

1 TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD
2 SHERMAN-DENISON MPO
3 City of Sherman
4 Council Chambers
5 August 6, 2009 9:00 a.m.
6

7 Members Present: Mayor Bill Magers (City of Sherman), Mayor Frank Budra (City of
8 Pottsboro), Bobby Littlefield (TxDOT), Gene Short (Grayson County)
9

10 Non-Voting
11 Members Present: Mike Shahan (North Texas Regional Airport)
12

13 Staff Present: Robert Wood, Wally Johnson
14

15 Guests Present: Jeff Miller (City of Sherman), Noel Paramanthanam (TxDOT), Kevin
16 Farley (City of Pottsboro), Kathy Williams (Herald Democrat), Tom
17 Speakman (City of Denison), Diane Lann (TxDOT), Peggy Shelley
18 (TCOG – 911), Chris Schmitt (TNP), Kirby John Pettitt Barazza
19

20 **I. Call to Order -**
21

22 Chairman Bill Magers called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.
23

24 **II. Acknowledgment of Quorum by Chairman -**
25

26 Chairman Magers declared a quorum of the TPB present.
27

28 **III. Approval of Minutes -**
29

30 Motion was made by Frank Budra, seconded by Bobby Littlefield to approve the June 3, 2009
31 TPB minutes. Motion passed unanimously.
32

33 **IV. Approval of the FY 2010 – 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) –**
34

35 Mr. Johnson began the discussion of the FY 2010 – 2011 UPWP with a PowerPoint presentation
36 outlining the purpose and development of the document. The initial public meeting was held on
37 April 1, 2009 with a public comment period between April 3 and May 17, 2009. No comments
38 were received. With the approval by the TPB the document will be forwarded to TxDOT, FTA
39 & FHWA for implementation. Commissioner Short asked how this program's budget compared
40 to the previous one. Mr. Wood responded by stating that we would be getting the same amount
41 of money. After a brief discussion Commissioner Short moved to approve the FY 2010 – 2011
42 UPWP. The motion was seconded by Mayor Budra. Motion passed unanimously.
43

44 **V. Discussion and Appropriate action on proposed amendment to the FY 2008 – 2011**
45 **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) –**

1 Mr. Johnson explained that the proposed project needed to go through the public involvement
2 process so it was presented for public input on June 24. The project calls for the building of an
3 over pass on FM 1417 (east) going over a new section of US 82. This is a safety bond project.
4 Mr. Littlefield commented that there have been a lot of accidents at that intersection. Mainly on
5 the east bound intersection. With the construction of the overpass, the traffic patterns should
6 change. Before the opening of US 82 east at that intersection, it dead ended at FM 1417. He
7 stated that it has been TxDOTs goal all along to complete the freeway section of US 82 to Frisco
8 Road. Any time there is an opportunity to get 'free money' from the federal government or
9 from safety programs we're (TxDOT) going to submit regardless for documentable accidents.
10 Not only does it help from the safety standpoint but it also helps us in the long range planning
11 aspect. It gets us one step closer to getting that (US 82) freeway. Chairman asked if this money
12 was only for safety projects, Mr. Littlefield responded affirmatively. After a couple of
13 questions regarding the traffic lighting at the intersection by Commissioner Short and some
14 explanation by Mr. Littlefield, Commissioner Short moved to approved the amendment. The
15 motion was seconded by Mayor Budra seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
16

17 **VI. Discussion and Appropriate action on TIGER Discretionary grants –**
18

19 Mr. Wood explained that the discretionary grants project is still on-going. TxDOT had selected
20 ten projects that they thought were best for the state but the Texas Transportation Commission
21 (TTC), recognizing that the ARRA program provides only \$1.5 billion for the entire nation and
22 Texas communities had submitted \$7.7 billion, decided not to endorse the 'top ten'. TTC is
23 asking the communities to submit their projects directly to the U.S. Department of
24 Transportation (DOT) and offer the services of TxDOT if they have the time or availability to
25 work on those projects. Mr. Wood had a question for the board. The staff recommended what it
26 felt was best for the region. US 75 overlay project from Sherman to US 84. He asked if the
27 board wanted to pursue the project. Mr. Wood also stated that he had received a call from the
28 city of Howe wanting to consider another project. That being a bridge over US 75 on Bledsoe
29 Dr. which is currently in the next long range plan. He asked if the board wanted staff to pursue
30 that request will additional staff time. Chairman Magers expressed concern over cities asking for
31 support for projects which do not come through the MPO. He understood that cities have their
32 own interests at stake. But if the MPO is going to be a functioning body, the members of the
33 MPO have got to use the MPO as 'their vehicle of first choice'. "I'll put Sherman on that deal, if
34 Sherman has a project..." it would have to come through the MPO.
35

