OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

February 3, 2016

The Technical Planning Committee of the Ozarks Transportation Organization met at its scheduled time of 12:00 p.m. in the OTO Conference Room.

The following members were present:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Rick Artman, Greene County Highway  Mr. David Brock, City of Republic  Mr. Randall Brown, City of Willard  Mr. King Coltrin, City of Strafford (Vice-Chair)  Mr. Travis Cossey, City of Nixa  Mr. Martin Gugel, City of Springfield  Mr. Rick Hess, City of Battlefield | Mr. Adam Humphrey, Greene County  Mr. Joel Keller, Greene County Hwy Dept. (a)  Mr. Larry Martin, City of Ozark (Chair)  Mr. Jason Ray, SMCOG  Mr. Andrew Seiler, MoDOT  Mr. Kelly Turner, City Utilities Transit  Mr. Todd Wiesehan, Christian County |

1. *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. David Bishop, R-12 School District  Mr. Justin Coyan, Springfield Chamber of Commerce  Mr. Tom Johnson, Missouri State University  Mr. Kirk Juranas, City of Springfield  Mr. Brad McMahon, FHWA  Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT  Mr. Kent Morris, Greene County Planning | Mr. Nicholas Konen, BNSF  Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA Representative  Mr. Shawn Schroeder, Springfield-Branson National Airport  Mr. Jeremiah Shuler, FTA Representative  Ms. Mary Lilly Smith, City of Springfield  Ms. Janette Vomund, MoDOT  Ms. Eva Voss, MoDOT  Mr. Terry Whaley, Ozark Greenways |

Others present were: Ms. Paula Brookshire and Mr. Eric Clausen, City of Springfield; Steve Bodenhamer, City of Ozark; Dan Wadlington, Senator Roy Blunt’s Office; David Rauch, Senator Claire McCaskill’s Office; Mr. Joshua Boley, Ms. Sara Fields, Mr. Jacob Guthrie, and Ms. Natasha Longpine, Ozarks Transportation Organization.

Mr. Larry Martin called the meeting to order at 12:08 pm.

* 1. **Administration**

1. **Introductions**

Prior to introductions, Mr. Martin asked the members to state their name when making a motion or seconding a motion to help keep the minutes more accurate. Introductions were made of members in attendance.

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

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

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

None.

1. **New Business**
2. **Revise Amendment Number Nine to the FY 2015-2018 TIP**

Ms. Longpine stated this was a revision to add an item to the FY 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Number 9. She stated that the City of Springfield wants to work on the outer road for the Campbell and Plainview intersection, but there wasn’t any STP-Urban programmed for the project. This would be in addition to the four items presented in January.

Ms. Longpine stated that the amendment would add the outer road project using $290,848 of STP-Urban Funding. Ms. Longpine asked if Ms. Brookshire would like to add additional details and she declined.

Mr. Hess made the motion to recommend approval of revised TIP Amendment Number Nine to the Board of Directors. Mr. Brock seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. **Draft Long Range Transportation Plan Document Overview**

Ms. Longpine stated that the OTO was about to start its public comment process on the LRTP in March, as many communities have business expos staff can attend. However, she explained that before the draft goes back out for comment, there needs to be a consensus between the TPC and Board of Directors members regarding the current draft of the LRTP. As many of the LRTP members are on the TPC, Ms. Longpine said OTO thought starting the review with the TPC would be appropriate. Ms. Longpine highlighted each section of the current draft and asked for comments from the members before starting the next section. She noted that the draft included the addition of the FAST Act which added two planning factors to the draft. The two factors related to resiliency and reliability of the system, including mitigating storm water and enhancing travel and tourism.

Ms. Longpine mentioned that the first chapter addresses some of the factors coming from the Federal level. She also said that Beyond Traffic is something new added to the draft since the last meeting. This initiative from The Department of Transportation looks at what is the next conversation on the future of transportation. The chapter also contains a summary of the planning process and survey results.

Ms. Longpine explained that the next chapter highlights the Plan’s vision and performance measures. She said OTO is also waiting on some guidance, as MAP-21 dictated that the State would create performance measures that would match the national goals, Then MPOs would need to coordinate with the state to develop local measures to match the state’s measures. At that time, new measures will be amended into the Plan. The chapter also contains the previously accepted design standards with the addition of a rural collector. An appendix to the plan is expected, which will contain the design standard graphics and charts.

