OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 16, 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. Larry Martin, City of Ozark |
| Mr. King Coltrin, City of Strafford | Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT |
| Mr. Travis Cossey, City of Nixa | Mr. Bill Robinett, MoDOT |
| Ms. Carol Cruise, City Utilities | Mr. Ralph Rognstad, City of Springfield |
| Ms. Hollie Elliott, Springfield Chamber (a) | Mr. Shawn Schroeder, Springfield-Branson Airport |
| Mr. Jonathan Gano, City of Springfield | Mr. Andrew Seiler, MoDOT |
| Mr. Nick Heatherly, City of Willard | Mr. Todd Wiesehan, Christian County (Chair) |
| Mr. Rick Hess, City of Battlefield | Mr. Terry Whaley, Ozark Greenways |
| Mr. Kirk Juranas, City of Springfield |  |

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. Duffy Mooney, Greene County Highway Dept. |
| Mr. Rick Artman, Greene County Highway Dept. | Mr. Ryan Mooney, Springfield Chamber |
| Mr. David Bishop, R-12 School District | Mr. Kent Morris, Greene County Planning Dept. |
| Mr. Randall Brown, City of Willard (a) | Mr. Troy Pinkerton, MoDOT (a) |
| Mr. Don Clark, Missouri State University | Mr. Mark Roy, Springfield-Branson Airport (a) |
| Mr. Rick Emling, R-12 School District (a) | Ms. Beth Schaller, MoDOT |
| Ms. Diane Gallion, City Utilities (a) | Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA Representative |
| Ms. Dawne Gardner, City of Springfield (a) | Mr. Dan Smith, Greene County Highway Dept. |
| Mr. Martin Gugel, City of Springfield (a) | Mr. Cheryl Townlian, BNSF |
| Mr. Jason Haynes, City of Springfield (a) | Mr. Garrett Tyson, City of Republic (a) |
| Mr. Jay Huff, Missouri State University (a) | Ms. Eva Voss, MoDOT |
| Mr. Joel Keller, Greene County (a) | Mr. Dan Watts, SMCOG |
| Mr. Kevin Lambeth, City of Battlefield (a) | Mr. Bob Wilslef, City of Ozark (a) |
| Mr. Brad McMahon, FHWA |  |

Others present were: Ms. Debbie Parks, Ms. Sara Edwards, Mr. Curtis Owens and Mr. Chris Stueve, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Ms. Stacy Burks, Senator Roy Blunt’s Office.

Mr. Wiesehan called the May 16, 2012 Technical Planning Committee meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

## Administration

# Introductions

# Approval of the Technical Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

Ms. Fields stated there was a revised agenda for the meeting. The only change to the agenda was the addition of four TIP amendments.

Ms. Cruise made the motion to approve the May 16, 2012 revised agenda. Mr. Hess seconded and the agenda was approved unanimously.

# Approval of the March 21, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Martin made the motion to approve the March 21, 2012 Meeting Minutes. Mr. King seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.

# Public Comment Period for All Agenda Items

None

# Executive Director’s Report

Ms. Fields stated that her last name has changed from Edwards to Fields. Ms. Longpine will be out of the office until August 1, 2012. There was an email (originally from Mr. Miller) sent out this morning regarding the Blue Ribbon Panel that will be in Springfield on June 1 at the Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce. The Blue Ribbon Panel was created by Missouri Speaker of the House Steven Tilley and will be discussing area transportation needs and possible solutions. Several people have been selected to provide testimony regarding transportation issues in the area. A large turnout would help legislators to understand the transportation issues and needs facing Missouri, especially in southwest Missouri.

Copies of the Long Range Transportation Plan are available for anyone who wants one. The Transit Coordination Plan was adopted by the Board of Directors at their last meeting. The OTO is currently soliciting applications for the different federal transit grants that are available. One application is for Human Service and Transportation Vehicles. This is for organizations such as the Council of Churches of the Ozarks, Springfield Workshop, and Burrell Behavioral Health. These organizations all have vehicles that are federally-funded and which are used to provide transportation for elderly and disabled individuals. The OTO directly notifies a number of area transportation providers that transit grant applications are being accepted in addition to posting a notice on the OTO website. There is only funding available for two vehicles per year, but nonetheless applications are being taken for those funds. There is also an application for New Freedom and Job Access and Reverse Commute transit funding, which City Utilities has typically received in the past. There is not a lot of funding available.

