

**OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES
April 17, 2014**

The Board of Directors of the Ozarks Transportation Organization met at its scheduled time of 12:00 p.m. in the Ozarks Transportation Organization Large Conference Room in Springfield, Missouri.

The following members were present:

Ms. Becky Baltz, MoDOT	Mr. Kirk Juranas, City of Springfield (a)
Mr. Harold Bengsch, Greene County	Mr. Jim Krischke, City of Republic (a)
Mr. Brian Bingle, City of Nixa (a)	Mr. Lou Lapaglia, Christian County (Chair)
Mr. Jerry Compton, City of Springfield	Mr. J. Everett Mitchell, City of Willard (a)
Mr. Craig Fishel, City of Springfield	Ms. Robin Robeson, City Utilities
Mr. J. Howard Fisk, Citizen-at-Large	Mr. Jim Viebrock, Greene County
Ms. Teri Hacker, Citizen-at-Large	Mr. Brian Weiler, Airport Board (a)

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

The following members were not present:

Mr. Mokhtee Ahmad, FTA	Mr. Bill Kirkman, City Utilities (a)
Mr. Mark Bechtel, FTA (a)	Ms. Susan Krieger, City of Strafford
Mr. Shawn Billings, City of Battlefield (a)	Mr. Bradley McMahon, FHWA
Mr. Steve Bodenhamer, City of Strafford (a)	Mr. Steve Meyer, City of Springfield (a)
Mr. Richard Bottorf, Airport Board	Mr. Andy Mueller, MoDOT (a)
Mr. Brian Buckner, City of Republic	Mr. Shane Nelson, City of Ozark
Mr. Steve Childers, City of Ozark (a)	Mr. John Rush, City of Springfield
Mr. Sam Clifton, City of Nixa	Mr. Dan Salisbury, MoDOT (a)
Mr. John Elkins, Citizen-at-Large (a)	Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA
Mr. Tom Finnie, Citizen-at-Large	Mr. Tim Smith, Greene County (a)
Mr. Wendell Forshee, City of Willard	Mr. Bob Stephens, City of Springfield
Mr. Quinton Hamp, City of Battlefield	

Others Present: Ms. Sara Fields, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Mr. Curtis Owens, Ms. Debbie Parks, and Ms. Melissa Richards, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Mr. Dan Wadlington, Senator Roy Blunt's Office; Mr. Dan Smith, Greene County Highway; Mr. Ray Weter, Christian County; Mr. Chris Jones, City Utilities.

Mr. Lapaglia called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

I. Administration

A. Introductions

B. Approval of Board of Directors Meeting Agenda

Ms. Fields stated there was one addition to the agenda, Item M. Item M is the proposed support for the Kansas Expressway Extension TIGER Grant application.

Mr. Fisk moved to accept the agenda as modified with the addition of Item M. Mr. Viebrock seconded and the agenda was approved unanimously.

C. Approval of the February 20, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Viebrock made the motion to approve the February 20, 2014 meeting minutes. Mr. Compton seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

D. Public Comment Period

Mr. Gene McKeen stated that he was a long time resident of the Springfield area and owns some properties in Rogersville. He stated that individuals in Rogersville have recently been made aware of the new proposed changes to Highway 60 coming through the Rogersville area. There have been public meetings and a lot of individuals did not hear about the last meeting. There is a new design-build process, but the concern is that there are two exits or entrances into Rogersville. One of the exit/entrances most citizens are okay with. The second exit/entrance the citizens are not okay with. The individuals being referred to are the business people and land owners around Rogersville. They would like to meet with Beth Schaller and would like to invite anyone who would want to be involved to come to the meeting. They are willing to discuss the placement of the two existing locations and the third location at the other end of town.

There is a large group of investors and business people concerned about this. He stated that the group would not back down. He thanked the Board of Directors for their time and invited OTO representatives to the meeting with MoDOT.

Mr. Lapaglia asked if MoDOT would be meeting with group. Mr. McKeen stated the group was meeting with MoDOT. Ms. Fields stated that a representative of the OTO would try and attend if the group would inform staff of the meeting time and place.