Ms. Longpine moved on to the next chapter of Existing Conditions and Special Studies. She explained that some of the information in this chapter came from the Travel Demand Model. Growth scenarios, population, and commuting patterns and times are also included in the chapter. Something new in this plan, Ms. Longpine mentioned, was the addition of reliability. She explained that analysis was done with information provided from MoDOT, looking at commute times to and from work at different times throughout the day. Additionally, the chapter references the 2012 Transit Study. Ms. Longpine noted that a majority of the data, in regards to freight, came from the MoDOT Statewide Freight Plan. Data is traditionally available for just Kansas City and St. Louis, so this plan is the best source for the Springfield area.

Continuing into the next chapter, Ms. Longpine explained the Plan considers factors such as the natural environment, cultural resources, and endangered species. She said the plan also looks at environmental justice, which focuses on minorities, low income, elderly, those below 18, and those disabled. The populations are determined by finding those census tracts with a percentage higher than the average for the MPO.

Ms. Longpine said the next chapter is on Financial Capacity. She described how the Plan includes revenue sources from the federal, state, and local levels. Additionally, the Plan includes funding projections through 2040. Ms. Longpine also said there are two scenarios shown. The first is based off of the current funding available. The second is based on the assumption of higher funding availability. Ms. Fields said that the projections in the plan are fluid because the Highways and Transportation Commission would be meeting and could have a different forecast. She explained that the low projection is probably very low and the high assumes the matching of federal funds, but not bringing back the Cost Share Program. Ms. Fields reiterated that the projections shown are a place holder until information is obtained from MoDOT.

Ms. Longpine explained that the next chapter, Range of Alternatives, describes the project submission process, prioritization of projects, and project selection. For selected projects, some categories are listed separately as it is inappropriate to identify individual needs now. For the prioritized projects, the first list will be for the expected funding scenario, then additional projects will be selected in the event the high scenario is realized.

The final chapter, according to Ms. Longpine would contain the Major Thoroughfare Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Map, and a schedule for five year implementation.

Mr. Martin explained to the members that the motion would be for a consensus from the committee that the Plan is on right path.

Ms. Fields said in the past, the plans had been 300 to 400 pages and an effort was made to produce a usable plan this time for the committee. Ms. Longpine noted that the Plan had not received federal comments at this time.

Mr. Hess inquired if a motion of consensus was needed to be made or if a vote of consensus was appropriate. Mr. Martin agreed and asked for a vote by the showing of hands. A vote for consensus was unanimous.

1. **Prioritization Criteria and Points**

Ms. Longpine guided the committee through the current revision of the Prioritization Factors. She explained what each criteria was along with the proposed points allocated to each criteria.

Following the explanation, Mr. Cossey asked if there was a way to give points for a travel delay if data was not available. Ms. Fields explained that data could be provided from the mobile Wi-Fi units. She also said that if the mobile units were not available someone could go out and take counts. Ms. Longpine said that approximately half of the current projects on the list do not have the Travel Delay data. Mr. Cossey said this concerns him as the projects automatically lose the seven points connected to the criteria. Ms. Longpine said several of the projects are actually new road projects which would not have data available. Ms. Fields suggested finding another way to measure Travel Delay. Mr. Humphrey asked what data was used for new roads that did not have data available either. Ms. Fields said in the past they used parallel corridors, for example, the data from 160 for the Kansas project. Ms. Longpine noted this score was just one tool in deciding the overall priority of a project.

Mr. Coltrin asked for clarification in the multi-modal criteria. Ms. Longpine explained that the first set was if the project addresses multiple modes where the second is if the project does something to get people off the road. Mr. Turner further explained items, such as an HOV lane don’t have multiple modes but could take people off the road.

Mr. Turner asked about the at-grade railroad crossing factor in safety. He noted that railroads used to have funding to partner on those projects. Mr. Turner recommended giving this more points to capture the potential for external funding.

Mr. Turner also asked about the requirements for Environmental Justice. He wanted to know if OTO is awarding projects for being in that area and if that was the intention of the legislative requirements. Ms. Longpine said that was part of the challenge. She said projects should not adversely impact a disadvantaged area, but also improvements should not avoid an area. Ms. Fields said the thing OTO should avoid is building a freeway through a disadvantaged neighborhood. Ms. Longpine quoted the legal wording as “ensure that there are no disproportionate adverse impacts in those communities.” Mr. Turners said it seems with the criteria as it is now, projects are rewarded for being put in those areas which he believes is not the intent. Ms. Longpine stated the assumption is the transportation improvement would benefit those areas. Ms. Fields, Ms. Longpine, and Mr. Turner agreed that the points for Environmental Justice should be evaluated and lowered.

