OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES

August 18, 2011

The Board of Directors of the Ozarks Transportation Organization met at its scheduled time of 12:00 p.m. in the Busch Municipal Building, 4th Floor Conference Room, in Springfield, Missouri.

The following members were present:

Ms. Becky Baltz, MoDOT Mr. Tom Finnie, Citizen-at-Large

Mr. Harold Bengsch, Greene County Ms. Teri Hacker, Citizen-at-Large

Mr. Phil Broyles, City of Springfield (a) Mr. Lou Lapaglia, Christian County (Chair)

Mr. Steve Childers, City of Ozark (a) Ms. Lisa Officer, City Utilities

Mr. Jerry Compton, City of Springfield Mr. Bob Scheid, Airport Board

Mr. J. Howard Fisk, Citizen-at-Large Mr. Jim Viebrock, Greene County

1. *Denotes alternate given voting privileges as a substitute for voting member not present*

The following members were not present:

Mr. Mokhtee Ahmad, FTA Ms. Roseann Bentley, Greene County (a)

Mr. Sam Clifton, City of Nixa Mr. Thomas Bieker, City of Springfield (a)

Mr. Tom Keltner, City of Willard Mr. Shawn Billings, City of Battlefield (a)

Mr. Aaron Kruse, City of Battlefield Mr. Brian Bingle, City of Nixa (a)

Mr. Jim Huntsinger, City of Republic Mr. Jim Bresee, Christian County (a)

Mr. Bradley McMahon, FHWA Mr. John Elkins, Citizen-at-Large (a)

Mr. Shane Nelson, City of Ozark Mr. Larry Highfill, City of Strafford (a)

Mr. Jim O’Neal, City of Springfield Mr. Jim Krischke, City of Republic (a)

Mr. John Rush, City of Springfield Mr. Steve Meyer, City of Springfield (a)

Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA Mr. Mr. Tom Rankin, City Utilities (a)

Mr. John Vicat, City of Strafford Mr. Tim Smith, Greene County (a)

Mr. Brian Weiler, Springfield-Branson National Airport (a)

Others Present: Mr. Ray Weter, State Representative, 142 District; Mr. Dan Wadlington, Senator Roy Blunt’s Office; Mr. Dan Smith, Greene County Highway Department; Mr. Matt Baker, Congressman Billy Long’s Office; Mr. Frank Miller and Mr. Kirk Juranas, MoDOT; Ms. Sara Edwards, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Mr. Curtis Owens, Mr. Chris Stueve and Mr. Michael Sparlin, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Ms. Ann Razer and Mr. Ralph Rognstad Jr., City of Springfield Planning & Development; Ms. Megan Hammer, Senator Claire McCaskill.

Mr. Lapaglia called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

1. **Administration**
2. **Introductions**
3. **Approval of Board of Directors Meeting Agenda**

Mr. Finnie made the motion to approve the Board of Directors Meeting Agenda. Mr. Keltner seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. **Approval of the June 17, 2011 Meeting and June 23, 2011 E-Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Finnie made the motion to approve the June 17, 2011 Meeting and June 23, 2011 E-Meeting Minutes. Ms. Hacker seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. **Public Comment Period**

None

1. **Executive Director’s Report**

Ms. Edwards stated that the OTO has the Transit Study Consultants under contract, to look at the current configuration of routes as well as possible extensions and to other jurisdictions. They are going to be in town the second week of October to conduct stakeholder interviews and public meetings. The OTO is looking at a February or March completion date on the study. There is no word on ozone standards. They said they would have them out the last week of July and that is still being debated up in Washington. We will hopefully get something out in the next couple of weeks. There is still nothing on the Federal reauthorization.

1. **Legislative Reports**

Ms. Burks and Mr. Usery presented updates on different legislative pieces in Washington.

# New Business

1. STP Urban Balance June 2011 Report

Ms. Edwards stated that each year the OTO is allocated STP Urban funds, usually around $4.5 but it varies each year. We sub allocate that money to our jurisdictions based on population. We do have a requirement enacted by MoDOT that we can accrue no more than three years of that at any one time, or it would be subject to the be forfeited. This report is looking really good this year. It is based on the requirement of the federal fiscal year, which is September 30th. So we are well out in advance looking at this September 30th deadline. To sum it up we are allowed to have fourteen million dollars, we are looking at a balance of five million. That is looking at some significant cost shares with MoDOT, from many different jurisdictions, to the tune of $11 million dollars. We are really doing a good job of spending this money. We are in no danger of forfeiting any funds.

