OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

March 21, 2012

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. Joel Keller, Greene County (a) |
| Mr. Don Clark, Missouri State University | Mr. Larry Martin, City of Ozark |
| Mr. King Coltrin, City of Strafford | Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT |
| Mr. Travis Cossey, City of Nixa | Mr. Duffy Mooney, Greene County Highway Dept. |
| Ms. Carol Cruise, City Utilities  | Mr. Ralph Rognstad, City of Springfield |
| Ms. Hollie Elliott, Springfield Chamber (a) | Ms. Beth Schaller, MoDOT |
| Mr. Jonathan Gano, City of Springfield | Mr. Andrew Seiler, MoDOT |
| Ms. Dawne Gardner, City of Springfield (a) | Mr. Dan Smith, Greene County Highway Dept. |
| Mr. Nick Heatherly, City of Willard | Ms. Eva Voss, MoDOT |
| Mr. Rick Hess, City of Battlefield | Mr. Todd Wiesehan, Christian County (Chair) |

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. Ryan Mooney, Springfield Chamber |
| Mr. Rick Artman, Greene County Highway Dept. | Mr. Kent Morris, Greene County Planning Dept. |
| Mr. David Bishop, R-12 School District | Mr. Troy Pinkerton, MoDOT (a) |
| Mr. Randall Brown, City of Willard (a) | Mr. Bill Robinett, MoDOT |
| Mr. Rick Emling, R-12 School District (a) | Mr. Mark Roy, Springfield-Branson Airport (a) |
| Ms. Diane Gallion, City Utilities (a) | Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA Representative |
| Mr. Martin Gugel, City of Springfield (a) | Mr. Shawn Schroeder, Springfield-Branson Airport |
| Mr. Jason Haynes, City of Springfield (a) | Mr. Cheryl Townlian, BNSF |
| Mr. Jay Huff, Missouri State University (a) | Mr. Garrett Tyson, City of Republic (a) |
| Mr. Kirk Juranas, City of Springfield | Mr. Dan Watts, SMCOG |
| Mr. Kevin Lambeth, City of Battlefield (a) | Mr. Terry Whaley, Ozark Greenways |
| Mr. Brad McMahon, FHWA | Mr. Bob Wilslef, City of Ozark (a) |

Others present were: Ms. Debbie Parks, Ms. Sara Edwards, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Mr. Curtis Owens and Mr. Chris Stueve, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Ms. Stacy Burks, Senator Roy Blunt’s Office; Mr. Jered Taylor, Congressman Billy Long’s Office; Ms. Paula Brookshire, City of Springfield.

Mr. Wiesehan called the March 21, 2012 Technical Planning Committee meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

## Administration

# Introductions

# Approval of the Technical Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

Ms. Cruise made the motion to approve the revised agenda. Mr. Smith seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

# Approval of the January 18, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Martin made the motion to approve the January 18, 2012 Meeting Minutes. Mr. Heatherly seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

# Public Comment Period for All Agenda Items

None

# Executive Director’s Report

Ms. Edwards stated that Ms. Parks put together a TPC guidebook that is now available. The guidebook contains the TPC membership information, By-Laws, and MoDOT information.

The Senate passed a version of the Transportation Bill on March 21. This is a two-year bill, though due to the current 6-month extension is actually an eighteen-month bill. The House will not be looking at the Senate bill and is instead looking at a six-month extension. Unless there is a change in direction a six-month extension is what will likely happen.

The OTO is still working on the Regional Transit Study. The consultants were in town in January looking at the Regional proposal. The draft has been distributed to the Transit Subcommittee. The consultants are also working on the rest of the draft, which the Transit Subcommittee will review later.

The aerial flights were flown and finished in February. The photography is scheduled for a May delivery.

Staff conducted a Board Training, which covered the OTO’s requirements under federal law. This will be conducted periodically. The development of an OTO Strategic Plan and a need for a Mission Statement came out of the discussion during the training. Staff will begin the development of that next.

Staff attended the TEAM Conference and Natasha Longpine received Local Public Agency Certification from Federal Highway.

