OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION

**TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**May 20, 2009**

The Technical Planning Committee of the Ozarks Transportation Organization met at its scheduled time of 1:30-2:30 p.m., at the Missouri State University Plaster Student Union (3rd Floor, Room 315).

The following members were present:

Mr. Harry Price, City of Springfield (Chair) Mr. Eric Bernskoetter, MoDOT

Mr. Steve Childers, City of Ozark Mr. Earl Newman, City of Springfield

Mr. Randall Brown, City of Willard (a) Mr. Shawn Schroeder, Airport

Mr. Gary Snavely, MSU Mr. Bill Robinett, MoDOT

Ms. Carol Cruise, City Utilities Mr. King Coltrin, City of Strafford

Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT Mr. Bob Atchley, Christian Co. Planning & Zoning

Mr. Roger Howard, BNSF Ms. Ann Razer, City of Springfield (a)

Mr. David Brock, City of Republic Mr. Rick Hess, City of Battlefield (a)

Mr. David Bishop, R-12 Schools Mr. Joel Keller, Greene Co. Planning Dept (a)

Mr. Brian Bingle, City of Nixa Ms. Dawne Gardner, MoDOT

Mr. Kevin Lambeth, City of Battlefield Mr. Duffy Mooney, Greene Co. Highway Dept

Mr. Dan Smith, Greene Co. Highway Dept

*(a) Denotes alternate given voting privileges as a substitute for voting member not present*

The following members were not present:

Mr. Jim Dow, Springfield R-12 Schools (a) Mr. Andy Mueller, MoDOT

Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA Mr. Ralph Rognstad, City of Springfield

Mr. Bradley McMahon, FHWA Mr. Daniel Nguyen, FTA (a)

Mr. Kent Morris, Greene Co. Planning Dept Ms. Diane Gallion, City Utilities (a)

Ms. Diane May, SMCOG Mr. Mike Giles, City of Springfield (a)

Mr. Paul Hood, City of Willard Mr. Terry Whaley, Ozark Greenways

Mr. Mokhtee Ahmad, FTA Mr. Mike Tettamble, Jr., O & S Trucking

Mr. Dan Watts, SMCOG Mr. Ron Effland, MoDOT (a)

Mr. Mark Roy, Airport (a) Mr. Ryan Mooney, Chamber of Commerce

Mr. David Hutchison, City of Springfield (a) Mr. Rick Artman, Greene Co. Highway Dept (a)

Others present were: Ms. Sara Edwards, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Ms. Debbie Parks, Mr. Chris Stueve, and Mr. Tim Conklin of Ozarks Transportation Organization; Mr. Steve McIntosh, Congressman Blunt’s Office; Mr. David Rauch, Senator Claire McCaskill’s Office; and Ms. Stacy L. Burks, Senator Bond’s Office.

# Mr. Price called the May 20, 2009 Technical Planning Committee Meeting to order at 1:35 PM.

## Administration

# Introductions

# Approval of Technical Committee Meeting Agenda

Ms. Cruise motioned to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Newman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously.

# Approval of the March 18, 2009 regular meeting, April 8, 2009 E-meeting and April 24, 2009 E-meeting minutes

Mr. Miller presented a change on page five of the March 18 Minutes, in the fifth paragraph down, as to the amount of stimulus money. The minutes state that the amount going out is listed as $20.5 million, but the amount that OTO will receive over all is $22.5 million.

Mr. Newman motioned to approve the corrected minutes as presented. Ms. Cruise

seconded and the minutes were adopted unanimously.

# Public Comment Period

None

# Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Conklin thanked the Technical Committee for participating in the two scheduled e-meetings. A lot of emails are received when the members hit reply to all, but it is necessary to meet the Sunshine Law requirements.

The FY 2010 UPWP has been approved by the Board of Directors, MoDOT and FHWA. The City of Springfield employees, Ms. Edwards and Ms. Longpine that are on Contract with OTO, will become OTO employees effective July 1, 2009. OTO will no longer be contracting for FTE’s through the City of Springfield. OTO will contract for services with the City of Springfield for specific tasks. The FY2010 Contract with City of Springfield will be on the City of Springfield Council Agenda on June 1st and June 15th.