1. Financial Statements for 4th Quarter FY 2011

Ms. Parks presented the 4th Quarter FY 2011 budget. The OTO operates off of a Consolidated Planning Grant that through MoDOT, which is 80% reimbursable. Because of the nature of our reimbursable grant it is important to have an operating fund balance. Included is the operational fund balance report. As of July 31, the balance was $194,161, going off the policy adopted that is a healthy balance. The OTO was under budget due to several key factors. There were several staffing changes. The executive director position and planner position sat empty for a couple of months. This resulted in a net of $70,000 under budget in the salary line. The TIP software was budgeted at $25,000, we moved that to the FY 2012. Printing was budgeted for $21,000 but was under budget due to the Long Range Transportation Plan but that will be completed in this fiscal year instead. We saved $50,000by not purchasing a New Travel Model. Instead we just did a Travel Model Update, to save the OTO $40,000. The Fixed Route Transit Study was not done, instead it rolled over to this fiscal year. The Statewide passenger Rail study, but we did not have to contribute on that. As far as the In-Kind match funds we really appreciate the time that you allow us to count at the Board of Directors meetings. For those of you who are new to the Board of Directors we will be sending out a letter so that you can count your time. The OTO had a lot of major projects last year that did not get completed, but they will get completed this fiscal year.

Mr. Lapigla commended the OTO for striving to meet their budget.

Mr. Scheid made the motion to accept the 4th Quarter FY 2011 Financial Statements. Ms. Hacker seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. FY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program

Mr. Owens explained what the Transportation Improvement Program was and the TIP update process. The Technical Planning Committee recommended that the TIP be brought to the Board for approval. On the comments section, we made the TIP available to the public in our office in addition copies of the TIP were placed in the Library Center and made available on our website. We asked for comment to be back by August 17. We ended up with four comments and they are in the Board packet. Two of the comments were related bicycle and pedestrian. One other comment was related to I-65 and Battlefield for the on and off ramp. There is not enough information on that at the time. When we get information we will respond to that. The fourth comment was related to HWY 160, Willard. At this time there is not funds available for that project.

The TIP sections include Aviation this year. A project came in on that. What used to be the enhancement section is now the Bicycle and Pedestrian section. We have renamed that for comments that were received from Federal Highway. In the Aviation section the OTO received 4.9 million for programming from aviation improvement programs. The largest project is the midfield terminal reimbursement. They are just standard. There are no new funding programs under the Bicycle and Pedestrian section. Projects that were previously programmed in the TIP are moved to the financial section so we can see where they are at when they are completed. One of the major projects that we have is the FY10. We had $1 million coming out for the Kearney Street improvements from Kansas Expressway to Glenstone sidewalks. This is just a list not a comprehensive list of expansion projects. Wanted to get a feel of the area. Wanted to see where the projects were laying and how they were really playing out in the OTO area.

Financial constraints for the roadway, we had a total of $157 million for the TIP three year program. $26 million of that comes out for operations and maintenance. The STP suballocated goes to the jurisdicitions and we let the jurisdictions make the calls on how to spend the funds.

I am going to be giving a chart for the total remaining is $93 million. Out of that $93 million there is $81 + for programming. Out of the programmed funds we have $400,000 for scoping. He went through highlights in the TIP as printed in the packet.

The Local Coordinating Board for Transit recently met and reviewed the grant process, there were four grant opportunities here. 5310 are discretionary funds and they are the local coordination board put together two projects hoping to get both of them. The first project that they selected was 15 passenger van for the Springfield Workshop. The funds are available for the second project. The Burrell for a 15 passenger van is the recipient of the second. 5316 is the Job Access and Reverse Commute Grant. City Utilities was awarded 5316 for continuing four lines. Continuation of the four lines. 5317 City Utilites also received close to $75,000 for bus shelters, turnouts, benches and that sort of thing.

Mr. Finnie made the motion to approve the 2012-1015 Transportation Improvement Program. Mr. ? seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. **Aerial Photo Cooperative Agreement**

Ms. Edwards stated that in the past, since 2001, OTO has partnered with different area entities to purchase aerial photography. The City of Springfield is the lead on that and they actually go under contract to purchase the aerials. Last time we had a partnership with Greene, Christian and several area jurisdictions. This time we are a little uncertain as to who will be able to participate due to budget restraints. The City of Springfield’s GIS department did outline a proposal based on OTO contributing $40,000 and other partners being included. It is a really great deal for us to be able to use our Federal funds to purchase aerial photography and to be able to directly offset the cost for the counties, city utilities, and the cities. It is just a direct offset of cost since we use their local funds and all of your spending to provide the match for the federal funds balance. The Technical Committee did meet on August 17, 2011 and recommend that this be approved. The flight will not be until February, and Springfield did agree that we would reimburse them after July 1 in our new budget year so what we would do is just put this in our new budget.

