



**MINUTES OF THE ABILENE METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD
February 20, 2024**

The Abilene MPO Transportation Policy Board met at 1:30 p.m. Tuesday, February 20, 2024, in the City Council Chambers, Abilene City Hall, 555 Walnut St., Abilene, Texas.

Voting Members Present

Mr. Glenn Allbritton, P.E., TxDOT Abilene District Engineer
 Judge Phil Crowley, Taylor County (out @ 2:45pm, in @ 2:57pm)
 Mayor Weldon Hurt, City of Abilene
 Councilmember Shane Price, City of Abilene (*Policy Board Chairman*)
 Judge Dale Spurgin, Jones County (*Policy Board Vice-Chairman*)

Voting Members Absent

None

Staff of Member Agencies in Attendance:

Mr. Scott Chandler, P.E., City of Abilene, Assistant Director of Public Works/City Engineer
 Mr. Billy Dezern, TxDOT, Advanced Planning Manager/GIS Coordinator
 Ms. Nellie Doneva, City of Abilene, Videographer
 Mr. Jeff Duebner, City of Abilene, Assistant Public Works Director
 Mr. Michael Haithcock, TxDOT, P.E., Transportation Planning & Development Director
 Mr. Max Johnson, City of Abilene, Director of Public Works
 Ms. Kelley Messer, City of Abilene, First Assistant City Attorney
 Ms. Lauren Stevens, City of Abilene, General Manager CityLink
 Mr. Bryce Turentine, P.E., TxDOT Abilene Area Engineer

MPO Staff in Attendance:

Ms. Rita Ryan, Abilene MPO, Office Assistant III
 Ms. E'Lisa Smetana, Abilene MPO, Executive Director

Others in Attendance:

Ms. Genny Abercrombie, Tuscola
 Ms. Tammie Coffman, Clyde
 Mr. James Condry
 Mr. Cody Ellis, Tye
 Mr. Matt Genova, AECOM
 Mr. Derrick Sowell, Buffalo Gap
 Ms. Mackenzie Swanzy, Buffalo Gap
 Mr. Brian Weaver, Merkel

1. Call to Order.

Chairman Price called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. He announced that public comments would be taken on any item on the agenda.

2. Consideration and Take Action on the minutes of the December 19, 2023 meeting.

Judge Spurgin made a *motion* to *approve* the minutes of the December 19, 2023 meeting as printed, with a *second* by Judge Crowley. *Motion Carried (5-0)*.

3. **Receive a Report, Hold a Discussion, and Take Action on the Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary Expansion.**

Ms. Smetana said a copy of the MPO Boundary that the MPO has been reviewing is included in the packet. She provided a brief background noting the Abilene Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) currently utilizes a Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary that was last revised in 2006. She spoke of the steps taken to get us here before introducing Mr. Matt Genova from AECOM and relinquishing the floor to him.

Mr. Genova introduced himself and thanked the Policy Board for allowing him to share his presentation. Mr. Genova noted that AECOM began work with the boundary in September 2023. He stated we need to ensure the boundary reflects regional population change/growth; keeps pace with changing travel patterns and volumes; better supports regional planning goals; promotes enhanced coordination between local jurisdictions through the MPO process and provides a strong foundation for long-term planning in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

Mr. Genova discussed the current boundary developed in 2006; then re-evaluated due to the 2010 Census; the fact that no changes were made at the time; and the Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) boundary revision process of 2022. Mr. Genova discussed key takeaways from the Boundary Expansion Committee Meeting. He then spoke on what the next steps were after today's Policy Board Meeting: 1) revise boundary based on Policy Board feedback; 2) continue engagement with local stakeholders; 3) seek TAC endorsement of newly revised boundary at their March meeting; seek Policy Board endorsement of revised boundary at their April meeting; 4) compile summary of process and feedback into technical memo; and submit memo, boundary map, support letters, and other materials to Governor's office for approval. Mr. Genova then suggested possible topics to get the conversation going before ending his presentation.

