

1 TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD
2 SHERMAN-DENISON MPO
3 Grayson County Courthouse - West Courtroom
4 Sherman, TX 75090
5 April 30, 2008 10:00 a.m.
6

7
8 Members Present: Commissioner Gene Short, Tom Speakman, Bobby Littlefield, Danny Offill,
9 Mayor Bill Magers,

10
11 Non-Voting
12 Members Present:

13
14 Members Absent: None

15
16 MPO Staff Present: Robert Wood, Wally Johnson

17
18 TCOG Staff Present: Frances Pelley, Jennifer Cantu, Sue Ann Stephens

19
20 Guests Present: Bill Giordanango (TAPS), Diane Lann (TxDOT), Van Price (Grayson County),
21 Jeff Miller (City of Sherman), Kevin Harris (TxDOT), Kevin Feldt (NTTA),
22 Jerry White
23

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

26
27 Commissioner Gene Short called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.
28

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

31
32 Mr. Short declared a quorum of the TPB present.
33

34
35 **III. Acknowledgment of Guests -**

36
37 Mr. Short recognized guests in the audience.
38

39
40 **IV. Approval of Minutes -**

41
42 Motion was made by Mayor Bill Magers, seconded by Danny Offill to approve the March 5, 2008 TPB
43 minutes. Motion passed unanimously.
44

1 **V. Review and Approval of the FM 691 Corridor Study (Kimley-Horn) -**
2

3 Mr. Wally Johnson reported that with the unabated growth being experienced in the Sherman- Denison
4 Study Area, the Transportation Policy Board, included in its FY 2008-2009 Unified Planning Work
5 Program (UPWP) a Sub-Area Corridor Study. The reasoning was to pro-actively address some key
6 facilities to maintain or enhance their functionality as their capacity continues to be tested.
7

8 Mr. Johnson reminded the Board that on February 20, 2008, the Transportation Policy Board voted
9 unanimously to authorize the Technical Committee to start negotiations with the preferred vendor (Kimley-
10 Horn) for the FM 691 Corridor Study. On March 12, 2008 the Technical Committee met to review the
11 proposed scope and contract. Several recommendations were made by the group which were sent to the
12 consultant. After a second set of comments was sent and changes made to the original draft, the final
13 document evolved.
14

15 The scope/contract will examine the engineering, economic, and public issues regarding the proposed
16 conceptual alternatives:
17

- 18 Task 1 - Develop Project Work Plan
- 19 Task 2- Evaluation of Existing Conditions and Short-Range Needs
- 20 Task 3 - Evaluation of Existing and Projected Environmental and Land Use Conditions
- 21 Task 4 - Analyze Future Travel Demand
- 22 Task 5- Evaluation of Extension to SH 289 and Additional Corridor Enhancements
- 23 Task 6 - Public Involvement Plan
- 24 Task 7 - Develop Corridor Strategy
- 25 Task 8 - Project Management

26
27 The schedule calls for a six month study beginning in May and concluding in October 2008.
28

29 The scope and agreement is divided into:

- 30 • Agreement
- 31 • Services to be Performed by the Client
- 32 • Services to be Provided by the Engineer
- 33 • Work Schedule
- 34 • FM 691 Corridor Study Fee Proposal
- 35 • Lump Sum Incremental Payment Schedule

36
37 Mr. Wood notified the board that on April 25th the MPO received notice from TxDOT that the funds for
38 the study had been approved.
39

40 Chairman Short asked the members of the technical committee (Jeff Miller, Tom Speakman, Jerry White
41 and Kevin Harris) and TxDOT if ‘this (the project) would give us what we need’ to study the plan for that
42 area. ‘Is TxDOT satisfied with it?’ All agreed affirmatively.
43

44 The TPB reviewed the contract. Motion was made by Mayor Magers, seconded by Tom Speakman to
45 approve the contract and give the consultant “notice to proceed” with the 691 Corridor Study. Motion
46 passed unanimously.

1 **VI. Review and Approval for a FY 2008-2011 TIP Amendment (SH 91 @ UPRR Bridge - Denison/**
2 **US 75 Maintenance Projects) -**
3

4 **SH 91 @ UPRR Bridge** - Mr. Johnson told the Board that the SH 91 overpass at UP RR, included in the
5 FY 2006-2008 TIP and scheduled to be let in August 2007 did not let. The project was not included in the
6 FY 2008-2011 TIP. TxDOT has asked the MPO to schedule letting for this project in October of 2009 (FY
7 2010). Mr. Littlefield pointed out that the TIP supporting documentation was showing a September '08
8 letting date. Mr. Johnson stated that the date would be corrected to reflect October 2009/FY 2010 letting
9 date.

