

RPA18

Regional Planning Affiliation - Region 18 Policy Board and Technical Committee Meeting

Jul 9, 2025 11:00 AM Training Room ▾ 17501 Eastern Hills Dr, Council Bluffs, IA 51503 ▾

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82747825477>

MINUTES

In attendance:

Policy Board Voting Members

- **Charlie Parkhurst** - Shelby County, Policy Board Chair
- **Susan Miller** - Pottawattamie County, Policy Board Vice Chair
- **Brian Rife** - Harrison County
- **Richard Crouch** - Mills County
- **Angie Winquist** - City of Glenwood*

Technical Committee Voting Members

- **Chris Fredericksen** - Shelby County
- **Dave Sims** - Harrison County
- **Clark Jamey** - City of Glenwood
- **Jacob Ferro** - Mills County, Technical Committee Chair
- **Brandon Burmeister** - Pottawattamie County

Non-Voting/MAPA Staff

- **Lindsey Button** - MAPA
- **Rachel Goettsch** - MAPA
- **Latifa Moro** - MAPA
- **Carlos Morales** - MAPA
- **Travis Halm** - Iowa DOT*

*Virtual attendance**

Charlie Parkhurst called the meeting to order at 11:01 am.

The slides noted the meeting was held in accordance with Chapters 21 and 22 of the Iowa Code and was live-streamed on MAPA's YouTube page.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Approval of the Agenda (Policy)

Charlie Parkhurst called for a motion to approve the agenda. No changes were made to the agenda.

Policy Board: Richard Crouch motioned to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded by Susan Miller. Motion passed unanimously.



B. Approval of the Minutes: July 09, 2025 Meeting (Policy)

Charlie Parkhurst called for a motion to approve the minutes. No changes were made to the minutes.

Policy Board: Susan Miller motioned to approve the minutes. Motion was seconded by Richard Crouch. Motion passed unanimously.

C. FY2025 Transportation Planning Work Program (TPWP) Amendment 1

Carlos Morales presented the TPWP and explained that it is done every year, and MAPA usually puts out a yearly budget outlining what we are going to work on. He stated that towards the end of the year, we usually make an adjustment between what was budgeted and what was actually spent.

This year, the budget experienced higher spending in several categories, primarily due to committee activity and staff training. This was attributed to staff turnover throughout the year, which required additional time and resources to educate and train new team members to perform certain tasks.

To illustrate the budget changes, Carlos presented the original budget, the amended figures, and the remaining balances to the committee. He also provided an overview of key work activities covered in the TPWP, including the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) administration, public and community engagement, and long-range transportation planning, among others, to the committee.

Technical Committee: Jacob Ferro motioned to

- Recommend approval of the FY2025 Transportation Planning Work Program (TPWP) Amendment 1.

Motion was seconded by Clark Jamey. Motion passed unanimously.

Policy Board: Susan Miller motioned to

- Approve the Technical Committee recommendation.

Motion was seconded by Charlie Parkhurst. Motion passed unanimously.

D. FY2026 Final Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Rachel Goettsch presented the FY2026 Final Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), noting that once the committee resolution is signed, and once approved, the TIP will be submitted to Iowa DOT by the July 15 deadline.

All RPAs and MPOs are required to prepare a TIP annually, with MAPA administering this requirement for the region. The TIP is a list of capital and non-capital projects within the region that are proposed for regional funding. The TIP covers a four-year period from FY2026 through FY2029 and includes various funding sources such as Surface



Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TASA/TAP), and other state-managed funding programs.

Projects are selected based on established regional priorities that align with the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), which is currently undergoing an update. The LRTP, MAPA's long-range planning document, is updated every five years and will be discussed further at the August meeting.

TASA was the only program with an opened call-for-projects in the last funding cycle. However, no TASA applications were received, so no new projects were included in the final TIP. Some projects updated in the plan since the draft TIP presentation were also reviewed. The public comment period for the TIP draft received no comments.

She further informed the committee about a new opportunity from the Iowa DOT to participate in a pavement condition data collection program. This effort would cost approximately \$120,000 in STBG funds. However, due to the return of about \$80,000 in unused STBG funding, most of this cost would be covered without significantly affecting the region's STBG balance.

Carlos clarified the purpose of the pavement condition program, noting that Iowa DOT conducts pavement assessments on a rotating basis across quadrants of the state. In 2026, the RPA region is scheduled for assessment. Local jurisdictions have the option to apply individually for additional data collection, but MAPA found that it would be more cost-efficient to program this effort through the RPA TIP, and doing so would also expand data collection across local roads without requiring a local match. This data would benefit all jurisdictions by providing updated information for future LRTP updates and project prioritization.

Jacob Ferro asked whether the program would provide additional data or simply more frequent assessments. Carlos responded that Iowa DOT currently collects statewide data every four years, but does not include localized road conditions. This program would provide more granular data in 2026, rather than waiting until 2028 or 2029, and would cover all paved roads within cities.

