

---

MEETING MINUTES: RPA 1 Transportation Policy Board  
Tuesday, October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013, 10:00 a.m. - Upper Explorerland RPC, Decorah

Board members in attendance: Jan McGovern, Howard County; Don Arendt, City of Decorah; Larry Schellhammer, Allamakee County; Dennis Karlsbrotten, Winneshiek County; and Vicki Rowland, Fayette County; Larry Murphy, City of Oelwein, Larry Gibbs, Clayton County

Others in attendance: Peggy Sherrets, City of Oelwein; Nick Rissman, Howard County; Brian Ridenour, Allamakee County; Lee Bjerke, Winneshiek County; Rafe Koopman, Clayton County; Karla Organist, UERPC

1. Meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.
2. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Karlsbrotten, seconded by Gibbs, approved unanimously
3. A motion to approve the 7-12-13 minutes was made by Arendt, seconded by Rowland, approved unanimously.
4. An update on TIP administrative modifications was provided by Organist: the review committee approved administrative modifications to move two trail projects from the FY2013 TIP into the FY2014 TIP. The projects are both part of the Dry Run Trail in Winneshiek County, TPMS numbers 22088 and 24780.
5. Motion to open the Public Hearing to review and receive comment on two additions to the 2014 TIP was made by Murphy and seconded by Schellhammer at 10:10 a.m. Motion approved unanimously
6. Public hearing was held to discuss the following changes to the 2014 TIP:
  - TPMS #26652 sponsored by the Iowa DOT: Add project on IA 9 from the eastern city limits of Cresco to 2 miles east of Ridgeway. NHSX-9-7(34)—3H-45
  - TPMS #21079 sponsored by Winneshiek County: Add TIGER IV Grant - HMA pavement rehab, pedestrian/bike grade and pave project on A6W from Decorah Corporate Limits to FHWA Bridge #347271. HDP-C096(124)-6B-96

Hearing no public comment, and having received no written or electronic public comments, a motion to close the public hearing was made by Gibbs, seconded by Rowland, and was approved unanimously. Public hearing was closed at 10:15 a.m.

7. A motion to approve the TIP amendments as presented was made by Schellhammer, seconded by Arendt, all unanimously approved
8. Long Range Transportation Plan
  - The board was given an update of the progress made at the tech committee meeting and invited to the follow up meeting on November 20<sup>th</sup>.
  - Additional comments from board members included adding the cooperation among engineers as a strength; perhaps incorporating data and/or narrative about how in some counties the amount of federally-owned property impacts the ability to generate property tax revenue; and how the distribution of safety funds might have more of an impact if done by crash data (currently, only 8% of HSIP goes to county roads, but 52% of the crashes occur there)

- 
9. Discussion regarding the DOT planning review recommendations:
- Small City Representation: This was determined not necessary for the following reasons:
    - There are 50 small cities – how would participation be determined
    - Small city representatives may not be able to adequately “represent” all small cities – whereas county supervisors have the time (many small city stakeholders are unpaid and work elsewhere) and are better able to represent all cities.
    - Worry that small city representatives wouldn’t have enough information for a broader perspective – only knowing/understanding their own city’s issues
    - Cities can’t apply for STP funds without county approval anyway
    - The Policy Board and Tech Committee have done a good job of funding city projects over time
    - Cities are invited to any Policy Board or committee meetings already. UERPC will begin sending the agenda to city clerks and administrators as additional outreach
  - Project Selection: The Board argues that the region’s selection process is not just “sub-allocation” and has determined that the process will remain the same for the following reasons:
    - The process used can easily be interpreted as a discussion and consensus approach
    - Maintaining a record of distribution among the counties is a matter of ensuring that in the long run, everyone benefits
    - If a scoring or point system were adopted, some important projects would never be competitive and scoring could be skewed by things other than the actual condition of the roadway.
    - Our region has so many important projects that need to be addressed that any project selected will have a regional impact – there are not enough funds available to do anything but the most important projects
10. DOT updates submitted via email from Krista:
- Hwy 3 reopened
  - DOT proposed funding concepts
  - Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan facilitators are scheduling public meetings across the state
11. Other Items:
- Jan had received an email from Bill Heckroth to all ISAC members regarding meetings around the state with Paul Trombino, possibly about the funding concepts. Board members noted that he would be in Decorah on the day of the ISAC meeting, so supervisors (and engineers) would be gone. Karla was asked to find out more and let the DOT know about the conflict. (*Updates were sent to the Policy Board via email*)
12. After scheduling the next meeting for Tuesday, January 14<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m. in the Postville office, the meeting was adjourned at 10:55 a.m.