10
11 **US 75 Maintenance Projects** - Three maintenance 'Grouped Projects' will be added to the FY 2008-2011
12 TIP. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the project description shows 'Mill and Place Novachip'. The verbiage
13 as revised by TxDOT should read 'Mill and Overlay'.
14

15 These projects, all on US 75, include:

- 16
- 17 • Travis to Dulin (csj 0047-02-128)
- 18 • Dulin to FM 1417 (csj 0047-03-070)
- 19 • FM 1417 to Shepherd Dr. (csj 0047-03-071)
- 20

21 Mr. Littlefield pointed out that the Travis to Dulin/Dulin to FM 1417 would be combined to form one
22 project from Travis to FM 1417. The CSJ would be determined at a later date.
23

24 These additions will require an amendment to the FY 2008-2011 TIP.
25

26 A Public Involvement Meeting was held on March 12, 2008.
27

28 The TPB reviewed the proposed amendments to the FY 2008-2011 TIP. Motion was made by Bobby
29 Littlefield, seconded by Tom Speakman to authorize staff to forward changes to Transportation Planning
30 and Programming in Austin. Motion passed unanimously.
31

32 **VII. Discussion and Appropriate Action on Proposed By-Laws -**
33

34 Mayor. Magers asked to leave the meeting (due to a medical appointment for a family member) before the
35 discussion on this agenda item began. He stated, however that he did have some questions he wanted to
36 discuss before the item was approved.
37

38 Mr. Wood told the Board that at the December 6, 2007 TPB meeting, staff presented a draft 'By-Laws'
39 document for review by the Board. After careful discussion, staff was directed to rework the document so
40 it would address certain areas more directly. He stated that due to the Triennial FTA review he had not had
41 an opportunity to review the draft in detail and perform due diligence to see whether or not we can or
42 cannot do some of these things. He stated he had called the Chairman the Thursday before the meeting to
43 express some concerns/reservations with some proposed suggestions. In addition, Diane Lann with
44 TxDOT, had some questions. Additionally, he had an e-mail from Barbara Maley from FHWA explaining
45 in more detail requirements for seeking outside grants.
46

1 The draft document was reviewed by the policy board members by section. Some observations/ suggestions
2 were as follows:
3

4 **Article I- Organization and Management**

- 5 • Resolution - No suggestions
- 6 • Section 1 - Organizational Structure - No suggestions.
- 7 • Section 2 - MPO Transportation Policy Board Membership - Change “elected official” to “selected
8 official appointment by City Council”. Mr. Offill felt that that was the most appropriate way to
9 include board members. The city council members are ‘elected’ officials and they are appointing
10 their representative. He said that we (TPB) should not take the decision out of city councils’ hands.
11 Mr. Wood interjected that according to SAFETEA-LU the board member should represent their
12 entity. Mr. Speakman stated that that is why he is here (as board member); because the Mayor and
13 city council appointed him to represent their entity. Chairman Short stated that based on the
14 differing opinions, that there are disagreements on this item.
- 15 • Section 3 - Ex-Officio Members - Suggested that the MPO Staff research if different forms of
16 transportation are going to be used in the area (example - DART rail) then there should be a
17 representative from that category as an Ex-Officio Member. Also, the order of appointment of
18 small cities representative will be Pottsboro, Gunter, Van Alstyne and Howe. Also noted is the fact
19 that when the 2010 census is out there might be more cities in this small cities category (1,200 or
20 less definition). Mr. Wood commented that ex-officio members might be listed.
- 21 • Section 4 - Chairman - Danny Offill suggested that it be added that ANY of the members of the
22 Board could hold Chairman position, small cities included. He stated that if continuity was an
23 issue, there is no guarantee that an elected official would be in office long enough for that to
24 happen. Therefore ‘continuity’ is a moot point. There was discussion as to whether to have
25 TxDOT as chairman as part of the rotation. The consensus was that the position should go to
26 members who provide local input and representation. Mr. Littlefield stated that he had no interest
27 in serving as chairman. He also stated that he saw no problem small cities being part of the
28 rotating schedule.
- 29 • Section 5 - Duties of Chairman - No suggestions.
- 30 • Section 6 - Vice Chairman - Suggestion by Mr. Offill that maybe the Vice Chairman position
31 should not be limited to just small cities representative.
- 32 • Section 7 - Cities of the Vice Chairman - No suggestions.
- 33 • Section 8- Presiding Officer - No suggestions.

