

**Governor's Transportation 2020 Citizen Advisory Commission (CAC)
June 27, 2011 Meeting Minutes**

**Courtyard Des Moines Ankeny – Salon I
Ankeny, IA**

ATTENDANCE:

Members:

X Nancy Richardson, Co-chair	X Jim Kersten
X Allan Thoms, Co-chair	X Lindsey Larson
X Scott Cirksena	X Rose Mitchell
Jeff Corkery	X Ann Trimble Ray
X Catherine Dunn (by phone)	X Dan Wiedemeier
X Geri Huser	X Larry Winum

Ex-Officio:

Rep. David Tjepkes	Sen. Tom Rielly
Rep. Jim Lykam	X Sen. Tim Kapucian

Others:

Jon Ranney, Iowa DOT	Scott Newhard, AGC of Iowa
Craig Markley, Iowa DOT	Tom Rohe, Plymouth County Engineer
Paul Trombino III, Iowa DOT	Danny Waid, Wright/Hamilton County Engineer
Stuart Anderson, Iowa DOT	Steve DeVries, ICEA Service Bureau
Dena Gray-Fisher, Iowa DOT (by phone)	Ellen Partridge, SSTI (by phone)
Roger Schletzbaum, Marion County Eng.	Jeff May, Knoxville Engineer
Lyle Brehm, Tama/Poweshiek County Eng.	Mark Tomb, Iowa League of Cities
Brenda Neville, Iowa Motor Truck Assn.	

1) Welcome (10 am)

Nancy Richardson said as evidenced by others in attendance today, she and Allan Thoms reached out to other entities since this effort impacts more than Iowa DOT road funding.

2) Approval of June 16th Minutes

Minutes were approved as written after a correction in section 6.

3) Review Critical Infrastructure Need

Stuart Anderson presented background information to the CAC on the methods used to determine critical needs. Following is a summary of the presentation along with comments from the Commission:

- Must target new funding to roadways most important to the states' economy.

- Discussed the TIME-21 60/20/20 funding split along with restrictions where funding can be utilized (Iowa DOT – Access Iowa highways, CIN highway and Interstate system; Counties – county road bridges and farm-to-market roads; Cities – entire street system).
- Reviewed a slide on Iowa DOT Primary highway bridge age to illustrate the approaching number of bridges that will need to either be repaired or reconstructed due to outdated design and/or structural issues. Sen. Kapucian asked for a breakdown of all (state, city, county) structurally deficient bridges that could be repaired versus those that required reconstruction – Iowa DOT staff will provide this breakdown in the near future but it will only be for a “snapshot” in time.
- Majority of discussion was on the hierarchy of road needs that was developed to categorize (6) types of improvements in the general priority order of “maintain, preserve, expand and modernize”. The \$215 million (in addition to forecasted TIME-21 revenue) critical need funding shortfall will allow for all of Categories 1 and 2 and part of Category 3 to be accomplished but none of Categories 4, 5 or 6 would be done. Thus, some of the road system will continue to deteriorate.

General discussion:

Geri Huser asked what makes up administration costs in Category 1? Stuart Anderson and Nancy Richardson explained that administration costs include staff to manage city/county/state road construction and maintenance activities and over the last few years there has been a major effort to reduce these costs. Allan Thoms expressed a possible public concern may be the view that any new revenue could be used as a way to backfill current administration funding needs and then use current revenues for other uses. Stuart stated we can emphasize current administration and maintenance activities will continue to be funded by current Road Use Tax Fund. TIME-21 revenue sources and any additional revenue will only go for additional construction and maintenance costs.

Lindsey Larson stated people he has talked to want a focus on “fix-it-first” maintenance (seasonal work like plowing snow and mowing ditches, crack filling, guardrail repair, etc.) and overlay projects before capacity projects that focus on adding new lanes to the highway system.

Roger Schletzbaum said to be careful in not allowing funds to be used on lower volume county roads as they are critical in getting grain to market.

Nancy Richardson asked if there was benefit in eliminating the Farm-to-Market requirement concerning use of funding for only construction purposes. The county engineers in attendance stated they were glad this requirement is in place so that those important construction needs are prioritized.