Mr. Conklin thanked MoDOT for assisting OTO in filling out six high priority project forms for Congressman Blunt’s Office. OTO staff utilized the OTO Priority Projects of Regional Significance to submit those forms along with a project request for City Utilities’ new buses. Those projects include U.S. 60, U.S. 65, north U.S. 160 and south U.S. I60.

Over the past few days, more information regarding the ARRA Discretionary Grant Program’s $1.5 billion in funding has become available. The Federal Register Notice has been handed out to the members. The deadline for those grants is September 15th and OTO staff will take comments on this proposed criterion guidance before June 1st.

If members have questions and as OTO finds out more information about this $1.5 billion dollars, that information will be shared. There is a link on the OTO website to the FHWA website where there is more information.

MoDOT District 8 will be hosting a mandatory workshop for all agencies and their consultants that are receiving ARRA funding for local projects. The workshop will take place on May 28th at the District Office.

All local agencies will need to apply for a DUNS Number. MoDOT should have been contacting the member jurisdictions already with regards to getting those numbers. With this meeting all of the ARRA Enhancement and STP Urban Funding will be programmed in the TIP, and approved at the June 18, 2009 Board of Directors Meeting.

Mr. Conklin thanked everyone for working together to identify projects that meet deadline criteria. The projects selected are a great accomplishment of the OTO region. Included in this agenda isa sheet that shows all the stimulus money, the projects that have been selected that have already been approved on the agenda, including the OTO funding, MoDOT funding, and the Local Match Funding. It is important to note that with the local funding, the ARRA project funding totals almost $58 million dollars in the OTO area.

OTO Board of Directors adopted a Reasonable Progress Policy on April 16, 2009. This was approved by the Technical Planning Committee at the March meeting. It will be discussed briefly, since this is critical that those jurisdictions utilizing meet the deadline. OTO had a deadline to get the member jurisdictions projects on this agenda which was May 4th. On June 18th, the Board of Directors will approve the remaining use of that funding. By July 1st, the Programming Data Forms should be submitted to MoDOT. By July 30th, Program Agreements should have been signed by local agencies and returned to MoDOT. By August 30th, the Final Engineering Services agreement of the plans specification and estimates need to be submitted to MoDOT. By September 30th, the money needs to be obligated. If it is not, OTO has set up procedures so that if any of these benchmarks are not met, the Board of Directors and look at how to spend the money within the OTO area. Ms. Sara Edwards or OTO Staff can assist members if more information on the Regional Progress Policy is needed.

The Board of Directors has asked that the OTO staff look at the Enhancements Funding Criteria that is utilized. OTO Staff will be working on that and bringing it to the Technical Planning Committee and to the Board of Directors in the next few months. Staff did attend the National American Planning Association Conference in Minneapolis. Staff will continue to update the members of any additional ARRA funding requirements. After this meeting, the TIP Subcommittee will meet. It is critical that OTO understand when the projects are proposed to be obligated and in what year.

Projects need to be shown correctly and there are quite a few who have participated in the past e-meetings to get the actual projects programmed in the correct year. In the future, projects and dollar amounts need to be shown correctly in the TIP.

# Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Report

Ms. Longpine stated there are two items that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee are currently working on. One is the current Bike Pedestrian Plan, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee would like to have a list of projects. These projects are meant to provide an awareness of what the needs are in the area. There is a form handed out at the this meeting that includes the letter that was sent out to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee and a form to provide needed information relating to the seven different categories.

The committee is looking to have that back by June 5th. The committee is asking that everyone work together in their communities to come up with one list. The second thing that the committee is working on is a kind of Best Practices Guide of Bicycle Friendly Streets. There is a form also attached to that packet that contains a nomination form with information. The committee would like to highlight the success stories in the OTO area and use the stories as a guide for future practices.

# New Business

* 1. Amendment Number Seven to the FY 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program

Ms. Edwards updated the Technical Committee on the process of numbering the TIP amendments. This is the seventh TIP amendment OTO has processed this year and there are nine specific amendment changes within the overall amendment.