Chairman Price requested Mr. Genova display the Draft Boundary endorsed by the TAC. Chairman Price asked Ms. Smetana: Is there a balance of how far we should expand, does that impact the Category 2 Funding based on population? Ms. Smetana explained: the way it works is formula based, and lane miles do figure into it, so there is a potential that the funding may increase. Chairman Price addressed the Policy Board stating this is our opportunity to give feedback to Ms. Smetana and AECOM. Chairman Price then addressed the inclusion of Anson. He asked Judge Spurgin for his thoughts and opinions about including Anson in the expansion of the MPO Boundary. Judge Spurgin referred to the slide showing traffic volume. He said this better illustrates his view point on how far north we go. The increased amount of traffic coming through Anson because of US 83 and US 277 as they split are feeding into Anson. Judge Spurgin noted US 180 runs east and west through Anson and a portion of that traffic turns south, down US 83/277. He referred to the Annual Average Daily Traffic exhibit, with Anson (#7) showing a 23.6% growth; and Hawley (#9) a 13.9% growth and noted there is significantly more traffic north of Hawley based on the percent increase. He said we may wish to include Anson because it is a regional snapshot of traffic feeding into the MPO area and he does not have any issues with the inclusion of Anson.

Mr. Albritton requested more detailed information on how far out from the current boundary can the boundary be extended? Mr. Genova said the maximum area the boundary can expand to is what the Census concluded to be the metropolitan statistical area (Taylor County, Jones County and Callahan County). Mr. Genova then addressed the federal requirements that are required for inclusion. He noted one of the items is to think about growth in the region and try to gather as much data as possible to allow anticipation of growth within the next 20 years and revise the boundary to reflect that growth. Mr. Albritton asked Mr. Genova, based on his experience, what is his opinion once the Policy Board approves a final version of the expansion and it is submitted, is it normally accepted as presented? Mr. Genova explained that in the past both TxDOT and the Governor's Office have come back and asked questions and made comments on a boundary and it then becomes a collaborate process to have the concerns or questions resolved. Mr. Genova stated as long as we show clear justification for why the boundary is being expanded to the extent it is; show a clear process which involves local stakeholders

who are in support of the changes; then that is typically the level of detail required by the Governor's Office for approval. Mr. Albritton asked about Category 2 funding, and if we looked at any preliminary numbers showing how those numbers would modify funding with the newly proposed boundary. Mr. Genova said no we have not yet run that analysis but we could look into that between now and the next meeting. Judge Spurgin noted funding would be dependent on funds allotted and if all of the MPOs are expanding with the set amount of funds for Texas, we may end up with the same amount of dollars. Ms. Smetana explained that every time the Census numbers are released MPO transportation areas are evaluated, some MPOs turn into large MPOs and new MPOs are created. She noted when you add larger MPOs and new MPOs the total funding has the ability to shrink.

Judge Crowley asked: 1) Are there any disadvantages to the areas that are coming in to the MPO and are there any disadvantages for the current MPO areas if new areas are brought in? 2) Would we need to amend the Bylaws due to new areas representation? Mr. Genova stated that if Callahan County is included as a new jurisdiction within the Abilene MPO then seats would need to be added on both the Technical Advisory Committee and on the Policy Board for representation. Mr. Genova addressed Judge Crowley's first question: the existing MPO region funding might not increase that much based on the fluctuation of numbers around the state and other MPOs expansion. He said a possible disadvantage is by expanding the boundary it increases the area where funding could be spent; that could potentially increase the demand for projects funded through the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Genova noted another potential challenge for the new communities is active participation due to geographical distance to attend meetings while the upside is the eligibility for Category 2 Funding thereby allowing MPO studies within their region and expanding planning resources.

Chairman Price requested clarification: 1) if there was a set timeframe for a discussion, vote or direction pertaining to amending the Bylaws. 2) Are we finalizing the expansion process prior to amending the Bylaws or 3) Will the Bylaws be amended after the boundary expansion is approved by the Governor? Ms. Smetana stated: we would like to have an approved boundary prior to amending the Bylaws to ensure representation for all of the new areas. She explained the plan is to visit with each of the communities that may be affected by the expansion and find out their thoughts and opinions. Ms. Smetana stated many of the surrounding communities are represented in our audience today and they may wish to share their opinions on the potential boundary expansion. Chairman Price said their attendance is appreciated and he will hold an Open Discussion to allow them to share their thoughts and opinions before the closing this agenda item.

