OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 16, 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. David Bishop, R-12 Schools

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

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

Mr. Ryan Mooney, Chamber of Commerce Mr. David Hutchison, City of Springfield (a)

Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT Mr. Gary Snavely, MSU

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

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

Ms. Dawne Gardner, MoDOT Ms. Ann Razer, City of Springfield (a)

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

Mr. Eric Bernskoetter, MoDOT

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. Earl Newman, City of Springfield Mr. Mike Giles, City of Springfield (a)

Mr. Daniel Nguyen, FTA (a) Mr. Shawn Schroeder, Airport

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. Dan Smith, Greene Co. Highway Dept. Mr. Rick Artman, Greene Co. Highway Dept.

Mr. Bob Atchley, Christian Co. Planning Mr. Ralph Rognstad, City of Springfield

Mr. Brian Bingle, City of Nixa

Others present were: Mr. Tim Conklin, Ms. Sara Edwards, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Ms. Debbie Parks, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Mr. Steve McIntosh, Congressman Roy Blunt’s Office; Mr. Carl Carlson, Scott Consulting Engineers; Mr. David Rauch, Senator McCaskill’s Office.

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

I. Administration

A. Introductions

B. Approval of Technical Committee Meeting Agenda

Ms. Cruise motioned to approve the Technical Planning Committee Meeting Agenda. Mr. Miller seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

# C. Approval of the July 27, 2009 Meeting & August 5, 2009 E-meeting Minutes

Mr. Ryan Mooney made the motion to approve the July 27 and August 5, 2009 Minutes. Mr. Whaley seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.

D. Public Comment Period   
None

E. Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Conklin stated that the $8.7 billion rescission was on the agenda for discussion. OTO was notified on August 27 about the rescission. Staff has been contacting both Missouri Senators and Congressman Blunt about the rescission. Letters have been sent to the Senators and Congressman Blunt expressing the need to repeal the rescission. OTO Staff is monitoring the situation on a daily basis.

OTO staff had the opportunity to spend three days with the FHWA and FTA Federal Certification Team as part of the OTO four year certification review for the planning process. OTO believes it will not receive corrective actions as a result of that review. OTO thanks MODOT and Ms. Cruise with City Utilities for participating in the review, as well as the TPC members and the public that attended the public meeting at the Library Center on South Campbell.

Mr. Conklin wanted to remind the TPC members that the springfieldmo.gov email extension no longer works and that it is now ozarkstransportation.org. OTO is able to do an in-kind match through MoDOT and FHWA to capture the time spent at the Committee Meetings. TPC members are reminded to complete the hourly rate form, so OTO can build its operating fund balance.

OTO is in the process of interviewing firms for Legal counsel and a CPA. OTO will make a decision on that in the next few weeks. The Memorandum of Understanding is in the agenda and to date, no comments from FHWA have been received.

F. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Report

Ms. Longpine stated that the last BPAC Meeting was in August. The September BPAC has been rescheduled to October 6. BPAC is working on the Best Practices Guidebook. A number of submissions have been received already. One of the additional things that BPAC is working on is asking what kinds of things people would like answers to, to result in a guidebook/reference for grants or examples when starting a new project.

BPAC is looking at the priorities from a regional perspective. These regional projects will be broken into pieces and will then be identified as feasible, moderately constrained, or constrained.

II. Unfinished Business

# OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendment Process

Mr. Conklin stated that OTO met with the Major Thoroughfare Plan Subcommittee a week ago. That meeting did not result in a recommendation for the Technical Planning Committee. Staff has handed out a revised policy from a staff perspective.

This revised policy recommends that the policy continues as it has in the past. OTO should take the lead. When amendments are submitted to OTO, the Major Thoroughfare Committee will continue, and will then make a recommendation to the technical committee.

