

1 TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD
2 SHERMAN-DENISON MPO
3 Texoma Council of Governments
4 Eisenhower Room
5 February 3, 2010 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 Robert Brady (City of Denison)
10

11 Members Absent: none
12

13 Non-Voting

14 Members Present: Mike Shahan (North Texas Regional Airport)
15

16 Staff Present: Robert Wood, Wally Johnson
17

18 Guests Present: Jeff Miller (City of Sherman), Noel Paramanthanam (TxDOT), Kevin
19 Farley (City of Pottsboro), Kathy Williams (Herald Democrat), Tom
20 Speakman (City of Denison), Fred Marquez (TxDOT), Chris Schmitt
21 (TNP), Barbara Maley (FHWA), David Dryden (Teague Nall and Perkins,
22 Inc.), David Selman (TxDOT), Don Keene (City of Sherman), Lorie Hart,
23 Teresa Foster (TAPS), Tammy Davis (City of Sherman)
24

25 **I. Call to Order** -
26

27 Chairman Bill Magers called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
28

29 **II. Acknowledgment of Quorum by Chairman** -
30

31 Chairman Magers declared a quorum of the TPB present.
32

33 **III. Approval of Minutes** -
34

35 Before the minutes were approved, Mayor Brady of the City of Denison asked that under
36 "Members Absent:" Robert Brady was shown as Mayor of Sherman rather than Denison.
37 Commissioner Short also noted that in several sections of the minutes he was still identified as
38 'Chairman'. Cooke County was also misspelled. He stated that he would meet with Mr. Johnson
39 after the meeting to identify where corrections are needed. Wally Johnson acknowledged these
40 comments and stated that they would be corrected. Commissioner Short made a motion to
41 approve the minutes subject to the changes. Mayor Brady seconded. Motion passed
42 unanimously.
43
44
45

1 **IV. Discussion and Appropriate action on Enhancement Projects –**
2

3 Chairman Magers opened the discussion on the Enhancement Projects by stating that both he and
4 Mayor Budra would recuse themselves from this vote due to the fact that their respective cities
5 are participating in the program. They would however like to participate in the discussion and
6 conversation as they are advocates for their cities. He asked Mayor Brady, MPO Vice Chairman,
7 to chair the discussion and action on this item due to the subject matter.
8

9 At this point he called on Kevin Farley, Pottsboro city manager. Mr. Farley presented the
10 “Pottsboro Pedestrian Walkway” project. He stated that their project was ‘pretty straight
11 forward’. What they were proposing a pedestrian walkway along both the north and south sides
12 of a portion of FM 120 from the high school area to the 400 block of FM 120. He detailed the
13 various reasons why the project is needed. The board members asked a series of questions as he
14 made his presentation.
15

16 After the City of Pottsboro’s presentation, Don Keene, Projects Manager for the City of Sherman
17 came forward and made his presentation. Mr. Keene presented the “Downtown Sherman
18 Streetscape Enhancement” project. In his PowerPoint presentation described the project and its
19 benefits to the board. As with the prior presentation, the board members asked a series of
20 questions as he made his presentation.
21

22 At the conclusion of both presentations Bobby Littlefield asked what was required of the board.
23 Mr. Wood responded by saying that there were two options as listed in the background
24 information 1.) Support for all projects 2.) Board prioritization of candidate projects. Mr.
25 Johnson also explained that the candidate projects would have a greater chance if they were
26 prioritized. Several questions were asked as to how the selection process works at the TxDOT
27 level. The discussion settled with what was the criteria that met the spirit of TxDOT’s goals.
28 Mr. Farley commented that the candidate projects would get preference or priority in the internal
29 rankings if the criteria are met. These include five development criteria:
30

- 31 1. A set of plans is prepared and ready for letting.
- 32 2. Federal funds requested are for construction associated costs only.
- 33 3. Local match is available and in cash.
- 34 4. The Project property is currently owned by the nominator and supporting documentation
35 is provided.
- 36 5. Coordination with the appropriate state agencies has been established to provide
37 environmental clearance.
38

