed upcoming December meeting items include 1) presentation of FY 2021 Unified Transportation Program (UTP) project scoring and prioritization process, 2) contract award for Subtask 4.2 Mobility 2050 Demographics and Travel Demand Model Update, 3) update on High Speed Transportation Study, 4) update on the New Braunfels Transit Study, 5) TxDOT Vision Zero funding submittals, 6) MPO Public Meeting Results, and 7) AACOG and CoSA air quality presentations

3. Citizens to be Heard

None

Consent Agenda: All items under the Consent Agenda are acted upon collectively unless opposition is presented, in which case the contested item will be considered, discussed and appropriate action taken separately.

4. Approval of the September 23, 2019 Meeting Minutes

5. Action on Roadway and Transit Amendments to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the FY 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program

Mayor Chris Riley moved and Councilwoman Ana Sandoval seconded to approve the Consent Agenda.
The motion passed unanimously.

Items for Individual Discussion and Appropriate Action

6. Update on Revision to MPO bylaws

For information and discussion only.

7. Discussion and Appropriate Action on the Alamo Commutes Program Update

For information and discussion only.
8. Discussion and Appropriate Action on a Status Report on the FY 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program Development

   For information and discussion only.

9. Monthly Status Reports

   a. Alamo Regional Mobility Authority (Renee Green)
   b. Air Quality Issues (Diane Rath)
   c. City of San Antonio (Mike Frisbee)
   d. San Antonio Mobility Coalition (Vic Boyer)
   e. Texas Department of Transportation (Mario Jorge)
   f. VIA Metropolitan Transit (Jeff Arndt)
   g. Others

   For information and discussion only.

10. Executive Session - Pursuant to Chapter 551, Subchapter D, Texas Government Code

   This item was not considered.

11. Adjourn

   There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

__________________________
Councilman Kevin A. Wolff, Chair
Transportation Policy Board
5. Action on the Contract Award for Subtask 4.2 Mobility 2050 Demographics and Travel Demand Model Updates

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to take action on the contract award for Subtask 4.2 Mobility 2050 Demographics and Travel Demand Model Updates.

Issue

On Monday, September 16, 2019, the MPO issued a request for proposals for the Mobility 2050 Demographics and Travel Demand Model Updates. This study was approved by the Transportation Policy Board for inclusion in the FY 2020-2021 Unified Planning Work Program on June 24, 2019. Notification of the RFP was e-mailed to 20 transportation planning, engineering, and data collection firms and was advertised in the San Antonio Express-News, La Prensa, and the Texas Register. Proposals were due to the MPO by noon on Friday, October 18, 2019 and were received from the following two teams:

- Cambridge Systematics, Inc
  - AECOM
  - Alliance Transportation Group, Inc.
  - Poznecki-Camarillo, Inc.
- TJKM Transportation Consultants

The consultant selection committee composition was approved by the Transportation Policy Board on August 26, 2019. Members are as follows:

- Alamo Area MPO – 2 representatives
- Capital Area MPO – 1 representative
- City of New Braunfels – 1 representative
- City of San Antonio TCI Department – 1 representative
- City of Seguin – 1 representative
- Texas Department of Transportation (San Antonio District) – 1 representative
- VIA Metropolitan Transit - 1 representative

The consultant selection committee met on Monday, November 4, 2019 to review the proposal scores. Based on the proposal scores, which are attached, the committee unanimously recommended the contract award be made to the Cambridge Systematics team.

Action Requested

A motion to authorize the MPO Director to negotiate and execute a contract with Cambridge Systematics for the conduct of the Mobility 2050 Demographics and Travel Demand Model Updates.
# Mobility 2050 Demographics and Travel Demand Model Updates Proposal Scores (out of 100 points)

**November 4, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility 2050 Demographics and Travel Demand Model Updates</th>
<th>Cambridge Systematics</th>
<th>TJKM Transportation Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAMPO 1</td>
<td>96.25</td>
<td>84.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal Ranking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMPO 2</td>
<td>94.25</td>
<td>89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal Ranking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of New Braunfels</td>
<td>93.50</td>
<td>80.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal Ranking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPO</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal Ranking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seguin</td>
<td>94.25</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal Ranking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>61.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal Ranking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA Metropolitan Transit</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>36.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal Ranking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

|                      | 92 | 72 |

**Average Ordinal Ranking:**

|                      | 1  | 2  |
6. Discussion and Appropriate Action on the Fort Worth to Laredo High Speed Transportation Study Presentation

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to receive a briefing on the Fort Worth to Laredo High Speed Transportation Study.

Issue

The Fort Worth to Laredo High Speed Transportation Study is a very high level review of potential high speed transportation modes in the corridor.

The study has been underway for several months. A TAC workshop was held on the study in May 2019. That workshop consisted of presentations on various high speed technologies including Hyperloop, Maglev, and Conventional Passenger Rail. Further discussion centered around identifying fatal flaws for potential corridors, station locations and Transit Oriented Development.

This item was also presented to TAC at their November 2019 meeting.

Action Requested

For information and discussion as necessary. No action is being requested.
FORT WORTH TO LAREDO
HIGH-SPEED TRANSPORTATION STUDY

POLICY BOARD PRESENTATION - AAMPO
December 9, 2019
MEETING AGENDA

- Welcome & Introductions
- Project Background and Purpose
- Corridor Development - Methodology
- Corridor Development - Analysis & Preliminary Findings
- Q & A
PROJECT PURPOSE

• The project purpose is to **conduct a High-Speed Transportation (HST) study** that connects Fort Worth, Waco, Killeen-Temple, Austin, San Antonio, and Laredo.

• It will **evaluate various technology options** and modes of travel.

• It will **recommend corridors and potential station locations** to include in future NEPA documents.
PROJECT MILESTONES

March
Kick-off Meeting

April
Memo Review & Revisions

May
Stakeholder Meetings Series #1

June

July

August

Stakeholder coordination

Review Technology and Design Criteria
Review of Previous Studies and Comments

Corridor Development

August

September
Memo Review & Revisions

October

November

December
MPO Policy Board Briefings

January

Final Report

Corridor Development

Final Report
METHODOLOGY & FINDINGS
CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY

Station Analysis

Level 1: Screening City Pair + Technology

Level 2: Alignment & Technology Compatibility

Level 3: Other Factors to Consider

Preliminary Findings
LEVEL 1: CITY PAIR + TECHNOLOGY SELECTION
LEVEL 1: CITY PAIR + TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

Level 1 identified cities by population size and distance and assessed technologies ability to provide optimal travel time savings.