The Technical Planning Committee will make a recommendation to the Board of Directors who will either approve or deny or refer it back to the Technical Planning Committee. If the Board does approve the MTP amendment, the Board will include in their approval a recommendation for the local jurisdiction impacted by that amendment to go ahead if appropriate and amend their major street plan and zoning & development regulations to implement the change at the local level. This is different then what was discussed back in July, but it became obvious this is not a routine item or annual item that a local jurisdiction does. The concern would be if there are three jurisdictions involved, then a year or two could go by before the Major Thoroughfare Plan is amended. It is the OTO recommendation that the current process is kept and that the Major Thoroughfare subcommittee and the Technical Committee are involved.

Mr. Price asked if some expert on the Major Thoroughfare Plan could explain exactly how the major thoroughfare plan fits into funding or other issues. He wanted to know why it is necessary to have a Major Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Conklin stated that the Major Thoroughfare Plan is part of the Long Range Transportation Plan that was adopted in 2006. Projects need to be in the Long Range Transportation Plan for federal aid. It also functionally classifies each of the routes that are shown on the Long Range Transportation Plan. From the Long Range transportation Plan standpoint, if there is a change to it or an amendment it needs to be in there for seeking federal funds. The issue that is being dealt with is whether or not at the local level the local jurisdiction needs to have the major street plan adopted and amended to help implement the MTP at the local level. With the LRTP/MTP, OTO has a role to play and an opportunity to show the regional perspective, where as when it comes to the local process of the planning and zoning commission and the city council, they can have additional discussions and they will have to adopt their own major street plan at the local level.

Mr. Price stated that if someone was wanting to seek federal aid to apply to a particular project it would have to be in the long range plan first, so they need to be thinking several months or a year out ahead, so that all the pieces in place.

Mr. Conklin stated that is critical that projects are shown correctly in the LRTP, so they can be put on the TIP. An example of this is the Republic TIGER project. It needs to be added to the LRTP to be programmed in the TIP should they receive funding.

Mr. Price asked if there was a motion to approve the recommendation of the Major Thoroughfare Subcommittee process for amending the Major Thoroughfare plan.

Ms. Cruise made the motion to approve the recommendation of the Major Thoroughfare Subcommittee and the process for amending the Major Thoroughfare plan. Mr. Hutchinson seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Whaley asked if this process was applicable to any project with federal funding. Ms. Edwards stated that it applied to a project that has received any federal funds.

Mr. Conklin stated he appreciated the question. This is a document that the MPO is required to have and that the projects in the MTP need to be selected off of the LRTP plan.

III. New Business

1. Amendment Number One to the FY 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program

Ms. Edwards stated that a revised amendment was passed out and that the one in the published agenda was irrelevant.

Mr. Miller stated that the first item of the amendment is a pavement grooving in Strafford to prevent wet weather accidents. MoDOT has done some work already on I-44 on the asphalt. This is for the concrete; the concrete is really smooth so whenever it is wet people are running off the road. This will help prevent that.

The second change has to do with Campbell and Weaver, one of the oldest projects in the TIP. MoDOT is going to move forward with MoDOT purchasing right-of-way. In order to do that, some right-of-way funding needs to be identified. It will be taken from the construction side, and the project should be completed in the spring.

Ms. Edwards stated that in the original agenda there were eleven railroad crossing projects that no longer needed to be included. Mr. Howard inquired about the eleven rail crossings to MoDOT. He wanted to know the source of the crossing projects. Mr. Miller stated that the Multimodal division handles the railroad crossing projects. They had listed those projects in the STIP. There is a bigger emphasis now with Federal Highway having the MPO’s TIP match the STIP. It was discovered that they did not match on those projects. It became an issue on the state wide level.

Mr. Howard clarified that MoDOT is addressing an internal handling of how the projects that are controlled in Jefferson City get into the TIP. Mr. Miller stated that was correct.

Mr. Howard stated that rail crossing projects one handled through the multimodal office and on-site diagnostics/engineering must be done. There projects are not just numbers on paper, so he was wondering how the numbers were reconciled.

Mr. Miller stated that was part of the reason that MoDOT has withdrawn these from the amendment. The information is not even up to date in the STIP.