39 The board felt that it would best serve the candidate projects by asking which projects met the
40 criteria. Bobby Littlefield asked the staff which project met these goals. Mr. Johnson responded
41 by saying that the City of Sherman met the criteria. Chairman Magers stated that he had heard
42 when in Pottboro the thing he ‘heard over and over again was safety’. He had a question ‘Is
43 there a safety bucket?’ which we (MPO) could go after. Mr. Littlefield stated that the only other
44 program he knows of was ‘Safe Routes to School’.
45

46 After a few more questions were asked, Mayor Brady made a motion, based on the evaluation

1 (five criteria), to place the city of Sherman in the first place the city of Pottsboro in second place.
2 The motion seconded by Commissioner Short. Mayor Brady and Mayor Budra voted for the
3 motion. Bobby Littlefield voted no. (Chairman Magers and Mayor Budra did not vote)
4

5 After the vote Chairman Magers commented on grants available via TxDOT. He asked why as
6 an MPO we are not looking ‘outside the TxDOT realm’ at grants. He said he would encourage
7 the staff to look for these. Mr. Wood commented that he would defer to FHWA (Ms. Maley).
8 Ms. Maley, qualifying her response without any regulations for her review, stated that it is an
9 ‘ineligible expense’ for staff being paid with PL money to charge time to chase additional grants.
10 If they are not 100% paid by PL money (i.e. 90% FEDERAL - 10% OTHER), they could use
11 that time (10%) to pursue those grants. Chairman Magers stated that he feels there are other
12 opportunities out there that support what the MPO does and it does not have to be TxDOT
13 money. He asked that this discussion be on the next agenda item at the next board meeting.
14

15 *At the request of MPO staff agenda items V & VI were switched in order for subject matter to*
16 *flow more evenly.*
17

18 **VI. Discussion and Appropriate action on Category 3 (Urban Mobility) projects –** 19

20 Mr. Johnson presented the board with a statewide 2010 – 2020 letting cap schedule for category
21 3. The distribution of monies for this exercise begins in FY 2012 (\$1.4m) FY 2013 – 2020
22 (\$2.2m) per year for a total of \$19.2m (construction cost). TxDOT Austin has requested that
23 MPOs on a statewide basis prioritize local projects. The recommendation from MPO and
24 TxDOT staff included:
25

- 26 1. **City Street** from Canyon Grove RD to US WB FR ‘new location non-freeway’ \$297,710
- 27 2. **FM 131 @ US 82 Frontage Roads** ‘Traffic signals & widening’ \$763,760
- 28 3. **FM 131** from Lamberth St (Sherman) to Taylor St (Sherman) ‘widen from 2 lane to 4
29 lane’ \$1,995,575
- 30 4. **FM 131** US 82 to Lamberth ‘widen from 2 lane to 4 lane \$2,404,000
- 31 5. **FM 131** North Creek Drive to US 82 ‘widen from 2 lane to 4 lane’ no funding
- 32 6. **US 75 @ Loy Lake Road (Sherman)** ‘widen existing bridge overpass’ \$4,100,000
- 33 7. **US 75** Loy Lake Road (Sherman) to FM 691 ‘construct new ramps’ \$5,383,000
- 34 8. **FM 120** from York St (Denison) to SH 91 ‘widen from 2 lane to 5 lane’ \$4,650,000
35

36 Mr. Littlefield reminded the board that the last time the board ranked category 3 projects the
37 amount was approximately \$24 million. He reminded the board that the top priority project at
38 the time was US 75 and FM 691. That project got selected and built with ARRA funds (approx
39 \$3 million). The second ranked project was the ramp reversal project in Sherman (approx \$1.6
40 million). He stated this project will be funded with additional stimulus or district discretionary
41 funds. So adding these two stimulus funded projects the amounts available would be a wash. In
42 addition there was a ‘backlog’ list of projects which the board approved. Per Mr. Littlefield,
43 ‘We had two lists of projects’. Moving forward for a discussion today, not only the projects that
44 would fit in the \$19 million, which are funded to 2020, but also I also have authority to develop
45 \$10 million in backlog projects. Chairman Magers asked if we had a list. Mr. Wood stated that
46 we found out about this list last night. Mr. Littlefield stated that we may have to defer that list at