Geri Huser asked what the \$215 million increase would buy. Stuart Anderson responded that this depends on individual jurisdiction priorities within the category constraints. Allan Thoms said it needs to be made clear to people that improvements contained in categories 4, 5 and 6 won't be accomplished with this additional

funding. Scott Cirksena pointed out that absent of polling all jurisdictions concerning projects and their associated costs we must present this in general terms since it isn't a "cookie cutter" prioritization process and we don't want to be viewed as trying to micro-manage improvements by all jurisdictions. Nancy Richardson and Stuart Anderson said it may be beneficial to work with city and county partners to add "real world" examples to "personalize" what types of improvements would be accomplished rather than generic descriptions (e.g., 50 miles of resurfacing by the Iowa DOT every year or reconstructing 10 structurally deficient bridges every year).

- The rest area privatization slide was reviewed that illustrated privately financed rest areas on the Interstate are prohibited except in extremely rare cases. There is also a state restriction on public-private partnerships for rest area development
- Missouri's design-build bridge project for bridges was reviewed.
- Several different state weight-distance taxes were discussed.
- Sen. Kapucian asked about the percentage of in-state versus out-of-state use of the highway system in relation to revenue – slide #14 from the June 16th presentation addresses this question. Jim Kersten then asked about just I-80 statistics – Iowa DOT staff will try to find data on this.
- Geri Huser asked Iowa DOT staff to provide a listing of highway users that are exempt from paying user taxes or pay reduced fees.
- Rose Mitchell said as soon as possible a way to collect revenue from alternative fueled vehicles needs to be put in place.
- U.S. 20 and three bridge (U.S. 275 in Council Bluffs, I-74 in Davenport and U.S. 20 in Dubuque) tolling studies were discussed with the bottom line being tolls usually don't generate enough revenue to cover administration costs and costs to maintain/improve the associated infrastructure.
- Tables and pie charts illustrating revenues and allocations for Iowa and adjacent states were reviewed. Nancy Richardson and Jim Kersten asked staff to add data concerning each jurisdiction's (state, city, county) percent of the highway system mileage and revenue per capita.
- The funding options from the sixth tab of the CAC binder were briefly reviewed and Nancy Richardson asked if there were any potential options missing or if some should be eliminated as not viable. After discussion it was agreed to present all currently identified options as well as Rose Mitchell's added option of offering premium service for a fee (e.g., allowing heavier loads for a fee).

4) Public Input Process and Schedule

- It was discussed that the first 15-20 minutes of the public input meetings should be utilized for a condensed overview of what has been discussed to date with the CAC and to possibly include city and county staff to provide a complete picture. This overview needs to include a discussion of current system condition, forecasted system condition without additional funding, review efficiency gains by the state/cities/counties and layout funding options.

7/7/11

- Bulk of the remaining time should be dedicated for public input. For example, Geri Huser said we should ask people if any of the funding options we have listed need to be changed or others added.
- Public input sites were discussed with Nancy Richardson and Allan Thoms to make the final determination concerning the number, locations and dates. This information will then be sent out to the CAC members to find out who can attend each of them.
- It was decided that July 7th would be reserved for presentations from cities and counties since they are the other two groups, in addition to the state, that own and maintain Iowa's public roadways. In addition, statewide stakeholder groups will be invited to provide their input on Iowa's roadway system needs. The various highway associations will be asked to attend the regional public input meetings to provide input. The next CAC meeting will be scheduled from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm.
- Iowa DOT staff will take notes at every public input meeting.

5) Messaging

- It will be important to put together a messaging plan to include pamphlets, talking points, etc. for CAC members to use at local meetings.
- Geri Huser said we need a Facebook option to solicit input.
- It was reiterated to illustrate to locals the type of roads and bridges to be impacted in their area with this additional funding. However, must be stressed that there is no commitment of funding for specific projects.
- Must be a news release for every meeting.
- At the request of the Iowa DOT, the State Smart Transportation Initiative will be assisting in the development of a consistent message/campaign for the general public, interest groups/stakeholders, local transportation officials, Iowa Transportation Commission and Iowa Legislature. This message will be focused on stewardship that supports economic development.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm.