OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION

**TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**July 27, 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. Earl Newman, City of Springfield (chair) Mr. Shawn Schroeder, Airport

Mr. Randall Brown, City of Willard (a) Ms. Carol Cruise, City Utilities

Mr. Bill Robinett, MoDOT Mr. King Coltrin, City of Strafford

Mr. Ralph Rognstad, City of Springfield Mr. Ryan Mooney, Chamber of Commerce

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

Mr. Roger Howard, BNSF Mr. Terry Whaley, Ozark Greenways

Mr. David Brock, City of Republic Mr. Joel Keller, Greene Co. Planning Dept. (a)

Mr. Brian Bingle, City of Nixa Mr. David Hutchison, City of Springfield (a)

Ms. Dawne Gardner, MoDOT Mr. Dan Smith, Greene Co. Highway Dept.

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

1. *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. Bradley McMahon, FHWA

Mr. Harry Price, City of Springfield Mr. Mike Giles, City of Springfield (a)

Mr. Daniel Nguyen, FTA (a) Ms. Ann Razer, City of Springfield (a)

Mr. Kent Morris, Greene Co. Planning Dept Mr. Rick Hess, City of Battlefield (a)

Ms. Diane May, SMCOG Mr. Paul Hood, City of Willard

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) Ms. Diane Gallion, City Utilities (a)

Mr. Gary Snavely, MSU Mr. David Bishop, R-12 Schools

Mr. Eric Bernskoetter, MoDOT Mr. Rick Artman, Greene Co. Highway Dept. (a)

Others present were: Mr. Tim Conklin, Ms. Sara Edwards, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Ms. Debbie Parks and Mr. Chris Stueve, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Mr. Steve McIntosh, Congressman Roy Blunt’s Office; Mr. Carl Carlson, Scott Consulting Engineers; Ms. Stacy L. Burks, Senator Bond’s Office; Ms. Gail Noggle, City of Republic; Mr. Jim Krischke, City of Republic; Ms. Carla Escobar, MoDOT.

Mr. Newman called the meeting of the Technical Planning Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

I. **Administration**

**A. Introductions**

Mr. Newman stated that the way the Technical Planning Committee is structured, that the City of Springfield would chair the meeting. (Mr. Price was absent). There is no Vice Chair for the OTO Technical Planning Committee. Mr. Newman stated he would serve unless there were any objections.

**B. Approval of Technical Committee Meeting Agenda**   
Mr. Bingle motioned to approve the Technical Planning Committee Meeting Agenda. Mr. D. Mooney seconded and the agenda was carried unanimously.

# C. Approval of the May 20, 2009 Meeting and June 5, 2009 E-meeting Minutes

Ms. Cruise motioned to approve the May 20, 2009 Meeting Minutes. Mr. Whaley seconded and the May 20, 2009 minutes were carried unanimously. Mr. Brock motioned to approve the June 5, 2009 E-meeting Minutes. Mr. Brown seconded and the June 5, 2009 E-meeting Minutes carried unanimously.

**D. Public Comment Period**   
None

**E. Executive Director’s Report**Mr. Conklin stated that OTO will be sending a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for all the planning partners to update and sign. The OTO is required to update these as soon as possible. OTO staff has talked to a couple of the jurisdictions about getting the MOU on their commission or council agenda. Staff will be contacting the other jurisdictions this week about the MOU. OTO has met with City Utilities on the Transit Draft MOU and plans to place it on the August Board of Directors Meeting MOU.

Of the $7,433,697 ARRA Funds, 84 percent have been obligated. The next milestone for OTO with regards to the ARRA funds is August 30 when the final approved plans, specifications, and estimates are to be turned into MoDOT. The City of Nixa was the first project to reach the August 30, milestone with submission of the engineering service contract for 160 and HWY 14. Beginning in September the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is planning on highlighting the best and worst performers on implementing the ARRA infrastructure programs. The next reporting to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will be September 30, 2009. The local projects will not show up until the November 30th reporting deadline.

The OTO Federal Certification Review will be August 25 through 27. The public meeting is scheduled at the Library Center on August 25, 4 to 6 p.m. The Board of Directors adopted an OTO purchasing policy and OTO appointed a purchasing agent, Deborah Parks. Greene County gave assistance with their purchasing department in setting up the OTO purchasing policies and programs. The Board of Directors also passed a Sunshine Law, since OTO is organized as a governmental entity OTO must comply with that law.

As of July 1st all OTO employees are employed directly by OTO. OTO is no longer contracting for FTE’s through the City of Springfield. OTO will also be transferring the computer network to OTO’s own network. The email addresses will change from the springfieldmo.org to Ozarkstransportation.org in the next few weeks. Staff will send out an email to remind everyone to change their contacts.

Mr. Conklin thanked the jurisdictions for submitting the membership dues for the fiscal year. OTO has been working with MoDOT and FHWA to look at in-kind match to help create an operating fund balance for OTO. OTO will be able to charge the time of members to attend the Technical Planning Committee Meetings and other standing meetings that are held by OTO. Federal Highway would like know what the hourly rate is for each member. This form will be filed for audit purposes. OTO tried to use the volunteer rate, however for those members who are in paid nonfederal positions OTO will need the actual hourly rate for Federal Highway.

Mr. Schroeder asked how the requirements of the Sunshine Law met on the E-meetings were being met. Mr. Conklin stated that all information is posted to the website as members vote.

Ms. Edwards stated that there is also a notice and press release for the public stating that the public can come to the office and attend the e-meeting and watch it.

**F.** **Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Report**Ms. Longpine stated that the next meeting will be August 4, 2009. The Committee will review the priorities that have been received. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee have not actually received every jurisdiction’s priorities. Once received, the committee will have a good base for what type of projects are priorities in the region and what types of things to incorporate into the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The next meeting will also be reviewing nominations for Bicycle and Pedestrian Best Practices. The committee is looking to highlight the successes of the region and will do two things. One is to create a smaller book that shows the ways that areas can achieve different levels of infrastructure and bicycle/pedestrian programs; whether it is doing pedestrian safety, streetscapes or afterschool programs, for example. The committee is also going to incorporate those local examples into the bicycle/pedestrian plan. The forms for both of those projects are on the OTO website under Bike/Ped, for those of members who would like to email it back.

**II. Unfinished Business**

# City of Springfield Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendments

Mr. Conklin stated that at the May Technical Planning Committee, this item was tabled in order to reference the 2002 Southeast Springfield Development Study that was accepted by Springfield and OTO. Committee Members were asked to reference the OTO Board December 2003 action and associated map and the City of Springfield Council Bill 2002-310 that accepted the study.

The OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan intent is described below:

“…to provide an overall framework for making decisions on thoroughfare improvements and extensions. The plan identifies the locations of future major transportation corridors and should serve as a general guide for securing street rights-of-way. The thoroughfares are shown in general locations and may vary from the location shown after further detailed location studies are completed.” (Source, OTO, 2006 LRTP)

The City of Springfield has proposed several amendments to the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan which include an extension of a new Primary Arterial from Republic Road south of U.S. 60 to Farm Road 170, providing greater connectivity to property located east of U.S. 65 and south of U.S. 60. The proposal would increase the intersection separation between the US 60 and Glenstone interchange and the Republic Road and Glenstone Avenue intersection.

The collector street system has been amended to align with Barton Street to the east and a south connection is proposed to Republic Road (the old quarry site). The existing east/west collector has been replaced with the new Primary Arterial that connects to Farm Road 170. A minor modification has been made to the collector street that is adjacent to the James River to provide greater separation from the river.

The proposed extension of Republic Road would cross U.S. 60, intersect with Lone Pine, cross U.S. 65 and continue over to State Highway J. Any future U.S. 65 interchange with the proposed Primary Arterial would have to be approved by MoDOT.

Since the last meeting, OTO has met with the City of Springfield and Greene County and have talked about coordinating a process to make sure that the local major street plans are coordinated and amended through the planning and zoning commission and the city councils when it involves multiple jurisdictions. At this time OTO is recommending that this be tabled until the actual amendments go through the City of Springfield and Greene County.

Mr. Newman stated that in the meeting there was some discussion on process. The City of Springfield is willing to see this stay on the table until there is an opportunity to go through a more formal process of coming through Planning and Zoning and City Council. It was not the City of Springfield intent to do anymore than follow the practices that have been followed for a while, which really is not the right way to handle these issues. The MPO needs to establish a more formal process and have some open discussion before it comes to this committee. There are a couple of reasons for holding off on this issue today. This is to be discussed in City Council, as far as the development plan. There was a thought and the City really wants routings and intent of major thoroughfares on the OTO plan because it helps the City to meet the requirements of a developer. To some degree it is hard to ask somebody to help participate in a major thoroughfare, both with right of way and construction money, if it is not on the plan. With all the different things involved with this, the City does not see a reason to push this forward. The City of Springfield would be glad to see this tabled and continue to be on the table.

Mr. Newman continued to comment that there are several aspects of the Major Thoroughfare Plan that are pretty important. That OTO needs to be far sighted to make sure there are areas where the area has not developed, because it does help the OTO when development is proposed. In the case of new streets and roadways, it is not a precise design. It is intended to be an A to B connector with general alignments. The MPO understands that people can now take the lines on these maps and superimpose them on aerials and come up with this is going through my house. Springfield’s intent is to not create this type of concern at this point in the planning. It still evolved out of the process. The fact that this would be formalized into more public input before it comes to this Committee to make a decision of putting something on a map as an amendment that would be a great process to get back to.