There is an upcoming Federal Highway webinar, one in Republic and another at District 8 Offices. The webinar is on procurement practices.

Staff is in the process of developing the Transportation Improvement Program for this Fiscal Year and OTO is purchasing software to do that. It will be set up by the vendor and staff will begin training in April. This software will allow agencies to directly input their projects over the web and create a report for the OTO.

Mr. Brock asked what the impact would be on the OTO if the federal funding expired. Ms. Edwards stated that the last time, Federal Highway stopped working. Federal Highway would not process anything for the OTO. This can create issues for OTO if there is not an extension, as OTO relies on timely reimbursements to keep operating. Last time, however, the shut-down only lasted two days.

# Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Report

Ms. Longpine stated that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Committee has been reviewing the region’s trail plan by dividing the trails into individual segments and identifying opportunities. The BPAC has been looking at better alignments or what should be higher priorities among the alignments. The committee started with the Jordan Creek Trail from Smith Park near Evangel and seeing if it could go to the Battlefield. This ends up tying into the Wilson’s Creek Greenway and the Trail of Tears Greenway which is newer. The committee will also examine the Strafford Trail near Route OO and then the Republic Trail System.

# New Business

1. TIGER Summary

Ms. Longpine gave a brief presentation that was given by Mr. Bob Brendel of MoDOT at a recent planning partners meeting, summarizing information from the DOT TIGER grants. The MoDOT PowerPoint is included at the end of the minutes.

1. MoDOT LPA Manual Update

Ms. Holtsclaw from MoDOT’s Central Office, Division of Local Programs introduced herself. She gave a quick overview of the changes to the Local Public Agency Manual. She stated that last summer MoDOT formed a vision team consisting of a diverse group: Federal Highway, MoDOT, local entities and consultants. The task was to make the program better. The vision team identified best practices around the nation and looked at local programs in other states to develop five main recommendations. The team met for a couple of days a week for several weeks.

The first recommendation was to develop a certification program for Missouri’s Local Program. This certification would stream line MoDOT’s resources. If a local entity was certified at the highest level then MoDOT would put more focus of resources on local entities that were smaller and do not have the resources to be certified. An agency that is certified at the highest level then would not have to submit as many items to MoDOT. Some of the training will be required.

Another recommendation was that the manual needed to be updated. It is currently not very reader friendly. MoDOT has been working on adding check lists, flow charts, and other items to make it more reader friendly. There has also been a search feature added to the online version of the manual. The online version currently is incorporated into MoDOT’s Engineering Policy Guide. If a person conducts a search it searches the whole Policy Guide not just the Local Program, so a search engine was created for just the Local Program.

A third recommendation is the project management tool. This is a database at MoDOT that will contain all the local program information. Currently, the Central Office would have to call the District to find the status of a project.

With this continuous improvement, a statewide advisory committee was formed. Duffy Mooney is on the advisory committee. The committee will listen to concerns of the local entities to continuously improve the Local Program in the state.

Ms. Holtsclaw stated there was a one-page summary of the substantial changes that have been made to the Local Program. The first recommendation mentioned was the Certification. The first level of certification is required. This is a four to six hour training that explains what happens when an entity uses the federal process. Several members of the TPC were at the TEAM Conference for the federal training. It will be a little different from that training. It will be MoDOT and will consist of at least four hours of training in basic federal aid. There is a lot to learn in four hours on the federal aid process. It is basically a general overview of what the agency is getting into and the paperwork that has to be filed for the federal aid process. This training is required by the end of this year for locals who are accepting federal dollars.

The second level of training is called Certified and it is optional. It is currently under development. The training courses are not all lined up for this yet. This is an additional training for the agency who does not want as much MoDOT oversight and less paperwork requirements. This has not been incorporated yet into the new LPA manual.

The basic training sessions will be held all around the state and at the MoDOT District offices. There is one being held in the OTO area in late May. There will be several opportunities and an agency will not have to attend a session in this area. This will be a continuous training so the training sessions will be held every year. MoDOT will post on the website the dates and times for all the courses. The advanced training level is coming out in the future and is optional.

