

**OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
June 11, 2014**

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

The following members were present:

Mr. David Brock, City of Republic	Mr. Joel Keller, Greene County Hwy Dept. (a)
Mr. Randall Brown, City of Willard (a)	Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT
Mr. King Coltrin, City of Strafford	Mr. Kent Morris, Greene County Planning
Mr. Travis Cossey, City of Nixa	Mr. Shawn Schroeder, SGF
Mr. Jonathan Gano, City of Springfield	Mr. Dan Smith, Greene County Highway Dept.
Ms. Dawne Gardner, City of Springfield (a)	Ms. Eva Voss, MoDOT
Mr. Martin Gugel, City of Springfield (a)	Mr. Dan Watts, SMCOG
Mr. Rick Hess, City of Battlefield (Chair)	

(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	Ms. Diane May, SMCOG (a)
Mr. David Bishop, R-12 School District	Mr. Brad McMahon, FHWA
Ms. Kristy Bork, SGF (a)	Mr. Bill Robinett, MoDOT
Mr. Don Clark, Missouri State University	Mr. Ralph Rognstad, City of Springfield
Mr. Doug Colvin, City of Nixa (a)	Ms. Beth Schaller, MoDOT (a)
Mr. Rick Emling, R-12 School District (a)	Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA Representative
Ms. Diane Gallion, City Utilities (a)	Mr. Jeff Seifried, Springfield Chamber
Mr. Jason Haynes, City of Springfield (a)	Mr. Andrew Seiler, MoDOT
Mr. Jay Huff, Missouri State University (a)	Ms. Cheryl Townlian, BNSF
Mr. Adam Humphrey, Greene County	Mr. Garrett Tyson, City of Republic (a)
Mr. Chris Jones, City Utilities Transit	Mr. Terry Whaley, Ozark Greenways
Mr. Kirk Juranas, City of Springfield	Mr. Todd Wiesehan, Christian County
Mr. Kevin Lambeth, City of Battlefield (a)	Mr. Bob Wilslef, City of Ozark (a)
Mr. Larry Martin, City of Ozark	Mr. Chad Zickefoose, MoDOT (a)

Others present were: Ms. Sara Fields, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Mr. Curtis Owens, Ms. Debbie Parks, and Mr. Jacob Guthrie, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Mr. Steve Childers, City of Ozark; Mr. Jered Taylor, Congressman Long's Office.

Mr. Travis Cossey called the meeting to order at 1:34 pm.

I. Administration

A. Introductions

B. Approval of the Technical Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

Mr. Cossey stated that a revised agenda adding Item H had been passed out. Ms. Fields stated that Item H was for City Utilities to apply for a Federal Transit Administration Grant, "Ladders of Opportunity," for nine replacement buses. Staff is requesting to add Item H to the agenda.

Mr. Morris made the motion to approve the Technical Planning Committee agenda. Mr. Hess seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

C. Approval of the March 19, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Brock made the motion to approve the March 10, 2014 Technical Planning Committee meeting minutes. Mr. Hess seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

D. Public Comment Period for All Agenda Items

Ms. Fields stated that the OTO received an email. It was a complaint on the City Utilities Transit System, in particular about a CU bus driver. CU has received the complaint and is handling it administratively. It is a staff issue for CU, but the OTO's policy is to pass out all public comment that is received. City Utilities assured staff that the issue was currently being addressed.

E. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Fields introduced the new OTO full time employee, Jacob Guthrie. She stated that he started work part time in January. His job transitioned into a full time position effective June 2, as a GIS Technician. The GIS position had been vacant for a while, so he will be working to catch the OTO up on all GIS projects.

Staff has attended a lot of training in the last few months. Ms. Parks attended the GFOA of Missouri's Conference and learned a lot on administrative functions and governmental accounting. Ms. Longpine attended the Mid-America GIS Consortium Conference meeting. Ms. Fields stated she had attended the Association of MPO's Policy Committee meeting.

Staff has been working on the 3/4-cent proposal. Hopefully at the next Technical Planning Committee, there will be a few more work product items on the agenda, some of the projects had been delayed due to work on the 3/4-cent proposal. Work is continuing on the Travel Demand Model. The base year has been calibrated and there is a calibration report. There was a scenario run on a Kansas Expressway Extension using the new model and it seemed to function well. There are some tweaks still needed, but staff should be able to run some future year scenarios shortly. The Travel Demand Model was due to be wrapped up in June. It might be extended through the summer.