Mr. Rognstad motioned to table the amendment. Mr. Smith seconded and the the motion was tabled unanimously.

**III. New Business**

# OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendment Process

Mr. Conklin stated that **OTO has been asked to amend the Major Thoroughfare Plan over the past several months to include new roadway alignments within multiple jurisdictions.**

**OTO would like to discuss having a policy of local jurisdictions updating their Major Street Plan through the Planning Commission/Board and City Council/County Commission prior to amending the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan.**

The purpose of the policy is twofold:

* Provide for the local jurisdiction public participation process and adoption to be completed prior to the OTO Board of Directors amending the OTO plan.
* Provide for an opportunity for OTO to work with multiple jurisdictions on reconciling and coordinating any issues that may result from the local adoption process prior to bringing forward an amendment to the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan.

All jurisdictions in the MPO need to be aware of the requirement that each project in the TIP be “consistent with the long-range transportation plan,” per U.S. Code, Title 23, Chapter 1, Section 134, subsection (j). OTO will assist all jurisdictions in reviewing the local Major Street Plans for consistency with the OTO Long Range Transportation Plan, Journey 2030.

There has been a lot of discussion on which should come first. The OTO’s Major Thoroughfare Plan or the local jurisdiction level. Last week when OTO, staff met with the City of Springfield and Greene County, a very good recommendation came of the meeting. OTO could facilitate and coordinate meetings that involve multiple jurisdictions, for example the U.S. 60/West Sunshine Study, to make sure that when it gets through the city councils that any issues that exist could be identified upfront. OTO needs to play a major role in meeting and coordinating those major street plans prior to going to the planning and zoning committees and city council processes.

The OTO is recommending that the Technical Committee draft a policy on amendments to the Major Thoroughfare Plan. On the draft policy, OTO is asking that the jurisdiction requesting the major thoroughfare amendment, also provide a map of what the amendment entails, when it was adopted by the local jurisdiction, ordinance and/or resolution number, and the public notices that went along with it. All the jurisdiction members recognize the importance of making a major thoroughfare plan from a regional level. It is also critical at the local level that when developed projects come through, the corridors are preserved. The OTO needs to make sure to have the local level in place to actually implement these plans from a regional to local level.

Mr. Miller stated that there was discussion about coordinating multiple jurisdictions with the major thoroughfare change. If a jurisdiction initiates a change that impacts another jurisdiction, and the other jurisdiction does not know about it, how does OTO make sure that the other jurisdiction has the opportunity to comment on the change? Mr. Conklin stated that OTO plans on scheduling a meeting and bringing all jurisdictions involved into the room to discuss it.

Mr. Howard stated that it is not clear how the mechanics of this would work. Should a jurisdiction, be it a city or county have a different viewpoint. It has not been uncommon for there to be disagreements between the city and county and other jurisdictions. How does that get worked out in a expeditious fashion if there are two jurisdictions that have gone through their process of planning and zoning with county commission and have made their amendments, but when it comes before this body, and it is not clear that this body has the ability to redesign or alter those plans to bring the accommodation, who mediates the differences? What process is used to ensure the planning process goes forward and that those issues are ironed out and compatible decisions are made?

Mr. Newman stated that one of the items discussed was the role of OTO to ensure that the jurisdictions are talking together and that they are going to come up with one major thoroughfare plan that everyone depends upon. There have been different plans in different jurisdictions in the past. It is important that everyone get on the same page. The first step that the OTO would take is that the director, when there is an interest in any sort of plan, would call together the affected jurisdictions so that they are talking together in the same room then proceed. Everyone would have to agree that this is something that the Board of Directors would have to approve and they are not going to approve or the Technical Planning Committee, something that is not acceptable to all parties involved.

Mr. Newman continued to state that there is going to have to be work done and it will need to be done before it comes to the Technical Planning Committee. When it does come to the committee, it needs to go through the process of the jurisdictions involved having come together in agreement. Then it goes through process to recommending approval of the amendment to the plan, pending approval of the OTO Board of Directors. It is reviewed by the Technical Committee before it goes to Board of Directors. It would go through the jurisdictions’ steps. In the City of Springfield’s case, the Planning and Zoning Commission and then City Council. The ordinance or bill that would be drafted would be contingent on the OTO Board of Director’s approval. The jurisdiction would not be the final decision maker on what gets added to the plan.