**City of Battlefield Cloverdale Sidewalk FY 2009-2012 TIP Amendment**

The City of Battlefield is requesting to utilize ARRA funding to construct sidewalks along Cloverdale Street near the Wilson’s Creek Middle School. They are utilizing all of their suballocated ARRA Funding on that project. In the amount of $73,797.30 and it is 100 percent funding so there is no local match on that.

**Safe Routes Safety and Education Initiative Phase II FY 2009-2012 TIP Amendment**

An amendment is being requested to add an enhancement project in the amount of $91,250 for Ozark Greenways to provide safety and awareness for bicycle and pedestrian commuters within the OTO area. Where Ozark Greenways is getting the funding is from 2008 OTO allocated Enhancement funding to the City of Battlefield, in the amount of $73,000 dollars. The City of Battlefield is requesting to relinquish that money. Instead the City of Battlefield is using their ARRA money for a sidewalk project. The $73,000 will go back into the pot.

What had been discussed at the March 20th Enhancement meeting is that the Ozark Greenways project would be OTO’s next priority project because of the speed that Ozark Greenways could spend the money, since it is not an infrastructure project. The end is near for the transportation bill that expires on September 30. It is very important that OTO go ahead and spend all of the region’s Enhancement money.

The Enhancement Subcommittee decided at the meeting to recommend that if there were any Enhancement funds left over then they would go to this project. Since this is 80/20 money, Mr. Whaley will be required to match the funds, bringing the overall project to $91,250.

**Ozark Greenways Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning and Education FY 2009-2012 TIP Amendment**

A TIP amendment is proposed to utilize Springfield and Greene County STP-Urban funding to fund salaries for transportation planning and educational activities related to bicycle & pedestrian facilities and programs conducted by Ozark Greenways.

Each the City and Greene County are proposing $20,000 in STP Funds and Ozark Greenways is matching that amount. The total project cost is $50,000 with $20,000 from the City of Springfield, $20,000 from the County, and $10,000 from Ozark Greenways for salaries.

**Kansas & Evergreen FY 2009-2012 TIP Amendment**

An administrative TIP amendment is proposed to change the program year of the project from FY07 to FY09.

This is an intersection improvement project that was programmed back in 2007, and now due to different interpretations of the guidelines, it has to be in the current TIP to be obligated. OTO is proposing to move it into the current TIP.

**Route 66 Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan FY 2009-2012 TIP Amendment**

An administrative TIP amendment is proposed to change the program year of the project from FY08 to FY09.

The same interpretation of guidelines requires the OTO to move the Route 66 amendment to the current TIP to obligate the money.

**Route 66 Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan FY 2009-2012 TIP Amendment**

An administrative TIP amendment is proposed to change the program year of the project from FY08 to FY09.

This amendment should read “Route 66 Scenic Byway Signage”, which also is programmed in 2008, and should be in 2009. This is in the agenda under MPO Wide Operations and Maintenance, listed as a separate project so the TPC members can look at that as well.

**ITS Management and Operations FY 2009-2010 TIP Amendment**

An administrative TIP amendment is proposed for ITS Management and Operations. The request is to adjust the MoDOT and Federal Highway Administration funding to reflect revised estimates.

OTO is calling the amendment administrative because the change in funding is not more than twenty five percent.

**On Call Work Zone Enforcement FY 2009-2010 TIP Amendment**

An administrative TIP amendment is proposed for On Call Work Zone Enforcement. The request is to adjust the MoDOT and Federal Highway Administration funding to reflect revised estimates.

This funding change is not more than twenty five percent of the overall cost, so it is administrative.

**US 160/State Highway 14 Intersection FY 2009-2012 TIP Amendment**

An administrative TIP amendment is proposed to change the funding amounts and sources for the engineering and design of the US 160 and State Highway 14 intersection improvement project.

There was a typo. Instead of calling MoDOT the funding source, it instead needs to read “Local Funding.” MoDOT requested that OTO add five thousand dollars to the project for the in-house design review that will need to be completed.