Staff has also been working on Performance Measures. Staff produces an annual report documenting how the OTO is reaching the Performance Measures in the Long Range Transportation Plan. It has also been delayed a little. A lot of work has been going into the

Growth Trends Report. It has been delayed due to the ¾-cent sales tax. She thanked the jurisdictions for providing the building permit data.

Ms. Fields stated that Ms. Longpine had been working on the Draft Transportation Improvement Program for the Fiscal Year 2015-2018. There is a subcommittee meeting scheduled for June 18. Staff has also been working with the Board to produce some strategic plan action items at this next fiscal year. The fiscal year begins July 1, so the Board will hopefully adopt the action items on the June 18 Board of Directors meeting. Missouri State University submitted a TIGER Grant, but there has been no update on the status of the grant. The Kansas Expressway Extension Grant was not submitted due to a lack of match funding.

There has been a lot going on with the federal legislation. The Grow America Act was released by President Obama. The Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee released a version of the new Surface Transportation Bill. The House has a version proposed that would cut Saturday delivery from the US Postal Service to fund the upcoming fiscal year deficit. There does not seem to be any consensus yet.

F. Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Report

Ms. Longpine stated that a lot of work had happened in the past few months deciding and approving the OTO Bicycle and Pedestrian Priorities, which are on the revised Priority Projects of Regional Significance map. Those priorities feed into the ¾-cent process as well. The BPAC has started to revise the Enhancement Application. It is now known as the Transportation Alternatives Program Funding. The funds are now directly sub allocated to the OTO. There is an actual balance that is tracked with the Funds Balance Report.

There will probably be an Enhancement Subcommittee meeting, probably before July to review the proposed changes and bring that to the Technical Planning Committee in July and the Board of Directors in August. The FY 2015 allocation is still unknown due to the federal legislative changes. The subcommittee will go ahead and post an application by September 15 and have applications due by December 1. That will give time to plan and prepare an application. That should put the OTO on track to use both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 year funding.

G. Legislative Reports

Mr. Taylor stated that there was not much to add. There has been some talk about transportation, but a lot has been about Benghazi and the terrorists that were recently released. He stated that he had talked to Congressman Long's Transportation Liaison in D.C. and the thought was that something will probably happen in the lame duck session, but not before then. He did not know what that would look like since there was currently no consensus. Ms. Fields inquired if he thought it would be in the form of a Continuing Resolution. He stated that is what the thought was, but the length of the Continuing Resolution was unknown.

II. New Business

A. Administrative Modification 2 to the FY 2014-2017 TIP

Ms. Longpine stated that the OTO Public Involvement Process allows the OTO to make Administrative Modifications to the TIP. These are minor changes that allow staff to

approve a change without having to go through the full Amendment process. This particular project was for the Route 65 pavement improvements. It was to move funding from FY 2015 and FY 2016 to FY 2014. It adjusted the funding amount of the project a little. That means it will happen this year and the project will be completed.

B. Amendment Number 3 to the FY 2014-2017 TIP

Ms. Longpine stated this was a MoDOT request to add bridge scoping on Route 13 over Radio Lane. That is a road just north of I-44. It will add scoping funding over the next few years for a total cost of \$6,000. After the scoping, the project will be looked at to see what needs to be done.

Mr. Smith made the motion to recommend approval of TIP Amendment Number Three to the Board of Directors. Mr. Hess seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

C. 2015-2019 Draft STIP

Mr. Miller stated that this was easier than most year,s because this year there were technically no projects added to the STIP. There were a few exceptions. One is for a few cost shares that were approved at the last cost share meeting. This includes the Division/65 Interchange, Kearney/Packer Intersection (both are Springfield projects), and Route 160/Hwy 14 in Nixa. There were also some ADA projects added from some statewide Transportation Enhancement funding. This is mainly for resurfacing Kearney in FY 2017. Last year's STIP stated various safety improvements in the OTO area, which are now being applied to particular projects. North Glenstone is being looked at with various safety improvements on the entire corridor.

Mr. Gano made the motion that the Technical Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors endorse the Draft FY 2015-2019 STIP. Mr. Smith seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

D. Funds Balance Report

Ms. Longpine stated that the Funds Balance Report includes all the funds that the OTO is suballocated, through March 31, 2014. If a more recent project is missing, that information can be obtained from staff. The overall Surface Transportation Program has a variety of funding sources within it. It states that large urban areas, like Springfield which is a TMA, get a specific set of funding. MoDOT helps the OTO track those balances. The OTO has decided to suballocate those balances out to the member jurisdictions. This report tracks those balances.