Mr. Viebrock stated as a follow-up to Mr. McKeen's presentation that Greene County is watching what is going on with great interest. Greene County will soon be the largest land owner there with the James Town Development, and is interested in where the interchanges will be located. As many of you are aware the Jamestown development,

E. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Fields stated that a lot of the items staff have been working on are on the agenda. The Transportation Input Initiative and the public input that was received will be discussed during the Board of Directors Training. There is a summary report for Board of Director

members that cannot attend the training. The summary report goes over the input that has been received. The Subcommittee will review the information. The subcommittee is made up of all the member jurisdictions, the Airport, and City Utilities Transit. MoDOT put together some project cost estimates for the projects of regional significance. It will be reviewed by the Subcommittee as well. The meetings will start on April 23. The subcommittee will come up with a project list to submit to MoDOT in the event the one-cent sales tax passes. The one-cent sales tax has cleared the House, but not the Senate.

Mr. Weiler stated that there is good representation and a lot of people are testifying, but there is also some opposition. The Committee considered all of it. There is a Committee meeting today. It is not known if that means it will be voted on one way or another but it was well attended by senior MoDOT staff and stakeholders. Ms. Fields stated that the OTO is moving forward on the project list.

Ms. Fields stated that staff had been doing a lot of work with the 5310 Transit Funding, which is the funding for Human Service Vehicles. The Federal Agencies are very slow in releasing guidance in implementing the current transportation bill. It looks like this is a case where the OTO will be held up on vehicle selection due to the lack of guidance. The OTO worked fast to get the Governor to designate a recipient and to get memorandums of understanding in place and now it appears it will take about six months because of FTA delays.

Staff has been waiting for the Performance Measures to come out. MAP-21 has five areas in which performance measures will be established and the OTO will be required to meet. It has not been actually stated if the MPO will not get funding if the MPO does not meet the Performance Measures. The guidance is being designed to talk about the ramifications financially. The guidance is very slow coming out. One of five drafts is out for public comment. Staff is waiting on the rest of the guidance.

Staff attended the Associations of MPOs Policy Committee in March and worked on a policy paper to give to law makers in Washington, D.C. One of the points that was made was to not put a lot of new law in place since MAP-21 had not been implemented yet. If the guidance was not finished yet, it would be hard to spend the funds if the laws were changed again. It was a good meeting attended by representatives from Senator Boxer. Senator Boxer is the head of the Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee. A representative of Senator Schuster also was there. The Senator is the head of the House Transportation Committee. It was good to be able to give MPO input in general to the individuals who are writing the bill. The Senate Environmental Public Works Committee has come up with an agreement on a six-year bill, but the House does not have any type of agreement yet. The President also came out with a budget for a four-year bill.

F. Legislative Reports

Mr. Wadlington stated that Senator Blunt is drafting a letter in support of the TIGER Grant that should be complete by the end of the week. There is no consensus on how to pay for a Transportation Bill. Every year the Federal General Fund pumps \$22 billion into highways. That is the deficit every year on the Highway Trust Fund. He stated that there has been a little push back in the House on trails and walking paths. Over in the Senate, it is not hopeful that there will be a bill. The Senator has promoted an Infrastructure Bill of \$50

billion that has bi-partisan support. There is hope that bill might be an avenue to put some money into highways, infrastructure, and things of that nature. It is expected that there will be an extension of some sort on the Highway Bill since it expires 60 days before the fall elections.

G. Recognition of Phil Broyles

Mr. Lapaglia requested that Phil Broyles be remembered with a minute of silence. He was an integral part of the OTO Board of Directors. Members of the Board shared stories about Phil Broyles, the former City of Springfield Public Works Director, for the remaining four minutes.

II. New Business

A. OTO Procurement Policy Update

Ms. Parks stated that the OTO originally wrote the current Procurement Manual in 2008 when the OTO became a separate entity from the City of Springfield. The OTO originally modeled it after member jurisdictions' manuals. After going through many purchasing scenarios the past couple of years, it was decided that the procurement manual needed updating. There are updates from MAP-21, the FTA Master Contract, as well as an updated FTA Circular 4220.1F. Staff tried to condense the requirements down to what was required of an organization like OTO. The OTO is a very small organization with just 5 staff members, unlike the OTO member jurisdictions that have purchasing and accounting departments to handle the RFP process. Staff looked at how to be good stewards of the OTO funds, meet all requirements, and at the same time not have to go through so many steps. More than once, the OTO has gone out to bid and has not gotten any responses.