Mr. Miller asked how much money is needed on advance construction. Ms. Edwards asked if it should be shown now or just in the new TIP. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Bernskoetter about the new TIP. Mr. Bernskoetter asked when it will need to move forward. Ms. Edwards mentioned it needs to move forward on October 1, 2009. The advance construction is listed a separate project in the TIP, effective October 1. Mr. Bernskoetter asked if anything will happen on this project prior to October 1, 2009. Mr. Miller stated that it will be in the FY 2009-2012 TIP. Ms. Edwards asked if the FY 09 funds were advance construction. Mr. Miller stated that they are all advance construction. The funds will be transferred in July. Mr. Bernskoetter stated that will need to be reflected to show that it is advance construction now rather than wait until October. Mr. Miller asked if at this point a note could be added to say that the advance construction would be reimbursed up to $14,000 by FHWA. Mr. Bernskoetter stated that this should be alright. This would be the first time that the construction actually is shown in the TIP. It should be noted in this TIP, because Federal Highway will question it when they review it.

Mr. Newman motioned to approve the TIP amendment number seven. Mr. Bishop seconded, and it the amendment was carried unanimously.

1. **STP-Urban Transfer from Battlefield to Greene County**

Mr. Conklin stated that the City of Battlefield has requested to transfer $20,000 in STP-Urban funds to Greene County.

The transfer will reimburse Greene County and the County will use these funds on another project within the MPO. This request has been approved by the City of Battlefield. The OTO By-Laws require a 75 percent vote of the member jurisdictions approving the transfer of funds from the City of Battlefield to Greene County. OTO is asking the Technical Committee to make a recommendation to the Board of Directors to transfer the $20,000 STP-Urban funds from the City of Battlefield to Greene County.

Mr. Lambeth made the motion to recommend the transfer to the Board of Directors. Mr. Newman seconded and the recommendation was carried unanimously.

1. **OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendments**

Mr. Conklin stated that the City of Springfield has proposed several amendments to the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan which includes the realignment and extension of a new Primary Arterial from Republic Road west of U.S. 60 to Farm Road 170.

The amendment will provide greater connectivity to a property west and east of U.S.60 & U.S. 65 and will increase the intersection and separation between U.S. 60 and the Glenstone Avenue Interchange. There are several collector street realignments that are proposed. The existing east/west collector has been replaced with a new primary arterial next to Farm Road 170. Minor modifications have been made to the collector street adjacent to the James River.

The extension of Republic Road would cross U.S. 65 and James River. Any future U.S. 65 interchange with the proposed Primary Arterial would have to be approved by MoDOT. When the extension of Republic Road is stated, it has not been named as Republic Road. On the map in the Packet, the proposed alignment is a bold line, next to the changes on the existing Major Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Howard stated that looking at the alignment along Farm Road 170, it is difficult to determine with all the dots and lines on the page exactly where the alignment is within this undeveloped property that is now subject to the City Planning and Zoning discussion that is on the table. It is a point of some contention and some antagonism to the folks that live in that area. In 2002 the City sought through the MPO to develop the Southeast Development Study. Many folks and organizations, who are still involved with the TPC, participated in the lengthy study which involved County, City, State, and Federal stakeholders.

Many others, including neighbors, met and selected a preferred alignment that met with the connection through this undeveloped property. That is the alignment that is being shown by a proposed developer now and it does not conform to what has been recommended in the Southeast Development Study, as subsequently approved by the MPO.

It appears that this proposal does not conform to the preferred alignment of the Southeast Development Study that was adopted in 2002. This has been brought up to make the Board aware of possible controversy. The MPO might not be following this previous line of discussion. The South East Development Study was put out at the urging of Mr. Fred May at that particular time, to give guidance to property owners in that particular area as to, what the future land use would be, what the routing of traffic would be and so forth. There is some concern, considering the fact that it is still under discussion within zoning and the City, on property that does not yet belong to the City.

Mr. Price asked if anyone wanted to start the discussion on Mr. Howard’s concern.

Mr. Newman stated that when the City puts lines on maps it always concerns folks because somebody is going to say “that is my home.” There are no homes shown but the proximity would say to somebody that the alignment is close to some existing homes. The meaning behind a line of the map is dependent on the stage of planning or engineering for a project. What this is intending to do, just as the OTO assumes with all of the Major Thoroughfare Plan Routes, that there is a way from A to B. There can be a dozen different ways that the route could actually follow here, and as in the Southeast Springfield Study. That was not a detailed study. The final routing that would be approved would come out of the specifics of the zoning case itself.