There is also a training tab on the MoDOT website. There are several NHI courses, some of which are lengthy. Some are four to six hours long, but can be watched on the computer screen. It is like modules of different scenarios that a person can go through for the local program. Tutorials are also being created for the local program. For instance, Chapter Four about consultant services has a tutorial on how to procure a consultant. A person can just click on the tutorial and there is a slide show that walks through step-by-step how to do consultant procurement. Another example is how to fill out an invoice to send to MoDOT. There will be 25 tutorials. It is sideline training, but MoDOT staff is also available to give the local agency the same training.

Ms. Holtsclaw stated she was in charge of the manual updates, which was done after the vision team was complete. There were eleven to twelve teams that helped rewrite the manual. There was a team for every chapter, which consisted of someone from Federal Highway, MoDOT, locals and consultants. MoDOT wanted the local voice incorporated into the manual. It was reworded so it would be easier to understand. That was done with every chapter; making it easier to read and checklists were added. A large amount of feedback was received about the need for checklists. There were also example documents that were filled out. Every chapter should have these attached to the back of the chapter. The new LPA manual is out for public comment at this time. It is posted on the MoDOT website. The public comment period runs through the end of March.

Ms. Holtsclaw stated that there were major changes incorporated into the new manual. The first change was to the Work by Local Forces. The information itself has not changed; it is just that MoDOT has not enforced it correctly in the past. The law has not changed, but everything has to go to Federal Highway for approval with the Work or Engineering of Local Forces.

The Conflict of Interest Disclosure is about consultants. A red flag has been raised with Federal Highway about pro bono work and that local agencies are not hiring people to do the upfront work like filling out TIP applications. The same consultants are being used over and over again. The disclosure form is that there are no conflicts of interest in the pro bono work going on in the background. It will be required that the Conflict of Interest Disclosure form be sent in with the signed consultant contract.

There is a template in the new manual for all the invoices coming in on the construction and consultant side. There is also a checklist that went with it. MoDOT can go through the checklist when they receive the invoices and make sure that everything Federal Highway is looking for is on the invoice. That is why the checklist was created. Federal Highway helped create the checklist since they will be doing a quarterly review. The next item new to the Manual is the chapter called Non-Infrastructure. It is for things like procuring right of way, buying equipment and that type of thing, items that were not covered in the old manual. This should be a helpful tool for some projects.

PS & E Certification is now a one-page form in the front of the new manual. The LPA would sign it stating that it has met all the state and federal requirements. The next thing which goes along with that is the required boilerplate, a bid proposal that is sent in with the plans. MoDOT is going to require that the boiler plate is used. The reason is that all the federal requirements like Buy America, Anti-collusion, and all those sorts of things are found in that boilerplate. It can be filled out and will state where to attach the forms and it has the instructions on how to fill it out.

MoDOT is requiring electronic submittal of documents. There has been feedback on these. MoDOT’s email size does not seem to accommodate the electronic submittal. Every District is going to work with the LPA’s and CDs are fine. If plans are placed on a CD, the plans can be delivered that way. Some Districts have enough file size and others do not.

Bid Concurrences after April will be sent directly from the LPA to the MoDOT Central Office Estimators. It can be sent to the generic email of lpasubmit@modot.mo.gov and that goes directly to the estimating staff that has the expertise to review these bid concurrences. This is done for all the MoDOT jobs as well as the local jobs. By sending it straight to the Central Office, the process is streamlined. There will be a week turn around for bid concurrences.

There will also be a centralization of databases with a centralized hub of information. Right now it is basically going to be for document storage for the Districts. The documents will be uploaded into PDF Files, such as invoices and programming data forms including everything that goes with those forms. It has all the dollars associated with the invoices. There, expenditures on the projects can be tracked. There is a Phase 2 that the IS department is working on where the locals can actually upload the information. This is similar to the TIP e-software. There is no time frame for this yet.