Ms. Parks stated that MoDOT and the Executive Committee reviewed the proposed procurement manual and the comments have been incorporated into the manual. The OTO will do a self-certification to state that the OTO has looked at the policies and guidance in place and staff feels like OTO meets the requirements.

An area of change is the approval process for purchases. There is a new matrix: amounts 0-\$999 requires Executive Director verbal approval, which is easier for staff to be make purchases. \$1,000 to \$4,999 is written approval of the Executive Director; and \$5,000 to \$25,000 needs to be in the UPWP and have the Board of Directors approval. If there is a large purchase it will come to the Board. The Executive Director is the signer for all OTO contracts. One of the problems with the old purchasing policy is the formal bidding required for purchases over \$25,000. MoDOT approved using the FTA guidance which is \$100,000 + for the formal bidding process. There is still a process for formal bidding under the \$100,000 threshold for items like consultants. This will allow items like office supplies and copy machine leases to not go through the formal bidding processes each time. There are repeat purchases that have been approved in the budget and UPWP process that do not need approval each time they are purchased. Another area that was updated is the contract clauses that are required on contracts by FTA. The FTA clauses have been updated and are included in a matrix for staff reference. There are a few items not allowed by the OTO's grant. One is that financial statement audits under \$500,000 in federal funds are at the OTO expense. The policy also outlines a written procedure for W-9s and the OTO sales tax exemption.

One of the comments from the review process was a policy for an emergency approval process. The procurement manual outlines that the Executive Director can make an emergency purchase on the OTO's behalf. Another request was to have a contingency approver in place if the Executive Director was unavailable for an extended period of time.

Mr. Bingle stated that if the Board of Directors approved the budget and the item being purchased falls within the budget, then the suggestion would be that the item would not have to come back to the Board of Directors for approval. Ms. Fields inquired if he was suggesting that on amounts over \$25,000 the item would not need to come back to the Board. Mr. Bingle stated that if the budget is already anticipated and incorporated within the approval of the amount to be spent, the OTO would then have the ability to go out to bid. It would not have to come back to the Board until the bid is awarded. Ms. Parks stated that was the staff's intent, that the OTO would only go out to bid on items in the approved OTO budget. It would be the contract that would come to the Board of Directors.

Mr. Fisk stated he would second Mr. Bingle's comments. Mr. Juranas made the motion to approve the OTO Procurement Manual. Mr. Krischke seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

B. OTO Procurement System Self-Certification

Ms. Parks stated that the FTA Master Contract requires that the OTO self-certify that FTA regulations are being followed to the best of the OTO's ability. The OTO operates off of a FTA/FHWA grant. The regulatory agency is the FTA so that is why it is a FTA Self-Certification.

Mr. Bingle made the motion to certify that OTO has complied with the required Federal Transit Administration Procurement Policy. Ms. Hacker seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

C. FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program

Ms. Fields stated that the OTO prepares a Unified Planning Work Program every year that outlines the work activities for the new year. This is attached to the contract with MoDOT in order to get reimbursement of the federal funds. She outlined the general tasks. She stated that in Task 030 staff is proposing an update to the Major Thoroughfare Plan, so staff will be looking at revisions that need to be made or if any roads should be added. Staff will also produce a Roadway Designs Standards Guidelines Brochure for the jurisdictions and public. There is an anticipated Travel Demand Model Scenario, such as one for Kansas Expressway. Staff is looking at working with all the agencies to coordinate a process on the Congestion Management Process. It is easier to compare data from the same year as opposed to multiple years. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan will also be implemented. The Bluetooth Units and Travel Time Collection has been moved forward to this next budget year. Task 060 is OTO's Transit Planning Activities as well as the City Utilities Transit planning activities. The FTA requires that the MPO list City Utilities planning activities and there is about \$200,000 in CU planning activities. The remaining \$48,000 is OTO transit planning. Task 070 is work that the OTO does with ITS or grant applications. This year there is a Task 080, which is new. The MoDOT Direct Cost work has been moved to its own task. This will allow the OTO to recover more of the value of their work. Last year it was \$65,000, but this year it has

been increased to \$115,000 based on MoDOT estimates of work that is planned in the OTO area, including signal timing and other work items Federal Highway allows as direct cost. This allows the OTO to use less dues. The OTO collects enough local jurisdiction dues to cover the match if the Direct Cost comes in lower than estimated. If the OTO does not spend all the local dues, then it goes into the OTO reserve fund. The overall amount of the UPWP is \$1,065,338, which includes the \$200,000 on the City Utilities side, so the OTO portion is \$865,338 with almost \$700,000 in Federal Planning funds, \$115,000 in MoDOT Direct Cost, and \$60,000 in Local Jurisdiction Dues. This leaves a balance of Federal funds, not including this year's amount, of \$969,545.40 in reserves for the federal amount.