Mr. asked when the last time this was flown. Ms. Edwards stated in 2009. It will be flown in 2012, we are on a three year schedule. Mr. ? asked if our approval was subject to receiving funds from the other entities? The OTO is not committing to paying for all the entities? Ms. Edwards stated that there has been discussion that in the event that we are only able to fly Greene County and not Christian County we will need to look at our prorated share. We do not need to contribute the full $40 if we are only looking at part of our area.

Mr. Lapigalia stated that Christian County is moving ahead with it. We have entities within that are still deciding.

Mr. Fisk made the motion to authorize staff to enter into an agreement to partner for the purchase of aerial photography. Mr. Broyles seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Report

Ms. Longpine stated that included in the mailing packet the OTO Bicycle Pedestrian Report. This something that we have done in the past, but more for internal purposes as opposed to a report for the public. This year we really wanted to highlight what we have been able to accomplish, from the recommendations from the prior plan. You will list our goals were included in the prior plan and then we wanted to show what goals we are going to be moving towards. Then in the report we plan to highlight we actually met these goals. We have done this in several different ways. The Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee as part of OTO helped with the background on a lot of this for bringing everyone together. There was a lot of cooperation. Through community support we worked with Ozarks Greenways and Community Partnerships. With infrastructure we have accomplished a lot of different projects in the area. There have been a lot of Bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Springfield has street scapes, a lot of additional ADA accommodations and some trail work as well. Specifically we highlight some of the Safe Routes to School systems in the area, the walking school bus, and education programs. Really a lot of the bicycle and pedestrian accomplishments in the area have been a effort of everyone working together towards the goals in our plan.

1. Growth Trends Report

Mr. Stueve stated that the Growth Trends Report 2010 was included in the packet. Basically the report looks at resident construction activity and population change within the OTO area and the Springfield Metropolitan area over the year 2010 and also comparing to 2000-2010. A lot of residential construction numbers came from building permit activity which was provided by each of our jurisdictions so a big thank you to everyone who provided data. It makes the report more accurate. If you do not see a map of your jurisdiction your data did go into the overall numbers. There are three main sections of the report, the first section is Building Permits and Construction Activity for various jurisdictions in the OTO and the OTO as a whole. The second section is population numbers and also includes OTO economic data and analysis of per capita income, median income, employment data. The third section is a series of maps of the entire OTO area. You can see where the growth is incurring. Growth is incurring everywhere. If there are any question you can contact the OTO office staff. This report is on the website.

1. Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update

Ms. Longpine stated that throughout the planning process the OTO wanted to keep the Board of Directors up to date with the progress of the plan information that we are including with the plan. Included with the packet is a list of performance measures that we have been working on in our subcommittee. As well as an anylsis of the public input that we have received of the course of the planning process. Really quickly I will highlight the performance measures, we have adjusted a couple of different areas, congestion, road conditions, basically looking at the bicycle and pedestrian and air quality. For each of those we have included a description. We look a the current trend and values to help us set our targets going forward for 2035. We include that target for 2035. We are trying to keep that more general, we are looking at more of a range. Going forward all the discussion of the authorization that has happened so far, performance measures have come up over and over again. We are not required to have it in place at this moment. We wanted to get a head start because we know what we would be facing if Federal Highway or ONEDOT would enact certain goals to make our funding.

One the public input survey we received 111 response both at our public meetings and on the internet. We asked a variety of questions, for example, we asked them what they thought would best improve mobility in the area. Then the responses included widening and building roads, expanding transit, and adding pedestrian facilities. We had them put it in the order of importance. We asked them what considerations public officials should have in transportation decision making. And they highlighted congestion efficiency and safety. Then changes that they would most like to see to the region including roadway design, adding and improving sidewalks, and adding and improving bike paths.

As far as what is next for the Long Range Plan we are going to finalize the draft right now. We have had a lot of meeting and requested a lot of information into the planning document. We are looking at having it done for the Technical Planning Committee in September and for Board Review in October, and actually going for adoption in November and December. We will be having public hearings as soon as the draft is done, and those will be in the last week of September and first week of October. We will let everyone know on the schedules, hopefully everyone will be able to help us advertise.

Mr. Finnie asked on the vehicle miles per capita what is the basis for that. Ms. Longpine stated that the VMT (vehicle miles traveled) per capita we included that information from MoDOT. The provided the report for every year based on the OTO boundries.