Chairman Price noted that currently we have the County Judges representing their counties on the Policy Board and the County Commissioners representing on the TAC. He said he believes not only the counties but the cities should have representation on the TAC. Chairman Price stated at a minimum we would want to do the same for the Callahan Judge, the Callahan County Commissioner, and all other cities or communities that are brought in. He said he realizes this is something that will have to be decided after the Governor gives his final approval but his recommendation is that we have equal representation at the table available to all. Chairman Price opened a Public Forum after welcoming and thanking the representatives from the surrounding communities. He stated public comment is allowed at any time and anyone that wishes to come up and speak to please come forward one at a time, state their name and their community for the record.

Mr. James Condry, a citizen of Abilene Texas and former City of Abilene employee shared a few observations: 1) there was no material presented in regards to the impact on water. Growth in an area large enough to be urbanized requires some form of water infrastructure. Expanding facilities takes time, infrastructure expansion takes time and a limitation of the current water supply could impact those areas. 2) The Census Bureau lowered the definition of an urban area to 5,000 and there is a density issue. 3) He feels the proposed boundary map may be stretching too far on the southern end of the Taylor County line. Mr. Condry shared his thoughts on where he believes the boundary should be adjusted to. He then said Anson should not be included, due to the distance and the non-urbanized areas

between Hawley and Anson.

Mr. Brian Weaver, City Manager of Merkel asked a clarifying question: Is someone already representing Merkel or is that something that would come in after Merkel's inclusion in the MPO is approved? Chairman Price stated that yes Merkel is currently represented by the Taylor County Judge Crowley and by the Taylor County Commissioner Williams.

Mr. Cody Ellis, Executive Director of the Tye Economic and Industrial Development Corporations shared a few of his observations and comments. Mr. Ellis stated a question that might be asked is are there any advantages to being in this MPO? Mr. Ellis stated he has been in the City of Tye for a long time as a staff member and stated he did not know this organization existed until last week when a colleague from another city that is being considered brought it to his attention. Mr. Ellis stated he has not seen any outreach from this organization at all. He doesn't feel there would be any disadvantages to being included but he has not seen any advantages to being included.

Ms. Tammy Coffman, Clyde City Council Member noted the map layering of traffic distribution but wondered if any consideration was given to the traffic that comes into our area as a result of healthcare and education. She identified Abilene as a hub for both. Ms. Coffman discussed the Census numbers on population and employment increases but that does not address that we have an aging population. This drives up the healthcare and education numbers and subsequently the transportation into healthcare and education hubs. She believes these fields should be added to our maps. Ms. Coffman stated our education community is not shrinking, it's growing and our healthcare industry is bursting at the seams. This is not going away as our population is aging.

Ms. Genny Abercrombie, City Administrator for Tuscola stated she appreciate the invitation to join the MPO. She stated as a city she believes Tuscola is looking forward to having a role and a voice. She stated Tuscola has experienced a lot of growth and school expansion which creates safety issues. Ms. Abercrombie noted Tuscola works very well with the Taylor County Commissioner and they are looking forward to being a part of the MPO.

Chairman Price noted seeing no further comments he is closing the public comments. Chairman Price then addressed Ms. Smetana requesting clarification that the MPO is not asking for anything but feedback and direction and not an official vote so is there anything the board needs to answer today? Ms. Smetana replied that this was just a discussion item for staff to get feedback. Ms. Smetana stated the Policy Board may see a slightly modified boundary at their next meeting.

