

1 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2 SHERMAN-DENISON MPO
3 City of Sherman
4 Council Chambers
5 220 West Mulberry
6 Sherman, TX 75090
7 March 17, 2010 9:00 a.m.
8

9 Members Present: Jeff Miller (City of Sherman), Jerry White (Grayson County), Kevin Farley
10 (City of Pottsboro), Bob Wood (Sherman-Dension MPO)
11

12 Members Absent: Tom Speakman (City of Denison), Brad Underwood (Texoma Area
13 Paratransit)
14

15 Non-Voting
16 Members Present:
17

18 Staff Present: Robert Wood, Wally Johnson
19

20 Guests Present: Becky Woodson (TAPS), Teresa Foster (TAPS), Noel Paramanantham
21 (TxDOT), Don Keene (City of Sherman)
22

23 **I. Call to Order -**
24

25 Bob Wood called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
26

27 **II. Draft By-Law Amendment -**
28

29 Prior to the discussion on the By-Law amendment, Mr. Wood briefly talked about a binder he
30 assembled for the TAC which included information on the makeup of the Transportation Policy
31 Board (TPB), the purpose of the MPO, contact information, the timeline for TIP, By-Laws, etc.
32 The meeting was then turned over to Mr. Johnson. He explained the reasoning behind the need
33 for an amendment to the By-Laws. Mainly, that the level of sophistication in the planning
34 process has increased both due to the requirements of SAFETEA-LU, complexity of laws and
35 the volume of changes coming from the state level (TxDOT). When the information is presented
36 to the TPB many times they do not have adequate time to digest the information before making
37 decisions.
38

39 The original By-Laws addressed committees and sub-committees on a cursory level. The draft
40 amendment under 'Article II Operational Procedures and the section on Standing Technical
41 Advisory Committee and Other Committees' expands the makeup and the charge given to the
42 TAC. With the formal set up of the TAC, its members have an opportunity to discuss issues
43 with the decision makers and provide advice before those decision makers attend a policy board
44 meeting. Mr. Miller asked if the by-law information in the binder provided by Mr. Wood was

1 the original or the draft. Mr. Johnson stated that the draft is not in the binder because it has not
2 been approved. He also stated that the current document only has one sentence for committees,
3 etc. The draft expands on the description and the charge of the TAC. Mr. White asked if there
4 would be other committees added. Mr. Johnson stated that if there is a need for a specific topic
5 and the TAC recommends it, it does allow that. Mr. Wood also stated that we have Ad hoc
6 committees as needed. Mr. Miller asked if the recommendations of the TAC go to the TPB. Mr.
7 Johnson responded affirmatively. Mr. Farley asked if they needed to vote on the amendment.
8 Mr. Johnson stated that since this is the first meeting of the TAC, not being a formal body yet
9 (TPB would need to approve the forming of the TAC), an acknowledgment of the draft would
10 serve as a recommendation to the TPB. After a few more questions, the members present agreed
11 to forward the amendment for approval by the TPB.

12
13 Mr. Johnson explained that the TAC would not ‘necessarily’ meet every other month. If there is
14 no need for a technical review of information, he would poll the TAC and the TAC would decide
15 whether to meet or not. There were some questions on the voting structure. Mr. Johnson
16 suggested that the TAC chairman (MPO Director) vote only in case of a tie. The group agreed.
17 Mr. Johnson stated that he would change the draft to include that verbiage.

18
19 Mr. Miller recommended that the draft be forwarded to the board for approval. The TAC agreed
20 unanimously.

21
22 **III. 2010 TAC Proposed Calendar -**

23
24 Mr. Johnson presented a proposed TAC calendar. Being that the TPB meets on the first
25 Wednesday of even numbered months, staff felt that the TAC should meet on odd numbered
26 months before the TPB to review topics needing technical study. This schedule allows TAC
27 members to report to the decision makers on aspects of various issues. After some discussion,
28 the group agreed to the proposed calendar.