Mr. Bernskoetter stated that information is more a look at the project not specific programming on projects. MoDOT will have to go back through and pare down the list so that each district can make sure that there are appropriate amendments and a more finite number. The reason that this has become an issue is that when MoDOT goes to the resource management office, which is the financial office, and they ask FHWA for an obligation of funds through Federal Highway, FHWA then looks in the TIP and they say “where do we see this in OTO’s TIP?.” If they do not see that project in the TIP or that the numbers match, then they will not obligate the funds, which obviously holds up everybody. It has been a changing philosophy and MoDOT has worked very hard in the last six months to get all these to match. Mr. Miller is the first district to try and get these in the TIP. It is an internal issue and MoDOT will work it out.

Mr. Miller stated that the earliest MoDOT would come back with this information is October. The amendment would just need to be processed in order to have the funding ready by the end of next summer.

Mr. Price stated that the projects are still worked out between railroad and MoDOT. The multimodal office in Jefferson City it is just a step in the federal process, it had to be in the TIP to match the STIP.

Mr. Howard stated that he wears several different hats. One of the hats is as the chair of the Railroad Association which is for the railroads operating in the state. What information needs to be imparted to them as far as procedures when working with MoDOT? Will the railroad’s notification continue to come from the central office or will there be interfacing at the district office?

Mr. Miller stated that it will be at Central Office. Everything from the railroad’s perspective will stay the same; it is just that MoDOT needs to make sure the information is corrected.

Mr. Bernskoetter agreed completely that it is the Central Office that will continue to work with the railroad. The only thing that might be passed on is the fact that if someone knows a project is coming up in eight months, that is the time to look ahead to make sure that it is on the TIP right.

Mr. Howard stated that railroad projects are ordered by the Commission and the railroad has to respond and install devices within a specified timeframe. If they do not, the railroad is exposed to penalties and fines, as well as civil liabilities. The timing is then not up to the rail road, but the Commission.

Mr. Bernskoetter stated that the MoDOT staff knows that as well.

Mr. Whaley made the motion to approve TIP Amendment Number One to the FY 2010 to 2013 TIP. Mr. Ryan Mooney seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. Member Jurisdiction ARRA Project Update   
     
   Mr. Conklin stated that in the agenda there was a reminder of the OTO Regional Progress deadline. It is the OTO understanding that everyone has met the August 30 deadline. OTO would like to have everyone update the group on the status of the ARRA funds. Mr. Price asked Ms. Gardner to give an update on where the projects stood.

Ms. Gardner stated that obligation of federal funds were next, so that the projects could be advertised or, if it is a planning study, the obligation of engineering contracts so that the consultation could start. So far MoDOT has the authority to bid on the engineering services contracts on the projects that have been obligated except for three projects. Strafford, CC in Christian County, and the Master Transportation Plan in Ozark are still waiting for FHWA to process their paperwork. Mr. Price asked what the next step would be.

Ms. Gardner stated that everyone met their deadline. Each local agency will hear from MoDOT as soon as their funds are obligated. Mr. Whaley got the authority to bid and advertised it on MoDOT’s website. Battlefield has the authority to advertise for bids, so they can advertise at any time, and the sooner the better.

Mr. Conklin asked if the information on jobs created would be fed into MODOT for reporting.

Ms. Gardner stated that was correct. Each time a local agency is notified to begin, the requirements are given to their contractor or their consultant to do the reporting on the number of employees and pay that needs to be collected monthly.

Mr. Miller asked if MoDOT was going to be contacting contractors that do not realize the importance of getting the reports in on time. MoDOT might really have to work with these contractors to make sure it is done in a timely fashion. Ms. Gardner said that it is addressed.

Mr. Conklin thanked MoDOT for taking on this responsibility for OTO. The reporting requirement comes to OTO, but it is on the local agencies and the contractors who are reporting and collecting the information. Also in the agenda is the letter from Chairman Oberstar, from the US House of Representatives, once again they are going to highlight the best and worst performers of implementing the ARRA funds. The US House of Representatives website shows that they have sent letters to the best performing three states and the worst performing three states. Based on the letter, the MPO will be evaluated, and the OTO staff has the understanding that OTO is currently ahead of the other MPO’s (St. Louis and Kansas City) here in Missouri. Ms. Gardner stated that OTO has set the standard.