Dave commented that it sounded similar to AADT data, but Carlos clarified that it specifically pertains to pavement condition and offered a link for further explanation.

Brandon Burmeister stated that most county engineers already have a solid understanding of their road conditions and rarely rely on Iowa DOT pavement data to determine maintenance priorities. He questioned the need for spending \$120,000 on something that counties already do every four years.

Jacob asked if the \$120,000 cost would be recurring, and Susan noted that the data would likely be more beneficial to cities than counties. Brandon also remarked that there



was no city representation present to comment on whether cities would find the program useful. Carlos responded that over time it is important to track how pavement conditions are changing, and that this would be a cyclically recurring charge. The Iowa DOT's Pavement Condition Index (PCI) contains valuable data for budgeting and prioritizing road improvements, and MAPA uses this type of information as part of the project selection and prioritization process. The additional data would allow MAPA to better classify and compare the condition of different roadways when evaluating STBG project applications.

Technical Committee: Jacob Ferro motioned to

- Recommend approval of the final FY2026 TIP with the removal of the pavement condition data purchase.

Motion was seconded by Dave Sims. Motion passed unanimously.

Policy Board: Charlie Parkhurst motioned to

- Approve the Technical Committee recommendation.

Motion was seconded by Richard Crouch. Motion passed unanimously.

E. Bylaws Update

Rachel presented the RPA-18 Bylaws Update and noted that significant revisions had been made to the bylaws language. These updates included general improvements to make the document more concise, removal of duplicated terminology, and updates to reflect current terms and structure within RPA-18. The revised bylaws incorporated changes that were previously voted on during the May meeting, such as adjustments to the small community representation structure and reducing the 2,500 population threshold to ensure continued inclusion of communities like Harlan and Missouri Valley.

References to officer roles such as Secretary and Treasurer were removed, as MAPA staff are responsible for administrative and financial duties. The election cycle language was also updated to reflect the recent decision to adopt a two-year term structure (even years), following the re-election of existing officers during the last cycle. Additionally, the formal inclusion of the Technical Committee in the bylaws is now detailed under a new Article V. With Jacob serving as Chair, the need to elect a Vice Chair moving forward to ensure meeting responsibilities are met in his absence was noted.

Brian raised a question regarding board chair appointments and noted that Tony had been designated as their board chair representative. Rachel acknowledged that many board positions had experienced turnover starting in December due to election cycles, and MAPA had to clarify many of those changes over the past month. As a result, she stated that members would soon receive an email requesting confirmation or redesignation of their official representatives.



Brian asked whether their county needed to submit a new designation if they preferred someone different. Rachel replied that it wasn't strictly necessary unless they wished to change their current representative. Brian stated he preferred Dave to serve as their representative. Rachel clarified that Dave is currently a Technical Committee member, and, under the new bylaws, individuals cannot serve on both the Technical and Policy Committees simultaneously. This change was made to simplify representation and avoid confusion about voting rights and committee alignment. Members can change roles if needed, but a person may serve on only one committee at a time.

Lindsey Button added that designations can be made simply by sending an email to MAPA identifying the chosen representative. Rachel confirmed this and said she would follow up after the meeting with a request for renewal of designations or confirmation that the current appointments should remain. She noted that Policy Board members would now be technically responsible for appointing their Technical Committee representatives. Previously, MAPA defaulted to engineers, but the updated approach allows for more flexibility; representatives can now be from fields such as planning, engineering, land use, or public health, emphasizing the importance of ensuring balanced representation across communities.

Rachel also told the committee that if anyone felt uncomfortable moving forward with the bylaw adoption, the vote could be postponed until the August meeting. Susan Miller expressed agreement with Brian regarding board chair representation. She shared that she had spent a long time learning how the committee functions, and changing chairs too frequently, especially every year or two, creates setbacks. She stated that instead of limiting representation to the county board chair, each county should be allowed to choose its representative. Charlie agreed with Susan.

Rachel responded that the bylaws require an official starting point to identify representatives, and the chair has historically been that point of contact. Without a designated person, the process becomes unclear. Carlos added that individuals can be named alternates and continue serving longer terms, but MAPA requires acknowledgment from the county board chair for transparency. He emphasized that the Policy Board influences funding decisions and infrastructure spending, so each county should have clear and formal representation to ensure informed decision-making.

Dave asked whether the funding discussed is used exclusively for roads. Carlos responded that while STBG funds are typically used for construction projects, they can also support trails, Safe Routes to School (SRTS), and preliminary engineering studies. He mentioned that communities like Logan would be using federal funding to help cover early-stage planning tasks such as right-of-way studies and cost estimation of the preliminary engineering. He noted that transferring some STBG funds to the RPA level could allow for more planning studies in local communities, ultimately streamlining future project implementation by improving cost accuracy and reducing delays.



