**MEETING NOTICE**

The Corridor MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization)  
TTAC (Transportation Technical Advisory Committee)  
April 4, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.  
Training Room – Cedar Rapids City Hall, Lower Level  
101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids

Chair: Seth Gunnerson – Cedar Rapids  
Vice Chair: Brenna Fall – Cedar Rapids  
TTAC Voting Members: Brad Ketels - Linn County; Randy Burke – Linn County Conservation; Dick Ransom - Hiawatha; Shane Wicks – Fairfax; Kesha Billings & Mike Barkalow - Marion; Scott Pottorff - Ely; Jon Bogert – Palo; Kelli Scott - Robins; Ron Griffith, Nate Kampman, Seth Gunnerson, John Witt, Steve Krug, Brenna Fall, Doug Wilson, Matt Myers, Steve Hershner, & Jason Middlekauff - Cedar Rapids; Tom Peffer - Linn County Trails Association.  
TTAC Non-voting Members: Cathy Cutler - Iowa DOT; Darla Hugaboom- FHWA; Daniel Nguyen - FTA

**AGENDA**

**Roll Call**

**Public Comment Period**

**Action/Discussion Items**

1. **Approve Minutes from March 7, 2019** – [ATTACHED](#)  
2. **Second Call for Projects for Roads** – (Hilary Hershner) - [ATTACHED](#)  

**Report Items/Member Updates**

**Next Scheduled Meeting**

- Next TTAC meeting: May 2, 2019 @ 2:00 pm, **Lower Level Training Room, Cedar Rapids City Hall, 101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids**
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TTAC)
MEETING MINUTES
Time Check Hall, First Floor – City Services Center
500 15th Ave SW, Cedar Rapids
Thursday, March 7, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nate Kampman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Gunnerson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Witt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Casey Dix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Griffith</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hershner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Middlekauff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Myers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenna Fall</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Pottorff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrived 2:11 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Wicks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Ransom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesha Billings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Barkalow</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Bogert</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelli Scott</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dax Suntken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Peffer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Cutler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darla Hugaboom</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Nguyen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Krug</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Ketels</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Present: Bill Micheel, Brandon Whyte, Hilary Hershner & Liz Darnall

Also Present: Jeff Morrow, Anderson Bogert

Seth Gunnerson called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Public Comment
There were no public comments.
**Action/Discussion Items**

1. **TTAC Minutes from the January 3, 2019 meeting.**
   Dick Ransom motioned to approve the minutes from the January 3, 2019 meeting. Seconded by Ron Griffith. The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Tower Terrace Road Corridor Management Plan Update Recommendation**
   Bill Micheel shared a presentation on the Tower Terrace Road Corridor Management Plan update recommendation:

   Tower Terrace Road CMP Adopted in March of 2010
   - Purpose for update
     - Road sections completed
     - Phasing and cost estimate updates
     - Funding
     - Completion Timeline

   **SUMMARY OF TOWER TERRACE ROAD CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL PLAN</th>
<th>UPDATED PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal corridor not included original plan.</td>
<td>Updated vision statement to emphasize multi-modal transportation and aesthetics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street bike lanes at full build (four vehicle lanes).</td>
<td>Bike lanes only present for initial build. Converted to vehicle lanes at full build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-foot wide trail on north side, 8-foot wide sidewalk on south side.</td>
<td>10-foot wide trail on both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-foot wide travel lanes desirable.</td>
<td>11-foot wide travel lanes desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning area terminated at I-380.</td>
<td>Planning area extended west of I-380 to include relocated Edgewood Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included plan view alignment and roadway layout.</td>
<td>Adds plan, profile, and cross section information based on aerial contour data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included general location of access points.</td>
<td>Updated access point locations and types based on actual constructed access and supplements plans to show access stubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified concepts of including trees and landscape along corridor.</td>
<td>Set a minimum goal of 30% pollinator plant mix along the corridor to support the goal of 1,000 acres of pollinator plantings endorsed by the jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **TABLE 1:** Summary of Tower Terrace Road Corridor Management Plan Changes
Planning Process Summary
• RFP and Selection Committee
  • CMPO Staff, Policy Board member, TTAC member
  • Anderson Bogert
  • HDR
• 10/30/2018 - Public Open House
• 02/28/2019 - Iowa DOT Public Hearing

