

**OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
March 19, 2014**

The Technical Planning Committee of the Ozarks Transportation Organization met at its scheduled time of 1:30 p.m. in the OTO Conference Room.

The following members were present:

Mr. David Brock, City of Republic	Mr. Brad McMahon, FHWA
Mr. Randall Brown, City of Willard (a)	Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT
Mr. Don Clark, Missouri State University	Mr. Bill Robinett, MoDOT
Mr. Travis Cossey, City of Nixa	Mr. Ralph Rognstad, City of Springfield
Mr. Jonathan Gano, City of Springfield	Mr. Shawn Schroeder, SGF
Mr. Rick Hess, City of Battlefield (Chair)	Mr. Andrew Seiler, MoDOT
Mr. Adam Humphrey, Greene County	Mr. Dan Smith, Greene County Highway Dept.
Mr. Chris Jones, City Utilities Transit	Ms. Eva Voss, MoDOT
Mr. Kirk Juranas, City of Springfield	Mr. Terry Whaley, Ozark Greenways

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

The following members were not present:

Mr. Mokhtee Ahmad, FTA Representative	Mr. Larry Martin, City of Ozark
Mr. David Bishop, R-12 School District	Ms. Diane May, SMCOG (a)
Ms. Kristy Bork, SGF (a)	Mr. Kent Morris, Greene County Planning
Mr. Doug Colvin, City of Nixa (a)	Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA Representative
Mr. King Coltrin, City of Strafford	Ms. Beth Schaller, MoDOT (a)
Mr. Rick Emling, R-12 School District (a)	Mr. Jeff Seifried, Springfield Chamber
Ms. Diane Gallion, City Utilities (a)	Ms. Cheryl Townlian, BNSF
Ms. Dawne Gardner, City of Springfield (a)	Mr. Garrett Tyson, City of Republic (a)
Mr. Martin Gugel, City of Springfield (a)	Mr. Dan Watts, SMCOG
Mr. Jason Haynes, City of Springfield (a)	Mr. Todd Wiesehan, Christian County
Mr. Jay Huff, Missouri State University (a)	Mr. Bob Wilslef, City of Ozark (a)
Mr. Joel Keller, Greene County Hwy Dept. (a)	Mr. Chad Zickefoose, MoDOT (a)
Mr. Kevin Lambeth, City of Battlefield (a)	

Others present were: Ms. Sara Fields, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Mr. Curtis Owens, Ms. Debbie Parks, and Ms. Melissa Richards, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Ms. Stacy Burks, Senator Roy Blunt; Mr. Carl Carlson, Olsson Associates; Mr. Josh Bird, Christian County.

Mr. Travis Cossey called the meeting to order at 1:31 pm.

**I. Administration**

**A. Introductions**

**B. Approval of the Technical Planning Committee Meeting Agenda**

Mr. Cossey stated that staff had requested to add item I. to the agenda.

Mr. Smith made the motion to approve the March 19, 2014 Technical Planning Committee meeting agenda with the addition. Mr. Hess seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

**C. Approval of the January 15, 2013 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to approve the January 15, 2014 meeting minutes. Mr. Brock seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

**D. Public Comment Period for All Agenda Items**

No comments.

**E. Executive Director's Report**

Ms. Fields stated that staff had been working on the Travel Demand Model. The Subcommittee had met and reviewed the data that is going into the model and some of the assumptions. The model is still on track to be completed by June. MoDOT is still working on a Statewide Freight Study that is due out in May. Mr. Miller stated that there would be a business partner meeting in St. Louis, Kansas City, and Springfield toward the end of April. Ms. Fields stated that Missouri State University has expressed interest in applying for a TIGER Grant. The notice of TIGER funding availability came out a couple of weeks ago. The applications are due April 28 and staff sent a notice out. There is one application that staff is aware of. Staff attended a MoDOT Planning Partner meeting in Jefferson City, where staff learned that MoDOT does not have any funding and nothing new will be added to the STIP this year other than maintenance projects.