There is the goal of continuous improvement so if there are any ideas or questions those can be shared with Duffy Mooney. There will be quarterly meetings of the LPA Advisory Committee. There is also a box on the MoDOT website where the LPA Advisory Committee can put the contact information and updates or changes will be sent out.

There have been significant changes on MoDOT’s website. The website is the central communication to the LPA, consultants, and Districts. The top has a tab for the Draft LPA. Ms. Holtsclaw showed some of the different tabs available on the MoDOT website.

The question has been brought up regarding who has to receive the training. It has to be the responsible person in charge of the LPA, whether that person is the person who signs the plans or paperwork. It is also required for consultants and the project manager if that is the appropriate person from the consulting firm. Ms. Edwards inquired if that individual had to be an employee of the jurisdiction. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that it should be a full time employee, but a County Commissioner can also count as long as the individual is available anytime.

Ms. Edwards inquired if every jurisdiction that receives federal funds has to have a representative go through the four hours of training. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that was correct. Ms. Edwards asked what the training was called. Ms. Holstclaw stated it was Basic Training and that the Certified Level was optional.

Ms. Longpine stated that at the TEAM training it was mentioned that if there was an engineering firm serving as the LPA Public Works Director that would not be counted as a full time employee. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that was correct as Federal Highway’s national person has seen it that way. There should be someone who is actually employed by the LPA. It is not a contract employee, instead someone who is signing the plans for the LPA.

Ms. Longpine asked if there could be more than one person certified per project. Ms. Holtsclaw stated it depends; someone with right of way staff could be certified and someone with construction could also be certified. Some entities only have one person who handles a project from start to finish and it would be that person who is the responsible person.

Mr. Brock asked about the Work for Local Forces and if that would include design work. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that was correct. Any part of preparing plans and specs would need to be approved. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that anything done in-house that would require reimbursements would need to be approved. If it will use federal funds it would require federal highway approval. The Federal Highway contract has stated that it is the construction that is really discouraged; it is not the inspection or the in-house design. As long as it can be proven to be cost effective, Federal Highway will be okay with it. It is the construction portion that the CFR is being interpreted that all jobs have to go to the lowest bidder unless it is an emergency. Mr. Brock asked how it is actually worked in the draft LPA Manual. He stated he had not heard the emergency language that way before. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that Federal Highway has read it and it is a hot topic. Federal Highway is really going over the LPA with a finetooth comb. She stated to not assume that something will be approved. The approval should be at the beginning before work is started or there might not be a reimbursement.

Mr. Brock stated that the Federal Highway representative at the TEAM conference did not seem to express an opinion that it was discouraged or not the norm. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that representative was from the national Federal Highway Department. It is the Missouri Federal Highway Office that has stated it is discouraged. It has been interpreted differently in different states. Mr. Brock asked if the LPA is modified to fit different individual interpretations what happens when a new interpretation comes along? Ms. Holtsclaw stated it is written in the manual as strongly discouraged, which can still be submitted for approval. It is going to stay in the manual that way for some time since the Federal Highway Administrator is on board with it. Ms. Edwards inquired if the members of the TPC could put in a public comment on the issue. Ms. Holtsclaw stated yes. Mr. Mooney stated that it is encouraged that everyone reviews the LPA Manual and makes comments. There is also the Statewide Advisory Panel. MoDOT wants the Local Public Agencies to be the lead on this committee. Mr. Mooney stated that if there are concerns to let him know and they can be discussed with the Advisory Committee. Ms. Holtsclaw stated it is an issue statewide.

Mr. Brock stated that the proposed arrangements would be particularly difficult for enhancement funding. The grant window for the application is usually only a month, and the idea that approval is needed before an application is submitted would make it very hard. Ms. Holtsclaw stated she would appreciate it if comments were submitted to Federal Highway. Ms. Burks asked if the approval of the LPA Manual was going to be held until after November. There is the possibility that there might be a new Federal Highway Administrator and Regional Administrator after the election. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that the LPA Manual was going to be approved in April.

