



**Policy Board Meeting**  
Centennial Library  
2503 Loop 250 Frontage Rd.  
Midland, TX 79705  
**May 15, 2017**  
**Minutes**

**Policy Board Members Present**

David Turner	Chair, Mayor, City of Odessa
Robin Donnelly	Vice-Chair, County Commissioner, Midland County
John B. Love III	Councilman, City of Midland
Robert Stephens	General Manager, MOUTD
Ron Eckert	County Judge, Ector County
John Speed, P.E.	District Engineer, TxDOT Odessa District
Bryan Cox	County Judge, Martin County

**Policy Board Members Absent:**

None

**Others in Attendance:**

Cameron Walker	Executive Director, Permian Basin MPO
Lorraine Quimiro	Senior Transportation Planner, Permian Basin MPO
Rina Bale	Mobility Manager, Permian Basin MPO
Rosie Spencer	Administrative Planning Assistant, Permian Basin MPO
Gary Law	Director of TP&D, TxDOT Odessa District
Robert Ornelas	Transportation Engineer, TxDOT Odessa District
Thomas Kerr, P.E.	Director of Public Works, City of Odessa
Hal Feldman	Traffic Coordinator, City of Odessa
Jose Ortiz	Engineering Services Director, City of Midland
Matt Carr	City Engineer, City of Midland
David Peck	Project Manager, Ector County
Trevor Hawes	Midland Reporter-Telegram
James Beauchamp	MOTRAN
Brent Hilliard	Midland Development Corp.
Keith Stretcher	Midland Development Corp.
Regan Latham	Midland Development Corp.
K Kasseroler	Citizen

## **AGENDA ITEM**

### **1. Call Meeting to Order**

The meeting of the Permian Basin MPO Policy Board was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Policy Board Chair, David Turner. A quorum was present.

### **2. Introductions and Announcements**

None

### **3. Public Comment Period**

None

### **4. Approve the Policy Board Minutes from April 17, 2017**

A motion was made by John Love and seconded by Robin Donnelly to approve the April 17, 2017 Policy Board meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

### **5. Approve the March 2017 billing statement**

The MPO is halfway through fiscal year 2017, \$53,598.50 was spent in March leaving us at 44% expenditures. The actual balance of funds is at \$453,221.96. March's billing is higher than usual because it includes the \$14,265.91 spent out of Task 5 for the Northeast Midland Feasibility Study. There is a separate recap sheet in the packet showing the SPR Funds of \$25,127.00 that was spent in that study as well. March is also the first month that RCTP is using 5303 funds instead of 5304. John Love asked if the MPO reimbursed the City of Midland for the Feasibility Study, or if it was paid in advance, Rosie answered it was a reimbursement.

A motion was made by John Love and seconded by Bryan Cox to approve the March 2017 billing. The motion passed unanimously.

### **6. Discuss the results of the project score card and *Vision 2040* MTP Amendment No. 4**

For several months, staff along with the TAC have been working to refine and present a draft score card. It was stated in the packet that the scoring sheet is incomplete until it is determined where the points can be allocated for Alternative Funding. The TAC spent one Special Meeting and one Regular Meeting going through the project list and scoring based on the twenty different criteria that are shown in the sheet with the multiple colors across the top. Those are the twenty different categories that were considered as part of the scoring sheet. Until the Board can determine where the alternative funding will be applied, staff is not able to apply any of the scoring points in that category. As the TAC was working through the score card, they saw it would be impossible to determine whether the safety improvement index was over 1 or under 1 for all 74 of the projects listed. Since there is a time constraint and the MPO must have an amended