1. STP Urban Balance Annual Report

Ms. Edwards stated that OTO receives a STP Urban allocation every year based on the 2000 urbanized population. Jurisdictions that have an urbanized population get an allocation of that according to the OTO bylaws. MoDOT now has a policy which states that they will take money away from the MPO if balance of STP-Urban funds exceeds three years of the OTO allocation. Last year OTO filled out the first annual report. OTO has been told that the MPO is going to be fine for this year ending September 30, 2009, however, OTO needs to look ahead a year, since these projects take a long time to get obligated. For 2010, it is projected that OTO will have programmed about $1 million dollars over the requirement. However, staff is not entirely comfortable with that figure because it is MoDOT’s estimation for two or three year’s allocation. Based on their funding scenarios they think OTO is only going to get $2.3 million in STP-Urban for fiscal year 2010. That would be really low for the area. OTO ran this year at $4.2 million. OTO needs to work hard to obligate some additional money this year. In this agenda each jurisdiction has a two page report. One is their balance that is programmed and the second is all funds that are obligated. The funds that are obligated are what really count. Every jurisdiction should have a breakdown of what is obligated.

There is also a breakdown of the OTO bridge funds that need to be spent. MoDOT is looking at some of the bridge funds that can be spent. Also, OTO is working with MoDOT to find some cost share projects. If some of the projects could get into the state wide cost share program, then they say it counts towards being obligated for the purposes of calculating the OTO fund balance. OTO is looking at finding some projects that can get into the STIP if OTO cannot get additional funds obligated. With the upcoming possible rescission it is in everyone’s best interest to spend this money as fast as possible. It should not be OTO’s policy to come in under the figure balance. The jurisdictions really should spend as much money as possible and get the balances down so that the funds are not lost.

Mr. Price asked what the MPO’s total balance was at this point. Ms. Edwards stated that the MPO’s total balance right now is nearly $15 million. With the MoDOT cost share it is about $10 ½ million. Mr. Price asked if the MoDOT cost share would obligate the balance.

Ms. Edwards stated that cost sharing would not protect those funds from the congressional rescission but it would protect it from MoDOT’s three year policy. Staff will try to do a report at every other meeting so that the jurisdictions would know how they were performing for the year.

Mr. Conklin stated that maybe the OTO should have a more aggressive regional progress policy. With the next reauthorization there are probably going to be more time frames that the OTO will have to meet. It is something that everyone should be aware of and be thinking about how to move the balances down.

Ms. Edwards mentioned that Mr. Whaley’s project with the STP-Urban funds from Springfield and Greene County were left off the report.

1. Memorandum of Understanding between OTO and Member Jurisdictions

Mr. Conklin stated that included in the agenda is the Memorandum of Understanding. The changes that have been made from the first draft have been underlined. OTO has received comments from the member jurisdictions that includes a couple of whereas clauses that talk about the expansion in the 2000 Census. Also included is that fact that OTO is designated as the Transportation Management Area. A suggestion was also made to make sure that acronyms are spelled out and that has been done.

After the Federal Certification review, it was suggested that the Memorandum of Understanding state on page nine and thirteen that if any local jurisdiction receives any Title VI Complaints on any project or plans that OTO takes action on that the OTO office be notified immediately. Title VI is the Civil Rights Act on Discrimination. FHWA wanted to have local jurisdictions certify that there is financial capacity to the do the projects that are showing in the TIP and also that the public has had the opportunity to provide input to the local public participation process. Public participation is important, for both the local jurisdictions and OTO.

For reference, the OTO website home page has the Title VI policy and the Title VI complaint form. If a jurisdiction does receive a complaint they should let OTO staff know.

Greene County has several suggested changes that they would like to see in the MOU prior to seeing it approved. Greene County is asking to add to the local jurisdictions roles and responsibility, should consider adopting the OTO Long Range Transportation Plan on number one, and two fill out the change on that. Item number six references the minimum design standards in OTOS LRTP. Staff added wording that federal aid projects are required to meet the minimum design standards and if they do not a variance should be requested. The MOU is a federal requirement for the MPO transportation planning process. Up dating the MOU is a recommended action that the MPO must take per the certification review. The Federal Highway Administration has asked for it to be complete by December 31, 2009. Staff understands that the local counties and city attorneys will need a chance to review the MOU, however, it is a required document that must be complete in order to continue to receive federal funds.