Ms. Fields stated that she would be going to Washington, D.C. to meet with the Association of MPOs on the new planning guidance and performance measures that is coming out of Federal Highway. Staff is getting ready to solicit applications for the TIP. OTO will not be soliciting any Enhancement Applications at this time, since staff is waiting on the new transportation bill. There will be multiple years of funding available at that time. November would be the earliest availability of Enhancement Funding. Mr. Rognstad inquired if November would be when the Enhancement Applications would be solicited. Ms. Fields stated that it would be November. She stated that new information states that the Trust Fund would be bankrupt in July. It is unknown if there could be another government shutdown and if the reimbursements would be affected. When the fund gets to a certain level there will be partial reimbursements. She wanted everyone to be aware that July and

August could have reimbursement delays if there is not a new transportation bill or general fund transfer.

**F. Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Report**

Ms. Longpine stated that the BPAC was excited about the adoption of the Two Priority Projects for Bicycle and Pedestrian needs for the region. The committee will be taking the Enhancement Application and adapting it to the new transportation alternatives programming requirements. The last time there was an enhancement funding round, the old requirements were mixed in with new requirements. The next set of funding will be purely the new set of requirements unless there is another new set issued in October. The committee will start looking at how the Enhancement application should look.

**G. Legislative Reports**

Ms. Burks stated that she did not have an update at this time on the Transportation Bill. Senator Blunt is in the state this week. She gave an update on the Senator's schedule and the bills that he has sponsored. She mentioned that he was sponsoring the Bridges Act and the Build America Act that have to do with infrastructure, cities, and communities. The Senator would like for there to be infrastructure bills to produce jobs and create projects.

Mr. Juranas inquired if the Bridges Act and Build America Act were all for bonds or loan guarantees. Ms. Burks stated that they were interest loans, bonds and bonding authorities. They are not from the government though, they would set up with a separate entity with a board. Ms. Fields asked about the likelihood of a general funds transfer in the full amount needed for the Trust Fund. Ms. Burks stated she could not answer that question, only that there is a very compacted year in terms of schedule. Mr. Miller stated that the Trust Fund depends on the weather, how fast contractors can get to work and get reimbursement requests turned in.

**II. New Business**

**A. FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program**

Ms. Fields stated there was a new Tab 2 passed out. The OTO prepares a Unified Planning Work Program that is worked on over the next fiscal year. The fiscal year runs July 1 through June 30. It is programmed into tasks. The proposed OTO budget is \$865,338, then the City Utilities Transit Planning is included to bring the total to \$1,065,038. The changes involve Task 080 found on pages 22 and 23. Federal Highway gave some helpful suggestions on how to capture more Direct Cost from MoDOT. That allowed the Task 080 from \$65,000 to \$115,000 and that allowed the OTO to get about \$40,000 more in federal funds. That allows the OTO to save some of the Local Jurisdiction dues. The numbers on pages 24 and 25 changed as well. The overall budget increased because of Task 080 and the Consolidated Planning Grant funds increased.

There was a federal fund balance of \$969,545 left so the OTO is in good shape. The annual allocation for FY 2014 is \$551,000 so the OTO is under two years of the annual allocation.

The OTO has a balance in part because when Congress appropriates money, it usually comes a piece at a time, so the whole balance is not usually available. The FY 2014 allocation was only announced this month and the FY 2014 is over half way complete. The rest of the balance is to save for projects like the Travel Model and other special projects. Work

projects planned for FY 2015 include reviewing the Major Thoroughfare Plan, the Roadway Design Standards brochure, and continued work on [giveusyourinput.org](http://giveusyourinput.org). The Travel Time Collection Units were proposed for last year's budget but the legal paperwork was not completed in time. The UPWP also accounts for continued work with the OTO committees and TIP.

Ms. Longpine stated that OCITE was hosting a lunch on March 26 where Jason Haynes from the City of Springfield would be talking about the bluetooth units and their use in the area.

Mr. Rognstad inquired if the Long Range Transportation Plan would be updated for 2016. Ms. Longpine stated it would be adopted by that December.