MTP to TxDOT Austin by August, the question was rewritten to say, “Does this project address a safety need?” Those points were then distributed where applicable. Question 19, the alternative funding question, was also rewritten to state “Does this project include non-traditional funding?” This would include the counties, cities, an economic development corporation, or a developer. If yes, the project would get 2 points for every percentage of the project cost, up to a maximum of 30 points. Staff is not able to present a complete score card because that major element cannot yet be addressed at this point. It was agreed that the TAC members would approach the appropriate persons or bodies regarding funding. Cameron then brought up the *Vision 2040* MTP Amendment, which the project list is a critical component of. The Board needs to approve the amendment in August at the latest to make it into the TxDOT UTP revision by September. John Love asked when is the latest date the TAC needed to vote on the list, John Speed answered that he believes the TAC does not need to vote on anything anymore. Their part in this process may be complete and the Policy Board can finish adding the scores that are missing since they are probably a little more aware of things like how long funding may be available out of certain budgets. John Love agreed and Robin Donnelly added that he is pleased with what the TAC has done. David Turner brought up that the questions regarding safety and security are more subjective than objective and Cameron answered that staff does not have the data needed for safety. Rina obtained some information for security which included a meeting with Barney Welch, the Director of Homeland Security in this area. The main question they ask is “are we keeping traffic flowing?” or “improving the flow of traffic?”. System preservation was also brought up, Cameron mentioned that the TAC had a description of that provided to them during scoring, but used the example that if you can show that improvements to Yukon will take traffic off 42<sup>nd</sup> St., then that would qualify for system preservation. John Speed wanted to clarify that because a lot of the criteria is trying to make objective determinations with information that will be in the Travel Demand Model (TDM), staff will be able to use it and amend the process in a way to allow more objectivity when it is available. David Turner stated much of this is “finger in the air”, to which Cameron answered everyone is working with the best we’ve got, and the TDM will help answer the majority of the questions and can be used when work begins on the next 25-year plan, which will begin in May or June of 2018. Robin Donnelly asked if the MPO will be getting the TDM at the end of July, Cameron mentioned staff will be training later this month and he believes the consultants will be delivering it at that time. John Speed brought up that a lot of the data regarding safety will be more objective when the TDM is applied, but he believes the list is close to what is needed in the region. Ron Eckert asked why the Yukon Corridor project is on the second page when it has been stated by his stakeholders that the expansion of Yukon to a four-lane road is their highest priority. John Speed added that a weakness in the scoring system right now is it doesn’t show future travel demands to which Ron added was one of the issues he discussed before starting the project, he is trying to build something special that will connect Midland and Odessa. John Speed pointed out that the projects will still be categorized separately, so Yukon may still come out at the top. He does believe that the projects are prioritized with the

community's interests and brought up the funding allocations that have been set up by the TAC and Board. John Love asked Judge Eckert to point out which line item he was referring to on page 2 because there is a Yukon Rd. project on the first page. Ron answered that one is just the interchange, he is specifically talking about the corridor expansion. John Love added this process is looking at various projects, various needs, and various stakeholders that have various interests. He understands that the Yukon expansion may be Odessa's priority, but this is why scoring is important. It is an objective way of prioritizing as opposed to "this is what Odessa wants." Tom Kerr stated he knows there is no perfect scoring system and a lot was done to get a good one in place, but there are a lot of issues. For example, a project automatically gets 20 points for being on the freight corridor which would make some projects higher than he would like them to be. He also believes the weighting of the numbers is difficult, environmental clearance gets 30 points but a lot of projects aren't considered for environmental clearance until they are highly considered for funding. 20 and 30 are a substantial amount of points. Looking at how the top 20 come out, Odessa and Ector County are well below a significant percentage of the projects. Tom ended by stating that if he was a voting member on the TAC, he would not vote for approval of the list. John Love mentioned the system was created by the TAC and Policy Board as an objective way to score projects amongst all stakeholders. He is perplexed that they created the scoring, but then complain when they do not like how the scoring turns out or do not believe a project ranked high enough. David Turner mentioned there are some things that can use data to answer, but for the questions regarding safety, security, or economic development it is a "stick your finger in the air" situation. He wants it to be a black or white issue and he agrees there are problems with this tool. John Speed also agreed but added it is the best we have and pointed out that a lot of projects are tied for first or second place in each category. An example in the Regionally Significant On-System category, the first one is CR 60 in Midland and the second is a tie between three projects, two of which go hand in hand and are in Ector County. He stated that the allocation percentages may still change and there could be some taken off I-20 and put into significant corridors. Ron mentioned his appreciation to that consideration because Ector County stakeholders have spent significant time amongst themselves, city planning, and chamber planning to generate the priorities of Ector County which should be realized by the MPO, but it goes through a filter which is the "report card" (referring to scoring criteria) and it gets lost. The people involved in the vision of Ector County are not involved in the scoring process which represents someone else's vision, usually TxDOT. John Love asked how many TxDOT members are on the TAC committee and Cameron answered 2 out of 14 members are from TxDOT. John Love then stated that with only 2 members being from TxDOT, he can hardly say it is a TxDOT document. Tom added it is structured by TxDOT rules but John Love answered that this is the MPO, it must follow TxDOT rules. Ron then stated that the problem is TxDOT is giving misleading signals because they encouraged everyone to put together priorities with stakeholders and create a vision, but the clear vision has gone through a filter of mud, so when it comes out the other end it is a "scrambled mess of gobbled-goo" that has been scored by many people who he