The opinion is that it is important now that the City has received a note of approval from MoDOT that they will have a favorable look on an interchange in this vicinity on U.S. 65 if there is a route that will serve that interchange. If it is going to be there, then it has got to meet certain criteria. The MPO has to at least look at the possibility of a routing from U.S. 65 back into Springfield. The City does not feel that it is too far off from where that line would go. On the other hand the County has a study that is looking at three different alignments on that side. Ultimately it is agreed that the routing of this major arterial will go to Farm Road 170.

The City is trying to convey that there is a need for this as determined in these studies, and that there is a possibility of a point of access. It is important for the MPO to recognize the need to extend the route across the southeastern part of the City and to show intent for the road to go there. On the other hand there are several steps that have to be gone through before anyone should be too concerned. Most of the concern should be directed towards the specifics of the zoning case and not the fact that the MPO has put on the Major Thoroughfare Plan the intent of connecting the dot.

Mr. Howard stated that Mr. Newman makes an interesting point. Because the folks in Planning and Zoning say that is not their job to determine that. They basically say exactly what Mr. Newman says, that it is a line on the map and it is the responsibility of the County. It is the responsibility of the City and ultimately all the traffic planning falls to the jurisdiction of the OTO which is now trying to indicate some guidance here to these other agencies, who say they do not have the deciding factor in it.

The feeling is that those who work day in and day out dealing with government do not always look at it from the perspective of property owners of an area and try to appreciate their frustration of going many months through study of the Southeast Development Study and participating in hours and hours of meetings. After going through four different alternatives for routing and to have that study recommend a preferred routing alternative, specifically in the study. Then to have it come back and to say that does not mean anything that the MPO is just going to put a line on a map.

The possibility is setting up a precedent, setting up an understanding that various entities have to deal with. It increases the people’s frustration. A lot of individuals do not know how the process works. They look at the process posing a burden on their time and efforts to get the public officials to listen to them. Then, when they think they have an understanding of how things are going move, they find that is not the case. Someone puts a line on a map. The issue is being raised from that perspective, for all too often planners look at this from a strictly planning perspective. The MPO is dealing with people’s investments and plans that they have made based upon a Study that was approved by the OTO and preferred by the OTO. And a study that appears on the City’s website as guidance to these people. The purpose of the Study was to examine how to develop the property and use it. It was a guiding document and now the OTO is just disregarding it. It is not even referenced.

Mr. Price asked if Mr. Howard could explain the difference between this line and the preferred line on the map of the Southeast Study.

Mr. Howard stated that this alignment goes more southernly to connect to Farm Road 170. The preferred alternative goes more to the north, basically following the utility easement, along the northern part of where all these properties where built.

Mr. Price asked if it crosses U.S. 65 at the same spot or different spot.

Mr. Howard stated that the crossing of U.S. 65 is not the issue, it is the alignment with the new proposed road into the development. It is from that point east, there is no concern about the connection with Farm Road 170, and it is how one gets to that point on Farm Road 170 as the road crosses the James River. The line that has been put on the map by the property owners and is under consideration by Planning & Zoning has chosen the southernly alignment. That brings it right into the Forest Ridge Property Development. People have built and developed on assurances, studies and participation. How the OTO looks at this, how the clinical standing looks, and how the real world looks at this, can differ.

Mr. Smith said it will take some significant engineering studies to determine where a bridge should go across the James River. Mr. Newman stated that the line could move significantly when the bridge is determined. Mr. Howard stated that was part of the discussion of the Southeast Development Study but the conclusion was that the bridge could be put anywhere, but the roadway could be put to circumvent those properties following the utility easement.

Mr. Smith stated that the people do not understand the distinction between a planning study and an engineering study. A planning study puts forth concepts and connecting from point A to point B. The Engineering study has to look at where you can get a bridge that is economical that can be maintained and that is not going to cause a problem. That is what the County is doing right now, going through an Engineering Study. In doing that, they are looking at multiple alignments trying to figure out which has the least impact and what is going to make the most sense. And before one of those alignments is approved there will be public meetings and it will give the public a chance to comment. That is where it is with the County as far as looking at the alignments.

This will not affect the study if it is interpreted correctly. This line is already on the Thoroughfare Plan. The City is saying that it is changing from a collector to a primary arterial, which will affect how the developer proceeds.