1 a future meeting. Chairman Magers commented that all those projects are cat 3 projects. Mr.
2 Littlefield said we would have the funded portion and the backlog portion. Mayor Brady asked
3 when the backlog list was due. Mr. Littlefield replied that there is no set date. He said he would
4 use the list that we (TxDOT) currently have. Chairman Magers agreed. Commissioner Short
5 said he would like to see the list. Mr. Littlefield replied by saying that the MPO needed to vote
6 on the proposed list as presented today in order to have it available for the ‘trade fair’ (the week
7 of February 8th). He stated that the ‘backlog list’ is more than \$10 million. Commissioner Short
8 asked what time period would that list cover. Mr. Littlefield said it would cover the same time
9 period as is being discussed this morning. He suggested that at the next MPO meeting perhaps
10 an agenda item could be added to discuss the list. Mr. Littlefield said that the list gives him the
11 authority to develop projects and have them ‘shelf ready’. After the board began reviewing the
12 proposed cat 3 list, Chairman Magers expressed frustration over the exercise. “We do these lists
13 and have two or three meetings on these lists and we get them and now we are going to change
14 the list again? I am ok doing it. I am just trying to understand what we are doing! I am a little
15 confused.” Noel Paramanthanam responded by explaining the need to have the project costs fit
16 the \$19 million as presented on the spread sheet. Mr. Littlefield interjected by saying “What
17 they (TxDOT/MPO staff) did was try to fit those eight projects within \$19 million. And the best
18 way they can do this is by dropping two of those projects of the list.” Chairman Magers stated
19 that he had no problem dropping two projects from the proposed list (FM 131 [Travis St.] from
20 North Creek Drive to US 82 and FM 120 from York St. to SH 91). “I will entertain a motion.”
21 Mayor Brady responded saying “So moved.” Commissioner Short seconded the motion.
22 Motion passed unanimously.

23
24 *Before the next agenda item discussion began Ms. Maley (FHWA) asked to comment and was*
25 *granted the floor.*

26
27 “I have several things you may want to consider that are working to your disadvantage in this
28 area. One is the influx and just the number of actions recently that you are having to make on
29 the fly because of how much money.it is a very fluid transportation system. I have been doing
30 this a bunch of years. Over twenty years. You are having to make decisions quickly and you
31 are on an every other month meeting schedule that is putting you at a terrible disadvantage. The
32 other thing that I think is working to your disadvantage is you do not have a technical
33 committee.” Chairman Magers interjected by saying “Yes we do. If you are not aware of this,
34 then shame on us for not making you aware.” Ms Maley asked if it has regular meeting dates.
35 Chairman Magers responded by saying ‘No. We can do that if we need to.’ Ms. Maley
36 continued by saying ‘I think that it would help you on making these technical decisions that you
37 are having to make during policy board meetings. At least you could have it that way where you
38 have the opportunity when you have to make decisions as quickly like from a Friday to a
39 Wednesday. I think that it might help you. Some outside observations.” Chairman Magers
40 responded by saying “I am fine with all that and I am going to shoot. Point the pistol to our paid
41 professional staff. If we need to be having technical meetings. Have them! I am not an expert in
42 MPO stuff and I don’t think anybody but Commissioner Short is. If we need to be having
43 technical meetings to help this deal, that is fine. Again, like I said I don’t think it is in the best
44 interest of our citizenry for us to make multimillion dollar decisions on the fly. And if we are
45 doing that, I think there is something we can do structurally to not do those things. To get our
46 folks involved. On the technical side we have two technical guys here (Tom Speakman, Jeff