There still is no news regarding enhancement funding. The 2012 enhancement funding has not been awarded because there is only a partial transportation bill in place and MoDOT has not yet released any enhancement funds. Once the funds are released there may be approximately $500,000 of enhancement funding available.

The Regional Transit Study is finished and there was a large turnout at the public presentation that was held in the OTO conference room. The presentation is available on the OTO website. There were three different improvement scenarios presented in the study: improvements that could be implemented at no cost, improvements that could be made if additional transit funding were available (in this case, $19 million per year compared to the current funding level of $6 million per year), and the implementation of a regional transit system. The two regional routes recommended in the report are a route running from Ozark to Nixa to Springfield and then back again, and a route running from Republic to Battlefield to Springfield and back again. The report includes cost figures associated with these regional routes and the fares that would be charged in addition to a map of the routes. The regional transit analysis included in the study provides good information for use in discussions regarding a regional transit system.

# New Business

1. Let’s Go Smart Presentation

Mr. Whaley stated that Ms. Fields and Ms. Longpine asked him to update the Technical Planning Committee on the new “Let’s Go Smart” initiative that Ozarks Greenways (OG) has developed. Three years ago in a strategic planning workshop, OG realized that they could not afford to build trails everywhere for everybody. Even if there were funds available to acquire land and develop the trail infrastructure, maintenance would be an issue.

OG decided to promote using bicycles for transportation, which leads to individuals using their bicycles in conjunction with buses, and then to walking, biking, and busing for the majority of their transportation needs. At the National Trail Symposium two years ago a program called “From the Garage to the Greenway” led OG to decide whether the “Green” or the “Way” was more important. Ten years ago there was a need for an advocacy committee that met routinely with four or five individuals. Over a period of time it was formally structured under OG and named the STAR (Sustainable Transportation Advocacy Resource) Team. The STAR team worked with Ms. Fields and Ms. Longpine on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan that was developed with Mr. Hutchison at the City of Springfield.

OG looked at this and asked the question, “How do residents get to the greenways since there cannot be a greenway next to everyone’s house?” The “Drive Less Live More” program was developed which was somewhat effective but wasn’t as impactful as had been hoped. OG hired a marketing team and created a new brand. The OG marketing committee discussed the importance of walking as everybody is a pedestrian at some point during the day. Accordingly, pedestrian safety, curb cuts and streetscapes are important issues to the community. Bicycling and the bus system are also important aspects of the local transportation system. The bus is one of the most underutilized public services in Springfield. However, most people use cars as their primary means of transportation. The slogan “Drive Less Live More” was problematic in that it sounded preachy and anti-car. OG is not anti-car as the car is a big element of the new “Let’s Go Smart” campaign; the campaign realizes that people need their cars and works to get people to use their cars smartly.

The “Let’s Go Smart” program was introduced on April 19. There are several different components of the “Let’s Go Smart” brand architecture. The “Smart” aspect of the brand means to think before you drive and ask: Is there another way to get to where I need to go? Is taking a car the wisest way? Is bicycling the wisest way? The “Smart” goal is to get people to think about the different transportation options available to them before they go anywhere. The “Smart” piece of the brand also means to travel smartly: whether you are walking, biking, or getting on the bus, you need to travel safely at all times. Finally, people should also be financially “Smart” and fiscally prudent regarding their transportation decisions.

The OTO, City of Springfield, and Greene County are all concerned with maintaining the infrastructure of the greenway and trail system. OG focuses on connecting bicycle and pedestrian trails to the road network, extending the trail system to schools, and the overall trail/street system and how it works together and where the best and safest places are to build bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. If bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is added to already-developed corridors, more cyclists will go there.

The “Go” aspect of the brand seeks to encourage the community to use the greenway network as part of a physically-active lifestyle. Conversely, the “Drive Less Live More” slogan implied that one way a person could drive less is by simply sitting on their couch and doing nothing. “Go” encourages people to get out and be active.

“Let’s” is the call-to-action part of the brand architecture. It invites everyone to join the movement. For example, this week is “Bike to Work Week.” Solid numbers are not available yet, but according to registration forms participation is up 25% from last year in terms of the number of businesses, schools and individuals participating.