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to recommend approval of the FY 2015 UPWP to the Board of Directors. Mr. Gano seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**B. FY 2015-2018 TIP Subcommittee Appointment**

Ms. Longpine stated that each year the Transportation Improvement Program is developed and part of the process is a review by the subcommittee of all the project requests. The project subcommittee would involve one or two meetings. The first meeting would be towards the end of May.

The following members volunteered for the FY 2015-2018 TIP Subcommittee: Joel Keller, Randy Brown, David Brock, Bill Robinett, Frank Miller, someone from the City of Springfield, and Rick Hess.

Mr. Juranas made the motion to accept the TIP Subcommittee. Mr. Rognstad seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**C. FTA Section 5310 Selection Criteria**

Mr. Owens stated that there was a handout with three changes. He described the changes in the new handout. The FTA 5310 program includes some New Freedom type projects. This program is going from SAFETEA-LU to MAP-21, which requires the selection criteria to be rewritten. It now includes operating assistance for this program. The old program simply provided vans, basically for human service agencies. The new program includes ADA type projects and consolidated the 5310 projects into that.

The actual selection criteria on the final page gives each project a ranking. That is the process that will be used when each project goes through the program. The thought is that it would be open so that a variety of projects can be compared, including vehicles and operating assistance. Vehicle and capital projects are still at an 80/20 ratio. Operating assistance is at 50/50. All the projects that come in will fall into one of those two matching criteria. One of the differences in the funding is a minimum of 55 percent of the program has to be spent on capital, 45 percent minus a 10 percent administrative fee for capital projects and ADA type projects. The Local Coordinating Transit Board has been working on this criteria. In 2013, the LCTB went through the application process and awarded two vehicles. Since then, there has been more funding identified, so those will be put into one grant cycle. The next application process will include the remainder of FY 2013 and all of FY 2014.

Mr. Whaley inquired what the implementation was for coordinated services. Mr. Owens stated that it could be like a single source call center. Ms. Fields stated it would be a website or a call-in line where there was one number and then they could put the caller in touch with the agencies that would be most appropriate to provide service. There is not local interest at this time, but OTO did not want to preclude it in case there was in the future.

Ms. Fields stated that once the criteria is approved it will be incorporated it into an application. The applications will go to the Local Coordinating Board of Transit. The LCBT will make a recommendation and then it will run along with the other TIP projects.

Mr. Whaley made the motion to recommend approval of the selection criteria to the Board of Directors. Mr. Brock seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**D. Title VI Policy Revision to Include ADA**

Mr. Owens stated that at the last TPC meeting, the Title VI Policy was approved and forwarded to the Board of Directors. Since the approval of the Title VI Policy there is a need to amend some of the documents in the Program. The documents are being updated to include ADA requirements and update the logo. The revised documents include notifying the public under Title VI and ADA. This notice is on the page posted outside of the office and on the website. The amendment to this is the title and the logo.

The title and logo on the complaint procedure was also amended. The steps for the complaint process was updated for the process with other agencies should there be a complaint. The last change was the Title VI/ADA title and logo. Appendices A, B, C were updated to correlate with the particular titles of these documents to go into the program.

Ms. Fields stated that a member of the public does not want to figure out what complaint form to fill out. The decision was made to not have multiple forms so one form was put together. If there is an issue with discrimination of disability or minority or low income they do not have to distinguish which form to fill out. Ms. Fields stated that the Title VI Coordinator for the OTO was Mr. Owens.

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to recommend approval of the Title VI Policy Revisions to the Board of Directors. Mr. Hess seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**E. STP-Urban Advance Policy and Agreement**

Ms. Fields stated that the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors has been working for several months on coming up with a policy that could be put in place to spend STP-Urban funds in advance. Included in the agenda is a history of the OTO fund balance. MoDOT allows staff to keep up to \$16 million without reallocating it away from the OTO. The OTO has carried a balance of more than \$16 million most years. OTO has reduced the appearance of this balance with future cost shares, but that program has now been suspended.