1 Miller).” He posed the question to Mr. Speakman and Mr. Miller. At this point Mr. Johnson
2 suggested that the committee meet on the months that the board does not meet. Chairman
3 Magers responded by saying “If we need to meet, if there is a reason to have a meeting, we’re all
4 in!” Commissioner Short commented by saying “This MPO committee ten or twelve years ago
5 was not very active. But we are getting more active and we need to be more active. I know I’ve
6 been there when it wasn’t very active and we have become more active. The committee could
7 assume more responsibilities than the committee is doing right now.” Chairman Magers
8 commented, “Transportation is not a Sherman, Denison, Pottsboro issue. It is a regional issue.
9 If we (technical committee) need to meet then that is fine. If we don’t that is fine. If there are
10 things that we need to do technical wise, let me know that. Give us time to prepare so that when
11 we come to the meetings and there are changes that are being made, we can speak intelligently
12 and make informed decisions. Not decisions on the fly. I understand what you (Mr. Johnson)
13 are saying (regarding the last minute cat 3 list). I would have like the opportunity as the
14 Chairman as the mayor of Sherman. To talk with my folks beforehand so that when we see these
15 things, we can say gee whiz this makes better sense than the other. So are we going to have a
16 technical committee every other month?”
17

18 **V. Discussion and Appropriate action on draft FY 2011 – 2014 TIP –**
19

20 Mr. Johnson began his presentation to the board by stating that the previous discussion on
21 category 3 projects was important in providing perspective on the draft TIP. The presentation
22 offered and overview of its relationship to the long range plan. The authorized funding amount
23 for highway projects is \$45,220,646. The estimated annual transit expenditures are \$1,484,754.
24

25 The presentation highlighted mainly category 3 (urban mobility) projects. A brief overview of
26 the ‘grouped projects’ was given. At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Johnson asked the
27 board to permit staff to present the draft TIP at a public involvement meeting to be scheduled
28 within the next three months in order to meet the timeline provided by TxDOT. There was
29 minimal discussion on this item.
30

31 Chairman Magers made a point to briefly talk about the US 75 project from FM 1417 to BNSF
32 RR ramp reversal. He commented that ‘this is a fully funded SEDCO (Sherman Economic
33 Development Corp.) deal. We are not looking for any cash it’s to help our industrial park out
34 with some traffic issues that we have going on down there. Per Bobby (Mr. Littlefield), it had to
35 be on the TIP to get it on the deal.’ Mr. Littlefield commented that the estimate has been
36 updated by Noel. Mr. Paramanthanan stated that the weaving lane would add another
37 approximately \$400,000 to the cost to bring up to \$1.7 million. Chairman Magers wanted the
38 board to know that they were not looking for any TxDOT money for this project. This is a
39 SEDCO driven project to help Blalock Industrial Park.
40

41 Chairman Magers asked for a motion to approve the draft TIP for presentation during the public
42 involvement meeting process. Mayor Brady made a motion. Motion was seconded by Mayor
43 Budra. Motion passed unanimously.
44
45
46

1
2 **VI. Discussion and Appropriate action on Jobs for Main Street Act –**
3

4 Mr. Johnson began his presentation by alerting the board that TxDOT has a balance in the
5 current ARRA program as a result of some underruns on projects that have already been awarded
6 and must be recommitted to other projects by March 1, 2010. Should the ARRA funding for
7 these projects not be available, they will be submitted for consideration in the Jobs for Main
8 Street Act. The projects are as follows:
9

10 **US 75** From: US 82 To: Loy Lake R. Reverse existing ramp configuration in the southbound
11 direction Cost: \$1,655,040

12 **FM 131 & US 82** Build Turn Lanes Cost: \$763,760

13 **FM 996** From: FM 120 To: FM 1417 Rehab existing road Cost: \$1,109,450

14 **SH 56** From: SH 289 To: Binkley Park Drive Overlay Cost: \$2,043,900
15

16 Chairman Magers asked for a motion. Mayor Brady made a motion to approve. The motion was
17 seconded by Mayor Budra. Motion passed unanimously.
18

19 **VI. Discussion and Appropriate action on possible change in fiscal agent –**
20