Matt Myers asked if the right and left travel lanes are the same. Mr. Micheel confirmed that they will both be the same.
### MEDIAN PLANTING: ALL GRASS

**Benefits**
- Maintained aesthetics
- Prevents incursion into metro area
- Lowest maintenance

**Challenges**
- Requires frequent irrigation (watering, fertilization)
- Exposes utility staff to traffic during maintenance
- Doesn’t provide habitat for pollinators

### MEDIAN PLANTING: ALL NATIVE SPECIES/POLINATORS

**Benefits**
- Natural aesthetics and native to Iowa
- Environmental considerations
- Maintains native species
- Less maintenance than grasses (less staff exposure to traffic, more drought resistant)

**Challenges**
- Maintenance expectations from the public may not initially coincide with the natural look, compared to Bermuda grasses
- Natural grasses cannot grow with proper, periodic mowing, sprays, trash removal, and periodic burning
- Native grasses can be flammable
- Medium cost to implement
### MEDIAN PLANTING: MIX OF GRASS/PLANTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More safety in aesthetics</td>
<td>Requires most maintenance (mowing, water, fertilizing, trimming, pruning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can provide some pollinator habitat</td>
<td>Exposes city staff to traffic during maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be effective in spot locations (gatesways, etc.)</td>
<td>Provides limited habitat for pollinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest cost to implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I-380: AT-GRADE CROSSINGS

**Benefits**
- Less expensive upfront cost, no additional cost to MPO

**Challenges**
- Location of pedestrian signals can conflict with vehicular signals at crossings of the interchange*
- Pedestrians may have to cross a signalized, channelized right turn onto and off of freeway*
- Gradeseparated crossings are safer than at-grade crossings**

**Travel Time**
- Approximately six minutes for pedestrians (30% less time) and three minutes for bicyclists (67% less time)

---

*“Emerging Diamond Interchange Information Guide,” Federal Highway Administration, August 2014
**“Manual 100 Iowa Traffic 2000,” Chapter 4, Section 5, Design Guidelines for Crossings
I-380: UNDERPASS CROSSINGS

**BENEFITS**
- 95% of pedestrians would use a tunnel if no extra time is required*.
- Pedestrian underpasses allow motorists to spend less time going through the interchange by eliminating the need for pedestrian walk phases.
- Travel time savings to the motorist generating $2.2 million over the life of the project.
- Grade-separated crossings are safer than at grade crossings**.

**CHALLENGES**
- If the grade-separated length is more than 50% longer than the at-grade option, the grade separation will have low use*.
- To be effective, an underpass must be designed to finish, walk, and safe.
- More expensive upfront cost; additional MPO cost of $500,000 to $500,000.

**TRAVEL TIME**
- Approximately eight minutes for pedestrians (33% more time) and three-and-a-half minutes for bicyclists (11% more time).

* [Institute of Transportation Engineers Study (1958)]
**[Iowa DOT 'Iowa Trails 2000' Chapter 4, Section 5, Design Guidelines for Crossings]
CEDAR VALLEY NATURE TRAIL:
AT-GRADE CROSSING

**BENEFITS**
- Utilizes existing pavement that is in good condition
- No additional right-of-way required to connect Cedar Valley Nature Trail to Tower Terrace Road Trail
- Minimal construction cost of approximately $150,000

**CHALLENGES**
- Pedestrian crossing interrupts vehicular traffic flow, slowing down motorists
- Grade-separated crossings are safer than at-grade crossings

*Source: IDOT "Tara Trails 2005", Chapter 4, Section 6, Design Guidelines for Crossings