The developed policy is for jurisdictions that get less than \$1 million, so the smaller jurisdictions would be able to spend the funds in advance. The smaller jurisdictions would be able to amend a TIP project and note that there is advance spending. The Board would approve it then and the jurisdiction would enter into this advance funding agreement. The



policy states that in the event the STP funding is discontinued and the jurisdiction has spent it in advance and Congress did not appropriate it in the future, the jurisdiction agrees to pay it back to the general OTO fund to be reallocated. The policy is for only three years in advance. MoDOT has agreed to let OTO go negative. If every dime of the \$26 million balance gets spent and the OTO accidentally goes negative, there is enough funding around the state to cover it until the OTO could make it up. There is no real risk for the OTO as a whole. The individual jurisdiction would take on a little risk in the event that the federal funding was discontinued. STP-Urban has been around for a long time. Ms. Fields stated she wanted the policy to be in place to allow advance spending to reduce the overall STP balance so that the OTO will not lose it per federal rescission or going over the fund balance with the State. The Executive Committee has reviewed it for several months and are recommending the policy, but it is coming to the Technical Committee for recommendation. Mr. Cossey inquired if there was a maximum. Ms. Fields stated that it is a three year maximum.

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to recommend approval of the STP-Urban Advance Policy and Agreement to the Board of Directors. Mr. Miller seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

**F. Amendment 1 to the Priority Projects of Regional Significance**

Ms. Fields stated that there would be a discussion on the Transportation Input Initiative. As part of this Transportation Input Initiative there was a rush priority project amendment through the Board of Directors on February 20. There was a request to add the MM Corridor, from I-44 to US 60 and expand the Route 14 priority, which currently stops short at Ozark, to run through Ozark to Route W, and include Business Route 65. The dashed lines on the map are the proposed projects to be added. There is a little bit of history on the priority project list included. In 2008, the Board adopted this priority list. It has been used to distribute to the legislature, the public, and for grant applications. It has been successful. The projects that have been completed in the priority project list have been listed.

The second map in the agenda is the volume-to-capacity map which has some errors on the capacities. The formula was run on US 65 and I-44 and on the James River Freeway. It used half the capacity and staff doubled that. The map handout is more accurate. Staff added to it so that the volume-to-capacity could be compared. The proposal for Highway 14/65 in Ozark is at a level of service E, at or above capacity. MM is not as much an issue of volume-to-capacity, but it is an issue of development and truck traffic occurring.

The accident rates have been included on the next map. Route MM is not as high. That is because a lot of the accidents are single truck accidents and are not being reported as accidents since the accidents are not fatalities or injuries. Both jurisdictions included letters of support and information about the issues. The projects were run through the scoring criteria that was in the Long Range Transportation Plan and both scored well under the criteria. Those are scores on existing conditions. There were some projections done on the possible development of MM. The acreage was compared to the development of PIC East. The traffic will double or triple causing it to have a problem. The Board approved it subject to Technical Committee review. The Board wanted to get the Technical Planning Committee concurrence to add it to the list.

Mr. Cossey stated that in 2008, the TPC went through and created the Priority List and scored the Priority List. That was the document that local jurisdictions could use towards providing input to the citizens that on the projects ranking and as funding became available and when the issues would be taken down. In addition to the Priority List, Mr. Cossey asked if the OTO making a separate list with these three new projects or would this be taken care of after the other ranking projects. The concern is that projects that were ranked high in 2008 would no longer be ranking as more projects are added to the list.

Ms. Fields stated that the original priority list was never in priority order. The list was of equal priority. The intent is that the OTO provides a geographical distribution that can provide roadways of different types so when different funding pots become available, the funds can be allocated as appropriate. Republic is hoping that MM will have Economic Development Cost Share money or TIGER grant money, since it is geared for economic development. Republic felt that if the project was on the list it would help with the grant applications. As far as stating that MM and Highway 14 would be funded last after all these projects might not be correct. Mr. Cossey stated that all of these are worthy projects, he just wanted to make sure that the OTO was not creating a slippery slope. Mr. Miller stated that he did not look at it as a list, just a map of priority corridors that need work.