Mr. Allbritton asked if the City of Tye was represented on the TAC. Ms. Smetana stated yes they are. Ms. Smetana noted that the City of Tye was very much a part of the TAC when Mayor Moore was with us but since her passing we have not had a representative. Ms. Smetana said that she did reach out to the Tye City Secretary and she will be appearing before the Tye City Council at one of their meetings and the same thing with Jones County to get that membership back active. Judge Spurgin asked if we have ever had anyone from the City of Impact on the TAC. Ms. Smetana said we did back in 2011, the Mayor of Impact attended a couple of meetings.

Judge Spurgin said the last project with the City of Tye was Military Drive, in relation to Dyess Air Force Base. He stated there was a lot of involvement with the City of Tye with that years ago. Judge Spurgin stated we want participating entities to be aware of what we are doing and get their input as it is in their backyard. Judge Spurgin spoke on the aspect of the disadvantages related to if we expand and the potential for more projects and the competition for limited dollars. He stated that projects must be approved by the Technical Advisory Committee and approved by the Abilene Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board so the projects still have to go through a process.

Chairman Price spoke to the board and referred to the presentation and to Mr. Condry's concern with regard to the Callahan Divide Hills area currently on the proposed boundary. Do we want to move

forward with what is drawn on the map or ask that area that is not going to urbanize be removed? He stated he has a similar question with Lawn. Is that too far south for right now as we will be looking at these boundaries in the Census every ten years? His question was do we include Lawn or do we stop at Tuscola? Judge Crowley stated he can definitely understand removing the mountainous area at this point unless someone has an idea that differs from his. He stated he would like to keep that southern boundary where it is because he believes south Taylor County is going to keep growing. Mayor Hurt said it would be pretty simple to take that mountainous area out; but he has no issue with leaving Lawn in the proposed boundary due to the continuous growth that is occurring.

Discussion Item Only - No Action taken.

4. Receive a Report, Hold a Discussion and Take Action on an amendment to the FYs 2024-2025 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Ms. Smetana provided a brief history of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and then discussed the proposed Amendment to the FY 2024-2024 UPWP. She said an amendment is required to incorporate changes for transit operations and special studies. Ms. Smetana noted in the packet that changes could be identified in red and yellow. Ms. Smetana discussed each of the changes and updates. She ended her presentation by providing a Recap of Changes to the document: cover page, table of contents, Task 4.1 MTP funding summary (added \$123,000 to MTP for 2024 (\$92,000 from 2023 moved forward plus \$31,000), Task 5.4 Safety Action Plan (Moved \$44,000 to 2024 from 2025 and added 29,500 to 2025), Task 5.5 Microtransit Services Study (added new subtask and funding summary added \$200,000), Budget Summary (updated above amounts and estimated TPF and carryover), Technical Advisory Committee Membership, and Appendix G - UPWP Amendment Summary. Ms. Smetana stated she would be happy to answer any questions. Chairman Price said with no questions asked, he would ask for a motion to approve.

Judge Crowley left the meeting at 2:45pm.

Mayor Hurt made a *motion* to approve the amendment to the FYs 2024-2025 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), with a *second* by Judge Spurgin. *Motion carried (4-0).*

5. Receive a Report, Hold a Discussion and Take Action on the FY 2023 Annual Performance and Expenditure Report (APER).

Ms. Smetana stated the Annual Performance and Expenditure Report (APER) is due by December 15th every year. TxDOT requests that the reports be given to them by December 15th to allow time for their review. The report is due to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transportation Authority (FTA) by December 31st to ensure compliance. The report was given to TxDOT on December 15th and we received comments from FHWA and FTA on January 25, 2024. The comments were address on January 29, 2024; final acceptance was obtained from FHWA/FTA on January 30, 2024. Ms. Smetana explained this is our year-end report which ties into our Uniformed Planning Work Program (UPWP). She noted there are five tasks: Task 1 – Administration and Management, Task 2 – Data Development and Maintenance, Task 3 – Short Range Planning, Task 4 – Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MPO), and Task 5 – Special Studies. Ms. Smetana then went through each of the tasks and shared the accomplishments of the MPO. She discussed the amounts budgeted, amounts expended, the balance and the percentage for each task. She noted that on the expended amount if it is 25% over or under a justification was required. Ms. Smetana discussed Task 2 - Data Development and Maintenance percentage of 17.90% due to the unfilled MPO GIS position and Task 4 - Metropolitan Transportation Plan percentage of 7.72% as a result of the planned kickoff being delayed from 2023 until 2024. Ms. Smetana said Federal Highways requested further information on the percentages and expenditure amounts and staff provided that information. The FHWA and FTA sent their approval/acknowledgement on January 30th. Chairman Price requested clarification that they were not approving the report but acknowledging it. Ms. Smetana stated it has to be acknowledged and approved by FHWA and FTA prior to public display; once this occurs it is presented to the Policy Board for acknowledgement. Mr. Albritton requested the status of the MTP. Ms. Smetana said prior to presenting