CEDAR VALLEY NATURE TRAIL:
UNDERPASS

**BENEFITS**
- 95% of pedestrians would use a tunnel if no extra time is required
- Pedestrian underpasses do not interrupt vehicle flow, motorists experience no delay
- Grade-separated crossings are safer than at-grade crossings

**CHALLENGES**
- Requires additional right-of-way to connect Cedar Valley Nature Trail to Tower Terrace Road Trail
- Requires retaining wall at existingEsplielen Property
- To be effective, an underpass must be designed to feel open, well-lit, and safe
- Initial construction cost of the underpass would be approximately $82 million more than an at-grade crossing

*Source: IDOT "Tara Trails 2005", Chapter 4, Section 6, Design Guidelines for Crossings
Mr. Micheel stated that the graphic above highlights the phasing of projects.
Mr. Micheel shared that the green lines represent 50% inclusion of MPO funds, and the blue represents 80% in each project. With less MPO money involved, the entire corridor is completed approximately 8 years earlier.
Mr. Griffith asked what the time frame is for the section that crosses the Cedar Valley Nature Trail to be completed. Mr. Bogert shared that this would be toward the latter end of the project.

Mr. Myers requested to discuss how the report affects the timing and funding of the plan, and for clarification on if the City of Robins has an arrangement for the bridge over Dry Creek. Mr. Micheel shared that there are two options (grade or at grade) with this bridge. There is approximately a 2.8 million dollar difference between the two options, and it would likely be beneficial to the City of Robins to consider a joint effort with this project.
Mr. Bogert shared that the budgeting was based on 2 million dollars per year out of the MPO budget.

Mr. Gunnerson asked what the approximate road funds are for the region. Mr. Whyte stated 2.8 million, however, it is better to base on 2 million as Mr. Bogert stated because there are different projects that occur from year to year.

Mr. Griffith asked if there are any changes to the access spacing recommendation. Discussion among the Committee confirmed that it is right in/right out, with left in possible.

Mr. Myers asked about the possibility of specific properties that don’t fit, as there could be something from I-380 to Marion that might be site specific. Mr. Micheel shared that the City of Hiawatha has already identified a plat that may not fit, and the CMPO will continue to work through those situations as they are identified.

Mr. Ransom asked about extending the trails on both sides of the bridges vs. under, and would like to see the report more definitive. Mr. Bogert shared that this is up to the jurisdictions to decide.

Mr. Myers asked how the amendment process is handled once the plan is approved. Mr. Micheel shared that the amendment process would consist of discussing the proposed change with TTAC, Executive Committee, and Policy Board. It would likely need to begin with Policy Board and Executive Committee representatives.

Tom Peffer motioned to recommend the adoption of the Tower Terrace Road Corridor Management Plan to Policy Board. Seconded by Mr. Griffith. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Ransom motioned to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Myers. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jillane Gilmour
Administrative Assistant II
Item 2. Second Call for Road Projects for FFY20-23 TIP Cycle

There is a surplus of road funds available in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 23 totaling $776,000. This surplus is due to a lack of funding requests during the initial call for projects.

At their meeting on March 21st, the Policy Board opened another call for road projects for the FFY20-23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to spend down the surplus of funding in FFY23.

If a surplus still exists after this call second for projects, then these extra road funds will be made available to transit and trail projects seeking funds during this year’s TIP cycle.

All road project applications are due to Hilary Hershner (h.hershner@corridormpo.com) on or before April 21st, 2019.
Item 3. Project Evaluation Criteria for 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

As a part of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) planning process, the CMPO will draft Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria to be utilized during the project selection process. WSP, the consultants assisting the CMPO with the planning process and document, will present proposed considerations for evaluating projects submitted to the Vision Project list. These proposed evaluation considerations will eventually become the project evaluation criteria used to evaluate projects submitted to Vision Project list. In addition, evaluation criteria will be used to determine which projects from the Vision Project list will be moved to the Fiscally Constrained Project list that will be included in the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan.