The motion to approve this should include a provision to approve this document pending any revisions resulting from the next tab, which is the OTO Operational Budget. If there are budget items that come up in that discussion, then that will affect this document as well.

Mr. Childers made the motion to approve the FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program. Mr. Compton seconded.

D. FY 2015 OTO Operational Budget

Ms. Parks stated that the OTO Operational Budget is almost the same as the OTO UPWP Appendix A. Last year during the OTO audit, it was brought up that the City Utilities Planning funds were included in the grant specific budget which the OTO was also using as the operational budget. The decision was made to have two separate budget documents. One budget is the OTO Operational Budget and the second is the grant budget. This will allow the OTO to continue to show the City Utilities Planning funds on the grant specific budget. One of the key differences in the two budgets is how the Local Jurisdictions Match Dues. This year, the OTO expects \$129,682 in Local Dues.

In the Operational Budget, the amount of Employee Insurance Premiums that the employees pay for family premiums is shown. The City Utilities Direct Outside Grant is not shown on the Operational Budget. The In-Kind match has also been removed since it is not real funds that the OTO is receiving, rather it is match on the federal grant. The MoDOT Direct Cost has also been removed from the Operational Budget for the same reason.

The OTO Budget is pretty much in line with last year's budget. There was an increase of \$35,000 in the salaries line. This is from a projected health care increase of 22 percent. This is an estimate based off of what has been happening in the health care realm. Staff based the increase on a worst case scenario. There are also staff raises budgeted into the salary line for current staff. At the discretion of the Executive Director \$14,000 was budgeted in to have the ability to hire a full-time GIS Technician. There has been a GIS hole, since the Multimedia Coordinator has been busy with the public input. Staff expects the public input work to remain time consuming. That \$14,000 would be added to the amount budgeted for two part-time interns. The intern positions would not be filled if a full-time employee was hired.

Staff there had been cleaning the OTO offices so a cleaning service has been budgeted for next year. There is a \$2,000 increase to the computer and equipment line. That is to purchase a second or third monitor for the large conference room. There is also an Errors and Omissions Insurance Policy budgeted. The advertising budget has been increased to

cover the increase work with public input. The \$80,000 from last year has moved forward for the purchase of the Bluetooth and the additional work with the Travel Model. There is a projected net increase of the Operation Fund Balance of \$92,000. This will only increase if the OTO receives as much In-Kind and MoDOT Direct Cost as budgeted. Otherwise the net Operation Fund Balance increase will be smaller. That leaves the Operating Fund Balance, if the full \$92,000 materializes, at \$358,000. This is a good position in case there is another government shutdown. Until everything gets finalized in Washington, it will be good to have some cash flow, because in any given month, there is \$150,000 in bills and OTO must wait 30 days to be reimbursed, since it is a reimbursable grant.

Ms. Robeson inquired if there was a set percentage amount for the salary increase. Ms. Fields stated there is a policy of a maximum of 4 percent on the salary increase. It is based on a score from the employee performance evaluation and ranges from 0 to 4 percent.

Mr. Bingle inquired if that included the COLA raise or if it is all merit. Ms. Fields stated it was only merit. Mr. Bingle inquired if the OTO had trouble filling the GIS position last time. Ms. Fields stated that the OTO did not go out to bid on the GIS position, because the position was changed to the Multimedia Coordinator Position. Staff felt that the GIS records were up to date and that there was work that needed developed in other areas. Planners do take GIS coursework as part of the planning degree, so the GIS work was being kept up. but now, the work load has increased and there is a need for a specific GIS person again. When Mr. Chris Stueve was hired, he started as the OTO intern.