Assessment Criteria:

• City & MPO Population Size

• Technology Mode:
  • Primary Technology
  • Infill Technology

• City Pair Distance

• Travel Time Savings:
  • Compared to Driving
  • Compared to Flying
LEVEL 1: CITY PAIR IDENTIFICATION

2 corridor wide routes to be considered

Service Area Population

Corridor Wide Routes

Fort Worth to Laredo-All stops

Fort Worth-Austin-San Antonio-Laredo
TECHNOLOGIES: PRIMARY (INTER-REGIONAL)

- **Hyperloop**
  - ~40-60 ft right-of-way

- **Maglev Train**
  - ~75-95 ft right-of-way

- **High-Speed Rail (Over 150 mph)**
  - ~45-65 ft right-of-way
TECHNOLOGIES: INFILL (INTRA-REGIONAL)

- Guaranteed Transit
- Conventional Rail
- Higher-Speed Rail (Up to 150 mph)

Typical managed lane right-of-way

Typical Conventional Rail right-of-way

Typical Higher-Speed Rail right-of-way
POTENTIAL STATION DISTANCE

Findings

• For Level 1:
  • Optimal station distances and service area population find that Hyperloop, Maglev and High-Speed Rail are appropriate for all stops, as well as a Fort Worth-Austin-San Antonio-Laredo stopping pattern

Fort Worth to Laredo - All stops

Fort Worth-Austin-San Antonio-Laredo
**TRAVEL TIME (COMPAARED TO DRIVING)**
Inline platform dwell time is estimated to be 3 minutes

Travel Time when compared to driving (mins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Pairs</th>
<th>Drive Time (Mins)</th>
<th>Hyperloop</th>
<th>Maglev</th>
<th>High-Speed Rail</th>
<th>Higher-Speed Rail</th>
<th>Conventional Intercity Passenger Rail</th>
<th>Guaranteed Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth-Waco</td>
<td>85-105</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco-Killeen/Temple</td>
<td>60-75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killeen/Temple-Austin</td>
<td>70-85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin-San Antonio</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio-Laredo</td>
<td>150-185</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher relative time savings

Lower relative time savings
# TRAVEL TIME (COMPAARED TO FLYING)

Assumes 130 minutes of dwell time.
No direct flights for San Antonio to other Cities within the study corridor.

## Travel Time when compared to Flying (mins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Pairs</th>
<th>Flight route</th>
<th>Flight time (mins)</th>
<th>Hyperloop</th>
<th>Maglev</th>
<th>High-Speed Rail</th>
<th>Higher-Speed Rail</th>
<th>Conventional Intercity Passenger Rail</th>
<th>Guaranteed Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio – Fort Worth</td>
<td>Direct flight</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher relative time savings

Lower relative time savings

No time savings
LEVEL 1 - SUMMARY

- Based on this analysis, **five single mode options** were generated for primary technology modes. **Two of these options stop at all stations.**
- **9 double mode (Primary + Infill) options were generated.** These cover all stops.
- **Primary technology modes provide at least 50% savings** in time compared to driving time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary technology modes</th>
<th>Hyperloop</th>
<th>Maglev</th>
<th>High-Speed Rail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth to Laredo—All stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth-Austin-San Antonio-Laredo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Higher relative time savings**
- **Lower relative time savings**
- **Not recommended**
LEVEL 1 SUMMARY - PRIMARY MODE OPTIONS

Option 1 Hyperloop

Option 2 Hyperloop

Option 3 Maglev

Option 4 Maglev

Option 5 HSR

Option 6 HSR

Hyperloop station
Maglev Station
HSR Station
LEVEL 2: ALIGNMENT AND TECHNOLOGY COMPATIBILITY
LEVEL: 2 OVERVIEW

• **Step 1:** Assess alignments and segments from the TOPRS study.

• **Step 2:** Screen combinations of Primary Technology with TOPRS segments.

• **Step 3:** Identify preliminary technology and alignment combination.
LEVEL: 2 TOPRS SEGMENT & PRIMARY TECHNOLOGY COMPATIBILITY

- Applied **high-level criteria** to narrow down feasible segments from TOPRS

- A total of **23 city-to-city** segments evaluated.

- Corridor types included:
  - Greenfield (new location)
  - Existing highway corridors
  - Existing railroad corridors
  - Existing utility corridors
Highway Corridors
• **Maglev and HSR cannot operate along highway routes** because both have more restrictive horizontal and vertical design criteria. To follow an existing highway, the speed of the technology would be greatly reduced.
• **Hyperloop has less restrictive design criteria** and could follow highway routes but a reduction in speed would be necessary.

Freight Corridors
• **Hyperloop, Maglev and HSR cannot operate on existing railroad tracks.**
• Track gauge for high-speed systems is incompatible with freight rail and potential interference with overhead catenary systems for electrical HSR vehicles.
• High-speed transit systems require 100 percent grade-separation to achieve high speeds.

Utility Corridors
• Primary technologies are feasible **generally following utility corridors**, and favorable in Texas due to geography and **long segments of uninterrupted linear paths**.
LEVEL: 2 PRIMARY TECHNOLOGY & SEGMENT ANALYSIS

Screening Criteria included:
- Segment characteristics
  - Length
  - Study area acreage
- Travel time savings by technology mode
- Capital costs
- Assessment of land use type and acreage from the National Land Cover Database via US Geological Survey.
- Travel time savings criteria assess the Primary Technology's speed and travel efficiency on in various corridors. Speed and time savings become degraded as each mode is assessed with various horizontal curvatures.
LEVEL: 2 – HIGHEST SCORING TECHNOLOGY AND ALIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Fort Worth to Waco</th>
<th>Waco to Temple</th>
<th>Temple to Taylor</th>
<th>Taylor to San Antonio</th>
<th>Temple to San Antonio</th>
<th>San Antonio to Laredo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL1 SP1</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL2 SP1</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL3 SP1</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL4 SP1</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL5 SP1</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL6 SP1</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL7 SP2</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL8 SP2</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL9 SP2</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL10 SP2</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL11 SP2</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL12 SP2</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLEV1 SP1</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLEV2 SP2</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR1 SP1</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR2 SP2</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HL – Hyperloop  
MLEV – Maglev  
HSR – High Speed Rail  
SP1- Stopping Pattern 1 - All (6) Stops  
SP2- Stopping Pattern 2 – Fort Worth- Austin- San Antonio- Laredo (4) Stops
LEVEL: 2 – HIGHEST SCORING TECHNOLOGY AND ALIGNMENT

High
HL– Hyperloop
MLEV- Maglev
HSR- High Speed Rail

Low
Hyperloop
Maglev
HSR

SP1- Stopping Pattern 1- All (6) Stops
SP2- Stopping Pattern 2 – Fort Worth- Austin- San Antonio- Laredo (4) Stops
LEVEL: 2 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS
HIGHEST SCORING END-TO-END TECHNOLOGY AND ALIGNMENT

• **Hyperloop with six potential stops in:**
  • Fort Worth
  • Waco
  • Killeen/Temple
  • Austin
  • San Antonio
  • Laredo

• **Alignment generally follows:**
  • Traveling south from Fort Worth to Waco generally following a Utility Corridor.
  • From Temple to San Antonio, generally following IH-35.
  • From San Antonio to Laredo in a greenfield corridor.
STATION ANALYSIS - AAMPO- San Antonio

Assessed station suitability based on identified metrics:

Multimodal Connectivity
- Access to transit stops
- Transit connectivity
- Existing railroads
- Existing transit hubs and park & rides

Major Activity Centers/Access to Regional Tourism
- Modal suitability density (population+ employment)

Environmental Considerations
- Feature coverage (Floodplain, wetland, historic sites, etc.)