Ms. Burks stated that from a federal perspective, if there were earmarks, then the corridors would be looked at to see what corridors fit project funding availabilities. That is how the legislature looks for those types of projects and take it into account. There are no earmarks right now, but the projects are still looked at as corridors. Mr. Cossey wanted to ensure adding to it does not create a misconception. Ms. Burks stated that it is a living document, because as people move there are different patterns that develop. There may be a change that takes place, even though it is only 6 years, to the priorities in those corridors.

Mr. Juranas stated that even now the mind mixer survey has different sections of Route 14 that are being rated in pieces. There is no guarantee that the whole route will be funded.

Mr. Juranas made the motion to agree with Amendment 1 to the Priority Projects of Regional Significance. Mr. Smith seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

**G. Amendment 2 to the Priority Projects of Regional Significance**

Ms. Fields stated that the tab was in the wrong place in the agenda. Greene County has requested that the TPC consider another amendment to the Priority Projects of Regional Significance list. The amendment is the Kansas Expressway Extension from Republic Road to Highway 14 in Nixa. It has a score sheet. It scores low because the scoring does not consider proposed roads. Existing roads have existing accident data so that can be scored. A proposed road does not have that data. An excerpt from the North South Corridor Study is included which talks about the growth that was projected and the volumes south of James River Freeway, projected at 112,000. The capacity added at the time was 37,000, which is a little higher now with the addition of the lanes. The speeds would be low with the projected growth. It would be over capacity several times over. The study evaluated different alternatives. The alternatives were the West Bypass Extension, the Kansas Expressway Extension, expanding U.S. 160, and National Avenue. The alternatives were ranked based on travel time reductions, economic development and the impact on natural resources, funding eligibility, and so forth. At that time, FF scored the highest. A lot was due to the potential economic development and the impact of federal and state funding, but at the end

of the study, the conclusion was that both routes were needed to reduce the impact of congestion and growth in Christian County. This shows evidence as to the need of some improved connections to Christian County.

Mr. Smith stated that Greene County has been working on the planning since the early 1980's knowing that another corridor was going to be necessary as growth occurred. Greene County defined the corridor in Greene County and has preserved 80 to 90 percent of the right-of-way. Greene County is getting to the point to be able to start putting dollars into construction. Greene County has also been discussing with the City of Springfield about potentially doing an environmental study and using federal funding. The County is to the point where construction can actually start. There is a lot of opportunity with the intersection of Republic Road.

Mr. Juranas stated it is seen as a viable alternative to expanding U.S. 160, where traffic could go south on Kansas and relieve some of the traffic there. Mr. Whaley stated that he sees state of the art Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities on each side.

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to recommend approval of Amendment 2 to the Priority Projects of Regional Significance to the Board of Directors with Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities. Mr. Whaley seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Rognstad inquired about the map for the US 65, it shows it from I-44 down south then in the description is only from U.S. 160. Ms. Fields stated staff noticed it and fixed it on the actual website. It was caught after the agenda was published. Ms. Longpine stated that some of it relates to the fact that the capacity is still needed south of 60, the interchange improvements are still needed north of there. Mr. Miller stated that the changes were on the map on the main website and not in the agenda on the web.

#### **H. Transportation Input Initiative Update**

Ms. Fields stated that there was a postcard telling everyone how to give input at [Giveusyourinput.org](http://Giveusyourinput.org) and a text number. There were three public meetings March 18th, one at Republic High school, one at the Library Center, and one at Strafford City Hall. There are three more coming up in Willard, the Springfield Chamber, and the OTC campus in Ozark. There were probably 50 people total at the three meetings.