There is an expanded introduction this year. Information has been included on each of the program balances for the overall OTO area. This includes the March 31 ending balance, what is left after the cost shares, the maximum balance that is allowed, and the OTO's rescission risk for the funding.

MoDOT has allowed the OTO to include cost shares that have been programmed within the OTO boundaries. There is a three year funds lapse policy. If there are more than three years of funding as a whole, then the funds could be spent elsewhere in the Southwest District. The cost shares help the OTO reduce its balance. Unfortunately, MoDOT has suspended the cost share program. Overall the OTO STP-Urban balance is \$23 million. Once

the programmed cost shares are counted, it is about \$10.5 million. The maximum allowed is \$16 million.

The OTO area still receives a little bit of Small-Urban funding from the statewide program. There was a little left over from the City of Springfield and the City of Republic has continued to receive it. Republic has changed over, joining the urbanized area and now Willard is a small urban area. The program has not reset yet to account for that switch. The funding is still set for Republic, but the suballocation of funds is done, so that the City of Republic does not receive additional funding, it is included in what the overall allocation should be.

MAP-21 discontinued the On-System Bridge Program, but it is still eligible under STP. MoDOT has continued to distribute that to the large urban areas. That balance is included, with \$1.5 million that needs to be programmed. Part of that is dedicated to the Battlefield/65 Interchange project. That leaves the balance at \$352,000 which is not a lot for a bridge. The Transportation Alternatives Program is suballocated directly to the OTO. The unspent funds will remain in the OTO area. The OTO is currently in the allowable balance of \$1.7 million. It shows a March 31 ending balance of \$1 million. The FY 2013 projects that were awarded have not all been obligated. The balance is actually a little bit smaller.

Overall, about \$25 million could be subject to a federal rescission. MoDOT has a three year lapse policy, but that does not stop Congress from taking action. Staff encourages the jurisdictions to continue to program the funds as soon as possible. There are some forward projections on the agenda yellow sheet that shows the OTO balance approaching the MoDOT limit, as well. There was a STP-Urban Advance Policy passed by the Board of Directors, which will allow a jurisdiction to spend beyond the current allocation.

Mr. Cossey inquired if there was talk at the federal level of a rescission. Ms. Longpine stated no, that the recent action was on old earmarks. Congress took action to clear out old earmarks. However, Congress is starting to find places where additional funding can be found. Mr. Taylor stated he would look into it. Mr. Brock inquired about the yellow sheet projection that seemed to be different than the Funds Balance Report. Ms. Fields stated that she had requested Ms. Longpine include a projection on the yellow sheet. The funds are received on October 1 of each fiscal year, so the yellow sheet table includes the October 2015 allocation. Staff wanted to show that funds are still coming in every year and it takes a while to put together a project. If something did not happen between now and September 30, 2016 then the funds are subject to rescission. There are a couple of allocations included, but staff wanted to warn the jurisdictions.

Mr. Miller stated that MoDOT only looks at it as OTO's balance. There are not individual cities tracked except the Small Urban. Ms. Longpine stated that the timing of the report has moved. It is now in line with the funding. The next report will be in November and show where the fiscal year ended.

E. Unified Planning Work Program Amendment

Ms. Parks stated that this is the first UPWP Amendment. The federal government allows OTO to claim direct cost from MoDOT. This means that MoDOT performs work for the OTO area that is eligible for federal reimbursement. Instead of submitting the expense MoDOT

allows the OTO to submit the value of expense on the OTO budget for federal reimbursement. This helps the OTO to match the Consolidated Planning Grant. The OTO had budgeted for \$65,000 worth of work from MoDOT in the 2014 UPWP, and instead the value came to approximately \$91,000. There is still one month left, but MoDOT is projecting it will be \$91,000. That is a \$26,000 increase of revenue, that was not budgeted in the FY 2014 UPWP. The OTO will need an Amendment in order to submit the excess for reimbursement. The FY 2014 UPWP format was a little different than the FY 2015, so the whole amount will not be captured. The net effect is an increase of \$12,441. There will be about \$8,359 not captured because of the way the UPWP was formatted.