29
30 **IV. Possible Fiscal Agent Move -**

31
32 Mr. Wood took the lead on this item. He reminded the TAC members that a few years ago the
33 then MPO Chairman ‘challenged TCOG’ about how much money they would charge the MPO to
34 be housed at the COG. The current chairman asked that this discussion be revived and study
35 options available for the MPO. Mr. Wood surveyed the MPO’s throughout the state to determine
36 what costs are currently being charged and compare to our situation. He explained on how the
37 MPO needs an employer of record as well as that entity having the ability to float at least two
38 months of operating expenses. Part of the research included contacting the two local colleges
39 (Austin and Grayson). Neither was interested in housing us.

40
41 The local paratransit provider Texoma Area Paratransit (TAPS) expressed interest in housing the
42 MPO. Mr. Wood met with officials at TAPS who were able to provide him with some costs to
43 consider. Among the items discussed with them was not only the housing cost but the benefit
44 package for the staff, which has accumulated seniority over the years. For the discussion the
45 agenda packet contained a letter from TCOG which explained their reasoning for their cost
46 structure and a table showing the cost breakdown of the MPOs who responded to the survey.

1 Mr. Wood went into an extensive explanation on the overall indirect costs as well as what
2 savings would be realized should the MPO be housed at TAPS. The cost comparison was
3 \$41,000.00 at TCOG vs. approximately \$20,000.00 at TAPS. He also said that there is a
4 possibility that at a certain point the study area would be expanded and perhaps another staff
5 member would need to be added. This would require additional money not available with the
6 current budget structure. Ms. Foster from TAPS explained the breakdown of what they would
7 offer if they would house the MPO. There was some concern over the loss of seniority. This
8 however would be addressed through some adjustments in benefit packages which could be
9 negotiated with TAPS. After a number of questions from TAC members, Mr. Wood informed
10 the group that later that day he would be traveling to Gainesville to meet with the TAPS board to
11 make a presentation on what he just discussed the TAC members.
12

13 **V. Staff Report -**
14

- 15 a) Category 3 (Urban Mobility) – Mr. Johnson gave the TAC members a quick recap of the
16 Trade Fair which included the projects which had been listed in the draft FY 2011 – 2014
17 TIP presented to the board in February of this year. Mr. Wood explained some of the
18 negotiating process which went on to develop this 2012 – 2020 project letting schedule.
19 One unfortunate aspect of this process is that for every year after the current year, the
20 cost of the projects increases by 4% (inflation factor).
- 21 b) Funding Levels/Revenue Scenarios – Mr. Johnson presented the TAC members with two
22 charts. One on ‘Gas Tax Indexing to Fuel Efficiency’ and the other on ‘Revenue
23 Scenarios’. The purpose of this presentation was to highlight the financial situation that
24 not only the state of Texas faces but the Sherman-Denison study area as well. The
25 background information provided to the committee included a table showing the loss of
26 state revenues as a result of fuel efficiency. The handout included a graph showing
27 various revenue scenarios with status quo, statewide enhanced, statewide enhanced +
28 local option and the actual needs. The graph illustrated the huge gap that currently exists
29 between the needs and resources for the years 2010 through 2035. The timeline for the
30 current long range transportation plan. At some point on a statewide basis and possibly
31 on a local basis, there will be a need to consider potential revenue sources including: an
32 increase in state and federal diesel and gas tax, indexing the motor fuels tax, increasing
33 vehicle registration fees, imposing vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) tax, etc.
34

35 **VI. Announcement of Draft FY 2011 – 2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
36 **meeting -**
37

38 Mr. Johnson announced to the TAC that the MPO would be having a public involvement
39 meeting on Wednesday April 14, 2010 at 5:00 pm at TCOG.
40

41 He also reminded the TAC members that should they want to add an item to the next agenda, to
42 feel free and contact the staff with the request.
43

44 Meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am.