Mr. Howard stated that this is where there is a concern of meeting the Sunshine Law requirements. If there is a meeting of the jurisdictions involved and it is not a full meeting of this committee, what would be otherwise be discussed at a staff meeting to get the process started. Once it goes to planning and zoning, then it would all have to be in public hearing type of formats with notices to meet the Sunshine Law, all the way to through the process until the final Board of Directors approval.

Mr. Howard stated that with multiple jurisdictions they would meet with OTO. It would be a small quiet meeting of the affected parties. They would come to some sort of agreement, and then it would move to the respective jurisdictions. It would seem the opportunity exists for one jurisdiction to leverage another, by getting to the table first, by writing something down in stone before the governing process. The other party can dictate where things go rather than the cooperation that takes place in open discuss.

Mr. Newman stated that it is OTO’s responsibility to ensure coordination and it is the responsibility of the Technical Planning Committee. The Technical Planning Committee would not be able to vote on something that would not work between the jurisdictions. It would seem that this process is one that would lead to agreement or it would not go any further. It would not seem possible to take anything to planning and zoning or to city council if there is an open disagreement with the other jurisdiction. It would seem that every effort would be made to bring everyone together before anything is brought forward.

Mr. Schroeder stated it would be the OTO’s responsibility to basically be the check and balances between both jurisdictions before it goes to the Technical Planning Committee and Board of Directors.

Mr. Conklin stated that OTO would want to be sure that if the Major Thoroughfare Plan is being amended, that twofold, one the local major street plan is also being amended by the local jurisdiction and they are in agreement with that amendment. There would be more coordination. If there are two communities in complete disagreement with each other it would be difficult to deliver that project no matter what is approved. OTO’s role is to facilitate and coordinate.

Mr. Howard stated that then OTO would then become the facilitator of the discussion, and try to mediate differences. If OTO is successful at facilitating the difference of opinion, and each jurisdiction is open on their own to take whatever action is necessary to amend their own street plans.

Mr. Conklin stated that is correct. That under state law they can adopt a major street plan. There is no consistency requirement between the major street plan at the local level and OTO. What does become an important factor is if the jurisdiction is going to compete for federal funds or place federal funds on the project, then the project needs to be in the Long Range Transportation Plan, Major Thoroughfare Plan, and Transportation Improvement Program. It would be at that time presented at the Technical Planning Committee meeting or the Board of Directors meeting. There would have to be decisions made as to whether the project would be funded.

Mr. Rognstad stated that one could envision a scenario where a community would be held back. Where a city wants to put a segment of road and does not have a plan and has been building the segment anyway.

Ms. Edwards stated that could happen before or after the OTO process.

Mr. Smith stated that it is no different from today. Really all that is to be accomplished with this is to encourage coordination.

Mr. Howard asked how this differs from the process today. It was the understanding that bringing these processes to the OTO, which has a wide range view of how these transportation things are supposed to work and thoroughfares are supposed to work in coordination with one another, once that is approved then the jurisdictions go and take them to their respective governing boards.

Mr. Conklin stated that a bigger difference that is seen is that OTO is trying to formalize it a little more. If there are meetings occurring with jurisdictions about coordination on their major thoroughfare plan or major street plan, than OTO should be a part of that.

Ms. Edwards stated that OTO has a map and there are communities that have not adopted the map that OTO has. It does not do any good to have it on the map with the right of ways and never have put it through the public process.

Mr. Howard stated it seems that this involving finery jurisdiction, but perhaps the view needs to be lifted a little. For example the issue brought up at the last Technical Planning Committee Meeting. It proposed extending the major thoroughfare arterial westerly, crossing BNSF at grade. The railroad has major issues with that proposal. If the OTO is going to place two jurisdictions to work out the issue, where do the other parties who may be interested, become involved in the discussions? That is the concern when it is broken down, and there are small sub groups with discussions that are ongoing that other people have no view of or understanding of that. It appears that on this particular plan what the MPO has always tried to avoid, putting at grade railway crossings on busy roads.

Mr. Newman asked where the at grade railway crossing was located at.

Mr. Howard stated that the City of Springfield was going to go over it with a bridge. This is just a map. It just indicates that it goes over 65 one way or the other to be parallel to 60 and now into the county. Whether that has interchanges or overpasses or whatever needs to be decided at whatever time, that detail is evolved. If the railroad states that the road is not crossing at grade then the road will go over the railway.

It is the same thing with the interchange, if MoDOT says the City of Springfield cannot have an interchange, then the City still needs a road that goes over and gives connectivity to the land over there. The City of Springfield did not really look at it to that kind of detail, other than there is a road needed and the detail of how one gets from A to B again is worked out as it evolves.