Existing and Future Land Use/Available Land
- Land use compatibility
LEVEL 3: OTHER FACTORS TO CONSIDER
LEVEL 3: OTHER FACTORS TO CONSIDER

**Level 3:** Develop a discussion and ranking of difficult to quantify criteria applicable to technologies.

**Outcomes:** Provide an additional qualitative assessment of technologies in relation to the outcomes of Level 2.

- **Station Location Benefits**
  - Urban vs. suburban location
  - Freight co-benefit of station location

- **Operational**
  - Required area for ancillary facilities
  - Reliability
  - O&M costs
  - Technology Maturity

- **Interoperability**
  - Compatibility with existing technologies

- **Regulatory**
  - Regulatory environment
  - Public and institutional plan consistency
  - Public support

- **Convenience**
  - Passenger experience
  - Travel efficiency

- **Safety & Resilience**
  - Vehicle and track safety measures
PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Station Analysis

Level 1: Screening City Pair + Technology

Level 2: Alignment & Technology Compatibility

Level 3: Other Factors to Consider

Preliminary Findings
PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

After screening, Hyperloop stopping at all identified city pairs ranked as the highest technology and alignment combination.

• **Hyperloop potential stops:**
  • Fort Worth
  • Waco
  • Killeen/Temple
  • Austin
  • San Antonio
  • Laredo

• **Alignment generally follows:**
  • Traveling south from Fort Worth to Waco generally following a Utility Corridor.
  • From Temple to San Antonio, generally following IH-35.
  • From San Antonio to Laredo in a greenfield corridor.
FEEDBACK

• What are your thoughts about the findings?
• Questions about the analysis methodology?
Questions & Answers

Thank you
7. Discussion and Appropriate Action on an Update on the New Braunfels Transit Study

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to receive a briefing on the New Braunfels Transit Study.

Issue

The purpose of this study is for a consultant to evaluate public transportation service options in the City of New Braunfels and potentially between San Antonio, Seguin and San Marcos.

Currently demand response transit service is available, however, with increased population and employment growth, formal study of multimodal transportation solutions is necessary.

The primary tasks include:

- Public Participation that includes: stakeholder interviews and briefings, focus groups, community meetings, surveys and an online presence
- Existing and Future Conditions and Needs Analysis
- Options for a Fixed Route Transit System including an Operations Plan and a funding framework

This study is funded using the MPO's planning funds. The consultant's presentation is attached.

Action Requested

For information only. No action is being requested.
New Braunfels Transit Study
A Briefing

KFH Group Inc. | Toole Design
Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

December 9, 2019
Agenda

1. Introductions

2. Review of Work Plan –
   *With an extended discussion regarding outreach*

3. Discussion of existing service, key issues, and demographics -
   *Review of similar systems – what we may expect*

4. Development of Strategies

5. Draft and Final Plan
Project Work Plan

Task 1: Project Management and Coordination

Task 2: Project Initiation

Task 3: Public Participation Plan and Outreach Efforts

Task 4: Existing and Future Conditions and Needs Analysis

Task 5: Development of Options for Service

Task 6: Development of Five Year Operations, Implementation and Financial Plan
Key Issues

Service Area
- New Braunfels
- Regional Connections

Seasonal/Weekend Service
- Do not compete with local operators.

Markets
- Local service for residents and visitors
- Regional commuter service - San Antonio area, Seguin, San Marcos, Austin
- Visitors: From hotels, intercept lots
- Regional commuters
- Infrastructure

Needs
- Local residents
- Visitors: From hotels, intercept lots
- Regional commuters
- Infrastructure

Study Goals
1. Determine the feasibility of a fixed route Public Transit System.
2. Conduct extensive outreach and engage all level of stakeholders.
3. Develop an organizational, operational and financial plan that will ensure safe, effective and sustainable transit.
4. Support the private sector transportation services - no competition.
# Outreach Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Oversight Committee –</th>
<th>We envision 4 formal meetings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews, intercepts and Meetings –</td>
<td>As many as needed for stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online/Onboard Surveys –</td>
<td>Over 400 responses of all types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meetings –</td>
<td>We will conduct two rounds of meetings. First round completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups –</td>
<td>2 focus groups – Hosted by: The Chamber of Commerce and McKenna Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers Bureau –</td>
<td>Enlisting participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media and Website –</td>
<td>Website is available - <a href="http://www.nbtexas.org/transit">http://www.nbtexas.org/transit</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Existing Services

Demand response is not an effective service design for New Braunfels.

Current demand response service:

- Very expensive on a per trip basis due to allocation formula
- Limited service availability

Currently spending over $800,000

- Doubling this cost to accommodate fixed route will increase ridership five or six fold.
New Braunfels

Based on the review of similar systems and assuming a five bus fixed route:

- Expect an initial ridership of six one way trips per vehicle hour or over 100,000 trips annually.
- A mature system will generate up to 10 one way trips per vehicle hour or over 180,000 one way trips annually.

New Braunfels Advantages:

- Large population base
- Commuters
- Visitors
- Student transportation (where school buses do not serve)
- Businesses
Demographics and Travel Patterns

1. Using the most up to date data from the American Community Survey and StreetLights cell phone data.

2. Numerous parts of New Braunfels have the population and density to support fixed route.

3. Visitors can help increase ridership especially in the Downtown to Gruene corridor.

4. Some corridors have sidewalk and pedestrian access. Others do not.
Origins: AM Peak

Figure 8 – Origin Zones: Weekdays (M-Th), Peak AM (6AM – 10 AM)

Figure 9 – Origin Zones (fine grained zones): Weekdays (M-Th), 7 AM – 8 AM
Travel Patterns

Zone 17

a) Origin: Weekday Peak AM (6 AM - 10 AM)

b) Origin: Weekday Peak PM (3 PM - 7 PM)

c) Destination: Weekday Peak AM (6 AM - 10 AM)

d) Destination: Weekday Peak PM (3 PM - 7 PM)
Existing Service: Origins and Destinations
Development of Strategies

Options to look at include, but may not be limited to:

**Operations**
- Minimum of five bus fixed route bus with complementary ADA service.
- Up to eight bus system

**Organizational**
- Operated directly by the City
- Contracted to a private or public operator, monitored by the city

**Financial**
- Continue/expand current arrangements with VIA, New Braunfels and FTA funding
- Review potential for sales tax
- Private sector sponsorships
Draft and Final Plan

1. Develop Draft Plan
2. Conduct Second Round of outreach
3. Develop Final Plan
Questions?

Ken Hosen
KFH Group Inc.
Khosen@kfh.com
8. Discussion and Appropriate Action on Air Quality Presentations

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to receive updates on air quality planning activities by both the City of San Antonio (CoSA) and the Alamo Area Council of Governments (AACOG).