Mr. Juranas inquired if the additions to staff were conditional on funding. Ms. Parks stated that the decision to hire was on work flow and having enough work for a GIS Technician. Ms. Fields stated that she planned to hire a GIS position and not fill the intern positions. Mr. Juranas asked if there was a shortfall in funding in later years, how that would be addressed. Ms. Fields stated that she would be clear that it was a year-to-year position. The position would be filled for one year and reevaluated the following year. If there is a good fund balance and the GIS Technician remains busy, then the goal would be for it to be a permanent position. Mr. Juranas inquired if the position would be set up as a year-to-year contract to avoid expectations. Ms. Fields stated that she was planning to do that.

Mr. Lapaglia inquired if there was a big concern about the funding. Mr. Juranas stated that the federal funding is uncertain. Ms. Fields stated that there are two issues on the federal side. The first is that the transportation bill is expiring. Staff is confident that there will be a continuing resolution passed. It is doubtful that there would not be a transportation bill for very long. The other issue is the bankruptcy of the Highway Trust Fund coming in July, in which case, there is the chance that there might be a couple months lag on reimbursements. It is nice to have an Operating Fund Balance to cushion the OTO in that situation. The addition of one staff person will not make that big a difference as far as cash flow.

Mr. Bengsch made the motion to approve the FY 2015 OTO Operational Budget. Mr. Fisk seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

E. FTA Section 5310 Project Selection Criteria

Mr. Owens stated that there is not guidance yet on the FTA Section 5310 Selection Criteria. OTO went ahead and started working on the program, off of the draft guidance. The 5310 program under MAP-21 legislation changed dramatically. The two programs, 5310, which just provided two vehicles for the OTO area, and the New Freedom program, 5317, which provided assistance for ADA, were combined under MAP-21. It has been challenging to write an application.

The new guidance stated that 55 percent of the funds need to be for vehicle and capital projects and 35 percent need to go to New Freedom type projects. There is also a 10 percent fee for administering the programs. A couple months ago there was a MOU for MoDOT and CU Transit to administer the funds. There is a policy that states that the OTO will follow the guidance of the percentage of breakdowns. There is also a selection criteria that will give both areas a fair playing field for these funds. The funds are about \$250,000 per year and the OTO has been waiting to award FY 2013 and 2014. The Local Coordinating Board for Transit looked at the nine selection criteria. The TPC recommended approval of the proposed 5310 Project Selection Criteria. Once this is approved, then the LCBT will start work on the application.

Mr. Lapaglia stated that it was mentioned earlier that MAP-21 had not been finalized yet. His question was how the OTO could approve something that had not been approved by the Federal Government yet. Mr. Owens stated it is the FTA Guidance Circular. The Guidance should be released sometime in the spring. There are a couple of items that the OTO will have to wait on from FTA. Mr. Lapaglia stated that it did not make sense that work would begin on a new bill before MAP-21 was finished.

Mr. Bengsch inquired if the Guidance is approved, would that change the OTO scoring criteria on the project evaluation. Ms. Fields stated that the OTO gets to determine the scoring criteria. The Local Coordinating Board of Transit has set the criteria. Mr. Bengsch stated that is good, since he was hesitant to approve something that had not been finalized.

Mr. Fisk made the motion to approve the FTA Section 5310 Selection Criteria. Mr. Weiler seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

F. FTA Section 5310 Designated Recipient

Ms. Fields stated that at the last Board of Directors meeting, the Board of Directors agreed to let MoDOT and City Utilities be the 5310 Designated Recipients so they could administer the funds. That includes things like holding title of vehicles and conducting audits of different agencies. The Governor needs to now make the official designation. Staff is requesting that the Board allow the Chair to sign the Designated Recipient Resolution and it will be sent to the Governor. Eventually, when FTA is ready, the OTO will be ready to go.

Mr. Childers made the motion to support the appointment of MoDOT and CU as FTA Section 5310 Joint Designated Recipients. Mr. Juranas seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

G. Title VI Policy Revision to Include ADA

Mr. Owens stated that the Board of Directors approved the OTO Title VI Program in February. The program took all the OTO policies and plans that were related to Title VI and

put them into one plan. This program was submitted to MoDOT on March 31. During that time, staff looked at the ADA requirements and is requesting to make a few minor changes to include them into the Title VI document. One of the changes is the title changes to include ADA and to bring everything up to date with the new OTO logo. There are four additional items that were changes, as well. The notice for the public of their rights will be posted on the OTO and website. The second item was to simplify the claims procedure for incoming comments and complaints. Instead of two separate documents they have been combined into one. The collaborative process for the complaint procedure to MoDOT and Federal Highway has also been updated. The Complaint Form has been updated to include the ADA complaints. The appendices were updated to the actual policy that was approved in February. There is a resolution, so that it can be to MoDOT in a timely manner.