guesses do not even reside in Ector County. He believes they need to hold TxDOT accountable to its own language, which is to make sure its vision plan reflects the stakeholder's priorities and visions. Otherwise he is no longer going back to them because this is a farce in what really is happening to their priority list and the money will go to wherever TxDOT wants. He would be satisfied with that too if he received 75% - 80% of the funding every time the "goo" is spit out. John Speed stated TxDOT is truly open to the vision and it is a Policy Board issue right now because there are clearly some problems with the language of the scoring in the objective portion. He wants to address the issue of the allocations, this may be a great argument to lower the allocation percentage to 1-20. Robin Donnelly let Ron know that the Board will back him and his stakeholders on that project, but he doesn't believe this discussion is about that. The discussion is to provide a background to start with, beyond that, it is up to the Policy Board to come up with a conclusion of what projects they want to push and he thinks Ron will find they (Midland) are more reasonable than he believes them to be. David Turner moved the attention to alternative funding, Robin agreed that leaving it out is the best option until they get to a point where they can better timeline the projects. John Love commented that according to the packet, alternative funding was not left out because of missing information and asked if it can be scored based on the information that is available and mentioned he is curious as to what is missing. Cameron stated he was provided copies of letters to John Speed, one signed by David Turner, another by Keith Stretcher, and another by Brent Hilliard indicating that they are willing to help fund some of the projects. The two letters received from Midland were project specific and the MPO needs to know ideally where Odessa and its partners want to spend their \$15 million so the 30 points can be applied. Cameron added that he agrees with John Speed that it is no longer up to the TAC, they can apply the 30 points but ultimately the Board is going to pick the projects. John Love pointed out that if the money is applied to the projects they want, those projects will go up in the list because they will have that score attributed to them. Tom added the calculation method was also a little flawed because it indicated a percentage over the required match and for one, it was not known what the required matches were before the TAC meeting and Gary indicated on-system had a 0% required match so the methodology wasn't usable. Cameron wanted to make it clear that the MPO asked for project lists from the TAC members at the same time they were asked to go through a draft of scoring criteria. One version was presented to the Board for opinions and it got general concurrence to proceed, since then it has been tweaked to better move the process along. Odessa and Ector County submitted a combined list as well as Midland and Midland County, TxDOT did not submit a list. The results of the projects are not because the MPO or TxDOT wanted to give those scores, all 74 projects were discussed in detail and when there was some doubt regarding safety, it was consulted with fourteen people present if those points should be applied. Ron reiterated that he does not believe the list is a correct representation of what Ector County wants, Robin stated that this is the first step and David added that they will get there. Cameron brought up the MTP timeline saying that he would like the Board to approve it in August meaning they would need to give the green light to send it out

for a 10-day public comment period at the July meeting and the list should be finalized by then. Cameron reminded everyone that a similar exercise was done in February where the Board was asked to approve a list to be sent to the commission for a March UTP amendment and was successful in receiving additional funds which he will talk about in more detail in the next agenda item. The main UTP will be adopted in August and that is when they will allocate more of the money than in March. The MPO would like to leverage some of the funding efforts through the MTP amendment to attract some of the funding to fill in the gaps. David mentioned he believed they agreed to lower the I-20 allocation to 25% but John Love pointed out that they had decided to leave it the way it is because they did not have enough information to make a definitive choice. Jose Ortiz wanted to make a comment that would maybe help clarify some questions on the scores, but when it came to system management, the projects that were further along and ready to go received the higher scores. Yukon is important to everyone, but it just doesn't score as well because of those numbers. John Speed added that before they make a decision on project list, they have two very large issues facing them. One is some of the projects are tied and the other is the distribution of spending in each category. His concern is they do not have a good handle on how Category 2 funds are being distributed. They need to add more money to each of the priority projects, the best way he thinks to do that is to have staff go through and determine what kinds of distribution of funds would get us going in the right direction. His staff can find other TxDOT funding mechanisms that might help on some of these projects, staff needs to be able to say they have some money available to help fund moving utilities or acquiring Right-of-Way. It is known that there is a commitment from the MDC on three projects, if scores are going to be lowered the Policy Board needs to make sure that their interests are not ignored. Bryan Cox added that since the data is not current, they are just going in circles because the scoring comes out the same. There is no data on Yukon except that they know it is happening, so unless there is new data the answers will not change. John Love pointed out that the area in yellow (system management) is a mechanism the communities can use to move their projects up by putting money towards it, getting schematics ready, or by procuring Right-of-Way. The problem is that it is just not happening. David asked why would they want to spend money if they do not know there will be funds like in the past? John Love invited Brent Hilliard to answer that question since MDC is present. Brent stated that because they know the money is there, they are going to have to make some bets and not every bet is going to be a winner. If Yukon Rd. is important, according to the list there is no environmental clearance, no schematics, and no Right-of-Way. He recommended the Judge tell stakeholders to put money towards it, because it shows how important it is to them. Ron mentioned that historically the money goes to Midland County and in response to the money issue, Ector County does not have money and it would have to come from other entities and he believes the Mayor is doing a good job with the ODC in doing what he is suggesting. Brent added that the cities and counties need to work together because they all connect to somewhere and repeated that they should help fund the projects they would like to see at the top to fast track them. Cameron stated the reason there are twenty scoring criteria