Mr. Coltrin asked what was being done for small communities that have two or three employees total, and won’t have the manpower to receive the training. Ms. Holtsclaw stated it is required to take the class so MoDOT would work to not eliminate anyone. Mr. Coltrin stated it would if they are required to attend the four to six hour training. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that District staff is going to go to the local agencies and give the presentations one-on-one if that would help the agency. Mr. Coltrin stated that for small agencies to take over the paperwork when it used to be done for them would result in the resource being taken away. Ms. Holtsclaw asked for clarification. Mr. Coltrin stated that in the past the consultants were able to do the paperwork for the agency. Ms. Holtsclaw stated to submit the concern to Federal Highway.

Mr. Martin inquired about the new conflict of interest disclosure. He wondered if that related to any work that a consultant does for an organization and that the agency should be prepared to hand over invoices showing that the consultants were compensated for the preliminary work. Ms. Holtsclaw stated that was exactly what was required.

Ms. Edwards stated her thanks to Ms. Holtsclaw for driving down from Jefferson City and giving the presentation.

Mr. Cossey asked how long it would be before the certified training is available. Ms. Holtsclaw stated it had not been established yet.

1. FY 2012-2013 Unified Planning Work Program

Ms. Edwards stated that some comments had been received from Federal Highway since the draft came out. The UPWP is the OTO Budget Document and the Work Program for the next fiscal year. The fiscal year runs July 1 to June 30. The UPWP is broken down into seven tasks.

General Administration, which is the financial management, training and contract management, is 14 percent of the budget. Committee Support for the Technical Planning Committee, Board of Directors, and other committees is 11 percent. General Planning, which consists of the Long Range Plan, Air Quality, and Congestion Management, is 36 percent. The TIP is 11 percent. Transit Planning is 17 percent. Special Studies is about 10 percent. The UPWP is the OTO budget and there is a 20 percent local match requirement. The budget is projected at $800,000 this year. It is quite a bit higher than in past years since there is $150,000 budgeted for the travel model update. Staff is waiting for the release of the December statistics. The plan is to start working at the end of summer to secure a consultant. That way the work on the model can begin as soon as the data is released. There has been $150,000 budgeted but it is not certain if that will be enough money. The aerial photography was flown earlier, but the City of Springfield is allowing the OTO to reimburse after July 1.

The UPWP is required to include all transportation planning activities for the region for the year. Included in the budget is $127,000 for City Utilities Planning Activities. It does not come out of the OTO’s funding source. It is FTA Transit funding, but since it is a planning activity it has to be included here. It makes the budget look bigger. OTO is continuing to utilize In-kind matches for attendance at meetings. City Utilities is doing the bus wrap for Ozarkscommute.com and MoDOT allows the OTO to count some MoDOT staff time for signal coordination and travel time runs.

A new document has been passed out with the changes highlighted, including removal of the Rideshare program. It comes down to the fact that Federal Highway feels that the Rideshare program is not eligible for planning funds. It has been removed from the budget since it is not eligible. The Federal Highway representative also stated that Federal Highway will not fund the rest of this fiscal year’s program. Staff is fighting that since there is a contract with MoDOT and signed by Federal Highway through June 30. The Rideshare site will be running through December.

Ms. Edwards proposed a subcommittee be formed to look at alternative funding. One funding source that could be utilized is the STP-Urban funding. The budget is currently $37,000 but less could be used to keep it running. The annual maintenance of the website is $7,800, so if the subcommittee felt it is important for the region, then the OTO could use some STP-Urban to do that. There might be other funding opportunities. For example, if the OTO were to become a non-attainment area there might be funding opportunities from CMAQ funding for this program. A fact sheet on Ozarkscommute.com has been provided. The program cannot be called highly successful at this point. Last year 101 accounts were created. Sixty three of those individuals did not find a match, which leads staff to believe that 37 percent did, but there is no way to track if those individuals are actually carpooling. The program was created in 2008 because gas prices were at $4.00 a gallon, then the prices fell, but now the price of gas could be back up to about $4.00. At that time in 2008 there were lots of calls and public interest. It has not been as successful as hoped, but gas prices fell. The current website contract expires December 31, 2012.