The goal for this agenda item is to have a discussion facilitated by WSP regarding the proposed evaluation considerations. Please review the attached matrix prior to the meeting and be prepared to provide input at the meeting. The consultant will give a brief overview of the entire matrix and begin a conversation about evaluation considerations, which will ultimately become project scoring criteria.

TTAC members will be asked to provide technical based input on whether these items represent the appropriate considerations for the goal for which the criteria are evaluating. Discussion topics/questions may include:

- Is anything missing from the proposed considerations?
- Is there any proposed considerations that should be removed?
- Provide input on prioritization and/or weight that each of the proposed considerations should receive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>FEDERAL PLANNING FACTORS</th>
<th>PROPOSED OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>PROPOSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY &amp; SECURITY</td>
<td>Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for all users.</td>
<td>2, 3, 10</td>
<td>• Reduce the number and severity of crashes</td>
<td>• Does project include safety features? Does project include safety features in high crash location? High crash areas to be defined by volume and severity of crashes in past five years. • Does project include bicycle, pedestrian, or transit improvement in area where non-motorists or carless households travel and live? • Does project incorporate traffic calming measure in area where non-motorists travel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC VITALITY</td>
<td>Support the economic vitality of the region by enhancing global competitiveness, travel, and tourism.</td>
<td>1, 10</td>
<td>• Improve access to and mobility within activity centers and region destinations</td>
<td>• Does project provide connectivity and access to prominent employer(s) or other regional activity center(s)/destination(s)? • Does project support the movement of goods within and throughout region? • Does project align with existing land use and transportation plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY &amp; HEALTH</td>
<td>Prioritize transportation investments that result in sustainable development, increased public health, and preservation and enhancement of the environment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Offer travel choices that improve opportunities for non-motorized transportation and physical activity</td>
<td>• Does project include or promote bicycle, pedestrian or transit component? • Does project promote fuel-efficient vehicles, transportation demand management strategies, and other efforts that support improvements in air quality? • Does project help connect residents to amenities including walking and biking facilities, parks, grocery stores, etc.? • Does project provide access to natural or cultural resources (greenways, parks, etc.)? • Does project avoid or minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas? • Does project provide non-motorized or multimodal facility in environmental justice (EJ) area and/or area with high % of carless households? • Does project help provide access to transit (pedestrian devices near transit, sidewalk connectivity, ADA ramps, improved headways, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION CHOICES</td>
<td>Increase the accessibility, mobility, and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td>• Reduce congestion through operational strategies and improvements to network connectivity, before investing in roadway capacity</td>
<td>• Is project located in congested location? • Does project improve connectivity by filling in gap in transportation network(s)? • Does project increase access to resources in environmental justice (EJ) area and/or area with high % of carless households?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM OPERATIONS</td>
<td>Invest in resilient, efficient system management and operation that also promotes energy conservation.</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
<td>• Improve travel time reliability through effective management of both recurring and non-recurring congestion</td>
<td>• Does project address or include TSMO strategies including access management, incident management, managed lanes, special event management, etc.? • Does project involve deployment of ITS features like variable speed limits, transit signal priority, signal optimization, real-time traveler information, connected or autonomous vehicles, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>Maximize preservation of the existing transportation system.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>• Keep existing infrastructure in a state of good repair. Prioritize system preservation and improvements to pavement and bridge conditions</td>
<td>• Does project involve improving physical deficiencies or conditions, rather than focusing on capacity expansion? • Does project address useful life of transit assets? • Does repaving or reconstruction of roadway incorporate complete streets elements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORMWATER &amp; GREEN FEATURES</td>
<td>Mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation to improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>• Reduce environmental impacts of projects through green design features and sustainable construction methods; Promote dialogue on relationship between transportation infrastructure and stormwater runoff</td>
<td>• Does project address useful life of transit assets? • Does repaving or reconstruction of roadway incorporate complete streets elements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes Federally-required measure