Mr. Howard stated that was part of the problem; that it was not on the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Newman stated that it was taken up as an informational item. There was no action on it, it was just information. The City of Springfield was just seeing if a developer was interested, and there was a potential that there could be a change. It was a matter of information at that time. The City and County thought it would best to at least to get it on the map.

Mr. Howard stated that he thought they were saying close to the same thing. There seems to be a distinction between the City’s interpretation of this and the interpretation of the public at large, at least a large number of the public. There appears to have been a distinction made on the Thoroughfare Plan, which was the guidance that the City provided the OTO to the public for future land use of the area. The Thoroughfare Plan also included these different options for routing traffic.

Mr. Newman stated that he wished Mr. Rognstad was present because he could fill the TPC in more about the Southeast Study. The Southeast Springfield Study primarily looked at the interchanges south. It did not really look at any details. If it did and there was a preferred alignment, the MPO should at least be made aware of that. There would still need to be a connector, and if the MPO follows that and puts it on the plan, maybe folks would be happier, but that still will not be what gets built. It would not lock it, because that planning study does not have the engineering element.

Mr. Howard said he understands that, but part of the frustration is that the motions are gone through and people are invited to come to the table and study and participate, and they do these things. They have these recommendations that are discussed with the Board and the MPO reaches an understanding and conclusion of what that study is supposed to do. It is supposed to be a guiding document for the future. Then the MPO has something else coming to the table that is completely different by everyone’s admission.

The Southeast Development Study has not been a part of the factors in the consideration of what the Technical Planning Committee is to consider. That was what the Study was intended to be. That is why the MPO spent the money for it. This disconnect is a problem for the OTO.

Mr. Smith asked if the new language references the Southeast Study and the hope is that the language did not change. That is something Mr. Rognstad would be aware of.

Mr. Howard stated the request was the reference of the specific Southeast Development Study, but then the issue is of one agency looking at another agency. If it should be specifically mentioned, this should say an alignment in consideration of the Southeast Development Study. This should say that. The proceeding before the zoning commission should say that. It should be talking about the same thing. When everyone starts talking about the same thing, the controversy is eliminated. The misunderstanding and the angst that is created out in the community is also eliminated. For those members that have to participate in those meetings and discussions it makes it go a lot easier if everyone is on the same page.

Mr. Price stated he would entertain a motion to table this item and reconsider it at the next Technical Committee Meeting with the Southeast Study as the alignment consideration.

Mr. Brown motioned to table the motion. Mr. Atchley seconded and the motion to table was carried with one abstention from Mr. Howard.

Ms. Edwards stated the OTO could put a link to the Southeast Development Study on the OTO website.

Mr. Miller stated that study was on the City of Springfield website.

Mr. Newman stated that it was not time critical so it would be looked at again.

1. **Member jurisdiction ARRA project update**

Mr. Conklin stated OTO is requesting each member to update the Technical Planning Committee on the status of their ARRA funded projects that are required by the adopted “OTO Reasonable Progress Policy” to be obligated by September 30, 2009.

**CC Study**

Mr. Atchley stated that the CC project is a joint Ozark, Nixa, Christian County project. It started out as a project utilizing STP funds. The three jurisdictions signed the Initial Programing Agreement. It has been executed and signed by the County and by MoDOT. MoDOT is in the process of preparing a supplemental agreement for the utilization of the ARRA funding. The County has gone through the RFQ process and the County had three submittals.

The County interviewed two of the three and selected Great River Engineering. (Palmerton and Parrish) is going to be doing the Geotechnical work.

Shaffer and Hines will complete some of the engineering work as well. The County should have a supplemental agreement from MoDOT by the middle of June.

Ms. Gardner stated that the supplemental agreement has been mailed.

**U.S. 65**

Mr. Miller stated that the plans have been completed on this project. MoDOT is looking at letting it in June.

Ms. Gardner stated that there was one more item on the CC Study. In the letter sent there was a 10 percent proposal to sign. The engineering firm will have to sign that.

**U.S. 60**

Mr. Miller was not sure if MoDOT was starting in Monett and Republic. There is a contract for construction on the Route AB.