If $37,000 of the budget is lost, then it will need to be replaced with something else. Obviously, there will not be the outlays for the website or special materials, but there will still be staff for which there are expenses. There have been a couple of items added to the UPWP to replace that loss of Rideshare funding. The first item is the annual performance measure report. The Long Range Plan develops performance measures, so staff will look at that and produce an annual report tracking those performance measures. The second part was requested by FTA, adding an item for Sustainability/Livability Planning. There are a lot of grants coming out for Sustainability/Livability. This item has been added for $7,200 to look at those opportunities to do the grant applications as the applications come along.

Ms. Edwards stated her recommendation of taking the revised UPWP to the Board for approval, as well as establishing a subcommittee to look at options for the Rideshare program and to take volunteers for that subcommittee. She stated it was important to know if the OTO thought Rideshare was a worthwhile program and if it is something that the OTO would be willing to take off the top of the STP-Urban funding.

Mr. Martin stated his understanding was that there was not going to be money lost on the Rideshare program. It was just a matter of getting through the year and deciding if it is something that the OTO wants to continue and try to find another funding source. Ms. Edwards stated that was correct. There is a still a certain amount of money to use, the funds just cannot be used on Rideshare.

Mr. Martin asked if it is possible to take that program versus what is being done now and reduce some overhead associated with it. The thought is to make it more of an open forum that staff does not have to be in the middle. Ms. Edwards inquired if he meant like a Facebook page. Mr. Martin stated he was not as familiar with the functions of Facebook. Ms. Edwards stated that is a possibility and that the subcommittee should look at it.

Mr. Martin asked about the statistics in potential ridership. Ms. Edwards stated she had provided a handout with the statistics, and at the bottom the stats were listed. There are also employer portals for the site. The City of Springfield, Mercy, Drury, Greene County, and City Utilities all have employer portals for the site. Missouri State University is looking at creating one right now. Those portals would all be shut down too. There is a $500 fee paid for the set up of the portal.

Mr. Heatherly stated it costs $37,000 a year to run the program. Ms. Edwards stated that she agreed that at the moment it is not a highly successful program. There can be more done through marketing, but the interest is just not there with gas prices so low. There might be more interest when gas hits $5.00.

Mr. Martin stated that there were a lot of people coming to council meetings at the same time the OTO was looking into Rideshare. People were looking for rides. Staff did a lot of work trying to find places for people to park and at some of the same things the OTO put together. As soon as the gas prices dropped and people got used to it, it was like all the effort was for nothing. Not one person wanted to carpool. Ms. Edwards stated that the Ozarkscommute.com domain name is good through 2018 so it would be possible to start back up at a later date if the OTO wanted. There are different options out there.

Mr. Smith asked if other areas had more success with their programs. Ms. Edwards stated she had listened to presentations by Kansas City and St. Louis and was not impressed. It was not the kind of results that one would expect. Mr. Smith stated that it might not be the OTO region, but something that people in general are not interested in at this time.

Mr. Martin made the motion to establish a subcommittee to look at the Rideshare Program and funding options and whether it should be continued, and to forward the revised UPWP to the Board. Ms. Cruise seconded and the motion was approved by the TPC.

1. **Transit Coordination Plan Update**

Mr. Owens stated that last October the timelines for the Transit Coordination Plan were brought to the TPC. Last November, the Local Coordinating Board for Transit Advisory Committee started the planning process. The process is at the end and is now going to public review and comment.

This plan covers the 5310, 5316, and 5317 grant programs and vehicles for human services. Some of the things that the committee found were: lack of coverage on nights and weekends, frequency of service issues, ADA compliance stops, compliance in buses and scheduling conflicts. Those were some of the gaps that were found in the coverage. The plan is to address those gaps and take away any overlap in those processes. There is no action needed from the TPC. The Local Coordination Board will meet again in March to address any public comment and to make a recommendation to the Board of Directors for the April 19 meeting.