Issue

a. Ozone Attainment Master Plan Update – CoSA (Ricardo Ambriz)

Bexar County was designated as marginal nonattainment for ground-level ozone by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2018. In order to achieve attainment status, Bexar County must lower ground-level ozone to 70 ppb or lower by September 2021 (using 2018, 2019 and 2020 monitoring data). If the ozone standard is not met, the EPA may require additional regulations for businesses that plan to expand or are potentially relocating to the local area.

The San Antonio Metropolitan Health District (Metro Health) developed an Ozone Attainment Master Plan to establish a strategic and technical review of current local ozone levels and provide recommendations. The Ozone Attainment Master Plan is voluntary and can be found online at: https://www.sanantonio.gov/Portals/0/Files/health/HealthyEnvironment/MasterPlan-Ozone.pdf

The draft presentation is attached for your information.

b. Subtask 3.3 Air Quality Planning – AACOG (Steven Smeltzer)

AACOG is under contract to the MPO to perform photochemical modeling in support of air quality planning. That work for the fiscal year has been completed and is documented in a technical report. The Executive Summary and the draft presentation are attached for your information.

Action Requested

For information only. No action is being requested
Nonattainment Background

October 1, 2015 EPA releases “health-based” standard

September 24, 2018 Bexar County determined to be in marginal nonattainment

December 31, 2020 Deadline to achieve attainment
Ground-level Ozone

Ozone is formed when Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) combine and are exposed to sunlight.
Public Health Concern

Ground-level ozone causes:

• Death of children and elderly people
• Cardiovascular disease
• Respiratory disease
• Asthma attacks
Consequences of Nonattainment

Costs of Federal Regulation:

• Emissions testing
• New project permitting
• Fewer jobs
• Cost of $800 million per year
Ozone Attainment Master Plan

- Communications and Marketing
- Volkswagen Settlement
- Ozone Best Practices
- Identification of Point Sources and Mitigation
- Business Community
- Policy/ Advocacy/ Funding
Communications and Marketing
Volkswagen Settlement

• TCEQ is administering VW funds.
• $61 million available for projects that reduce NOx in the San Antonio area.
• $15.4 million allocated for second round of funding in San Antonio area.
• 2nd round of funding for projects that replace or repower Refuse Vehicles.
Ozone Best Practices

Diesel Construction Equipment Anti-idling

Vanpool Pilot Program
Identification of Point Sources and Mitigation
Gas Cap Replacement

Remote Work Policy
Actions Everyone Can Take

- Limit driving and idling
- Conserve electricity
- Use paint and cleaning products with less or zero VOCs
Actions Everyone Can Take

- Refuel your vehicle in the evening
- Keep your vehicle and gas-powered equipment maintained
- Don’t burn wood or yard waste.
Thank you!

Questions or comments?
Air Quality and Photochemical Modeling Results

Presented by

Steven Smeltzer
AACOG

December 9, 2019
### Current Three-Year Average, 2016-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Monitor</th>
<th>Fourth Highest 8-Hour Average O$_3$ Measurement, ppb</th>
<th>Three Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. Northwest C23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Bullis C58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras Lake C59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two regulatory monitors exceed the ozone standard.
### Ozone Season to Date, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PPB</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PPB</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PPB</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PPB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.A. Northwest C23</td>
<td>6/13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Bullis C58</td>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6/13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4/9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras Lake C59</td>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6/13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4/9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ozone data validated through June, 2019

Current fourth-highest is above the maximum allowable to attain NAAQS
Air Quality Monitoring Sites in the San Antonio-New Braunfels MSA
Current Attainment Status

• Based on air monitoring data from 2015-2017, Bexar County was designated nonattainment with a marginal classification.

• All other counties in the MSA were classified as attainment/unclassifiable.

• Attainment date (no later than) September 24, 2021.

• Bexar County Attainment year = 2020.
If Bexar County Meets the Standard in 2020

• If the three-year design value is at or below 70 ppb, the area is eligible for re-designation to attainment

• Demonstrates maintenance for 10 years after EPA approval (Includes contingency plan)

• Re-designation does not lift any SIP-approved regulations

• A second 10-year maintenance plan would be required
If Bexar County Does not meet the Standard in 2020

• If the three-year design value is 71 ppb or greater, the area is reclassified to moderate
  – By operation of law – no action from the state
  – Federal notice and comment rulemaking

• Reclassification would likely occur in early 2022

• States usually have one year after reclassification to submit federally required SIP revisions

• Attainment would be required by the end of 2023

• 179B Demonstration
Photochemical Modeling

• The Alamo Area Council of Governments conducts ozone analysis using photochemical models that simulate actual high-ozone episodes.

• The modeling episode currently being used for the San Antonio area is April 16 to September 30, 2012.

• The cities of Houston, Austin, Dallas, and other areas in Texas are also using the same episode to conduct photochemical modeling analysis.

• The 2012 ozone season episode is approved by TCEQ and EPA for use in the Texas SIP.
Change in San Antonio-New Braunfels MSA Eight-Hour Design Values, 2020, 2023, 2026, and 2030

Based on a 5 year weighted modeling design value
Local Contribution at C58 for Average Peak 8-Hour Ozone on Design Value Days by Emission Group, 2023
Ozone Reductions, 2020 (ppb.)

Graph showing the change in 8-hour ozone design value (ppb.) for various transportation methods and strategies:

- **Carpooling**:
  - CAMS 23: -0.003
  - CAMS 58: -0.003

- **Electric Vehicles - Trucks**:
  - CAMS 23: 0.000
  - CAMS 58: 0.000

- **Electric Vehicles - Cars**:
  - CAMS 23: -0.002
  - CAMS 58: -0.002

- **Traffic Signalization**:
  - CAMS 23: -0.001
  - CAMS 58: -0.001

- **Telecommute**:
  - CAMS 23: -0.001
  - CAMS 58: -0.001

- **Vanpooling**:
  - CAMS 23: -0.001
  - CAMS 58: -0.001
Ozone Reductions, 2020 (ppb.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CAMS 23</th>
<th>CAMS 58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managed Lanes</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW Class 4 to 7 Trucks</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW Class 8 Trucks</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW School Buses</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW Transit Buses</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predicted Ozone Design Value Reduction at C58 for Each Mobile Hourly Run, 2020

Change in 8-Hour Ozone Design Value (ppb.)