Ms. Edwards stated that it must be signed and put into place by every jurisdiction by December.

Mr. Price stated that the TPC really needs to have this draft policy including the changes handed out, in front of the city attorney or the jurisdiction attorney right now. There might have to be a special meeting to get it to the Board of Directors.

Mr. Conklin stated that if the TPC did not want to move it along to the Board and instead wanted to do an e-meeting with the changes, that could be done. The City of Willard was going to have their Council approve it, but staff asked for it to be pulled off their agenda since FHWA had not commented on it yet. It is unclear how much leeway each jurisdiction has on the document changes as it goes through this process. The last MOU took eight months for the signatures to be obtained.

Mr. Price stated that Springfield City Council would need a minimum of a month, more like six weeks, to get something on the agenda and get it passed.

Mr. Brock asked about how the paragraph on certifying and demonstrating financial capacity would be implemented Mr. Conklin stated that each jurisdiction would have a certification application page to sign stating that they have the financial capability when they submit their request for TIP projects.

Mr. Bernskoetter stated that was correct. MoDOT would not be surprised if the next thing that FHWA wants is a chart showing the jurisdiction’s revenue versus expenditures, just like MoDOT currently shows. Ms. Gardner stated that was happening anyway. Mr. Miller stated that what MoDOT does is state that the city and state gas tax are funding as well as any sales tax.

Mr. Bernskoetter stated that every time a project goes to FHWA, MoDOT looks specifically at the type of funding that is used.

Mr. Brock asked if the TPC could recommend the approval of this, along with any required changes that come down from FHWA.

Mr. Conklin stated that the TPC could recommend it for approval. Hopefully it is general enough that it can be approved and move forward without changes. Mr. Howard asked what happens if the MOU is not approved by December 31. Mr. Conklin stated that FHWA will be back and then it will be a corrective action. Then the federal funds that OTO currently receives could be withheld from the region.

Mr. Bernskoetter stated that is correct. That is the message that they relay when they tell the MPO that. From experience with federal highway if they know the MPO is in the process of getting all of the signatures then FHWA will work with the MPO. They will not withhold funds at that point but MoDOT cannot guarantee that.

Mr. Conklin stated that FHWA would like to see progress, since OTO has had a federal certification review. FHWA is back in Jefferson City writing their report, and when they give the OTO the draft report, in theory progress should have been made from August to October/November so if there is no progress, what was told in August could change.

Mr. Bernskoetter stated that when OTO was certified back in 2005 it was a recommendation back at that time. It was never followed through, from OTO’s side, FHWA’s side or MoDOT’s side. Now they knew in August that OTO was already working towards it with everyone. That is why it was only a recommendation and not a corrective action yet had a solid drop dead date on it. FHWA is currently working with OTO.

Mr. Conklin stated that it needs to be done anyway. Mr. Miller asked if FHWA would have to look at it again with the changes. Mr. Bernskoetter stated that MoDOT should probably take a look at it again.

Mr. Howard asked why it had to be binding language, and why can’t it just say the MPO agrees to play by these rules then sign off on it?

Mr. Conklin stated that is what it is; some attorneys would have to look at it though.

Mr. Miller stated that basically the MPO is agreeing to follow the guidelines. Mr. Price stated that the MPO has to do it or the jurisdictions will not get the money.

Mr. Howard asked if there is anything that keeps the MPO from amending the MOU in the future. Every jurisdiction can approve this document today or in the near future without any changes and agree to revisit it after the first of the year and amend it with any changes at that time.

Mr. Conklin stated that anyone with concern could bring it back for an amendment. Mr. Price stated that a motion to approve the Board of Director with the changes as outlined OTO staff was on the table.