The thing that is concerning in retrospect is that this came out of to some degree, working with a developer about a road, that could be extended from where the developer is really locked in about an intersection/interchange to 65. The City has that one preset as to where it goes, then it goes back to Glenstone to be a part of the City’s major road system, and then then it needs to go east it has to go beyond the James River and connect with something. MoDOT says that one condition of an interchange is that it will have to get from Mentor on one side all the way to Farm Road 170. How does that really happen? At this point the City does not know, only that it is a requirement that the road has connectivity.

Mr. Howard stated that the question is raised because of the process that is being presented to the TPC. The OTO would put the city and county together on a primary arterial or major street plan. If this road is crossing railroad, there is nothing that is said about other parties being involved in these discussions. There is concern that a city takes action on a proposal, then it comes to the OTO and there is a real problem and it is already locked in. The local jurisdiction has already approved the routing of the plan, but has not considered the overall perspective.

Mr. Newman stated that there would be open meetings and there would be opportunity to for everyone to speak. The railroad is also part of this committee. It would be a formal approval process where there are public meetings before it ever comes here as a proposed amendment and that is what is currently missing. That is what is changing significantly here, OTO has agreed to be the facilitator to make sure that the parties are involved from the start.

The alignment might not be approved, but it still needs to be considered on the Major Thoroughfare Plan because it is a major route. Beyond that, there is some interest in trying to be very specific in the design and layout in this connection, and that is where there is not a comfort level with this one. People want to know where is it going to go because they want to see the alignment. That is why it should be kept on the table at this point.

Mr. Howard stated this is just discussion about the process. People may have to go back and adjust cost figures, and have to adjust a lot of things. How do the other players get brought in to the front end of this process, when the talk is about involving the jurisdictions and railroad is involved? The process is setting up the opportunity for some discussion and disappointment later on.

Mr. Rogstad stated that if due diligence was done, the railroad would be brought in early on. There would be no reason that they would not be involved. Mr. Newman’s map is pretty conceptual. The map does not show where an arterial intersects with an interchange, but shows the idea that there needs to be an interchange or an overpass. Some of those things should be in the policy on how the jurisdiction treats railroad crossings, in whether an overpass is needed.

Mr. Miller stated that there is a major thoroughfare subcommittee. Perhaps one of the steps that needs to happen, is that the first things that the Major Thoroughfare Subcommittee reviews the proposed change before it goes to jurisdiction and those comments then go on to the local planning and zoning commission. By the time that it comes back it is known that they heard upfront what the multijurisdictional concerns are and that should also help identify any other stack holders or others that need to be involved.

Mr. Bingle stated that one of the comments made earlier that could use some clarification is that if the MPO made a major thoroughfare plan and just because one jurisdiction has some philosophical differences for the purpose of preserving the corridor, that the local jurisdictions, might, as a point of interest to the region, decide that it needs to come off the major thoroughfare plan. It is a concern that this organization is accepting the responsibility that goes with that Major Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Conklin stated that was one of the issues OTO was working through. It is critical that the local jurisdictions also implement the major street plan. There are some concerns that from a local development review perspective, that the best way to preserve the corridors when the region is growing rapidly is to have it on the major street plan that is already in statute. From the OTO perspective, the MPO does not have statutory authority in the community to say it is on the OTO plan that can preserve that right of way. The local jurisdiction needs to adopt the local street plan. As the projects move forward and as the OTO rank, projects and looks at them, they should be given consideration for following regional OTO policies that are adopted. That would help everyone get on board.

Mr. Newman was wondering if the Major Thoroughfare Subcommittee meeting was an open meeting as well.

Mr. Conklin stated that the OTO would do the notifications required by the State of Missouri statutes that would involve sending notices out that would be required for a public meeting, however, that would be more for a coordination type meeting.

Mr. Newman stated that if an agency like the City of Springfield is going to have City Council’s recommendation to change the plan, it means that they are certainly supportive of that plan and want that plan to reflect the best knowledge that they have, but it still has to come back to the Technical Planning Committee and to the Board of Directors. If they find that the plan is unacceptable because they are charging ahead of others then it would not be approved. The effect of having this process would be that number one, the OTO would have the political jurisdictions giving buy-in before it is brought forward, and secondly it would ensure that everyone works from the start in coordination with the other jurisdictions. That process would make it work.

Mr. Smith stated that it did not seem that there had been a coordination problem, since the jurisdiction seems to share the information. But this sets a policy that encourages that coordination. It is important to understand that now before changing policy the City or County could go and change their major thoroughfare plan without any discussion with the OTO. This just encourages that coordination.

Mr. Conklin stated that the policy would be worked on some more and clarified by the Major Thoroughfare Subcommittee.