Mr. Hess made the motion to recommend approval of the proposed 2014 UPWP Amendment Number One to the Board of Directors. Mr. King seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

F. Program Management Plan

Mr. Owens stated that the Program Management Plan is from the 5310 Program, Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities. The 5310 Program provides capital and operations funds which the OTO will award soon with the grant application. This particular grant provides services for traditional 5310 and New Freedom Projects, which includes ADA compliant vehicles and operating expenses for ADA.

The Program Management Plan is a description of how the 5310 program will be managed. The purpose of the plan is to help facilitate both the recipient and the FTA oversight. The plan is outlined in a FTA Circular that was just released on June 6.

The plan discusses the guidelines given for program goals and objectives, roles and responsibilities. It goes right on down through the table of contents. This is actual information from the circular that has been put straight into the program management plan. It covers all of those things. The reason for the Program Management Plan is because the OTO signed a MOU with CU and MoDOT who is partnering with this program. OTO is responsible for administering the grant administration process. MoDOT and CU will administer the actual projects. There is a list of requirements. OTO is responsible for having the Program Management Plan for City Utilities. MoDOT will be responsible for the State Management Plan which is currently being developed.

The Program Management Plan was recommended by the Local Coordinating Board for Transit. The plan has to be submitted to FTA by the Designated Recipient, which is City Utilities. This plan will go through and be submitted from CU.

Mr. Brown made the motion to recommend approval of the Draft Program Management Plan to the Board of Director. Mr. Gugel seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

G. ¾-Cent Project List

Mr. Cossey stated there was a revised project list from the mailed agenda. Ms. Fields stated that the ¾-Cent Project List has been worked on for quite a while. There was first a Public Input Committee which consisted of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee and OTO members. The committee worked hard to develop the Public Input Campaign. The OTO received over 5,000 votes for various projects. These are summarized

in the Transportation Initiative Report, which is available on the OTO website. This was considered in developing a project list.

When the list was first being developed, the OTO was looking at a one-cent sales tax scenario, but then it passed the legislature as a 3/4-cent sales tax scenario. It was scheduled for the November ballot, and then it was moved to the August ballot. That moved the timeline. The subcommittee worked hard and had 5 meetings to look at the project list. The first item considered was MoDOT Maintenance. MoDOT requested \$40 million off the top to help maintain the existing system. The OTO also requested estimates for different modes of transportation. The OTO requested City Utilities Transit, the Airport, and OATS to submit project lists. The submitted proposals were much larger than shown on the lists. This proposal shows partial funding for each of the agencies.

Also included are parts of the Regional Trail Priorities that were voted to be the OTO Regional Priorities. There are small pieces of several different trails. The OTO was aiming for a 15 percent multimodal set-aside for rail, airport, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit. This is based off what different statewide multimodal groups are requesting. Different planning partners around the state agreed early with those groups to avoid amendments to the bill as it moved through the legislature. The Missouri Public Transit Association passed a resolution in support, as well as the MO Bicycle and Pedestrian Federation. There is a lot of support from different groups out there. There was feedback that the groups were impressed with this percentage. The thought is that the groups will support the sales tax effort locally.

There were initially some large amounts of funding for future needs, such as partnerships for grant matching for emerging needs that the OTO did not see coming yet. Items could include a TIGER Grant, or communities that had a project that did not score as high on the Regional Priority List but would be willing to use STP-Urban or local funding to apply for the grant. There were some larger set-asides originally. Staff called MoDOT several times asking if the project estimates could be tweaked to be shortened or have less lanes in order to maximize the projects. A lot of the estimates were cut in half. The projects have been tweaked and tweaked again, in order to touch the most amount of communities and the most amount of people. The subcommittee produced the last page provided in the agenda handout. It was approved unanimously. It came out with the next projects in priority order if there was additional funding. Originally it looked like there was not going to be any additional funding.

However, based on a request from MoDOT, there is a revised Project List that has been handed out. Mr. Miller stated that when MoDOT looked at the list statewide there were a lot of undesignated funds sitting in program pots. For example OTO has \$24.5 million, plus \$5 million for Bicycle and Pedestrian and this equals more than 15 percent of the money. The feedback from the Central Office is that voters do not want to see money in pots and trust the State to spend it later. The voters want a project list. The requirement now is that no more than 5 percent of the funding can be in those funding pots. He stated that he had called Ms. Fields late in the day yesterday. MoDOT and OTO had agreed on between 5 to 8 percent. Ms. Fields had wanted to keep \$10 million in the regional pot, for matching and partnering, and \$3 million for Bicycle and Pedestrian. This would increase the Strafford Trail scope from Washington Avenue to Partnership Drive. The Project List that was handed out shows these changes.