it we will be sending out Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for a consultant, meeting with TAC for their input on the selection of a consultant and then presenting it to the Policy Board at our April 16th meeting. With no further questions, Chairman Price said he would take a motion to acknowledge the FY 2023 Annual Performance and Expenditure Report (APER).

Judge Crowley returned to the meeting at 2:57 pm.

Mr. Albritton made a ***motion*** to acknowledge the FY 2023 Annual Performance and Expenditure Report (APER) with a ***second*** by Judge Spurgin. ***Motion carried (5-0).***

**6. Discussion and review of transportation projects.
(TxDOT Staff, City Staff, CityLink Staff)**

TxDOT – Mr. Turentine presented updates and plans on projects, noting most projects have changed site location on the list since his previous presentation. He provided highlights and updates on the Planned Projects: 1) FM 2833, Overlay from Jones County to SH 351 previously programmed in 2027 has been moved up to 2024; 5) new, SL 322, is part of the Carbon Reduction Plan to install ITS at various locations around town including SL 322; 6) new, US 277, Rehab/Preventive Maintenance on South End of BNSF Bridge, update: previously programmed in 2026 has moved up to 2024, has bid with construction to start soon; 7) FM 3034, MPO Funds, Widen road /add shoulders from US 83 to near PR 343; 15) SL 322, Median Barrier –Cable and Concrete from Lytle Creek to US 83, update: has moved from 2024 to 2025; 18) IH 20, MPO Funds, Widen road add lanes and shoulders from Judge Ely Blvd. to SH 351, no changes; The following are all new projects: 22) BU 83D Intersection Improvement at Treadaway and Pine Street; 23) FM 89, a Turn Lane Project, Widen Road add Lanes and Shoulders, south of town towards Buffalo Gap; 24) SL 322, Intersection Improvement at SH 36 Intersection and Access Road Project; 25) FM 707, Widen Road add Lanes and Shoulders, East of US 83 to FM 1750; 28) SL 322, Preventive Maintenance, Overlay, I-20 to US 83; 29) FM 707, Preventive Maintenance, Overlay, Tye. Mr. Turentine explained the order is now in line with the date they let.