There are a number of partners involved with the “Let’s Go Smart” campaign, including City Utilities, the City of Springfield, The LINK, and the Healthy Living Alliance. OG publicly launched the campaign, along with the “Let’s Go Smart” website (letsgosmart.org), on April 19. Nationally-known bicycle advocate and speaker Joe Kurmaskie, who is also known as “The Metal Cowboy,” was in Springfield to help launch the “Let’s Go Smart” campaign. Mr. Kurmaskie is from Portland, Oregon and stated that Springfield’s bicycle infrastructure reminds him of Portland’s ten years ago.

Mr. Whaley then showed the “Let’s Go Smart” website to the TPC, passed out “Let’s Go Smart” business cards, and made available several copies of the bicycling book *Joyride*.

1. Amendment Number One to the Long Range Transportation Plan

Ms. Fields stated that the City of Springfield had a cost share project for Glenstone Avenue from Battlefield Road to James River Freeway. It was discovered that the project was not listed in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) exactly the way it should be. The project needs to be added to the LRTP and also to the TIP. In order to add the project to TIP it will first need to be added to the LRTP. Page 182-A1 shows where the project was added at a cost of $13 million. The LRTP is very tightly constrained financially and adding the Glenstone Avenue project would push the project list out of fiscal constraint, meaning there would be insufficient funds for the projects listed in the plan. Fortunately, several items allowed the Glenstone Avenue project to be added to the LRTP while keeping the project list fiscally constrained. First, $6.8 million in cost share funding was added to the LRTP to help cover the cost of the new Glenstone Avenue project in addition to a project at the James River Freeway - Kansas Expressway interchange. Secondly, Project M95 and its $2.3 million cost was removed from the LRTP as it has been incorporated into the new Glenstone Avenue project. Finally, a $37 million calculation error was discovered in the funding projection tables. These three items resulted in a net funding gain of $39 million, which provides room to add projects in the future if the need should arise.

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to recommend approval of the Long Range Plan Amendment Number One to the Board of Directors. Mr. Miller seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

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

Ms. Fields stated there are four items in TIP Amendment Five. The first item is that the State of Missouri has received some additional Section 5310 vehicle funds. Locally, this means that funds are available for an additional vehicle; a company called RSVP is receiving $20,000 in federal funds to accompany a $5,000 local match. The second item is a project for which the City of Nixa would like to use STP-Urban funds. This project was originally listed in the TIP as a $2 million project; however, the project will now cost $2.6 million. Additionally, some funding has been reallocated to include engineering and right of way acquisition in addition to construction. The project will improve Main Street from Aldersgate to Tracker Road with significant improvements at the intersection of Tracker Road.

The last two items in TIP Amendment Five are requests by MoDOT. The first MoDOT request is to add funding to a paving project on Route 60 between Glenstone Avenue and Route 125; the original project cost was $1.2 million but has increased to $5 million. The second MoDOT request is to add a project that would resurface Route 60 in Republic between Illinois Avenue and Route 174 or alternately, Route FF in Battlefield between the James River Freeway and Weaver Road. Mr. Miller will discuss later how the second project is dependent on low bids if the money is available.

Mr. Miller stated that the resurfacing project on Route 60 between Glenstone Avenue and Route 125 is happening in conjunction with a project outside the OTO boundary that continues resurfacing Route 60 toward Seymour, across Webster County, and to the eastern boundary of the Southwest District. The second resurfacing project needs explanation. As part of the recent MoDOT district reconfiguration, MoDOT is now planning to repave all major routes on five- to seven-year paving cycles.

This paving schedule will be accomplished by delaying some bridge projects and switching them with paving projects. There are some pavement projects that were programmed as pavement improvements on various routes. The Route 60 project in Republic covers the section of highway that was expanded to five lanes around 2003. There is an alternative option to resurface Route FF between the James River Freeway and Weaver Road in Battlefield. It should cost about $1.2 million to resurface Route 60 in Republic but with a good, low bid part of Route FF might also be resurfaced for about $1.5 million. This situation factors into all projects in the Southwest District; there will be two-lane road repaving projects all around the District. There is a total amount of funds available repaving and we will try to repave the alternate sections of roadway if funds are available due to lower-than-expected bids. To date MoDOT has been able to award all alternative projects during the past couple of years that this method has been tried. If for some reason the alternate Route FF project cannot be awarded, there will be a new, Route FF-specific project to capture it.