21 Mr. Wood reminded the board that back about four years ago there was a discussion about the
22 cost that TCOG was charging the MPO to house the staff. Currently the cost is running about
23 \$45,000. The board asked Mr. Wood to look for alternatives. He checked with Austin College
24 and Grayson County College which had been mentioned at a previous meeting with federal
25 highways and TxDOT. Neither were interested. TAPS is interested. Chairman Magers asked
26 what would be the approximate savings. Ms. Foster (with Texoma Area Paratransit System) said
27 it would be \$25,000 per year. Commissioner Short asked to make a comment. The contract with
28 TCOG calls for a decision to be made before the budget year starts. Mr. Wood said that the
29 MPO would have to give TCOG six months notice. Therefore, the MPO move would need to be
30 in the federal fiscal year. Chairman Magers wanted to know what is the MPO's total budget
31 amount. Mr. Wood stated that the figure was \$180,000. Some years with carryover the figure
32 would go as high as \$250,000. Chairman Magers commented 'then this is roughly a 10%
33 savings.'
34

35 Mayor Brady asked what the move would cost. Mr. Wood stated that the staff would lose
36 seniority with the move. The financial cost would be minimal. Mr. Wood said the cost might be
37 \$10,000. It would depend on how much the MPO would need to pay TAPS for the move. Ms.
38 Foster stated that the renovation currently at TAPS is part of the stimulus project they are
39 working on now and would not be passed on to the MPO. Mr. Wood then estimated the
40 physical move might be \$1,000. Mayor Brady asked if this required action. Mr. Wood stated
41 that it would require MPO to notify TCOG of the possible move.
42

43 Commissioner Short said he wanted to hear from TAPS first. Ms. Foster commented that Mr.
44 Wood talked to the TAPS board in January in the 'public comment' portion of their agenda. She
45 stated TAPS needed the MPO board to give Mr. Wood direction on formally going before the
46 TAPS board to discuss the possible move. The TAPS board would also have to agree that TAPS
47 would be willing to take on the MPO. TAPS was also looking at October 1st as a possible move

1 date. Commissioner Short asked Ms. Foster to go into cost. Ms. Foster said they looked at their
2 fringe rate and overhead rate. Both are a little bit lower than TCOG. Commissioner Short asked
3 about meeting facilities. Ms. Foster stated that with the renovation, meeting facilities would be
4 available. Mayor Brady made a motion to allow Mr. Wood to make presentations to the TAPS
5 board for the purpose of possible relocation to TAPS. Mr. Wood asked that the motion to be
6 expanded to permit him to also notify TCOG of the possibility of a move from TCOG. Mr.
7 Littlefield wanted clarification on the motion. "Is all that he is doing is making notification to
8 TAPS board and to the TCOG board of the possibility of a move and at a later time TCOG put a
9 counter proposal, if they choose to do so. That way we can have an itemized listing of what they
10 would be charging us to be housed over there (TAPS)? Then at some later time we can make a
11 more informed decision." Commissioner Short commented that he had met twice previously
12 with the TCOG administration and asked them to sharpen their pencil. Mayor Brady said that
13 'Bobby's' (Littlefield) point is that there is a new administration at TCOG. Chairman Magers
14 commented that "We owe it to the taxpayers to lower (expenses) by 10% which gives us 10%
15 more dollars to do other things." Ms. Foster stated that their board will meet again in March, if
16 you (TPB) gave him (Mr. Wood) the go ahead with authority for negotiations, then our TAPS
17 board would give the TAPS staff the go ahead to negotiate as well. TAPS would have March
18 and April to finalize negotiations by May 1, 2010. Commissioner Short said that the
19 communication should be 'we are thinking about it'. He said he wanted to know what FHWA
20 and TxDOT think about this. Mr. Littlefield commented that other than the logistics of it, we're
21 ok. Ms. Maley said that from the federal perspective it is a local decision. Mr. Marquez from
22 (TxDOT) wondered out loud if this was a redesignation. At this point, Mayor Brady asked to
23 restate his motion. To do the due diligence to consider moving from the COG to TAPS before
24 making any decision, we would have a detail listing of what that entails. This is only the first
25 step and notify the COG that we are thinking about it. Motion was seconded by Commissioner
26 Short. Motion passed unanimously.

27

28 **IX. Public Comment Period -**

29

30 Mr. Littlefield asked the board if the next meeting be move to either March 31 or April 14. The
31 board agreed to move the next meeting to March 31.

32

33 Chairman Magers adjourned the meeting at 10:55 am.