**National and James River**

Mr. Miller stated that there are signed agreements from Springfield on the cost share for that project. MoDOT is still looking at the July letting.

**State Highway 14 and Third Street Traffic Study**

Mr. Childers stated that there is a redevelopment project downtown. Ozark is in the process of negotiation with the developer and they are working on Ozark’s final site plans for roadway improvement. Once the City of Ozark has gotten through that portion then they will need to go out for RFP on this project for additional engineering to be done. Ozark is just waiting on the final plans from the developer.

The second one is the Ozark Master Plan which Ozark is excited about. It will be a Master Improvement Plan to work on and identify the segments and intersections to prioritize those projects. There is a meeting on Friday to finalize the scope of that work. It has not begun yet, but City staff is getting approvals on May 20, 2009. As soon as the scope is finalized, then it will be under contract as soon as Friday.

**Sidewalk Project**

The sidewalk project is ARRA funding, but the City of Ozark was able to secure it as a stage three portion. The stage two portion was already underway with approval to go forward. They were able to just make a change order to the existing engineering contract to add this to the project.

The City of Ozark paid for that, it was not ARRA funds. The City of Ozark was able to make that change order and pick up that tab which allows the City to make the change order to a construction project which they will able to go forward with. The engineering should be done in thirty days.

Ms. Edwards asked when the project will be in construction.

Mr. Childers stated that the City will have to bid out the project so it will be another sixty to ninety days before that happens. It will probably be late August.

**City of Strafford**

Mr. Coltrin stated that the City of Strafford is in a similar position as Ozark. Strafford has entered in with the Engineer. The City entered into non-ARRA funding to modify and expand the sidewalk plans. Those plans are at eighty five percent right now. Monday night, the City of Strafford did approve the sidewalk, but did not have an ordinance. The next Council meeting will provide the ordinance to attach to the forms. Ms. Gardner will receive the Data Programming Forms long before the schedule requires it.

**State Highway 14/US 160**

Mr. Bingle stated that the City of Nixa is waiting on the project number once TIP approval comes from ONE DOT. The City will proceed with the Request for Qualifications as soon as the ONE DOT approval is received.

Ms. Gardner stated that the last TIP Amendment went to ONE DOT on Monday. Ms. Gardner is in the process of getting a project number so the program agreement can proceed. The RFQ can go forward as long as ARRA funds are not used. From this point forward any time Federal funds are used and a RFQ is submitted for engineering services, it will have to be advertised. Sending letters to a certain amount of engineering firms or making phone calls is no longer allowed. The new requirement is that is has to be advertised. It can be advertised online if it is supplemented with additional letters. The advertisement must be for two weeks. It can be posted on the jurisdiction website or on MoDOT’s website.

**City of Battlefield Sidewalks**

Mr. Hess stated that the Programming Data Form has been submitted and the DUNS number will be submitted May 21st. The Engineering for the project design is coming out of City funds, not ARRA funds. The remainder of the easements will be signed, as soon as the City receives the approval. The RFQs will then be submitted.

Ms. Gardner stated that the final design plans must be to MoDOT by August 30.

Mr. Conklin stated that the MPO has an opportunity here to show how the MPO can get these projects moving and completed. It would be wonderful to have 100 percent of the region’s Stimulus money programmed.

**City of Willard**

Mr. Brown stated that the City of Willard is working with Olsson Associates. The Programming Data Form is complete. The City is taking a resolution to the next Council Meeting and will be submitting that. Preliminary survey along with the right of way has been identified. Mr. Turner is the Representative from Olsson that the City of Willard is working with at this time. Everything is starting to be put to paper.

Mr. Conklin stated that the City of Strafford is getting an ordinance for their project. Does it matter if it is an ordinance or a resolution?

Ms. Gardner stated that it would have to be an ordinance.

**Frisco/Highline Trail**

Ms. Gardner stated that she was talking on Mr. Whaley’s behalf. Ozark Greenways will do a design sheet to show the overlay, since the project is already designed. The Program and Data Sheets have been mailed.