Mr. Howard made the motion to forward the MOU to the Board of Directors with the presented changes. Mr. Whaley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. SAFETEA-LU Rescission Update and Highway Reauthorization

Mr. Conklin stated that the October 6 email was passed out explaining OTO’s exposure if Congress does not act on the rescission, considering the $15 million unobligated balance. According to Todd Grossner and MoDOT, the rescission amount is approximately $7.6 million dollars of STP-Urban funds. OTO staff had a conference call with FHWA, however, the only information that was received is that FHWA is planning to rescind money. There is no additional information on action that is being taken by Congress to repeal the rescission.

Mr. McIntosh stated that the scenario is pretty simple. The Highway reauthorization bill contains a rescission unless it is waived, it kicks in September 25. The House has passed an extension of the current highway authorization bill; the Senate has yet to do so. It is on the Senate side that the amendment will be accepted on the extension of the authorization bill will include a waiver of the rescission bill. It is unknown how the vote will go or what will happen in conference between the House and Senate versions.

Mr. McIntosh stated that what is making a lot of people nervous is that it might get down to September 24th before a repeal happens. This rescission of unobligated funds is across the board, so every county commissioner, county administrator, or whatever the counterparts are for Missouri County Commissioners throughout the United States, are all concerned because the off system bridge program is included in that. A lot of those folks build up funds over the years in order to do a bridge project. Congressman Blunt and the entire Missouri House Delegation signed a letter to the respected Committee Chairman of the House saying, leave that program alone.

Mr. Rauch stated that what is being heard is that something regarding the repeal of the rescission will happen. There is no guarantee of that until it is done, but the Senator’s office in Washington has confirmed that it is the interpretation. It is tied in with the extension of the authorization. The Senate and the President are in agreement so it is expected that in the next few months something will happen.

Mr. McIntosh stated that the House version of the extension was for three months which is totally unrealistic. The last two reauthorizations took at least twenty four months to get through. Eighteen months is much more realistic.

Mr. Conklin stated he would like to thank Mr. McIntosh, Mr. Rauch, and Ms. Burks. They have been very responsive to OTO’s phone calls and emails and David Toomey emailed back just to check. Mr. Rauch stated that Mr. Toomey was Ms. Claire McCaskill’s transportation expert in Washington.

IV. Other Business

1. Technical Committee Member Announcements

Mr. Whaley stated that Ozarks Greenways has a new committee called START: Sustainable Transportation Advocacy Resource Team. The committee is looking at alternative transportation, such as bicycles, buses, carpooling, etc. It meets monthly and anyone is welcome to come. Next month, Springfield will be hosting the Missouri Trail Summit October 7-9, 2009. There will be three days of trail and alternative transportation discussion.

This Monday and Tuesday the Institution of Transportation Engineers, Missouri Section will be hosting a conference at the University Plaza. Information can be found at [www.ocite.org](http://www.ocite.org).

Ms. Edwards stated that anybody who is a planner can get six credits for the Sunday course at the University Plaza.

Mr. Hutchison stated that there is a Professional Transportation Planners course and a Sectional Transit Operations Engineer Course on Sunday.

Ms. Longpine stated that the Missouri APA Conference will be held in Springfield as well on October 21-23, 2009 and registration just opened up for that.

Mr. Conklin stated that it would be a good idea to develop a Regional Progress Policy as discussed with the STP-Urban funding. Mr. Conklin requested that a subcommittee be put together to work on developing the Regional Progress Policy. That is something that the MPO really needs to work out and adopt, otherwise the OTO risks the MPO’s funds being reallocated to other agencies.

Ms. Gardner stated that she was volunteering.

Mr. Conklin stated that this is in anticipation of having a more rigid timeline to obligate the funding, as part of the next reauthorization.

Mr. Miller stated that St. Louis has adopted a reasonable progress policy because of the difficulty getting the local jurisdictions to obligate the money. They are in danger of losing a percentage of their funding.

Ms. Edwards stated that someone from every jurisdiction should be on the subcommittee and that an email would be sent to the jurisdictions.

Terry Whaley, David Hutchison, Joel Keller, and Dawn Gardner volunteered.

V. Adjournment

The motion to adjourn was at 2:46 p.m.