- 7am - 8am
- 8am - 9am
- 9am - 10am
- 10am - 11am
- 11am - noon
- noon - 1pm
- 1pm - 2pm
- 2pm - 3pm
- 3pm - 4pm
On-Road Contribution to Ozone at C58, 2023 (ppb)
On-Road Contribution to Ozone at C23, 2023 (ppb)
Mobile Source Contribution to Ozone (ppb)

From the NE, E, SE, S, and SW directions at each monitor (every 5 degrees, 1 km samples)
### Top 10 Mobile Source Regions’ Contribution to Ozone (ppb)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Intersection or Location</th>
<th>Ozone (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Downtown San Antonio</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loop 410 / US 281 Interchange</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Loop 410 / Broadway</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Culebra / Grissom</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IH 10 / De Zavala</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Loop 410 / Babcock Road</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>US 281 North of Downtown</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lackland AFB / Nogalitos St.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fredericksburg Road / Huebner</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Loop 410 / Bandera Road</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of C23 and C58 ozone monitors
## Top 10 Mobile Source Region Contribution, Ozone (ppb)/ NO\textsubscript{X} (ppm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Intersection or Location</th>
<th>Ozone (ppb)/NO\textsubscript{X} (ppm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US 151 / US 90 Interchange</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loop 410 / US 281 Interchange</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Loop 410 / Broadway</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 410 / Babcock Road</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Downtown San Antonio</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NW Loop 1604 / UTSA</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Culebra / Grissom</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IH 10 / De Zavala</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Loop 1604 / US 281 Interchange</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lackland AFB / SW Military</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of C23 and C58 ozone monitors
Pie Chart for C58 Average Peak 8-Hour Ozone by Texas Regions on Days > 60 ppb, 2023

- San Antonio, 10.38, 19%
- All Other States, 21.65, 39%
- Boundary (International), 18.87, 34%
- Houston, 1.33, 2%
- Dallas, 0.47, 1%
- Beaumont, 0.29, 0%
- Tyler/Longview, 0.46, 1%
- Temple/Waco, 0.69, 1%
- Austin, 0.48, 1%
Next Steps

• Continue APCA runs by grid square

• Additional Control Strategy Runs

• Update Local emission inventories

• Run base case, base line, and projection cases with the latest emission inventories
9. Discussion and Appropriate Action on a Traffic Incident Management Update

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to receive an update on TxDOT’s Traffic Incident Management Program.

Action Requested

For information only. No action is being requested.
10. Discussion and Appropriate Action on Safety Performance Measures, Target Setting and Dashboard Demonstration

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to receive a presentation on updated regional targets associated with safety performance measures and see a demonstration of the online performance measure dashboard.

Issue

The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) has implemented several roadway-related performance requirements created under MAP-21 and the FAST Act. The Transportation Policy Board (TPB) took action in January 2019 (as well as in 2018) supporting statewide 2019 targets developed by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and a comprehensive group of traffic safety stakeholders. The TPB will continue to need to take action supporting new statewide targets or set regional targets yearly.

Safety performance measures focus on reducing the number of people killed and seriously injured in motorized and non-motorized crashes. By reporting targets in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program, performance measures can inform planning and funding decisions in the pursuit of regional and national goals.

At their respective meetings on November 13 and November 20, the Bicycle Mobility Advisory Committee and Pedestrian Mobility Advisory Committee took action on recommendations for 2020 targets. TAC and TPB action are scheduled for January 2020.

MPO staff will present proposed regional targets at this meeting. The draft presentation is attached.

Action Requested

For information only and discussion only. Action is scheduled for January 2020.
Safety Performance Measures: 2020 Target Setting
Outline

- Target-Setting Process
- Trend Data
- Proposed 2020 Targets
- New performance management dashboard
- Action is scheduled for January 2020
Target Setting Process
Federal Performance Measure Target Dates

FTA
- Transit Assets
  - 4 measures December 2017

FHWA
- Safety (PM1)
  - 5 measures February 2018
- Infrastructure (PM2)
  - 6 measures December 2018
- System Performance (PM3)
  - 6 measures December 2018

Targets are updated:
- Annually by transit providers
- Annually by DOTs and MPOs
- Every two years by DOTs and MPOs
- Every two years by DOTs and MPOs
Five federal safety performance measures

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities
3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries
5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries
Every year by February 27th, MPOs must decide to either **support the statewide targets** for that year or adopt targets specific for their region.
TTC approved goal of zero deaths

TxDOT Embraces Goal To End Deaths On Texas Roads By 2050

Contact: TxDOT Media Relations
Phone: (512) 463-8700
Date: May 30, 2019

#EndTheStreakTX campaign helps TxDOT with lifesaving effort

May 30, 2019

AUSTIN - How many deaths are acceptable each year on Texas roads? That's a question TxDOT is addressing through a new ambitious goal, which ultimately states that the answer to the question is zero.

Every day for nearly 19 years at least one person has died on Texas roadways. Now TxDOT aims to reach a goal to end all fatalities on Texas roads by 2050. The Texas Transportation Commission approved the goal in its monthly meeting Thursday. The commission also set a goal of cutting fatal crashes in half by 2035, which would reduce annual fatalities to about 1,800.

"While we are committed to invest in the best engineering practices to make our roads safe, we also need drivers and passengers to act more responsibly and help us end the streak of daily deaths on our roads to reach our goal of zero deaths," said Texas Transportation Commissioner Laura Ryan.

Ten people are killed every day on average on roads in Texas. Texans can play a major role in ending fatal crashes with a few simple driving habits: wearing seatbelts, driving the speed limit, not texting or being distracted, and never driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs.
TxDOT’s annual targets are data-driven

- Targets aim to reduce rising trends 2% by 2022 and maintain declining trends
- Achieved through an annual 0.4% reduction
TxDOT set aside $600 million for safety projects over five years

• TxDOT nearly doubled “Safety” funding by assigning an additional $600 million over five years to the Highway Safety Improvement Program

• That is a rough estimate of the funding needed to decrease Texas traffic fatalities by 2% in that timeframe
Trends in Texas and the AAMPO region
Developing a target

TxDOT calculated a linear trend based on five years of regional crash data and projected it to 2022, the year of their Strategic Highway Safety Plan. AAMPO mirrored the statewide methodology.
Number of Fatalities (2010-2018)

- **Texas**
- **AAMPO**

Graph showing a 5-Year Trend from 2010 to 2018 with data points for Texas and AAMPO.