Ms. Burks asked what other transit organizations are impacted or represented within these three grants besides City Utilities and the City of Springfield. Mr. Owens stated OATS, City Utilities, Medi-Transit, Council of Churches, and the Springfield Workshop are a few of about 40 different agencies.

Ms. Burks asked if they all get funding out of the three grants. Ms. Cruise stated they are eligible for the 5310 program. Ms. Burks asked if City Utilities normally gets the JARC funding. Ms. Cruise stated usually, but it is competitive. Mr. Owens stated that the full plan is on the OTO webpage. It has a list of all the recipients and agencies that were contacted.

1. STP-Urban Balance Report December 2011 Update

Ms. Longpine stated the recent STP-Urban Balance Report has been included in the agenda. It is a report that the OTO produces every six months. The total operating balance is a little over $20 million. Factored in to this amount are the MoDOT cost shares, which bring the actual balance down to $9 million dollars. MoDOT allows the OTO Region to have three years worth of funding before it is taken back and redistributed. This allows the OTO to have a balance up to $13 million, but the OTO is allowed to apply the cost shares, so the $9 million is a safe zone. Unfortunately, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, anything unobligated is subject to rescission. The full $20 million is actually subject to rescission. Currently the balance is okay only as far as MoDOT policy is concerned.

The report includes the information for each jurisdiction and what projects have been counted towards the obligation balances. There is also a running balance for the area as well as the reports that MoDOT has produced.

This report includes a projected amount for 2012. Staff included the six-month allocation in the report. That number may or may not change depending on whether there is a continuing resolution or reauthorization. These reports are projected on a full year allocation for 2012. Ms. Edwards stated that the OTO decided to make the 2012 funds available to the jurisdictions. There is a $20 million balance and these are long term MoDOT cost shares. Jurisdictions that want to use their 2012 money even though there is not a full-year transportation bill can use the funds.

Federal Highway does not like the practice of suballocating STP-Urban funds. Federal law states that STP-Urban funds cannot be sub-allocated. OTO has made the case for several years that regional priorities are being met. These are the OTO’s Long Range Plan projects but it would not be a surprise if funding cannot be suballocated this way anymore. If that was to occur anything in the TIP or MoDOT Cost Share is protected. The remaining suballocated funds would then be available for all OTO jurisdictions.

Mr. Brock stated that he recalled that the North-South Corridor received an allocation. Ms. Edwards stated there were several earmarks that were “Below the Line.” It was not actual money. The funds were required to be spent on the North-South Corridor, but it was coming out of funds that were already on hand. Mr. Miller stated that basically they have a formula, their formula funds go to the states, some of that goes to metropolitan areas in the states so there are different programs. If it is an “Above the Line” item it is considered a true earmark. “Below the Line” is not a true earmark; it is just language where they need to use the funding. Mr. Miller stated that there are both types going to 60/65. It does not make that much of a difference since earmarks are only given to priority projects. The only ones that come out “Above the Line” generally are in Highway Reauthorization Bills. These are pretty good size, usually in the amount of $20 million.

1. Administrative Modification Number Two to the FY 2012-2015 TIP

Ms. Longpine stated that the next item on the agenda is an administrative modification to the TIP. There are a couple different ways that administrative modifications are allowed to be done per the OTO’s Public Participation Plan.

The City of Springfield will be participating in a cost share improvement project for improvements to the Route 160 Bridge over I-44. The City of Springfield will be providing $500,000 toward construction, reducing MoDOT’s share by that amount. The local portion is provided by savings from the City of Springfield’s 1/8-cent Transportation Sales Tax. The overall project cost remains the same.

1. Amendment Number Three to the FY 2012-2015 TIP

Ms. Longpine stated the next item on the agenda is actually a handout. This is an actual amendment to the TIP, so staff is asking for a recommendation to the Board. There are two items included. One is looking at cost share funding for Kansas Expressway and James River Freeway. There is an application in currently. Mr. Miller stated that the committee just met in the morning. This project was approved for cost share funding with a total project cost of $5 million for improvements to Kansas Expressway and James River Freeway.