Mr. Brock stated that the information here indicates when there will be a public hearing or a notice of a public hearing. That is consistent between the statutes of the different counties and cities. There are noticed differences here, in lieu of trying to get too deep as to what a statutory requirements would be for a city or county, just require a certification that the jurisdiction had met whatever the required standards are, and that would keep this committee, OTO, and the Board of Directors, out of the trying to do any kind of research as to whether they really met the requirements.

Mr. Newman requested a motion to table the motion with the OTO taking in the suggestions that have been received in the Technical Planning Committee meeting.

Mr. Miller motioned to table the policy. Mr. D. Mooney seconded and the motion was tabled unanimously.

# Update and Presentation of Potential TIGER Grant Application Projects

Mr. Conklin stated that at this time OTO has been contacted and held a workshop several weeks ago in regards to the TIGER Discretionary Grant Program. The deadline for the TIGER program is September 15, 2009. The City of Republic has a project, as well as Greene County. At this time the OTO staff encouraged member jurisdictions to discuss potential projects that will need to be considered by the TPC and OTO Board of Directors for TIP amendments and/or certification by OTO. Later on in the agenda there are two TIP additions from the 2010-2013 TIP adoption which includes the City of Republic and Greene County’s project located in the TIP.

Mr. Smith stated that Greene County thought hard about submitting a proposal for TIGER funding knowing that MoDOT is trying to do a major project on I-70, it looked that the likely hood of getting funds here was very low. A month after discussing it, Greene County met with MoDOT and looked at every way to make it work. At this point it looks like almost a zero chance, but the project is so important to the County. The project is on U.S. 60 east there is concern about U.S. 60 east’s capacity. From a capacity and safety standpoint, it is seen as a part of the County that is going to see quite a bit of growth, especially once the sewer project goes through the city. Greene County submittal for TIGER funding is as a way to raise awareness of the project among those who will be doing the review and understanding that the likely hood of receiving funds is not very high.

Ms. Edwards asked for clarification on what the project actually was.

Mr. Smith stated that is U.S. 60 east from the 60/65 interchange & the NN/J interchange. There was a POD there a year ago with a major development potential. This would be to raise U.S. 60 to freeway standards out to that point. MoDOT estimates it would be approximately 35 million dollars. It would be a tremendous benefit to the area if it could happen.

Ms. Edwards asked if that included the interchange. Mr. Smith stated it did include the interchange at NN and J, and that the plan would not go beyond the interchange any further than necessary to make it work. Mr. Mooney stated that it would not go to 125.

Mr. Smith stated that looking at the timeframes, that the County would be fortunate to get it to NN/J in the amount of time necessary. The ARRA funds have such stringent time tables there is only so much that can be done.

Mr. Conklin stated that there is preferential treatment for nationally and regionally significant projects. Projects that can be completed by 2012, projects $20 million above, job creation and partnerships between multiple jurisdictions that are some of the main criteria. Based on the last email, they are looking for ready to go projects.

Mr. McIntosh asked who the official applicant for this TIGER project is. Mr. Smith stated that Greene County is the official applicant. Mr. McIntosh asked if it would not be MoDOT or OTO. Mr. Smith stated it would not be MoDOT or OTO, but Greene County is asking anyone who would like to sign on to do so, but Greene County is the official applicant.

What if MoDOT or OTO would not like to spend the money on that project? Mr. Smith stated that is something that they sat down and talked to MoDOT about. It is their road. There is no use applying if MoDOT is not willing to accept the money if it comes. At this point, it is Greene County’s understanding that MoDOT is not going to endorse the project since it does not meet the criteria, however, MoDOT would probably not reject the money if it came.

Mr. Miller stated that they are welcome to apply, but it would involve a 20 percent match. There is a preference for projects with a 20 percent match. There are already a lot of applications in for high speed rail. About 100 billion dollars for 8 billion dollars worth of funds.

Mr. Krischke stated the City of Republic feels their project is important, not just to the Republic area but to all of Greene County. There is a description of the project and map. It is taking the back connection of the airport along Chestnut where B Highway continues south and makes the connection at MM. There is an intersection improvement at the MM/B intersection with I-44. It continues south on the MM/B corridor, with the addition of Brookline to the city limits of Republic back in 2005. The city is proposing an $11 million infrastructure improvement in that area. Marketing that area as a commercial, manufacturing and industrial area. The City of Republic feels that the importance of that is truly significant not just to the City of Republic but to all Greene County.

Trying to connect all the major hubs along the way and trying to coordinate with all the major agencies and jurisdictions, the City brought up the idea of connecting MM all the way to ZZ highway, which would bring it to Wilson’s Creek Battlefield. When looking at the map, two major portions of that are already identified on OTO’s major thoroughfare plan as high priorities; B highway connection up to Chestnut and the airport from I-44. Then there is also a medium priority placed on the new intersection of ZZ/MM and that connection from where it currently is on Republic Road.