- **2019 Statewide Target**: Reduce expected rise by 0.8% to ≤ 3,980 fatalities
- **2019 Statewide Actual***(as of 10/1/2019)*: On target
- **2020 Statewide Target**: Reduce expected rise by 1.2% to ≤ 4,068 fatalities

[www.alamoareampo.org](http://www.alamoareampo.org)
Rate of Fatalities (2010-2018)

Texas

AAMPO

2019 Statewide Target
Reduce expected rise by 0.8% to ≤ 1.47 fatalities per 100 MVMT

2019 Statewide Actual*
On target
*(as of 10/1/2019)

2020 Statewide Target
Reduce expected rise by 1.2% to ≤ 1.48 fatalities per 100 MVMT
Number of Serious Injuries (2010-2018)

- **Texas**
- **AAMPO**

**2019 Statewide Target**
Reduce expected rise by 0.8% to ≤ 18,367 serious injuries

**2019 Statewide Actual** *
On target *(as of 10/1/2019)*

**2020 Statewide Target**
Reduce expected rise by 1.2% to ≤ 18,602 serious injuries
Rate of Serious Injuries (2010-2018)

Texas AAMPO

2019 Statewide Target
Decrease rate of serious injuries to ≤ 6.60 SIs per 100 MVMT

2019 Statewide Actual*
On target *(as of 10/1/2019)

2020 Statewide Target
Decrease rate of serious injuries to ≤ 6.56 SIs per 100 MVMT
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities & Serious Injuries (2010-2018)

- **2019 Statewide Target**: Reduce expected rise by 0.8% to ≤ 2,394 non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries
- **2019 Statewide Actual**: On target *(as of 10/1/2019)*
- **2020 Statewide Target**: Reduce expected rise by 1.2% to ≤ 2,477 non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries

---

www.alamoareampo.org
Staff proposes supporting statewide 2020 safety targets and 2050 zero deaths goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>State Target for 2020</th>
<th>AAMPO 2020 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>4,068</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>18,602</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities &amp; Serious Injuries</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- BMAC and PMAC took action in November 2019
  - Recommended supporting 2020 statewide targets and 2050 zero deaths goal
- TAC and TPB are scheduled to take action in January 2020
- Targets are revisited annually
Performance Measure Dashboard
Data Sources

• Fatalities: 2010-2016 Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS); 2017 Annual Report File (ARF); 2018 & 2019 Crash Record Information System (CRIS)

• Serious Injuries: 2010-2019 CRIS

• VMT: TxDOT and AAMPO Travel Demand Model
11. Discussion and Appropriate Action on a Status Report on the FY 2021 Unified Transportation Program Project Scoring and Prioritization

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to review the draft FY 2021 Unified Transportation Program (UTP) project scoring and prioritization project process.

Issue

The UTP is a ten-year planning document that is developed annually and is approved by the Texas Transportation Commission. The UTP authorizes highway and other projects for construction, development and planning. The UTP is neither a budget nor a guarantee that projects will or can be built. However, it is a critical tool in guiding transportation project development within the long-range planning context.

A multiagency workgroup has met twice (September 9 and October 21) to provide direction on the project scoring and prioritization process. This information was also presented to TAC at their November meeting.

The draft presentation is attached.

Action Requested

For information and discussion only. Action is scheduled for January 2020.
FY 2021
Unified Transportation Program
Project Scoring and Prioritization

Transportation Policy Board
December 9, 2019
The Unified Transportation Program (UTP)
- a ten-year planning document
- developed annually
- approved by the Texas Transportation Commission
- authorizes highway and other projects for construction, development and planning
- neither a budget nor a guarantee that projects will or can be built
- is a critical tool in guiding transportation project development within the long-range planning context
FY 2021
Unified Transportation Program

• Funding categories
  – Category 2 Metro Corridor
  – Category 4 Connectivity
  – Category 12 Commission Strategic Funding / Clear Lanes

• **NOT** MPO funding categories
  – Category 5 Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement
  – Category 7 Surface Transportation Block Grant
  – Category 9 Transportation Alternatives
Project Lists:
on system added capacity and operational projects

MPO staff provided data for

- **MTP**: $2.5B, $3.3B, $3.3B
  - 35 projects
- **UTP**: $2.5B, $3.3B
  - 27 projects
- **TIP**: $2.5B
  - 42 corridors
- **Unfunded**: $10.8B

Years: 0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40+
Governor’s charge for Congestion Relief Initiative

“The State of Texas is spurring economic development and creating jobs by making a historic investment to build more roads and improve our infrastructure. That’s why today I am directing the Texas Transportation Commission to create a focused initiative to identify and address the state’s most congested chokepoints and work with transportation planners to get new roads built swiftly and effectively.”

- Governor Greg Abbott, September 23, 2015
Texas Transportation Commission Launches Congestion Relief Initiative

"Today, I am directing TxDOT Senior Staff to develop a plan for Commission review, to apply substantially more of the new funding sources on the Top 100 congested roads to determine how funding can be allocated to address these worst chokepoints. If funding streams are insufficient for additional highway capacity that is needed by our growing population, the source of any new funding streams is a policy decision not for this Commission, but for our State Leaders and the Texas Legislature.

While we can all agree that funding sources that allow for “free” general purpose lanes, or a “pay as you go system,” is what Texas historically has relied upon as our traditional funding source, this Commission’s responsibility is to plan for the transportation needs of Texas today, and the future of Texas — in doing so, we are indifferent about the sources of funding streams but not indifferent to our commitment to building new roads to meet our mandate from the people of the state of Texas to address transportation needs of Texas.

This Commission will continue to execute, as we have in the past, to deploy all available funding sources to build new roads to meet the needs of all Texans.”

— J. Bruce Bugg, Jr., Chairman
Texas Transportation Commission Meeting
Dec. 14, 2017

Texas Clear Lanes Update

October 30, 2019
Added Capacity Project Scoring

- 40% Congestion
  - 2017 base year volume/capacity ratio
  - Difference in 2045 No Build and 2017 base year volume/capacity ratio
  - Congestion Management System score

- 40% Safety
  - Crash rate (per 100 million vehicle miles of travel)

- 20% Statewide Freight Network
Operational Project Scoring

- 45% Safety
  - per million entering vehicles

- 30% Congestion
  - 2045 No Build volume / capacity ratio

- 25% Impacts of improvement
  - regional, corridor, subarea, or local
Project Stratification

- Added Capacity and Operational Projects
- Expressway and Arterial Projects
Project Tiering

1. Finish a Top 100 Corridor (IH 35 and Loop 1604)
2. Other Top 100 Corridors of Statewide Significance
3. Project Readiness (i.e., environmental clearance, feasibility study)
Considerations

- Further direction from TxDOT Administration indicated projects already in the UTP did not need to be scored again
- Concern about submitting projects that would not be implementable within the ten year timeframe of the UTP
## Project Scoring Spreadsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 1604</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 1604</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 306</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>MISSION VALLEY (CONSTRUCTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Added Capacity (A)</td>
<td>Easy (1) or Aerial (2)</td>
<td>Tests</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MTP only</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAFT: dated November 25, 2019**
Next Steps

- Action is scheduled for January 28, 2020
- Transmitted to TxDOT prior to January 31, 2020 deadline
A Resolution In Support of the Region's Scoring and Ranking of Projects for the FY 2020 Unified Transportation Program

WHEREAS, pursuant to federal law, the Governor of the State of Texas designated the Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO) as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the San Antonio region; and

WHEREAS, AAMPO’s Transportation Policy Board is the entity for cooperative decision-making regarding regional transportation issues in Bexar, Comal, and Guadalupe Counties and a portion of Kendall County; and

WHEREAS, the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) is a valuable partner in planning for and implementing the region's mobility needs; and

WHEREAS, TxDOT's Unified Transportation Program (UTP) is a 10-year planning guide for transportation project development and construction that is updated annually; and

WHEREAS, the 2020 UTP includes projects funded using Category 2 Metro Corridor Projects, Category 4 Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects, and Category 12 Strategic Priority and Clear Lanes Projects; and

WHEREAS, TxDOT's Transportation Planning and Programming Division has requested MPOs and TxDOT Districts collaboratively score and rank Category 2, 4 and 12 projects that are in and proposed for inclusion in the 2020 UTP; and

WHEREAS, the projects shown in the attached list:
• are consistent with previously identified priorities
• have been technically scored and ranked
• are included in the AAMPO's conforming Transportation Improvement Program and/or Metropolitan Transportation Plan; and
• have been supported through the AAMPO's public involvement process

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Policy Board approves the ranking of projects in the attached list.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 22nd day of April 2019.