Mr. Turentine discussed updates to the current construction. He shared that the project listing order had also been changed since his last presentation to the Policy Board. Mr. Turentine noted that there are multiple site locations grouped together as part of the same project; he began his update: Site #1 and #4 are the same project, 1) IH 20 - Overlay from West of Old Anson Road to Callahan County Line; and 4) IH 20 - Overlay from Near Wells Lane to .75 miles East of Hayter Road; should reach completion at the end of April/early May. 2) ES 7th Street - Bridge Replacement at Cedar Creek is progressing well. 3) IH 20 - Preventative Maintenance from Nolan County Line to near Wells Lane new overlay. Sites #5 and #13 are MPO projects Buffalo Gap Road are the same project: 5) FM 89 - Rehabilitation of Existing Road near Bettles Lane to Rebecca Lane in Abilene; and 13) FM 89 - Widen Non-Freeway from Rebecca Lane to just North of US 83; the project is progressing, they are getting close to beginning able to shift the traffic north of Rebecca Lane and open some of that up while paving is being done south of Rebecca Lane. Sites #6, #9 and #11 are all one project: 6) US 83 - Safety Improvement Project, cable/concrete barrier from FM 707 to .25 miles North of FM 3034; 9) SL 322 - Safety Improvement Project from N 10th Street to Lytle Creek; and 11) US 83 - Safety Improvement Project from Bus. 83 Interchange to 1300' North of Amber Ave.; the project is under construct but the contractor is still working north of Anson. 7) FM 1082 - New Location Non-Freeway from West of Cheyenne Creek Road to East of Dam, new bridge and road with MPO funds is progressing well and should begin construction of some of the bridge elements soon. 8) IH 20 – Overlay, Preventative Maintenance from Nolan County Line to near Wells Lane, will be starting soon; 12) BI 20-R - Safety Improvement Project from Leggett Drive to Ross Avenue is complete, they are closing out paperwork. Sites #14 and #15 are both Flashing Chevron Projects: 14) N 10th Street -Flashing Chevrons from Shelton Street to Kirkwood Street for the curve; and 15) N 10th Street -Flashing Chevrons from Shelton Street to Kirkwood Street for the curve, installation is complete and they are working on some device issues; 16) BI 20-R - Safety Improvement Projects (Railroad) from Pioneer Drive to T&P Lane is a delay start. Mr. Turentine ended his updates and asked if there were any questions. Chairman Price asked if Buffalo Gap Road was still anticipating a fall completion? Mr. Turentine stated yes we are.

City of Abilene – Public Works – Mr. Chandler began his updates with Projects under Construction: *Project #1*) Honey Bee Re-alignment is underway again after a delay due to water line relocation; *Projects #2 and #3* are being worked by the same Contractor: *#2*) Maple (Carriage Hills to Loop 322) is currently being worked; and *#3*) Five Points Roadway Improvements (Fulwiler Rd and Marigold St) is on hold. *Projects #4, #5, #6 and #10* are approaching completion: *#4*) EN 10th Improvements, (Judge Ely to 322 Loop); *Project #5*) Pine St. @ N 10th St. Intersection; and *Project #6*) S 27th Improvements (South Danville to Barrow St); and *#10*) N 14th St. @ Westwood Drive Intersection, Concrete intersection; *Project #7*) South 14th St Walkability Project (Sidewalks/Pedestrian Bridges), is a Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TASA) project. has begun, they are working from Barrow Street to the West, the Water Department is scheduled to shortly begin a project to the left side of our project but our contractor does have bridge work scheduled that will slow down the installation of sidewalks thereby giving the Water Department time to complete their project. *Project #8*) Work Zone S13 Street Maintenance is about to begin; *Project #9*) The Festival District located between the hotel and Convention Center, is progressing; *Project #10*) South Willis St. @ South 7th St. Intersection, a Street Maintenance Project is a signal rehab and a concrete intersection project, there are some utility relocations and tree removal occurring to prep for the widening, project is delayed due to signal equipment delivery (possibly 16 to 18 weeks); *Projects #11 and #12* will be presented to the City Council on Thursday, February 22nd, 2024: *#11*) S 27th Signal Improvements (Treadaway to Catclaw), a hybrid project due to the multiple previously completed improvements, this is an effort to coordinate all of the signals along that corridor and to install a turn arrow where needed. *Project #12*) Work Zone S5 (Canterbury Trails), if approved by the City Council these two projects will move forward to contract and construction. *Project #13*) Cypress Street Reconstruction, a Tax Increment Reinvestment Zone Project (TIRZ), is not actively being managed as a street construction project.

Mr. Chandler then provided an update on Projects Under Design: *Project #1*) Maple (Loop 322 to ES 11th) is holding at 90% designed, they are working out some design issues with AEP's line to the east of the corridor, currently there has been discussions of shifting pole locations. *Project #2*) Antilley @ Memorial Traffic Signal; and *Project #3*) Work Zone S23 (Fairways); both will be advertised to bid starting February 25th, 2024. *Projects #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, and #9*, are all ongoing projects that will be progressing on into the summer at various levels of design, they will be staged to bid in the fall: *Project #4*) Work Zone N6B (Pasadena Heights); *Project #5*) Work Zone S10A (West of Rose Park); *Project #6*) N. 18th St. Grape to Mockingbird (Includes N. 18th & Kirkwood intersection); *Project #7*) South 7th St. (Danville to Pioneer); *Project #8*) Corsicana Ave. (S. 7th to Benbrook); and *Project #9*) Andy Street Culvert. Mr. Chandler finished his updates and asked if there was any questions.