Mr. Juranas made the motion to approve by resolution the Title VI Policy with proposed ADA Provisions. Ms. Robeson seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

H. STP-Urban Advance Policy and Agreement

Ms. Fields stated that the Executive Committee had been working on a policy to help spend down the OTO STP-Urban fund balance. OTO is allowed to have about \$16 million and MoDOT counts cost share projects against the maximum amount that the OTO is allowed to have. Ms. Longpine presents a STP-Urban fund balance report twice a year that tells the OTO members what the balance is and if the OTO is in danger of losing the funding.

Ms. Fields stated that MoDOT announced that there will not be any more cost shares approved. That will not be an option to reduce the OTO balance. The proposal is for those jurisdictions that receive less than \$1 million in a year to be allowed to spend up to \$3 million in advance. The jurisdiction would agree that if the program was discontinued by the Federal Government, then the funds would be paid back. Prior to the letting or programming of the project in the Transportation Improvement Program, the jurisdiction would need to sign the agreement. It would go to the jurisdiction's council and there would be a resolution that in the event that funding was discontinued, the jurisdiction would be required to pay it back. The funds would go into deposit with MoDOT back into the overall STP-Urban fund balance. The OTO fund balance has been consistently high or over the \$16 million figure. The MoDOT staff member over the local programs talked to staff last week about the OTO's high balance.

The smaller jurisdictions can spend the money quickly and this allows better planning. The Executive Committee reviewed the policy and the Technical Committee recommended approval. As part of this policy, staff will make a determination that funds are actually available. There is also an email from MoDOT authorizing the OTO to go over the balance up to \$2 million. MoDOT is interested in the whole State spending down the federal funds. This would give some room in the case there was a miscalculation and jurisdictions were accidentally allowed to spend more than they had. MoDOT would then work with the OTO to figure out how to make it up. Staff is confident that there is no risk of this to the OTO. If the program is discontinued, it will come back to the pot because of the signed agreement.

Mr. Bingle asked Ms. Fields for clarification on the paragraph following the itemization of the balance, where there is a sentence that reads if funding comes back "they will likely be used on maintenance projects within the MPO." He asked if there was a current

prioritization list. Ms. Fields inquired if he was referring to the maintenance. Mr. Bingle stated yes. Ms. Fields stated that it is at MoDOT's discretion. Maintenance is an area that the OTO does not give input on. There is a pavement rating system. Ms. Baltz stated that there is a pavement plan that covers the OTO area.

Mr. Bingle stated that this would be part of the TIP and could be used for construction and plan preparations. Ms. Fields stated that was correct that it could be used for transit, sidewalks, and anything else eligible under the STP-Urban category. Mr. Bingle inquired if staff was authorized to approve it or if would come back to the Board. Ms. Fields stated she believes that she would approve the agreement, but the Board would approve it via the TIP. When it comes forward as a TIP Amendment or the annual process, staff would note in there the project is using advanced funding, so it would be approved by both.

Mr. Bingle made the motion to approve the STP-Urban Advance Policy and Agreement. Mr. Fisk seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

I. Amendment 1 to the Priority Projects of Regional Significance Report

Ms. Fields stated that the Board heard this request at the February meeting. The motion included that the Technical Committee analysis and decision be brought back to the Board of Directors. There is a lot of the original information, as well as additional information, pertaining to the request. There is still a map of the proposal. Volume-to-capacity has been added to the map, and is color categorized by the level of volumes versus the capacity. Highway 14 Business Route/65 is consistently over capacity as far as the daily volumes. The MM Corridor is not as much, but it is developing rapidly. There are businesses going in. There were projections done based on the PIC East Development. The MM Corridor is 1,300 acres so a third of that development build-out was used. That either doubles or triples the amount of traffic expected on MM depending on calculation methods. It is a legitimate issue as far as traffic volumes are concerned. The safety of the Highway 14/Business Route 65 Corridor was typical of the other OTO priority corridors. The MM Corridor was not as high, but accidents increase with volume. The single vehicle accidents have not been reported to the highway patrol. The scores of these projects have been listed in relation to the other priority projects. These scores do not measure against every score in the Long Range Transportation Plan, as staff picked the highest scores on the corridor to compare. The score reflects the traffic congestion along the entire corridor. The scores do not represent every project in the area, just the priority corridors. The Technical Planning Committee did review all of the information and agreed to include these two into the Priority List of Corridors.