Kevin Wolff, Chair
Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTP only</td>
<td>3 Unfunded</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP only</td>
<td>4 MTP only</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP only</td>
<td>3 Unfunded</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP only</td>
<td>4 MTP only</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP only</td>
<td>3 Unfunded</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP only</td>
<td>4 MTP only</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table continues with similar data for other roads.*
12. Discussion and Appropriate Action on Transit Amendments to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the FY 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to review transit amendments to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the FY 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program.

Issue

The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) amends the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) on a quarterly basis. To meet our local process for amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), amendments were reviewed in September with action scheduled for October. In order to keep the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and TIP consistent, amendments to the TIP will also need to be made to the MTP.

Transit TIP and MTP amendments are attached.

It is important to note that none of the proposed amendments are triggering the need for transportation conformity.

Action Requested

For information and discussion only. Action is scheduled for January 2020.
## FY 2020 Transit Project Descriptions
### Alamo Area MPO Transportation Improvement Program
#### 2nd Quarter 2020 Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Project Information</th>
<th>Funding Information (YOE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Sponsor:</strong> VIA Metropolitan Transit</td>
<td><strong>Federal Funding Category:</strong> FTA - Section 5339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPO Project Number:</strong> 10306</td>
<td><strong>Federal (FTA) Funds:</strong> $6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apportionment Year:</strong> 2020</td>
<td><strong>State Funds from TxDOT:</strong> $12,160,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Phase:</strong> C</td>
<td><strong>Other Funds:</strong> $89,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description:</strong> Transit: Paratransit Facility FY 2018 5339b Paratransit Facility</td>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year Cost:</strong> $18,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5309 ID #:</strong> N/A</td>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost:</strong> $18,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendment Date:</strong> TPB approved 1-27-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Project Information</th>
<th>Funding Information (YOE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Sponsor:</strong> VIA Metropolitan Transit</td>
<td><strong>Federal Funding Category:</strong> FTA - Section 5339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPO Project Number:</strong> 10316</td>
<td><strong>Federal (FTA) Funds:</strong> $12,363,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apportionment Year:</strong> 2020</td>
<td><strong>State Funds from TxDOT:</strong> $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Phase:</strong> C</td>
<td><strong>Other Funds:</strong> $5,946,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description:</strong> Transit: Revenue Vehicles FY 2018 / FY 2019 / FY 2020 5339a Purchase 139 Paratransit Vehicles</td>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year Cost:</strong> $18,309,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5309 ID #:</strong> N/A</td>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost:</strong> $18,309,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendment Date:</strong> TPB Approved 1-27-20</td>
<td><strong>TDC Requested:</strong> $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TDC Awarded:</strong> $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date TDC Awarded:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Amendment:</strong> add project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2020 Transit Project Amendments
### Alamo Area MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plan
#### 2nd Quarter 2020 Amendments

### General Project Information
- **Project Sponsor:** VIA Metropolitan Transit
- **MPO Project Number:** 10306
- **Apportionment Year:** 2020
- **Project Phase:** C
- **Project Description:**
  - Transit: Paratransit Facility
  - FY 2018 5339b
  - Paratransit Facility
- **Section 5309 ID #:** N/A
- **MTP Amend Appr:** TPB approved 1-27-20

### Funding Information (YOE)
- **Federal Funding Category:** FTA - Section 5339
- **Federal (FTA) Funds:** $6,000,000
- **State Funds from TxDOT:** $12,160,034
- **Other Funds:** $89,966
- **Fiscal Year Cost:** $18,250,000
- **Total Project Cost:** $18,250,000
- **TDC Requested:** $0
- **TDC Awarded:** $0
- **Date TDC Awarded:** N/A
- **Amendment:** update description and cost

### General Project Information
- **Project Sponsor:** VIA Metropolitan Transit
- **MPO Project Number:** 10316
- **Apportionment Year:** 2020
- **Project Phase:** C
- **Project Description:**
  - Transit: Revenue Vehicles
  - FY 2018 / FY 2019 / FY 2020 5339a
  - Purchase 139 Paratransit Vehicles
- **Section 5309 ID #:** N/A
- **MTP Amend Appr:** TPB approved 1-27-20

### Funding Information (YOE)
- **Federal Funding Category:** FTA - Section 5339
- **Federal (FTA) Funds:** $12,363,531
- **State Funds from TxDOT:** $0
- **Other Funds:** $5,946,429
- **Fiscal Year Cost:** $18,309,960
- **Total Project Cost:** $18,309,960
- **TDC Requested:** $0
- **TDC Awarded:** $0
- **Date TDC Awarded:** N/A
- **Amendment:** add project
13. Monthly Status Reports

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to provide information on several important issues.

Issue

Reports will be presented as follows:

a. Alamo Regional Mobility Authority/Bexar County (Green)

b. Air Quality Issues (Rath)

c. City of San Antonio (Reinhartd)

d. San Antonio Mobility Coalition (Boyer)

e. Texas Department of Transportation (Jorge)

f. VIA Metropolitan Transit (Arndt)

g. Others

Action Requested

For information, discussion and action as necessary.
Air Quality and Regional Planning Efforts in the San Antonio-New Braunfels MSA

Volkswagen Settlement Updates

As of November 6, $21,483,556 in TxVEMP funds to replace or repower school, transit, and shuttle buses have been awarded in the 4-county San Antonio Priority Area, representing 16 school districts and one transit agency. Only $71,375 remains of the San Antonio Priority Area’s allocation for this grant round. The TCEQ continues to accept applications for funding under the Texas Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation Plan (TxVEMP) for projects that replace or repower refuse vehicles. The San Antonio Priority Area has been allocated over $15 million for these grants. Vehicles eligible for replacement or repower must be configured to collect and transport municipal solid waste and powered by a diesel engine. Replacement vehicles and engines may be powered by diesel, electric, or other alternative fuel. The deadline for TCEQ to receive applications is October 8, 2020. As of the writing of this report, no awards have been issued under this grant round.