on the sheet is so the MPO could address everything under the FAST Act and the state House Bill 20. He would argue there are very few of them that could be completed objectively because the categories themselves are not measurable. Even if they had the data the Board still has the ability to adjust the projects. They will then be put into the three categories of allocation. Robin wanted to address the allocations stating he was concerned with all the money that is going to I-20. Cameron mentioned they have been applying \$3 million of Category 2 money to multiple I-20 projects with the idea that it is a priority corridor. The MPO is intending to spend \$36 million on twelve different projects at \$3 million each in the MTP amendment. If the project costs \$22 million, but we are applying only \$3 million, we are hoping to find other funding sources to make up the difference. If that is not possible, the work done on I-20 will be limited because \$66 million is only going to get a few projects completed. Robin agreed adding that this is a great interstate, he does not believe it needs to be changed and that the stakeholders in Odessa have already said they do not want one-way frontage roads. John Speed corrected him and mentioned that support for one-way frontage roads was overwhelming for both Midland and Odessa in the survey for the I-20 Corridor Study and of course it would all be done in stages. He used Midkiff as an example, he was able to get money from one funding source to jump start it, then MDC stepped up and are contributing funds because of the economic development factors associated with it. Now the project is going to be funded and it started out with just Category 2 money. He then suggested taking the 40% allocation to I-20 down. Robin added he was concerned that when the Board tries to prioritize local projects, they will be in a bind because some will not see eye to eye on what is important. The discussion went back to the allocations and David asked if it could be put on as an action item, but Cameron stated he would prefer to put it all together with the MTP Amendment. John Speed then requested staff put together that would show the projects separated by the three categories and their allocations.

#### **7. Discuss an amendment to the FY 2017-2020 TIP**

TxDOT presented a list of projects to the Commission at the March amendment to the UTP and were successful in getting four additional projects programmed. Those projects are US 385 overpass in north Odessa at 338, Loop 338 overpass at Yukon, interchange at CR 1250 & I-20 near the Schlumberger building, and Loop 250 & Elkins Rd. overpass. Staff will be back in July to ask the Board to approve the TIP amendment because there are only two projects in the current one. Because some of the money is Category 2, it comes off the top of the original \$167 million the MPO had to spend. Cameron then made reference to a document that came from TxDOT showing money for a 10-year time frame.

#### **8. MPO Staff Reports:**

No questions were brought up to staff regarding this item.

## **9. Agency Project Reports**

**TxDOT-Odessa District – Gary:** Pointed out a correction on the project status report that was sent out with the packet last week. Fairgrounds Rd. overpass at Loop 250 was let two weeks ago, there were eight bidders. Winning bid came in 27% less than estimated, just under \$13 million. Next month will begin resurfacing SH 158, four miles south of I-20 out to the Glasscock County line. Mayor Turner asked if they were going to do anything on Business 20 and Gary answered that John Speed has him and the Director of Operations on it.

**City of Midland – Matt:** Had a ribbon cutting last Tuesday for Briarwood. Many surface treatment projects across town in progress but the one on Illinois, they will resurface then re-stripe and reduce down the number of through lanes, add a left-turn lane and find some parking on both sides.

**Midland County – Robin:** Laid asphalt on CR 1230 from the city limits to CR 140.

**City of Odessa – Hal:** Installing curb and gutter on the south side of 3<sup>rd</sup> St., contractor has started putting up asphalt on 31<sup>st</sup> St. which is being done in three phases. Pavement Rejuvenation program should start next week.

**Ector County – David:** Danny's Paving will start their CETRZ project number ten, Dixie, Golder, and Yukon sealcoating next Monday. Hopes to have the final CETRZ project approved through the court next Monday as well, which is buying some LED stop signs.

**Martin County – Bryan:** Plans for the new jail have been approved just need to get a contract manager.

**MOULD – Rob:** Huitt-Zollars is the contractor they are working with for the maintenance facility expansion and they should have construction beginning in 3-6 months. Excited about combining Greyhound services, for years they have been talking about a multi-modal concept.

## **10. Future Meetings**

Policy Board Meeting – June 19, 2017 at 5:00 pm

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting – Thursday, June 1, 2017 at 8:00 am

RCTP Meeting – Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 11:30 am

LEAP Rural Rail District Meeting – Tuesday, May 23, 2017 at 8:15 am

**11. Conduct Executive Session concerning any and all subjects and for any and all purposes permitted by Chapter 551 of the Texas Government code, including, but not limited to:**

Texas Government Code Section 551.071 for the purposes of consulting with the Board's attorney; Texas Government Code Section 551.072 to deliberate the purchase, lease or value of real property; Texas Government Code Section 551.074 to discuss personnel matters.

**12. Take Action Concerning Executive Session Matters**

None

**13. Adjourn**

A motion was made by John Love and seconded by Robin Donnelly to adjourn the meeting at 4:15 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.