The second item is for City Utilities for a Livability Grant. It includes performing an engine overhaul to the buses, replacing a transit supervisory sedan and, a voice annunciation system. These are subject to approval of that funding.

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

1. **Administrative Modification Number Three to the FY 2012-2015 TIP**

Ms. Longpine stated that this is a new item on the agenda. It is Administrative Modification Number Three to the TIP. The City of Ozark is requesting to add funding to engineering of Third Street in Downtown Ozark, specifically adding a total of $37,167 ($29,734 in STP-Urban and $7,433 in local) to Engineering in order to fund additional design necessitated by a right-of-way issue. The total project amount will be revised from $2,040,200 to $2,077,367.

1. Growth Trends Report – through December 31, 2011

Mr. Stueve stated that the Growth Trends Report looks at population and looks at changes in the OTO area as well as residential construction activity. There is a four-page handout which includes a few of the key pages. There is also a web address for the full report. The full report contains sections on residential construction activity in the area and looks at socio-economic data. There are maps that show population migration, they show where people move from when they come to the OTO area and where they are moving when they leave.

There is a series of maps that looks at residential construction more closely. This shows total residential building permits for single family and multifamily homes in the OTO area for 2000-2011. Everything in 2005 started to fall off a cliff, but over the past couple of years there have been signs of a comeback. It is nowhere what it was, but it is starting to go into the right direction overall in the area.

The first slide shows populations in the counties of Greene, Christian and Webster which is the old MSA, between 1980-2010 for about 225,000 to over 400,000. That is almost an increase of 70 percent. The next one shows population of the individual cities within the OTO and how the cities have grown over the past 20 years numerically. One of the socio-economic slides shows the per capita income for the various cities in the OTO area. The socio-economic data comes from the Census Bureau. The building permit data comes from the local jurisdictions. Battlefield has the highest per capita income within the OTO with Springfield and Willard being on the lower end of the spectrum.

The next slide shows the commuting patterns within the OTO. Ninety percent of Greene County residents both live and work in Greene County. Over 70 percent of Christian County residents commute outside of Christian County to work. Webster County residents take about 30 minutes for their average commutes. Greene County residents take about 17 to 19 minutes to get to their workplace. This map and the one after are in the handout. Another slide shows growth. Within Missouri, the surrounding counties of Webster, Polk, Lawrence, Taney and Stone are the main contributing counties. Looking at outside of the state of Missouri, there is Johnson County, Kansas and Kansas City, Kansas/Overland Park area. Phoenix, Arizona is a very high contributor to the area. This data comes from the Internal Revenue Service. Every year the IRS publishes county to county migration profiles. This report substitutes the number of tax exemptions for people. It is probably not exact, but it is a fairly good estimate. This map shows that when people leave the area they are going to Webster, Polk, Lawrence, Taney, and Stone Counties, in addition to Kansas City and St. Louis. Outside of the state, they are going to Johnson County, Kansas, Northwest Arkansas, Tulsa and Phoenix, AZ.

The final set of slides shows the net change in housing units in the area over the past year. January to December 2011 and overall in 2011, most of the residential growth in the area occurred west of Springfield in northeast Republic, and in north central Christian County. Overall, Fremont Hills, Ozark, Battlefield, East Republic, and South Springfield have experienced the most growth over the past 11 years.

## Other Business

# Technical Planning Committee Member Announcements

Mr. Miller stated that the City of Springfield had two cost share projects that were approved. The first was to change Kansas Expressway and James River Freeway to a diverging diamond. This project should let in August. The city has some savings from the 1/8-cent program which can be applied. The MoDOT Commission has increased the cost share program. Anyone who wants to apply for a cost share should go ahead and apply at this time.

Ms. Cruise mentioned that City Utilities has some events coming up about the proposed transfer station.

###### Transportation Issues For Technical Planning Committee Member Review

None

1. Articles For Technical Planning Committee Information

## Adjournment

Mr. Martin made the motion to adjourn at 3:00 p.m.