34 **Article II - Operational Procedures**

- 35 • All Sections - No suggestions.

36 **Article III - MPO Director and MPO Staff**

- 37 • Diane Lann (TxDOT) requested that this item be tabled so it can be reviewed by TxDOT. She
38 stated that they has just received the draft and had not had a chance to review it. Additionally, Mr.
39 Wood informed the Board that Barbara Maley FHWA had some concerns with this item and was
40 unsure why this is in ByLaws - it should be in personnel “administrative” section of the contract.
- 41 • Mr. Offill stated he had a ‘hard time understanding’ why mpo director stuff is in the by-laws. Ms
42 Cantu stated that when she reviewed the initial draft in December this section was part of that first
43 draft. She stated that it was very unusual that the by-laws have this article in it. At that point Mr.
44 Offill asked if ‘we as a board’ can decide whether to keep article 3 in the by-laws or not. Mr Wood
45 responded affirmatively.
- 46 • Chairman Short asked if there was anything that gave them ‘heartburn’. Mr. Wood stated that there

1 were some issues. Specifically section 5 dealing with alternative funding sources for ‘entities’
2 within the study area. Chairman Short explained that this meant looking for other sources which
3 would benefit the MPO. Mr. Wood remarked that would be fine except that this request would
4 need to be included in the UPWP and go through the approval process. Chairman Short stated that
5 the statement would need to be reworded. Mr. Wood stated that personnel issues belong in the
6 contract between MPO and its administrative agent. Other issues included the ‘day-to-day’
7 supervision of the Director, (section 10) complying with the TCOG Policies and Procedure.
8 Chairman Short stated that there are two staff members who ‘nobody here has time to supervise’.
9 He thought the staff members need some kind of supervision. Mr. Offill asked the Chairman if
10 placing this section in the by-laws would mean supervising them more. Chairman Short said that
11 the Community Development Director for TCOG would do the supervising. Then Mr. Offill asked
12 Mr. Wood if the MPO has a contract with TCOG at the time. Mr. Wood stated that the MPO needs
13 to have a contract between the MPO, the state and also a contract between the MPO and its fiscal
14 agent (TCOG). Mr. Littlefield stated that if this is included in the contract it should be generic.
15 Chairman Short remarked that if you don’t make it specific you are diluting it too much. Mr.
16 Speakman commented that if they are not doing their job you find somebody else to do their job.
17 Chairman Short stated ‘somebody needs to be responsible to somebody’. He stated that he did not
18 have time and remarked that perhaps someone else on the board might have time. At this point Mr.
19 Wood commented that that is the reason to have this verbiage in the contract (vs. by-laws). The
20 followup issue to this would be ‘How would you compensate the Community Development
21 Director for this function?’ Currently that is not the way the contract reads. Ms. Cantu at this point
22 commented that the wording was formulated with the idea that it would become effective May 1,
23 2008 (TCOG) fiscal year. Per Ms. Cantu the compensation would work out to be about an hour a
24 week (in pay). She stated that Mr. Culbertson (TCOG - finance officer) looked it up and that it
25 would be eligible through FTA. According to Ms. Cantu, it is not an exorbitant amount. This
26 subject was brought out at a meeting at TCOG in January or February with Commissioner Short,
27 Frances Pelly, Bob Wood, Terrell Culbertson and Ms. Cantu. Commissioner Short asked Ms. Cantu
28 if she was willing to take the supervision. She responded by saying that an hour a week is not a
29 problem. Mr. Littlefield stated that he would defer to TxDOT (Ms. Lann). Mr. Wood stated that
30 he would recommend that the verbiage be as generic as possible. At this point Chairman Short
31 stated that once the next iteration of the by-laws is brought before the next meeting there might need
32 to be some issues the board would need to vote on.
33

34 The Board agreed that the MPO should amend By-Laws as suggested and have them ready for a review at
35 the next meeting.

36
37 There was no action taken on this item.

38
39 **VIII. Public Comment Period-**

40
41 Bill Giordanango (First Transit) expressed his desire to help in any way which would help the board’s
42 constituents.

43
44 **IX. Adjournment -**

45
46 The TPB meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.