Mr. Turner said that 67 percent of the points in Economic Development revolve around freight. He asked if the current two freight items should be combined. He said that a new headquarters for a freight company could actually generate more traffic in an area, but could also create more Economic Development as well. Mr. Brock asked what was used last time for this Economic Development criteria. Ms. Longpine said economic development zones created by communities were used and projects would receive points if they were in that zone. Ms. Longpine said the last plan also had strategic economic corridors, which ended up just being major roadways.

Ms. Longpine asked the committee if there was any criteria that needed to be added, removed, or combined. She suggested taking another look at Travel Delay for evaluation. Mr. Cossey agreed it was an important factor, but could hinder 50 percent of the projects and recommended removing it from the criteria list. Ms. Longpine asked if anyone would like to see it kept. The item received no support.

Mr. Brock said there should be some other criteria besides freight for Economic Development. Ms. Longpine suggested changing the points from 5 to 10 for Local Priority to offset the freight criteria and combining the two freight with a combined score of five.

Mr. Martin asked that if a motion was made for approval, that it include whatever changes had been added or removed during the meeting. Ms. Longpine summarized the revised factors as eliminating the Travel Delay criteria and combining the two fright criteria into one. She also removed the criterion under multi-modal that “Project Will Result in Some Trip Reduction.”

Ms. Longpine asked for suggestions and recommendations in regards to the criteria points. Mr. Brock said he would like to see multi-modal carry more weight than environmental justice. Mr. Turner recommended taking five points from Environmental Justice and adding them to Priority Projects since so much time is spent creating them. Mr. Brock agreed with Mr. Turner’s recommendation. Ms. Longpine noted the new change would push multi-modal above Environmental Justice. Ms. Longpine recommended the points for multi-modal remain the same with the exclusion of Project Will Result in Some Trip Reduction. Ms. Fields asked to add two points to the ITS Architecture because they may not score in many other categories. Ms. Longpine asked if 18 was sufficient for the Crash Rate criteria points. Mr. Turner said that adding to At-Grade Railroad Crossing could provide incentive to leverage more funds from the railroads. Ms. Fields agreed there could be some statewide rail money available. He said the minimum share for project could be an additional 5 percent, and it could be more. Mr. Coltrin said there actually may not be any MoDOT rail money left but was not sure. Ms. Fields said it could be helpful to make it a higher priority when competing for statewide funding. Ms. Longpine recommended changing the points under safety to allocation of 15, 5 and 5 and changing the overall for Priority Projects from 20 to 25.

Mr. Turner asked in Congestion Management if there would ever be a scenario where a project could receive the seven points but not the five points under Volume-to-Capacity Ratio. That might happen with one or two projects, but, Ms. Longpine state, most would probably be the other way around.

Ms. Longpine said OTO will send out revised Prioritization Factors to all the members. Ms. Longpine summarized the points allocated, with 25 for the Priority Projects, 25 for Safey, 20 for Congestion Management, 5 for Environmental Justice, 10 for Multi-Modal, and 15 for Economic Development.

Mr. Humbrrey made the motion to approve the Prioritization Criteria with all amendments and modifications noted by Ms. Longpine. Mr. Cossey seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

1. **Project List and Scoring**

Ms. Longpine stated that she did not think the committee would be able to finish evaluating the scoring as there are some things that need be added and revised. She mentioned that she sent out information to the committee about the improvement year and costs. Ms. Longpine said previous costs were adjusted with an inflation factor. She said the numbers shown in the Projects list are based on the timeframe of potential construction. Additionally, she noted that there were some gaps showing up on new projects. Mr. Humphrey stated that Greene County would like to revise some of the dates they have in the project timeline in regards to the Kansas Extension and East/West Arterial.

Ms. Longpine mentioned that the prior plan asked for $1.7 billion in proposed needs and the current plan could come between $1.2 and $1.3 billion after review. Mr. Cossey inquired what the deadline would be for getting all information in the Project List. Ms. Longpine replied within the next week. She said the next LRTP Subcommittee meeting would be February 25 and she would like to finalize the Project List at that time. Ms. Longpine also asked members if they could think of any outreach opportunities within Springfield. Mr. Turner suggested Arts Fest in early May. Ms. Longpine said that OTO had tried the Safe and Sound event last year with minimal success.

Mr. Martin reminded the committee that this item did not require a motion at this time.

1. **Other Business**

Ms. Fields stated that she would be sending out a survey to all committee members asking if they would like to receive agendas via a Kindle and what size of Kindle they preferred between a 7-inch and 10-inch.

Mr. Martin reminded the TPC that the next meeting would be on Wednesday, March 16, 2016 in the OTO Conference Room.

1. **Adjournment**

Mr. Turner made the motion to adjourn. Mr. Brown seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 1:24 p.m.