36 Mr. Littlefield asked if the project was in the long range plan. Mr. Johnson stated that it was not
37 in the current long range plan but was in the draft long range plan (The next long range plan is
38 scheduled for approval on or about December 1, 2009). Mr. Wood stated that to his
39 understanding if the project is selected, this would occur sometime in December, which is when
40 the next long range plan would be in place. He again stated that the project would not need to be
41 in the current long range plan. Mr. Littlefield commented that the Howe project is a good project
42 but it needs to be vetted by the board. Mr. Wood stated that, if selected, the board would need to
43 support it. Chairman Magers stated that it was best for the board to speak with one voice with
44 one project as opposed to two. Mr. Littlefield remarked that the board could support either the
45 candidate projects or none. Chairman Magers again stated the importance of cities coming
46 before the board to have projects supported by the board. Mr. Littlefield stated that he

1 understood what the chairman was saying but in this situation there was a deadline for the
2 submittal (September 15th). After some discussion they agreed that it would endorse the project
3 if it were to be selected by DOT. Chairman Magers said he would entertain a motion to support
4 the US 75 overlay from Sherman to US 84 as written and direct the staff to move forward on it.
5 Chairman Short made the motion. Before a second was made, Mr. Littlefield asked Noel
6 Paramanathanam (TxDOT) to come to the podium to provide some details on what the
7 construction and engineering consisted of. After his discussion, Mayor Budra asked if the
8 motion include the city of Howe’s request. Chairman Short responded by saying “We could do
9 that later if you want to.” Chairman Magers reiterated that cities could submit individually but
10 “If we are going to have an MPO, we ought to go to the MPO first. If the MPO does not want to
11 do it, then we (cities) can go off on our own.”

12
13 After the discussion Chairman Magers ‘repeated’ motion by Commissioner Short and clarified to
14 say ‘submit the concrete overlay from downtown Sherman to US 84 as currently written on the
15 books as our (MPO) TIGER application’. Motion passed unanimously.

16
17 **VII . Discussion and Appropriate action on Pictometry purchase –**

18
19 Mr. Wood introduced Ms. Peggy Shelley, TCOG’s 911 program manager who is seeking some
20 additional funds for the aerial photography currently used by various government agencies
21 including the MPO. Mr. Wood told the board that there is currently funding available in the FY
22 2008 – 2009 UPWP. The availability of funding is due to the fact that the staff did not get to the
23 other projects because of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) projects or the
24 TIGER grants.

25
26 Chairman Magers asked how many dollars were available for the project. Mr. Wood provided
27 the figure (\$150,000 approx.). All planning funds which will roll over to the next fiscal year.

28
29 Ms. Shelly came before the board and explained the reasoning for the need to expend their funds.
30 Mainly that coming to the end of their program on August 31, 2009. She described what
31 Pictometry is used for (i.e. GIS, Mapping, addressing, 911). Two years ago the high level
32 aerials were purchased for approximately \$150,000. This time the contractor is proposing a cost
33 for one flight in the amount of \$201,165.00. She went on to describe various options available
34 including web hosting at TCOG. She stated that the 911 program does not have the funds to do
35 this project ‘alone’. Chairman Magers expressed concerns over the various specific needs from
36 the various entities. He specifically cited the needs for the city of Sherman. Ms. Shelly
37 explained how the new proposal would offer entities access to better Pictometry via the internet.
38 Mayor Budra questioned some costs of the flyovers and suggested economies of scale. Some
39 other questions regarded the multiyear contract being a challenge to some agencies which do not
40 know what their funding would be from year to year. Specifically for the MPO was the question
41 of one flight at \$31,000 versus a multiyear option costing \$25,523 first year, \$26,604 second
42 year and \$27,995 for the third year.

43
44 Chairman Magers questioned overlaps in costs by different agencies. After extensive discussion
45 on the subject, Chairman Magers suggested further study before any action by the board on the
46 item. He asked for a motion for further study on the subject. Commissioner Short asked the

1 Chairman to use the technical committee to work with the separate entities study and bring back
2 to the board a recommendation. Ms. Shelly stated that her committee needed to make a decision
3 by next Friday because of time constraints. Mr. Littlefield asked a question to Bob Wood and
4 Diane Lann. If 911 goes ahead and purchases the program by next Friday, can the board vote at
5 a later time to participate in the buy? Mr. Wood said he thought it could be done. Ms. Lann
6 stated that it (the purchase) would need to be in the UPWP. Ms. Shelly stated that they (911) are
7 seeking cost sharing because they are trying to update the product. As well as bring a better and
8 expanded product to the local governments in the web hosting aspect. Chairman Magers again
9 asked if 911 is a cheaper way to go, why doesn't the appraisal district get on board with them.
10 Ms. Shelly responded by saying 'it is different'. The discussion continued on technical costs,
11 etc.

12
13 Mr. Littlefield made a motion to table the item until further information is available for the
14 board. Chairman Short commented that this review would need to be coordinated with the
15 various agencies. Chairman Magers asked Mayor Budra if he would head up the technical study
16 group. Mayor Budra accepted. Commissioner Short seconded the motion. Mr. Littlefield
17 clarified 'that is with the assumption that we can reimburse if we choose to do so at a later time'
18 to the motion. Motion was passed unanimously.

19
20 **VIII . Public Comment** –
21
22 Mr. Littlefield took the opportunity to thank Ms. Lann for her thirty years of service to TxDOT.
23 She will be retiring at the end of August.

24
25 Having no further items, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 am.