Chairman Price requested clarification on the statement that the Cypress Street Project is not being actively managed by the city, please explain what that means. Mr. Chandler stated it is kind of its own funding source and currently there is a question of construction manager at risk. He said he does not believe that agreement has been approved by the City Council yet. Mr. Chandler stated the City will most definitely be involved with the project once it gets into construction but the City has not actively bid it out of their department. The project is a little bit of a hybrid project.

CityLink – No updates at this time.

7. Discussion and review of reports:

Ms. Smetana discussed the following reports, noting the full report is available in the packets.

Financial Status –Ms. Smetana discussed the Fiscal Year 2023 report noting the ending balance was \$351,472.60 and for Fiscal Year 2024 we have received one work order in the amount of \$69,591.60. We have submitted two billing: for October 2023 - \$12,653.70 and November 2023 - \$17,864.15 and in addition we have the December 2023 for \$21,283.31 which will be submitted to TxDOT shortly. She summarized the authorization of \$69,591.60 minus those three expenditures \$51,801.16 leaves a remaining balance of \$17,790.44. She said we have been in discussions with TXDOT for the non-receipt of the carryover funds of \$351,472.60 and the non-receipt of the rest of

our 2024 authorizations for our PL-112 dollars. She stated that TxDOT said we would be getting our authorizations within the next couple of weeks.

Operation Report – Ms. Smetana discussed a few of the many items contained in the report and she noted the full report was available for review in the packet.

Director's Report

- **MPO Staffing** – Ms. Smetana discussed that the Transportation Planner position has been open since June 10, 2022. She said that with the amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program that was done in December 2023, we have the funds to use towards either the City of Abilene or a consulting firm to help with mapping in the interim but we are still working with the City through this process.
- **Year-end Report – FY 2023 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects (ALOP)** – She noted that every year the Annual Listing of Obligated Projects (ALOP) is due by December 31 to FHWA and FTA to ensure compliance and TxDOT requests that the report be given to them by December 15 to allow time for their review. We should be getting the information from the City on the ALOP information pertaining to transit in the next few days. We have not received the information on the highway portion of the ALOP from TxDOT. Once we get that from the City and TxDOT this report can be submitted.
- **MPO Safety Plan** – She said that in early 2023, it was disseminated that a new requirement for MPOs is to develop a Safety Action Plan. Currently there is funding for 23 MPO's at \$50,000 (\$1.2 million) out of the Federal State Planning and Research Funds (SPR) to develop a plan designed with local data and priorities. The MPOs are working with TxDOT and the Texas A & M Transportation Institute to get a plan in place. On January 18, 2024, we were notified by TxDOT that the MPO Safety Planning contract was executed and that kickoff meetings would be soon to follow.
- **FYs 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** – Ms. Smetana said that the new Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FYs 2025-2028 is due on June 18, 2024. Staff is currently working on compiling this data and will begin conducting public outreach. This will be presented at the April 16, 2024 Policy Board meeting.
- **FYs 2025-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)** – She stated that the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is due on December 17, 2024. It will cover years 2025 to 2050. The MTP is the long-range plan or “blueprint” and has a minimum twenty-year planning horizon with an update every five years. The Request for Qualifications for a consulting firm will go out in early 2024 and it will be presented at the April 16th Policy Board and April 25th City Council meetings.

8. Opportunity for members of the Public to make comments on MPO issues.

No comments received.

9. Opportunity for Board Members, Technical Advisory Committee Members, or MPO Staff to recommend topics for future discussion or action.

Ms. Smetana shared that the April 16, 2024 Policy Board Meeting may run long due to the number of items on the Agenda.

10. Adjournment.

With no further business, Chairman Price adjourned the meeting at 3:13 p.m.