Again the City of Republic faces the same constraints with matching dollars and MoDOT. If the City was successful, They would be willing to partner with the City of Springfield on their roadways. With the same level of support from the City of Springfield, the City of Republic feels they will have a significant advantage out by the airport and the opportunities there. Greene County and Battlefield would also receive benefits. The school district already in advance knew the requirement of the railroad and the grade separations plans in that area as well.

Mr. Conklin stated that OTO staff talked to MoDOT right before the meeting in regards to what it was going to take to receive certification through the governor’s office in Missouri. The certification can be a statement that the projects will be “included in the relevant planning documents prior to the reward of the TIGER Discretionary Grant”. If the grant is rewarded the OTO would amend the Long Range Transportation Plan and the TIP. That could change the next item on the agenda. The MPO could certify that these projects could be added if the Grant was awarded.

Ms. Edwards stated that instead of putting these two projects into the TIP and amending the Long Range Plan the OTO could make a motion to go forward to recommend that they certify intent to amend the plan to include those in the event an award was made. That way there are not projects in the TIP that might not be funded. That would also help with Federal Highway approval because they have been standard in not approving amendments if there are not funds available for them. It might not be approved in the TIP if it is done that way. The governor will certify it that OTO could submit the application without the amendment now.

Mr. Conklin stated that the reason it was brought to the TPC agenda is that OTO Staff believed that had to be in the Long Range Plan and TIP in order for the governor’s office to certify that these projects could move forward.

Mr. Miller stated that the MoDOT Staff person working with the governor’s offices thought that Governor Nixon wanted them to be in the TIP prior to, going above and beyond the programming guidelines. They did not realize that it would be problematic to the MPO’s, to not only deal with the Program Guidelines but also to dual certify.

Mr. Bingle stated that the City of Republic should be applauded for their initiative. There is a little concern that once OTO reprioritized the TIP then OTO identifies a new North/South Corridor. Then the new North/South Corridor will be in competition with the all the other North/South Corridors, this organization is trying to establish. It is somewhat of a concern, but at the same time applauded, that once it is on the TIP, then it will be in competition with the other North/South Corridors that originally ranked higher.

Mr. Krischke stated that in regards to the entire area, some of these areas three years, four, five years ago, whenever the OTO did the last ranking, might have ranked higher. But when the OTO looks at how things have changed, whether it is the opening of the new airport, the consolidation between Brookline and Republic, or its Republic High School to Battlefield, things have changed. The OTO cannot just sit back and allow ourselves to say we cannot change. The City of Republic is not saying that the project is going to rank any better than 65 or Campbell. It is important that from the city’s view point that it is just considered alongside those projects.

The City of Republic spent countless hours going through all the perimeters of the TIGER Grant application, job creation, and economic growth. Going down the list even MoDOT recognizes that the City of Republic is a little further along the process. The City plans on moving forward with the environmental work and hopefully at some point and time tackle the right-of-way issues. It has only been in the last two years that it has come forward and the City has real opportunity to gain Republic this is just as much Springfield as Republic. It is just as much significance to Springfield as Republic in regards to job creation and the rest. Not to downplay any other project, but the City of Republic does not want it to just be swept under the rug. The City of Republic is asking for support on the project and if it is not successful, then next go around hopefully it will get ranked. The City wants to make sure that they do get funds in there.

Ms. Edwards added that the OTO’s Plan is aging and that the MPO is required to redo it every five years. The process will have to start in 2010 sometime reprioritizing all the projects. It will definitely come up again and the OTO will have to look at everything. There have been a lot of changes and a lot of money spent in the area. The OTO staff did not know that there so much money would come into the area with the ARRA. There is going to be some room to change the Plan.

Mr. Rognstad stated that looking at the projects in context with the other projects, if the OTO could do it through the process of saying that the OTO would certify it if the funds are awarded.

Mr. Newman has given a communication that was received a couple of hours ago stating “it is safe to say the notice indicates a certification should be submitted from the appropriate agency that the project will be included in the relevant planning document prior to award of the TIGER Grant.” That is the possible motion on the table, that before the awarding of the Grant it would be included in the relevant planning document.

Mr. Rognstad made the motion that before the awarding of the Grant it would be included in the relevant planning documents. Mr. Brock seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Conklin asked if the City of Republic wanted to continue and move forward with the agenda item to add the project to the Long Range Transportation Plan at this group or was the action taken to regards to the certification that if the project is successful that the planning documents would be amended to reflect the project.