Mr. Martin asked if the paving project on Route 60 toward Seymour is the type that grinds down the pavement. Mr. Miller stated no it was just an overlay.

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to recommend approval of TIP amendment number five to the Board of Directors. Mr. Martin seconded and the motioned carried unanimously.

1. Urbanized Area Presentation

Mr. Stueve presented a series of maps showing the 2010 Springfield Urbanized Area. The Census Bureau released all 2010 urbanized area boundaries within the past couple of weeks. The maps show the 2000 Springfield Urbanized Area boundary so it may be compared with the 2010 boundary. The Census Bureau delineates urbanized areas in all cities with at least 50,000 people. They start by selecting core census tracts that meet a certain population density threshold and then add on eligible census block groups and census blocks until all qualifying urban areas are included. In 2000 the Springfield Urbanized Area had a population of 215,000. Republic was considered an urban cluster in 2000; urban clusters are communities that are not in an urban area and that have a population between 2,500 and 49,999 people.

The 2010 map shows that the Springfield Urbanized Area population is now 273,000 and includes Republic and Strafford as there has been sufficient urban buildup between Springfield and Republic and Springfield and Strafford for these two cities to be included in the urbanized area. Rogersville and Willard are now urban clusters. There are a few fringe areas that were considered urbanized in 2000 but are not now. This is due to the Census Bureau tweaking their urbanized area delineation criteria every 10 years.

There is a population chart on the map that shows both the 2000 and 2010 urbanized area populations. A different chart shows that there is a total of 6.4 square miles of land that was considered urbanized in 2000 but were not in 2010. Conversely, there is now 38.1 square miles of urbanized area that was not considered urbanized in 2000. In conclusion, now that the Springfield Urbanized Area contains Republic and Strafford and has a larger population, the OTO can hopefully receive a bigger slice of the transportation funding pie. With Republic’s inclusion in the Springfield Urbanized Area, it is no longer eligible for STP-Small Urban funds. However, Willard is now eligible for STP-Small Urban funds since it is now an urban cluster.

Mr. Brock asked if Rogersville is also eligible for STP-Small Urban funds since it is also now an urban cluster. Mr. Stueve stated that technically Rogersville is outside the urbanized area. Mr. Miller stated that the Census Bureau considers all towns with at least 2,500 residents to be urban while the Federal Highway Administration’s urban threshold is 5,000. Rogersville’s population is less than 5,000 so it is not considered urban in the eyes of the Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Brock asked why the OTO boundaries do not encompass the entire Willard urban cluster and if there is a downside to that. Mr. Miller stated that there is no downside to an urban cluster not being entirely within the MPO boundary. The MPO is able to modify urban area boundaries with the Federal Highway Administration. MoDOT accommodates small urban areas by using the urban area boundary plus the city’s municipal boundaries. For example, Ozark’s city limits extend south along Route 65 to Route EE; this “tentacle” is outside the OTO so there is a precedent. Just to clarify the issue from MoDOT’s standpoint, STP-Urban funds will continue as-is until there is another transportation reauthorization bill. Republic will continue to receive some STP-Small Urban funds. Willard will not receive any STP-Small Urban funds until the new transportation bill is effective. The Commission at that point will decide whether to continue the small urban program. Currently there is no indication as to what the Commission may decide. It is unclear what impact, if any, a change to the program would have since the OTO distributes funds differently.

Ms. Fields stated that there should be no change in the amount of transportation funding received until the State of Missouri recognizes the OTO’s increased population. At that point, in theory, all area transportation funding should increase. Willard will not receive any additional funds because small urban areas are factored in to large urban area funding calculations. Mr. Miller stated that large urban area transportation funding is distributed by the Federal Highway Administration and will be distributed as soon as Congress passes a transportation bill. The decision regarding the small urban funding program will happen only when Congress passes a transportation bill and examines the newest census data. Nothing will change with the small urban program until something happens with the new transportation bill. The large urban area funding program may see a change sooner because it is based on the latest transportation bill extension.