At the same time, MoDOT looked at the estimates and some of the estimates were decreased. However, on the freeway projects, inflation was unknown, so those estimates were increased. The net result was about \$16 million that was freed up. The alternative project that was looked at was Route 14 from Cheyenne to 65 which could not be completed for the \$20 million. There was an option to go from Combs Road to US 65 on Route 14 and that would fit the amount of additional funding available. This was placed on the list for now.

Mr. Miller stated that the Taking Care of the System could not simply state resurfacing roads in the future. The roads had to be listed out. Basically all the freeways are there. A lot of the major routes had been recently resurfaced, but in a 10-year cycle the roads will need to be resurfaced again. There were minor routes included as well. There are two bridge projects. One was just approved with the scoping amendment, Route 13 over Radio Lane. The other is H north of Springfield over one of the Sac Rivers. Ms. Fields stated that when the Statewide Project List comes out, there will be all those resurfacing projects. Mr. Miller stated that the Springfield projects are hard to see because the projects are jumbled up.

Mr. Smith inquired of Mr. Miller if the estimates were as refined as could be. Mr. Miller stated yes, at this point the list is \$370,000 over. Mr. Smith stated that he noticed that the secondary list was not included in case of additional funds. Mr. Miller stated that there will not be a secondary list now because the proposal changed to a ¾-cent proposal.

Mr. Smith made the motion to recommend approval of the handed out (revised) 3/4-Cent Project List to the Board of Directors. Mr. Coltrin seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Brock stated he was could not find the set-asides for multimodal or transit. Ms. Fields stated that for transit, there were fleet service improvements listed. She stated that the Statewide List would be more specific, it might say purchase buses and improve two routes. OATS has down to purchase 6 to 8 buses, with two or three more days in Christian County and serving five days a week in the City of Springfield. OATS has really significant service denial right now. Service additions in Ozark, Nixa, and Christian County and then in the City of Springfield would help meet the demand. The Airport has safety improvements. Mr. Miller stated that there are six safety projects. Ms. Fields stated that the \$10 million would not be further designated in partnership and emerging needs and \$3 million would be left in bicycle and pedestrian. This is a reduced 5 percent funding amount.

In addition, studies were not faring well with the polls of potential voters. The Inter-City Passenger Rail Study has been removed from the list. The I-44 NEPA study has also been removed from the statewide list. The OTO has added right-of-way acquisition of 60 from Republic west to the OTO western limits, because the statewide project list includes US 60 capacity projects of about \$50 million. It is going to be right-of-way acquisition and then four lanes between Monett and Aurora. If it passes, then the next 10-year list could include the project in the OTO area.

H. Support for CU Ladders of Opportunity Grant

Ms. Longpine stated that the Department of Transportation announced a new program using remaining discretionary funds that are under the FTA. This is titled the Ladders of

Opportunity Initiative. It is a capital program. City Utilities is using it to apply for 9 new buses. It will replace some of CU's existing fleet, four of the oldest buses and five of the 2000 model year buses. These buses are fully equipped with low floors, ITS Integration, automated vehicle location, passenger counters, and voice annunciation systems. This will bring the fleet more in line. City Utilities is requesting a letter of support and for the OTO to certify that the projects would be added to the TIP if CU receives the funding.

Mr. Smith made a recommendation for support for the CU Ladders of Opportunity Grant to the Board of Directors. Mr. Hess seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

III. Other Business

A. Technical Planning Committee Member Announcements

Ms. Fields mentioned that MoDOT has an Open House, Wednesday, July 18 from 4:30 to 7:00 p.m. for the MoDOT Statewide Project List. The list is supposed to come out on Friday and there are having meetings across the state for the public to come and review the list. The Springfield area meeting is at the Springfield Chamber of Commerce.

B. Transportation Issues for Technical Planning Committee Member Review

None.

IV. Articles For Technical Planning Committee Member Information

Ms. Fields stated that the Kansas City sales tax proposal submission was included, which shows only 55 percent of the funds on roadways. St. Louis is also transit heavy. Mr. Miller stated that the St. Louis MPO gave the funds directly to the counties to manage. That is why the City of St. Louis published a list.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

X

Travis Cossey
Technical Planning Committee 2014 Chair