Ms. Fields gave a summary of the online voting to date. She stated that when the public input process is done there will be a public input report compiled. It will include all the outreach that was done and the number of participants. Mr. Whaley inquired if any of the input gathered would change any of the OTO priorities that have been discussed over the past couple months. He inquired if it could be used for that purpose. Ms. Fields stated that yes it potentially could. The Board of Directors at the last Board meeting established a one-cent subcommittee to put together a list in the event a one-cent sales tax made it through the legislature. The committee will look at the data from the priority projects and made the decisions based on that. Right now, based on that public input, there is nothing that suggests there will be changes. Mr. Whaley stated that looking at the Bicycle and Pedestrian page, the number 5 item is the number one priority on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, which is on-street facilities for bicyclists. He stated that the number one listed is the Wilson Creek/Schuyler Trail, but it is not the number one at the committee. Ms. Longpine stated it actually was one of the priorities that was adopted, the downtown



Springfield to downtown Republic corridor. Ms. Fields stated that is why the projects were listed on the input questions. Ms. Longpine stated that these preliminary votes would probably change by April 4 when the public meeting votes and website votes had been counted.

Ms. Fields stated that the text questions were open ended. Individuals could text in and let the OTO know of any additional projects that were not covered in the other places. Ms. Burks stated that some people did not understand the location that was surveyed. Ms. Fields stated that there was actually a question added for the SMCOG area, since the OTO was asked to look at the 10 county area. Staff will forward that information to SMCOG. The feeling was that in Christian or Greene Counties not everyone understands the OTO boundary, so that way there would be a category for their feedback.

Ms. Longpine stated that this is also giving input for the next Long Range Transportation Plan. This such a large outreach effort there is no reason not to include it. MoDOT has helped with signs and Greene County made the signs and installed them. There have been a couple of billboards purchased on Glenstone, so there has been a lot of partners involved. The input is being run by a joint subcommittee with the Springfield Chamber Transportation Committee. Ms. Richards mentioned that there have been some shares on Facebook and a recent post had about 8,000 views. Ms. Longpine stated that the Giveusyourinput.org belongs to the OTO. After this campaign ends that is going to be where the OTO directs people for public comment on all of the OTO initiatives.

**I. MoDOT Request to Withdraw Amendment Number Two**

Ms. Longpine stated that there was a handout with a map and letter from MoDOT. This request had been approved by the Board of Directors for USDOT to approve the amendment for the TIP. In the meantime MoDOT examined their funding and decided that even though there might be funding for scoping on this project, there is not any committed funding for actual project completion after the scoping. MoDOT has requested the project be pulled from the TIP. The decision was to go through the proper approval process to rescind the TIP amendment.

Mr. Miller stated that the multimodal division receives funds for federal and state railroad crossing safety. Usually, this is spent on resurfacing and new gates. Occasionally there is enough funding to do a full priority grade separation. There were some funds built up for a big project in St. Louis that fell through, so there was some additional funds to be spent. The Southwest District had been identified for two railroad grade separations that the state had agreed to fund. One is at Chestnut Expressway, the BNSF just west of 65, which was a cost share.

There were significant overruns, so the City and the Southwest District will not have to pay those overruns. The other one was the Route 125 crossing just south of Route D on the eastern boundary of the MPO. MoDOT was going to scope some more projects including this one. This map has the wrong location. It is closer to 60 where Route M goes over the tracks west of the intersection. There is not enough funding right now to finish the project. The second problem with Multimodal on this particular project is that there is a lot going on with it beyond the crossing. There would be additional state and district money needed to complete it. With the cost share program suspended, there would be no reason to scope

the project. It needs to be officially removed from the STIP. Ms. Fields stated that if the scoping was to be done in the future it would need to go through the whole process again.

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to recommend withdrawal of TIP Amendment Number Two to the Board of Directors. Mr. Smith seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

**III. Other Business**

**A. Technical Planning Committee Member Announcements**

None.

**B. Transportation Issues for Technical Planning Committee Member Review**

None.

**C. Articles For Technical Planning Committee Member Information**

No comments.

**IV. Adjournment**

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to adjourn at 2:38 p.m. Mr. Juranas seconded and the meeting was adjourned.

**X**

Travis Cossey  
Technical Planning Committee 2014 Chair