A TxVEMP application webinar for freight vehicles will be held on Wednesday, January 22, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. To participate, you must RSVP by sending an email to vwsettle@tceq.texas.gov, and a meeting link will be emailed to you the day of the webinar. The opening date of the TxVEMP freight vehicle grant round is yet to be determined.

Air Quality News and Upcoming Events

The TCEQ continues to accept applications for the Light-Duty Motor Vehicle Purchase or Lease Incentive Program (LDPLIP). Rebates of up to $2,500 are being offered for eligible fuel cell or electric drive vehicles, and up to $5,000 for CNG/LPG vehicles. Statewide, 2,000 rebates have been allotted for fuel cell/electric drive vehicles, while 1,000 rebates have been allotted for CNG/LPG vehicles. Unless the application period is suspended by the TCEQ prior to the deadline, applications must be received and date-stamped at TCEQ by January 7, 2021. For more information, please visit https://www.tceq.texas.gov/airquality/terp/ld.html.

The TCEQ is also accepting applications for the Texas Natural Gas Vehicle Grant Program (TNGVGP), which encourages entities with medium- and heavy-duty motor vehicles to replace or repower them with natural gas vehicles or engines. For this grant, natural gas refers to compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), and liquefied propane gas (LPG, or propane). To be eligible, at least 75% of the annual use of the grant-funded vehicle must occur within the Clean Transportation Zone (CTZ), which includes Atascosa, Bexar, Comal, Frio, Guadalupe, Karnes, McMullen, Medina, and Wilson Counties. Applications must be received and date-stamped at TCEQ by February 26, 2021. For more information, please visit https://www.tceq.texas.gov/airquality/terp/tngvgp.html.

The TCEQ will be hosting an application workshop in preparation for the opening of the Alternative Fueling Facilities Program (AFFP). The workshop will be Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 2:00 p.m. at AACOG's Al J. Notzon III Board Room. The AFFP offers grants for the construction or expansion of natural gas and other alternative fuel fueling stations (including electric vehicle charging stations) within the CTZ. Information on the previous AFFP grant round can be found at https://www.tceq.texas.gov/airquality/terp/ctt.html.
2015 Ozone NAAQS Timeline

The following is the anticipated timeline of ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) implementation and is not reflective of any proposed legislation or any regulatory modification by the EPA Administrator:

- September 24, 2018: Nonattainment designation for Bexar County became effective
- October 1, 2018: Initial Infrastructure and Interstate Transport SIPs due
- February 4, 2019: Final rule on implementation of the 2015 ozone NAAQS becomes effective
- September 24, 2019: Initial Transportation and General Conformity determinations are due
- September 24, 2020: Emission Inventory SIP revisions and Emission Statements are due
- September 24, 2021: Attainment deadline for Marginal areas
- September 24, 2024: Attainment deadline for Moderate areas

The TCEQ will be hosting an Emissions Inventory SIP public hearing on Thursday, January 9, 2020, at the TCEQ Regional offices at 14250 Judson Road.

San Antonio – New Braunfels MSA Ozone Status

Bexar County is currently designated marginal nonattainment under the 2015 ozone NAAQS. The current certified design value for the region, using data from 2016-2018, is 72 ppb, and is shown in Table 1. Two regulatory monitors in Bexar County continue to show violations of the 2015 ozone NAAQS through the 2018 ozone season: CAMS 23 at Marshall High School and CAMS 58 at Camp Bullis.

Table 1: Fourth Highest Eight-Hour Average Ozone Measurements and Design Value (in blue) at Regulatory Monitors, 2016-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor Site</th>
<th>Fourth Highest 8-Hour Average O3 Measurement, ppb</th>
<th>Three Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio NW C23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Bullis C58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras Lake C59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2019 ozone season ended on November 30. Table 2 shows the four highest eight-hour average ozone readings at each regulatory monitor in 2019. Table 3 shows the preliminary three-year average at each regulatory monitor when the current fourth-highest value is applied. Both CAMS 23 and CAMS 58 continue to be out of compliance with the federal ozone standard.

Table 2: Four Highest 8-Hour Average Ozone Measurements at Regulatory Monitors, 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PPB</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PPB</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PPB</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PPB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* As of November 13, 2019; Ozone data validated through September
Table 3: Fourth Highest Eight-Hour Average Ozone Measurements and Three-Year Average at Regulatory Monitors, 2017-2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor Site</th>
<th>Fourth Highest 8-Hour Average O₃ Measurement, ppb</th>
<th>Three Year Average*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio NW C23</td>
<td>73 72 75</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Bullis C58</td>
<td>72 73 69</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras Lake C59</td>
<td>65 71 63</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Three-year average not official until certified by EPA; certification of 2019 data expected no later than May 2020

The three-year average trend from 2010-2019 at each regulatory monitor is shown in Figure 1: Three-Year Average Trend at San Antonio Regulatory Monitors, 2010-2019*

* 2019 ozone data not official until certified by EPA in May 2020

There has been a generally downward trend in the three-year average at each regulatory monitor since 2013. Note that the 2019 figures are not official until certified by the EPA.

![Figure 1: Three-Year Average Trend at San Antonio Regulatory Monitors, 2010-2019*](image)

* 2019 ozone data not official until certified by EPA in May 2020

There were three moderate ozone days (days > 54 ppb) at Bexar County regulatory monitors during October, which is far below the average of seven. An average October typically has one or two days over 70 ppb, but none were recorded in October 2019. November had one moderate ozone day and no days over 70 ppb, which is about average for the month. Figure 2 shows the frequency of moderate ozone days and days with 8-hour ozone over 70 ppb at regulatory monitors using data from 2010-2018. This graph will be updated when all 2019 ozone data is validated.

![Figure 2: Frequency of Moderate Ozone Days and Days with 8-Hour Ozone over 70 ppb](image)

There have been seven Ozone Action Day alerts issued for San Antonio during the 2019 ozone season. In addition, there was one day > 70 ppb that was not preceded by an Ozone Action Day alert. Details are provided in Table 4.
### Table 4: Ozone Action Day Statistics at Regulatory Monitors for 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Alert? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Peak Ozone</th>
<th>Verified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/9/2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70 ppb</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59 ppb</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76 ppb</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2019</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78 ppb</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59 ppb</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/25/2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74 ppb</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76 ppb</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27/2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67 ppb</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There is a chance that ozone levels may have exceeded 70 ppb if an alert had not been issued

---

**Figure 2:** Ozone Exceedances of Selected Thresholds at Regulatory Monitors by Semi-Monthly Period, 2010-2018
14. **Executive Session - Pursuant to Chapter 551, Subchapter D, Texas Government Code**

At any time during the meeting of the MPO Transportation Policy Board, the Board reserves the right to adjourn into executive session at any time to discuss any of the matters listed on the posted agenda, as authorized by Texas Government Code Section 551.071 (consultation with attorney), Section 551.072 (deliberations about real property), Section 551.074 (personnel matters), and Section 551.086 (economic development).

15. **Adjourn**