

# Regional Transportation Coordinating Council Planning Project Management Team

## MINUTES

Meeting 3 of 5

Wednesday, February 22, 2018

1:00 pm to 3:00 pm

Great River Regional Library

### 1. Call to Order & Introductions

Brian Gibson welcomed everyone to the meeting. The group introduced themselves. The meeting was facilitated by Phil Barnes. Tom Cruikshank provided technical support for the memos.

### 2. Hear Public Comments – Any members of the public who wish to be heard

There were no public comments.

### 3. Review Draft Technical Memos #4 and #6

To begin the discussion, Brian provided a brief update since the last PMT meeting. Brian reminded the group that the RTCC not only needs to provide staffing, but also needs to have at least four counties agree to participate in the RTCC. Currently, the APO is in the process of approaching the counties to discuss county participation. Brian further stated that the RTCC host organization also needs to be confirmed. The St. Cloud APO Board will be meeting to decide if the APO is willing to serve as the host organization for the RTCC. In order for the APO to host the RTCC, the St. Cloud APO Board needs to approve that decision at one of their monthly meetings.

#### a. Review staffing needs

Tom began an overview of the staffing needs. The staffing memo includes standards of operation. The memo stated there will be one salaried staff member.

Following some discussion, the PMT agreed that additional staff is needed. The PMT agreed that the Operational Implementation Plan (OIP) should include additional staffing. Since the OIP focuses on the first two years of operation, the PMT agreed that additional staffing can be staggered. OIP budget ranges should be included to address additional staff. This will make the RTCC budget transparent for PMT members.

During discussion risks were identified by the PMT:

1. APO alienates non-APO member counties (Morrison, Mille Lacs, Wright)
2. APO member county says no to staffing plan
3. Counties don't understand 20% local match
4. Growing organization

#### b. Discuss possible hosting arrangements

Members of the PMT have expressed a desire for the St. Cloud APO to be the host organization for the RTCC. However, the St. Cloud APO Board has not approved being the hosting

organization. Currently no other organization has expressed interest in becoming the host organization.

The PMT had a discussion regarding how the host organization and RTCC would relate to one another. The PMT preferred that RTCC staff reported to an independent board rather than the APO Board. The group discussed the importance of the RTCC filling gaps in the transportation network. The group further discussed the importance of an RTCC as a cost-effective transportation option.

c. Discuss budgetary needs and possible funding sources

Tom provided an overview of the budget and current scenarios. Currently, the technical memo provides options for funding scenarios for the RTCC. MnDOT is expected to provide 80 percent of funding with a 20 percent local match.

Based on the group conversation, the PMT agreed to utilize a funding scenario that combines all the funding scenarios.

The PMT agreed to have the APO ask the Counties for seed money to start the RTCC for the first two years. During the first two years, the Mobility Manager should actively seek funds for future, long-term funding opportunities.

In the event that the Mobility Manager cannot accrue enough funding to meet budget needs, the Counties should be approached LAST to provide a safety net to meet the unmet funds.

During discussion a funding scenario with the following priority order was created:

1. Seed funding requested from the counties (to cover the 20% local match for the first two years grant from MnDOT) – pass resolution of support
2. Membership (private sector and providers)
3. Feds – SmartLink
4. Independent sources (grants from schools, foundations i.e. McKnight)
5. Counties as a “safety net” should all other sources not be able to sustain RTCC once value is proven – determined by population of each county – up to \$X amount

4. Review Draft Brand Materials

The PMT then reviewed the RTCC logo and branding materials. After some discussion, the group agreed to use the “Central Minnesota Transportation Council” logo and color palette.

5. Next Steps

The PMT meeting adjourned. Below is important upcoming dates:

- a. Complete Draft OIP by February 28, 2019
- b. Present Draft OIP for Public Review and Comment
- c. Incorporate Public Comments and Finalize OIP
- d. Final OIP is Due to MnDOT by June 30, 2019

Below are white board notes recorded at the meeting.

# ★ FUNDING SCENARIO

- #1 VALUE PROVEN SAFETY NET  
POPULATION COUNTY

- Up to X amount

- #2 INDEPENDANT SOURCES  
- Schools, GRANTS, FOUNDATIONS  
Meknight  
Chicken OR EGGS.

- PASS Resolution of Support

→ #1 - SEED FUNDING FOR SUSTAIN POSITION

#2 MEMBERSHIP (PRIVATE SECTOR)  
- PROVIDERS

#3 FOPS - SMART LINK

## FUNDING SCENARIO

- SHOW THE POTENTIAL OF STAFF
- WHAT DOES IT TAKE TO RETIRE OF?
- 2-YEAR PLAN
- SHORT VS. LONG TERM

1, 2, 5 yr Scenarios  
- Possibility for Consulting/Partners

① MTM GAPS = Short-term

- RTOO COST EFFECTIVE RATE
- GAPS ACROSS THE BOARD
- POINT OUT GAPS.
- HIGH-LEVEL RTOO.

# STAFFING Scenario

- ONE-PERSON (to grow)
  - Ambitious
  - APO Housed Employer
    - RENT PER MONTH
  - FISCAL AGENT
  - MAX AMOUNT / TRANSPARENT

## - RISKS

- APO Aliquates Non-APO
- APO COUNTY STAYS No.
- Counties don't understand 20%
- GROWING ORG.