Mr. Miller stated that the MoDOT data was based on the traffic counts. Mr. Finnie asked if they just took traffic counts on certain routes and project them out. Mr. Miller stated that the counts are done on all the MoDOT routes, and we are able to determine the amount vehicle miles traveled on the roads. Mr. Finnie stated that these are just counts on MoDOT roads. Mr. Millers stated yes it was just on the MoDOT roads. Ms. Longpine stated that on the modal split that was from the census. Going forward we should be able to get that information updated and really see the trends.

1. Kansas Expressway Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendment

Ms. Edwards stated that the City of Springfield requested that the major throughfare plan be amended for Kansas Expressway. This is just for the section South of James River Freeway and Republic Road. This will align up with the future Kansas Expressway Extension, which we already have classified as a primary arterial. Kansas Expressway North of James River Freeway is classified as an expressway and will remain that. We are just talking about this section that is currently classified as an expressway. The City is requesting that it be classified as a primary arterial. Basically it does change the right of way, a lot of that comes out of the median. We already have a constructed roadway. It really makes sense at this point to break the classification at the Freeway instead of at Republic Road. Staff is recommending approval and the Technical Committee also recommends approval.

Mr. Finnie stated he plans on voting no. The reason that he is voting no is that it opens a door, to have another traffic light. To most of the community it looks like Kansas Expressway it does not stop at the Freeway, it stops at Republic Road. It is just as logical as James River, and I think it would be unfortunate to open the door to more traffic impediments there. I think it also opens the door, in the extension of Kansas Expressway to make it look like a regular road versus an expressway. And it opens the road in my mind, to change the Kansas Expressway designation. In the next ten years if we are not careful to looking more and more like Chestnut Expressway, and less and less like Kansas or the West By-Pass. I think that the By-Pass is the right model; Kansas in my mind is already slipping as an Expressway in this system.

Mr. Broyles stated that in full disclosure, what started this was the Price Cutter on Republic Road, requested a right in right out onto Kansas Expressway. That caused the City of Springfield’s Traffic People to take a look at that section, what they looked at was the volume change at James River Freeway. It reduces about 25% when you go South at the Freeway. North of the Freeway is over 26,000 and it is under 20,000 South. The section from Republic Road South has been mapped as it goes into the county as a primary arterial.

Mr. Finnie stated that the traffic counts go down since there is only one block before the road ends. If you open it up to the new section of road those traffic counts will probably go back up. It would open it up for a request for a traffic light.

Mr. stated that the pressure may be there but that is not the request at this time. The request at this time is just for the reclassification.

Ms. Hacker stated that she thought there was a lot of logic in what Mr. Finnie had presented. Our responsibility is to look long term and to see what can happen when we make small changes in our plan. I am going to vote no as well.

Mr. stated he travels this road every day many times a day. I have to agree with Tom I do not think it is a good idea.

Mr. asked Mr. Broyles if the City had considered what characteristic Kansas will take on when the new road is put in. Mr. Broyles stated that this was just in response to the request of the grocery store. It is probably in response to the new grocery store going in down the road. What they are trying to do is improve the access from the North to get in and out of the store. We are allowing U turns at Kansas.

Mr. Finnie stated he knew that, he is thinking further down the road that there will be a lot of traffic there when the new road is opened up. Our job is to think what is best.

Mr. Compton asked if there was a right in right out at the new Hyvee. Mr. Broyles stated there will be because of the new city street that is going in behind the will come through the parking lot. It is controlled by medians just like this section. Mr. Compton asked what the overall public road if we were to allow this. Would it decrease problems with the traffic there. Mr. Broyles stated it remains to be seen. It is possible. The thing with Republic Road is we are looking at some sort of temporary arrangement to be able to get them out to Republic road so they can go East. Right now they have a real problem unless they make a U-Turn. Mr. Broyles stated that City does not really have an opinion. They just responded to the need in a way that was logical due to the split at the Freeway. It seemed that an Expressway should go from Freeway to Freeway which it does, it just extends a little farther.

Mr. Fisk says that he agrees with Mr. Finnie’s position. Preserving a corridor is very important. How the road is set up is not a surprise to people when they decide to develop a site. I do not blame any business for asking.

Mr. Broyles made the motion to approve the requested major thoroughfare plan amendment. Mr. Fisk seconded the motion. The motion did not carry. It was declined.

1. OTO Office Relocation

Ms. Edwards stated that the primary purpose of the OTO Board, the reason we receive Federal funds, what we are charged with is to conduct the collectory planning process. What that means is our job is to bring all of our partners together in one place to make transportation decisions. We are very thankful that the City has been letting us use the 4th floor conference room at no charge. The County has been allowing us to use their conference room at no charge. The University has been giving us space pretty cheaply. However, it is harder and harder to schedule meetings, and it is confusing for our members. It is confusing for our members when we move meetings, trying to figure out where there are, always at a different place. The primary purpose would be to get us a meeting room. We would be going from about 1,000 square feet to 2,750 square feet with a large conference room. We would have an additional office from what we have right now. It is space to grow. It is space to have a professional atmosphere. We would be looking at significant time savings in the agenda. From scheduling, travel time getting to meetings. So the Executive Committee has been meeting for about six months looking at different spaces, looking at the pros and cons, looking at the rent rate. There has been a lot of different issues. Specifially defined we wanted a conference room, we safe environment, we want a professional atmosphere; we wanted the ability to park when we have to have ADA accessibility. What we are looking at is the Holland Building with a five year lease term. The rent would be fixed for three years and then have a three percent increase after that. There increase in annual cost is approximately $38,800 dollars for years two and three and then it would be up to about $40,000 for the last two years of the lease. The equates to approximately $7,600 in local dues match portion. There would not be an increase at all. We would be using the existing funding that we have. We have been able to keep the dues because of the In-Kind contributions that were talked about earlier. We have In-Kind work that MoDOT does for us. We have Ozarks Commute.com that is advertised on the City Utility buses for us that we get to count as In-kind match. Part of it we would be able to conduct training. We get free training opportunities from Federal Highway and Federal Transit. The lease does include all utilities, internet and trash service. There is not insurance or taxes on top of the lease. Every thing is included in the rent, even Spring net internet. The owner is paying for the infill, all the walls, carpet and paint to make it ready. There are elevators to make it ADA accessible

Mr. asked how the conference room was compared to this one? Ms. Edwards stated that it is different since the 800 square feet is longer and narrower. It will fit more people at the table. It will be designed to fit the Technical Committee at the table. We will not have the space issue.

Mr. Lapigalia stated that as a point of information the OTO Executive Committee voted for this unanimously to bring it to the Board.

Mr. Finnie stated this was a real positive a step in the right direction.

Mr. thanked the Executive Committee for their work on it.

Mr. Fisk commented that there was a wide diversity in the spaces that were looked at from the IBM building to the Hammonds Office Building to the College Station Parking Garage Downtown. You name it we looked at it to see what would suit us. There are meetings that take place all over town each week that could take place here. Another thing we thought of was the travel time of our staff. Our staff was continently dragging things all over town. It is really a more important use of their time to stay in one place.

Mr. Finnie made the motion to authorize the OTO Executive Committee to enter into a lease agreement to relocate to the Holland Building. Ms. Hacker seconded and the motion carried.

1. Unified Planning Work Program Amendment for Office Relocation

Ms. Edwards stated that the Unified Planning Work Program is our budget. In order to do the relocation we do have to process an official amendment. This document is our official budget that federal highway approves. We are looking an increase this year up $67,524 that is to cover moving expenses, additional conference room, as well as the rent. As I said earlier the rent will be $38,800. I put a list of the balance of our federal funds. We have a significant reseserve of federal funds. We feel we have gone through the budget very thoroughly and we feel that it is a responsible expenditure for us. I wanted to mention that our federal allocation from ONEDOT has been running about $472,378.00 a year. We got news yesterday that our most recent allocation has gone up to $521,000.

Mr. Fisk made the motion to approve the requested UPWP amendment. Mr. Broyles seconded and the motion carried.

1. Executive Director Annual Evaluation Process

Mr. Lapigalia stated the semi-annual review of Ms. Edwards and Mr. Fisk took it upon himself with the Executive staff to come up with different questions that were received. He compiled them in the computer. I have that copy. If you want to discuss them we will ask Ms. Edwards and staff to step outside. If the Board wishes to see the compiled questions I will pass them out.

Mr. Finnie stated it would be good if it was sent out and let us look at them in advance. Mr. Fisk asked if there would be a formal evaluation at the end of the year, and everyone would be receiving the same questionnaire. We will discuss it in the October meeting.

Ms. Edwards stated that

1. **Other Business**
2. **Board of Directors Member Announcements**
3. **Transportation Issues For Board of Directors Member Review**

None

1. Articles for Board of Directors Member Information
2. **Adjournment**Targeted for **1:45 P.M.** The next Board of Directors regular meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 20, 2011 at 12:00 P.M. in the Busch Municipal Building Fourth Floor Conference Room.