Mr. Kerskie stated that there was no choice but to move things along because of the September 15 deadline, with what Ms. Edwards just stated about next year starting to look at the projects. With that and the certification, the City of Republic will just hold off on the amendment, and just ask that the rest of the project to be considered in 2010. The City of Republic is withdrawing the request.

# Amendment Number Eight to the FY 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program.

There are two administrative amendments being proposed by the City of Ozark to change the funding amounts for the Ozark Master Transportation Plan and the 3rd Street/Highway 14 Traffic Study. Both projects are utilizing American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding.

**City of Ozark Transportation Plan FY 2009-2012 Administrative TIP Amendment.** The City of Ozark has requested an administrative TIP amendment to add STP-Urban and local funding to the already programmed ARRA funding in order to prepare a Citywide Transportation Plan. The Citywide Transportation Plan will provide for preliminary scoping and cost estimates. The overall project funding is being increased from $40,000 to $50,000.

**City of Ozark 3rd Street Traffic Study FY 2009-2012 Administrative TIP Amendment.** The City of Ozark has requested a TIP amendment to decrease the STP-Urban and local funding of the planning study to analyze traffic on 3rd Street from Jackson to Church. The funding is being decreased from $33,188 to $20,000.

Mr.Atchley made the motion to approve the TIP amendment number eight. Mr. Bingle seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. **Approval of the FY 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program**

Ms. Edwards stated that on an annual basis, the MPO staff develops a four-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) document that provides details on proposed transportation improvements, including anticipated costs, fund sources, and expected project phasing over each of the four-year time frame for the TIP. The TIP includes a status report for each project contained in the previous year’s TIP, a financial constraint analysis, and description of the public involvement process.

The Draft TIP was posted on the website on July 3, 2009 and an email was sent to the Technical Committee requesting review and corrections prior to the Technical Committee meeting. Staff has received several corrections which are attached for your information. These corrections as well as any additional corrections will be made and a new draft will be distributed to the Board of Directors prior to the August Board Meeting.

The recommendation is to do an E-meeting the first week of August, so that everyone can look at it one last time. The requirements are strict about having the projects in the right place. Mr. Miller has asked that MoDOT review the TIP one more time to make sure the numbers are correct. The recommendation is to defer to an E-meeting. That way it would have more time. OTO Staff will make it a link on the website so everyone can access it.

Mr. Rogstad moved to defer the FY 2010 Tip to an E-meeting. Mr. Miller seconded and the deferral was carried unanimously.

Ms. Gardner had a comment on the enhancements. The enhancements were programmed for construction in 2010. The projects are getting behind with these projects moving, iff these could get into construction this year that would be great.

1. **Member Jurisdiction ARRA Project Update**Mr. Conklin stated that included in the packet was the tracking that Ms. Gardner put together for the spreadsheet for MoDOT. Also the Transportation Infrastructure Committee US House Report that they are getting tracking the MPOs. Also included is the US House Committee on Infrastructure and Ms. Gardner mentioned that how MPOs delievered projects, they are going to start ranking the best and worst performers on September 30. Obviously everyone is being monitored with regards the reporting for ARRA through the Governor’s office, but also through the US House of Representatives Committee on Infrastructure.

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

Mr. Coltrin stated that the City of Strafford is moving along and is ahead of schedule. Plan and design work is done. Currently it is being reviewed in house before it goes to MoDOT.

Ms. Gardner stated that the City of Ozark was in the process of phasing two rights away. Final plans should be back within the week. They are working on their RFQ which was sent on July 10.

City of Willard has submitted final plans to MoDOT. It should go out to bid in two to three weeks.

Mr. Whaley stated that Polk County section is under design.

Mr. Atchley stated that there are engineering services contracted on the joint project.

Mr. Bingle stated that the City of Nixa has all the paper work finished. The Funds should be obligated next week.

Mr. Lambeth stated that the City of Battlefield was working on everything.

Ms. Gardner stated everything was fine.

City of Springfield and Greene County sub allocated the funds in July.

Ms. Cruise stated that the City of Utilities transit deadlines are different. September 1 is the deadline for grant approval.

**IV. Other Business**

1. **Technical Committee Member Announcements**   
   Members are encouraged to announce transportation events being scheduled that may be of interest to OTO Technical Committee members.
2. **Transportation Issues For Technical Committee Member Review**Members are encouraged to raise transportation issues or concerns that they have for future agenda items or later in-depth discussion by the OTO Technical Committee.

Mr. Miller introduced Carla Estobar the MoDOT Traffic and Engineering planning intern.

**V. Adjournment**

The meeting of the Technical Planning Committee was adjourned at 3:17. Mr. King seconded.