Mr. Brock asked if he understood correctly that STP-Small Urban funds will be offset. Ms. Fields stated that was correct. Mr. Miller stated that the balances will remain as well. That happened when Springfield became a large urban area and the small urban area balance was carried forward.

Mr. Coltrin asked what it meant for Strafford to be absorbed by the Springfield Urbanized Area. Ms. Fields stated it does not really mean anything since last year the OTO voted that large urban funds would be distributed to all OTO area jurisdictions instead of only to those jurisdictions within the Springfield Urbanized Area. The OTO

also voted to add small urban funds to the total MPO area funding pot. This ensures that if an area receives small urban funding it does not also receive more large urban funding than it should. Overall, Strafford’s inclusion in the Springfield Urbanized Area should have no effect. The primary significance of the urbanized area boundary change is that the OTO is now required to analyze the boundaries of the MPO area. The boundaries do not need to be adjusted at the present time as the area included in the 2010 Springfield Urbanized Area is not significantly different from the area that is expected to be developed over the next 20 years. The federal government requires that an MPO must include the main urbanized area plus areas that are expected to become urbanized within the next 20 years.

1. FY 2013-2016 TIP Project Submittal Update

Ms. Fields stated that the OTO had hoped to have an electronic TIP management program in place. However, the software developers have had some trouble in completing the project on schedule. Apparently the OTO prefers a lot more information regarding TIP projects than the typical MPO and the software developer did not anticipate the OTO’s level of customization. The OTO will go ahead and process the Transportation Improvement Program as normal. A notification email and letter have been sent out with an Excel spreadsheet to be filled out. Once the TIP software is up and running staff will manually enter that information here in the office. This year there will be both a paper TIP and an electronic TIP. Next year there will only be an electronic TIP if the new software works as it should.

Staff thought that on May 1 a letter could be sent out stating that the projects could be submitted online at the end of the month. That did not work out. Staff is willing to work with any jurisdiction that needs extra time. There is still a deadline that has to be met to get the program adopted and in place, including the long review time of the Federal Highway Administration and the Governor’s office. Hopefully the online TIP program will be user friendly when it is complete. The program will also include a map where the user can zoom to a project, click on that project, and receive all the information associated with that project on a printable page. Although the project is delayed for now, in the end the online TIP project will be worth it. The TIP project submission deadline is May 25.

1. Draft FY 2013-2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

Mr. Miller stated that there is now a draft 2013-2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which is the statewide version of the local TIP. MoDOT uses the STIP as a basis for submitting projects for inclusion in the local TIP. The only difference between the STIP and the TIP is that MoDOT’s fiscal year is from July 1 to June 30 while OTO’s fiscal year runs from October 1 to September 30. The STIP outlines what transportation projects are scheduled. MoDOT will be resurfacing major routes on a five- to seven-year cycle; this represents a large addition of projects, especially when looking at the map of projects in the Springfield area. There are a lot of projects in the Springfield area mainly because of all the major route resurfacing projects.

The rest of the projects are projects added last year, such as the Route CC improvement project between Fremont Hills and Cheyenne Road in the Nixa area and the Route 14-Cheyenne Road intersection improvement project. All of those projects remain in the STIP. Temporarily there are a couple of projects, such as the Glenstone Avenue-Peele Street turn lane project, withheld until the cost share agreement with Springfield is approved. The turn lane improvement project at Kansas Expressway and the James River Freeway has been removed from the draft STIP because the diverging diamond project cost share is taking that project’s place. That is the most significant change aside from the pavement projects.

MoDOT is delaying improvements to some bridges, such as the Route MM/B bridge over I-44 and the Route 65 northbound bridge over Lake Springfield. However, MoDOT is proceeding with the bridge replacements on Route 65 at the Finley River and at Farmer Branch. Improvements to the Route 65 southbound bridge over I-44 will also be delayed. The bridge improvement projects are being switched with pavement resurfacing projects in order to get all major routes on the five- to seven-year pavement replacement cycle.

Mr. Juranas asked how long the Route 65-Lake Springfield bridge project will be delayed. Mr. Miller stated it is being pushed back one year to 2015.