Susan asked if she and Charlie, who were voted in as Chair and Vice Chair, now needed approval from their county board. Rachel clarified that reapproval from county boards are not required, but documentation of alternate representative designations are. It was also noted that this was not a change as a result of the updated bylaws, but was actually the implementation of the process outlined in the original bylaws, which had not been consistently enforced in the past. She explained that MAPA was working to strengthen its administrative processes to ensure clearer documentation, consistency, and efficiency, especially with frequent turnover among staff.

Susan disagreed and stated that since the bylaws were being amended, they should reflect how the committee currently operates, which has been working well. She made a motion to table the bylaw adoption until the next meeting and requested that Rachel send a redlined version showing both the proposed changes and the current practice. Rachel asked for clarification on what Susan meant by “current operation.” Susan explained that each January, their Board of Supervisors assigns committee appointments, including MAPA, and those assignments are communicated to MAPA directly.

Rachel agreed that this process made sense and said it was not in contradiction with the bylaw update. The main requirement is that MAPA receives documentation confirming those appointments.

Brandon requested the January meeting minutes that designated Susan as a RPA-18 representative. It is understood that this was a misunderstanding of the fact that these are county-level designations that occur annually at county Board of Supervisors meetings, and are not to be confused with RPA-18 alternate representative designations which is a documentation of the county decision provided to the RPA-18 staff at MAPA.

Lindsey stated they would review the bylaws to ensure alignment with existing records and clarified that the intent of the update was not to change functional operations but to clean up and formalize language for consistency.

Carlos concluded that they could update the bylaws to reflect that county supervisors are the ones responsible for making designations. If everyone agrees that change can be incorporated into the updated version.

Policy Board: Susan Miller motioned to

- Not approve the updated bylaws until the next meeting.

Motion was seconded by Angie Winquist. Motion passed unanimously.

F. Election of Technical Committee Vice Chair

Rachel initiated the election for the RPA-18 Technical Committee Vice Chair, noting that this would account for the future adoption of bylaw updates mandating the position,



and allow the new officer to begin their role effective July. She asked if there were any comments or concerns regarding the technical committee portion of the bylaws and received no comments.

Technical Committee: Brandon Burmeister motioned to

- Elect **Chris Fredericksen** as Vice Chair of the RPA-18 Technical Committee.

Motion was seconded by Jacob Ferro. Motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

G. Public Comment

The floor was opened to give members of the public the opportunity to comment. No remarks were made.

H. Additional Business

a. RPA 13 & 18 SS4A Update

Rachel presented updates on the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) project, a joint effort between RPA-13 and RPA-18. She noted that the first Safety Technical Advisory Group (STAG) meeting had recently been held. The safety plan focuses on seven communities: three in RPA-18 (Glenwood, Missouri Valley, and Harlan) and four in RPA-13. Rachel explained that, moving forward, the team would continue reaching out to individuals interested in joining the STAG to ensure a wide range of perspectives are represented. Consultants are currently conducting crash data analysis and developing a community-specific safety dashboard.

The project team is pursuing public engagement through participation in existing community events such as farmers' markets and sports events. Susan asked if the team would be going to county fairs, and Rachel answered that county fairs were on their list, but there were logistical challenges, including potential fees for setting up tables. Lindsey added that materials were not ready in time for this week's fairs, making participation difficult, with Charlie mentioning that some county fairs were scheduled to begin the following day.

Dave asked whether the SS4A funding was intended to make safety money more accessible, and expressed concern that it now appeared to focus only on cities. Rachel clarified that the SS4A plan is specifically for cities excluded from the 97-county Iowa plans. Due to federal restrictions against overlapping planning geographies, this plan is designed to fill the gaps left by the broader county-level safety plans.



Dave also inquired about the status of county plan submissions. Carlos responded that Pottawattamie County had submitted its draft plan, while plans had not yet been received by Shelby, Harrison, and Mills counties. Carlos emphasized the importance of these plans for aligning safety goals in the region's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and noted that such coordination also supports more effective grant applications. While the SS4A application window for this year has closed, Carlos explained that having an adopted safety plan remains critical for future construction grant eligibility. He added that MAPA staff are available to assist jurisdictions with applications.

Travis added that he has been asked by the Local Systems Bureau to serve on a committee that will focus on turning local safety plans into actionable projects, mentioning MAPA staff may receive correspondence from him this fall regarding opportunities to apply both locally developed plans to support safer infrastructure projects.

Rachel concluded by encouraging members to share information about any upcoming outreach events or local contacts that could support the SS4A engagement process. Lindsey emphasized that anyone interested in joining future meetings should notify staff, and Rachel noted that all contacts will continue receiving meeting invitations and access to materials, including slides and recordings.

I. Adjournment

Charlie Parkhurst called for a motion for the meeting to adjourn.

Richard Crouch motioned to adjourn the meeting at 11:56 am. Motion was seconded by Susan Miller.

FUTURE MEETINGS & EVENTS

- **RPA-18 Policy Board and Technical Committee Meeting:** August 13, 2025 at 11:00am
- **RPA-18 Policy Board and Technical Committee Meeting:** September 13, 2025 at 11:00am *(if needed)*