Mr. Juranas inquired if there were routes in the major corridors that had significant congestion that had been moved. Ms. Fields stated that staff did not analyze that. There probably is movement in the congestion. In the Long Range Plan, there are scores available for every project. If there is an area of concern it can be scored.

Mr. Viebrock stated he wanted to thank the Technical Planning Committee. It was not the ordinary request and he appreciated the committee looking at the projects for the communities.

Mr. Lapaglia stated that good ideas were brought to the committee. Some projects needed to be added and there was good discussion from what he heard from the Christian County TPC member.

Ms. Hacker stated that for the record she just wanted to thank staff for the work that was done.

No action was requested as this amendment had been previously approved pending provision of supporting information and a recommendation from the Technical Planning Committee.

J. Amendment 2 to the Priority Projects of Regional Significance

Ms. Fields stated that Greene County, Christian County, Springfield, and Nixa have been talking about the need of the Kansas Expressway Extension. Greene County has requested to add that roadway to the OTO Priority Projects of Regional Significance, as well. The scores are included in the agenda packet. Some work is beginning in Greene County, and it is time that in order to continue that work, federal funds might need to be accessed. Putting this alignment on the Priority List helps with that. The scores from the North-South Corridor Study are included. The scores looked at potential traffic time reductions. It shows what the growth of 160 looks like without doing anything else. It is exponential because of the growth in Christian County. The North-South Corridor Study looked at developing an alternative route to relieve some of the congestion on 160. Some of that information is included on the volumes. The final North-South Corridor Study recommendation was that the Kansas Expressway Extension be built as well as the West Bypass/FF Extension. Those both would be needed to relieve the traffic in Christian County. Kansas Expressway is the most likely one that could happen right now because of the right-of-way acquisition that Greene County has been doing since the 1980's. That is where staff recommends that efforts be concentrated. The Technical Planning Committee reviewed it and also recommended approval. The motion included adding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along the corridor, as well.

Mr. Bengsch made the motion to approve Amendment 2 to the Priority Projects of Regional Significance. Mr. Viebrock seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

K. Support for MSU Tiger Grant

Ms. Longpine stated that Missouri State University is looking to apply for a TIGER Grant for an Intermodal Transfer Facility, to be located on the east side of campus, between Harrison/National and Monroe (otherwise known as Bear Boulevard). That facility would not just be a parking structure, but would tie in with the Bear Line Shuttle System. It would also accommodate City Utilities buses. City Utilities is going to accommodate the Bear Line at the new City Utilities transfer station as well, so that is a developing relationship. There is also a proposed car sharing and bike sharing program on campus. That will help to alleviate some of the parking concerns. In addition, depending on which version is built, there could be upwards to 1,450 additional spaces, which would give MSU more land to infill on campus. This would prevent the expansion beyond the MSU campus boundaries. MSU is requesting \$13.5 million in TIGER funding. MSU will be providing \$14 million, so a 51 percent match. That will give MSU a strong showing in the TIGER application. MSU is asking for a letter of support from the OTO Board of Directors that supports the planning efforts

that have been done. The Intermodal Transfer Facility supports some of the recommendations from the Regional Route Study with the National Line for City Utilities.

The OTO has to certify that the project would be added to the TIP should the TIGER grant be awarded.

Mr. Juranas stated that Mr. Greg Burris has been very supportive of the TIGER Grant application and is providing a letter of support from the City of Springfield. The City of Springfield believes it is a good project, since it enhances and supports the streetscapes, pedestrian access, and those efforts.

Mr. Jones stated that Scott Miller, the General Manager of City Utilities, is also providing a letter of support.

Mr. Juranas made the motion to approve a letter of support and certification of inclusion in the TIP for Missouri State University's TIGER Application. Ms. Hacker seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

L. MoDOT Request to Withdraw TIP Amendment Number Two

Ms. Longpine stated that this a TIP Amendment that was approved at the February Board of Directors meeting for scoping the Brookline/MM Railroad crossing. Since then, MoDOT has spoken with the Multimodal Division and even if the project was scoped, there is not any money identified for construction on whatever the recommended improvements would be. MoDOT has asked that the OTO remove it from the TIP and not send it to FHWA for approval. Since the Board of Directors had already taken action, it will need to take action to withdraw the request from the TIP. In the future, if funding is identified, this request might be submitted again.

Ms. Hacker made the motion to approve the withdrawal of Amendment 2 to the FY 2014-2017 TIP. Mr. Krischke seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

M. Support for the Kansas Expressway Extension Tiger Grant Application

Ms. Fields stated that there were \$35 million available nationally for this round of TIGER funding for planning grants. That allows agencies to apply for environmental or design work of a corridor. The one that is on the list right now is the Christian County part of the Kansas Expressway Extension. In 2005, there was a study that identified three alternative alignments in Christian County. An alignment has not been narrowed down, because in order to use federal funds, there had to be a NEPA, or Environmental, analysis, which would cost a minimum of \$1 million. If the OTO wanted to do environmental and design to where it would be confident that the right-of-way was in the right place it would be \$2.5 million. The proposal is for a \$2.5 million study with 20 percent in local match. This section of Christian County is in a rural portion, according to the Census. That means that the minimum amount of match is \$0, but traditionally, on all of the TIGER Grants, everyone has provided a great deal of match. MSU is doing 50 percent, which is pretty standard on the urban side.

Staff thinks that the application would have a good showing if there is 20 percent match to be competitive. The application would be for environmental review and design. This would allow Christian County or Nixa to acquire the right-of-way when it came through the planning and development process. If awarded, it would set up the OTO for future TIGER Grants, because the DOT likes to continue funding projects that have been funded in the past. If it is a good project this round, then maybe in a couple years an application could be made for actual construction dollars. It is a long shot, but support is requested for OTO staff to apply, then administer the grant, and then to certify that the OTO would put it in the TIP if the OTO were to receive that award. Christian County has agreed to a 10 percent match, which is \$250,000 on a \$2.5 million grant. There were letters of request sent out to the legislators and staff is confident that the legislators will send support letters.

Mr. Bingle stated that the City of Nixa is short on funds due to the election on Tuesday. He did not anticipate Council's support of allocating \$250,000 as a match to accommodate the 20 percent. He would report back to staff on Monday regarding the Council's decision. Ms. Fields stated she would like blanket permission, if Nixa could not do a \$250,000 match, to tailor the grant application to whatever amount of match is available. The goal would be to keep the match at 20 percent. The environmental could be done for about \$1 million. If the City of Nixa decides to do nothing, then staff does not want to write a grant application that would not have 20 percent and not be able to compete.

Mr. Juranas inquired what the difference was between the planning and construction grants. Ms. Fields stated that one of the big differences is \$10 million versus no minimum. The planning grant has no minimum required. Since the OTO is a Transportation Management Area, the minimum required on the TIGER Grant is \$10 million, except for the little portion that is rural. There is a \$1 million requirement on the rural side. The planning grants have no minimum. The match has been around 50 percent. Planning grants can be used for environmental and design. The projects need to be shovel ready.

Ms. Longpine added that this was the first time since the second TIGER round that planning grants had been offered. This is currently round 6, so this has not been offered recently. It would be good to apply if possible. Mr. Lapaglia stated he would like a motion with the provision that Mr. Bingle gave regarding the City of Nixa's position.

Mr. Fisk made the motion to support the application, OTO administration of the grant, and certification of addition to the TIP. Mr. Krischke seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

III. Other Business

A. Board of Directors Member Announcements

Mr. Juranas stated that there is a ribbon cutting at Close Park on May 9.

Mr. Weiler stated that the Springfield Chamber of Commerce is hosting the State of the Airport Address on April 24th. There is a lot more detail on what is happening at the Airport, so OTO members are welcome to attend.

Ms. Baltz stated that it was Work Zone Awareness Week last week, where MoDOT kicks off the construction season. It was a reminder to watch out for workers.

Ms. Fields stated that on April 24th there is also a Statewide Freight Plan Draft Public Meeting at the Springfield Chamber.

B. Transportation Issues For Board of Directors Member Review

None

C. Articles for Board of Directors Member Information

None

IV. Adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.