Ms. Fields stated that there will be signal improvements at the intersection of Kansas Expressway and Sunset Street and at the intersection of Kansas Expressway and Walnut Lawn Street. Mr. Miller stated that project will replace the wood pole signals. There are a number of projects that will replace wood pole signals with metal poles; these projects are now delayed due to funds being switched to the major route repaving plan. The Kansas Expressway-Sunset-Walnut Lawn signal project may expand its scope to include intersection improvements as well. There is also a signal improvement project at the Route 60-Route 125 intersection near Rogersville.

Mr. Juranas asked about turn lane improvements on Chestnut Expressway at Sherman Avenue. Mr. Miller stated this project was scheduled for May 2013. The project’s fiscal year did not change, it just did not have a final date as the letting month was not decided before now. This project is now listed in the middle of page 4.5.

Ms. Fields stated that there are no new projects on the list aside from the new pavement projects. Mr. Miller stated that there are no new capacity addition projects or other improvement major projects as MoDOT is transitioning into maintenance mode. Other than cost sharing projects there will be no new projects aside from resurfacing or bridge projects. MoDOT is receiving some money for safety projects. MoDOT is emphasizing safety projects such as rumble strips and shoulders on minor routes with these funds. Those projects are in rural areas and not in the OTO area.

Mr. Hess made the motion to recommend approval of the draft FY 2013-2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Mr. Juranas seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

## Other Business

# Technical Planning Committee Member Announcements

Mr. Martin stated that the City of Ozark has reached a landscaping work agreement with MoDOT. The City will be the continuing authority while the Chamber of Commerce and several city groups work on beautification and right of way projects. The City is working to make sure the various beautification items, trees, shrubs, and perennial flowers make a minimum impact, stay within a mulched area, are at grade, and do not impact large pin oaks in the area. This project will help to solve some erosion issues within the right of way. The beautification enhancements are designed to be easy to mow around with a brush hog. Creation of the intergovernmental agreement has been a long process.

Mr. Fields stated it might be a good idea to send out a copy of the intergovernmental agreement in the event another jurisdiction would like to undertake a similar project. Mr. Martin stated that throughout the process MoDOT did not seem very enthusiastic about entering an agreement. Mr. Miller stated that MoDOT’s main concern with such agreements centers on a jurisdiction’s ability to maintain the landscaping improvements. MoDOT is working on an agreement with the City of Branson where MoDOT will resurface the roads and the City will take care of everything from the curbs out. Mr. Martin stated that the intergovernmental agreement is the key to getting everything worked out. With an intergovernmental agreement MoDOT is assured that there is a party responsible for long-term upkeep of the right of way.

Ms. Burks stated that she had no new news to report. The Conference Committee had met once and there continues to be significant debate between the two sides.

Mr. Whaley stated that Ozarks Greenways in conjunction with the Springfield-Greene County Park Board would be dedicating a new one-mile section of the Wilson’s Creek Greenway on June 2. That is the second-to-last trail enhancement project in the pipeline; Ozark Greenways will break ground on the last project in July.

Mr. Juranas stated that the ballot language for the 1/8-cent transportation tax was approved by Springfield City Council. The transportation tax vote will take place on August 7. The City of Springfield is working with the Chamber of Commerce, who will lead the tax information campaign. There are a number of important projects in the transportation tax proposal. The Battlefield-Route 65 interchange is on the project list and is on the City’s top five needed-improvements list. The City was also able to move ahead with MoDOT on the six-laning of Glenstone using reinvested funds generated by the last 1/8-cent transportation tax.

Mr. Martin asked what other projects were included with the 1/8-cent transportation tax proposal. Ms. Fields stated there were some bridge projects on the list. Mr. Juranas stated there would be funds available to widen the two Republic Road bridges over the James River Freeway. The improvements along Republic Road will also include a shared bike facility. There are other bridge projects on the list as well. Multimodal improvements include sidewalk and trail construction and rail crossing upgrades. The City has also partnered with BNSF to help accelerate several rail crossing upgrades within the City. Resurfacing funds are included in the proposal, as are turn lane and Intelligent Transportation System improvements. The proposal also includes a cost share component in the event there is an opportunity to develop a cost share project with another entity.

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

None

1. Articles For Technical Planning Committee Information

No Discussion

## Adjournment

Mr. Rognstad made the motion to adjourn. Mr. Juranas seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 2:26 p.m.