**City Utilities**

Ms. Cruise stated that City Utilities has two projects, the Transfer Station and the expansion of the Maintenance Campus. Both of those projects have to contain some Enhancement and Security improvements. The Transfer Station Feasibility Study is complete. City Utilities is in the process of obtaining property. The Maintenance Campus Feasibility Study is winding down and is almost complete. City Utilities is hoping to put out an RFP for design work next month. The packet calls the funds other Federal Funds on the Transfer Station line. City Utilities actually had two earmarks and this is only showing one. For a total of $3.1 million federal funds, the other federal funds, and the local would change to $775,000.

Mr. Price stated that this concludes the updates.

Ms. Gardner mentioned that there is a mandatory meeting coming up for anyone receiving ARRA Funds. That is a Statewide Mandatory Meeting and the letters for the members should arrive shortly. The meeting is June 10th at the Jefferson City Capital Plaza.

Mr. Bernskoetter stated that the meeting is to be held in the Capital Plaza and that the letters should have been sent out today. It is mandatory for local jurisdictions that received the ARRA funds to attend the meeting. Jurisdictions that did not receive ARRA funds do not need to be there.

Ms. Cruise asked if this meeting was only for Federal Highway Fund recipients. Ms. Gardner responded that it was only for Federal Highway Fund Recipients.

Andy Mueller usually sits on this Committee. He has been temporarily reassigned to be the “sheep dog” of all local agencies for the State Priority projects. His job is to make sure that all local projects run smoothly and meet the deadline.

The question was raised if the STP Funds were given to a State Project, does the jurisdiction still need to attend the June 10 meeting? Ms. Gardner stated that only if the jurisdiction was actually receiving the funds because of the deadlines topics.

Mr. Miller stated that on the State projects either OTO or MoDOT will handle all the reporting requirements. MoDOT is handling the work with the contractors, because MoDOT has to send information to them to make sure they certify how many jobs they have created, and how much money has been spent.

Ms. Edwards asked if they need to attend the meeting even if it is Enhancement funds. Mr. Miller stated that even if it is just Enhancement funds the members still need to attend. Mr. Bernskoetter stated the deadline is geared towards the Enhancement projects and STP projects.

## Other Business

# Technical Committee Member Announcements

Members are encouraged to announce transportation events being scheduled that may be of interest to OTO Technical Committee members.

Mr. McIntosh thanked everyone at the table that jumped in at very short notice and put together information so that Congressman Blunt would be in the position to submit to the Committee Chairman the High Priority Projects. The projects have been submitted and in two or three years the results will be found out, but there was a lot of work done and it is appreciated.

Mr. Newman stated that on September 20 through 22, Springfield will be hosting the joint Missouri Valley Section of ITE at the University Plaza. The Technical Committee Members will be on the mailing list. The theme for the conference is “Smarter, Safer, and Sustainable.” There will be some nationally recognized speakers and presenters. It will be a major conference with about two hundred or more attendees.

Mr. Price stated that there was a celebrity in the room. Mr. Earl Newman is one of the APWA Top 10 Public Officials of the Year. There are only ten officials chosen in North America, which includes the Public Works Officials in Canada as well as the United States. Mr. Marc Thornsberry was selected about seven or eight years ago, and Mr. Earl Newman was selected this year as well as David Miller in Branson. Missouri has quite a distinction of two of the top ten people in 50 states as well as Canada.

Mr. Bernskoetter stated that something the Federal Highway requires the MPO to do every four years is go through Federal Certification. Federal Certification review for Ozarks Transportation Organization has been scheduled for July 21-23. The reason this is brought up is that not only do they review MoDOT processes, OTO, and their processes with the local jurisdictions but also how well all the members work together.

A TMA or Transportation Management Area is required to hold a public meeting during certification. It will likely be in the evening. The way it has happened in Kansas City and St. Louis, it will likely be on the evening of the 22nd, possibly on the 21st. FHWA and FTA will run that meeting.

1. **Transportation Issues For Technical Committee Member Review**

Mr. Conklin stated that there is guidance in the packet on the $1.5 billion in Discretionary Funding. Projects have to be at least $20 million up to $300 million. OTO Staff is not sure how the money is going to be distributed. No more than 20 percent of the funds will go to one state. There will be a lot of competition with the 50 states.

## Adjournment

Mr. Price made the motion to adjourn at 2:40 p.m. Mr. Howard moved and the meeting was adjourned.