MEETING OF THE
ADMINISTRATION/PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

6:00 P.M.
02/02/16

If you would like to submit a comment regarding an item on this meeting agenda, please visit the Form Center.

I. Roll Call

II. Approval Of Minutes (October 27, 2015 And December 8, 2015 Meetings)

Documents: DRAFT_ADMINPUBLICWORKS_10_27_15.PDF, DRAFT DECEMBER MEETING MINUTES X.PDF

III. Public Participation

IV. Administration

A. For Information

1. Financial Update (Wards – All)

2. 2015-2019 Strategic Goals And Objectives – Status Update (Wards – All)

Documents: 2015-2019 STRATEGIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES - STATUS UPDATE.PDF

3. 2016 Salary Plan Update (Wards – All)

Documents: 2016 SALARY PLAN UPDATE.PDF

B. For Action

1. Abandoned Structure Regulations (Wards – All)

Documents: ABANDONED STRUCTURE REGULATIONS.PDF

2. E-News/Social Media Policy (Wards – All)

Documents: E-NEWS AND SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY.PDF

3. Purchase Of Accounting Software Upgrade (Wards – All)

Documents: INCODE SOFTWARE RECOMMENDATION - INCODE.PDF

4. Employee Retirement Plan Management (Wards – All)

Documents: EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT PLAN MANAGEMENT.PDF

5. Alternative To Sewer Lateral Repair Tax (Wards – All)

   Documents: ALTERNATIVE TO SEWER LATERAL REPAIR TAX.PDF

V. Public Works

A. For Information - None

B. For Action

1. Review Of Construction Bids For Manchester Road Bike Lanes (Ward One)

   Documents: MANCHESTER ROAD BIDS.PDF

2. Review Of Construction Bids For Concrete Street And Sidewalk Replacement (Wards – All)

   Documents: REVIEW OF 2016 CONCRETE STREET AND SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT CONTRACT.PDF

3. Manchester Road Streetscape Phase 3 - Supplemental Design Contract (Ward Eight)

   Documents: CONSULTANT SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT FOR MANCHESTER ROAD STREETSCAPE PHASE 3.PDF

4. Old State Road Conceptual Design – Cost-Share Proposal (Wards Seven And Eight)

   Documents: OLD STATE ROAD CONCEPTUAL DESIGN.PDF

5. Proposed TIP Application For Route 109 Improvements (Wards One And Eight)

   Documents: STP-S FUNDING FOR ROUTE 109.PDF

VI. Items Not Ready For Action

A. Senior Programming Update (Wards – All)

VII. Other

VIII. Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 8, 2016

IX. Adjournment

If you would like to submit a comment regarding an item on this meeting agenda, please visit the Form Center.

The Council Administration/Public Works Committee Will Consider and Act upon the Matters Listed above and Such Others as May Be Presented at the Meeting and Determined to Be Appropriate for Discussion at That Time.

Notice Is Hereby Given That the Council Administration/Public Works Committee May Also Hold A Closed Meeting for the Purpose of Dealing with Matters Relating to One or More of the Following: Legal Actions, Causes of Action, Litigation or Privileged Communications Between the City's Representatives and its Attorneys [RSMO 610.021(1)1994]; Lease, Purchase or Sale of Real Estate [RSMO 610.021(2)1994]; Hiring, Firing, Disciplining or Promoting Employees by a Public Governmental Body [RSMO 610.021(3)1994]; Bidding Specification [RSMO 610.021(11)1994]; And/or Proprietary Technological Materials [RSMO 61-.021(15)1994].

The City of Wildwood Is Working to Comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act Mandates. Individuals Who Require an Accommodation to Attend a Meeting Should Contact City Hall, 458-0440 at Least 48 Hours in Advance.

DRAFT

WILDWOOD

CITY OF WILDWOOD
October 27, 2015
Meeting Minutes
Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting
6:00 p.m.
Community Room

Committee Members in Attendance:
Council Member Jim Bowlin, Chair
Council Member Ed Marshall *(arrived at 6:35 p.m.)*
Council Member Sue Cullinane
Council Member Katie Dodwell
Council Member Dave Bertolino
Council Member Greg Stine
Council Member Larry McGowen

Absent
Council Member Joe Garritano

Also Present:
Mayor Tim Woerther *(arrived at 6:06 p.m.)*
City Administrator Ryan Thomas *(arrived at 6:30 p.m.)*
Director of Public Works Rick Brown
Council Member Jeff Levitt
Council Member Jim Baugus

I. Roll Call

A roll call was taken at 6:00 p.m. with the above noted as present.

II. Approval of Minutes

Council Member McGowen made a motion to approve the September 15, 2015 meeting minutes. Council Member Bertolino seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

A motion was made by Council Member Stine, seconded by Council Member McGowen to change the order of the agenda as presented and move forward to begin with item 6. Compensation of Elected Officials followed by item 5. Media Relations Policy and allow those in attendance to address the committee. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

IV. Administration

B. For Action

6. Compensation of Elected Officials (Wards – All)

Council Member Levitt discussed his concern over last year's election of council members (10) who ran unopposed and strongly recommends increasing the current compensation of $2,400 to $4,800 as well as increasing the Mayor's compensation. There has not been an increase since the city's incorporation (20 years). Polling other neighboring cities, the amount of increase still makes the city the second lowest paid with Clarkson Valley being the lowest. Council Member Stine asked what are the anticipated results from this change? Council Member Levitt replied it will encourage more interest

for other residents to run for office. Mayor Woerther stated money is not the purpose for becoming a council member and the fact of the matter is it will not attract residents to serve on council. Council Member Stine replied this will not be a raise for Council Member Levitt, according to the Charter Section 3.3. Compensation and Expenses – The Council shall determine compensation of the Council members by ordinance, but no increase in such compensation shall become effective for any Council Member until the commencement of a new term of office. Council members may receive reasonable reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties as Council Members, provided that such expenses are supported by appropriate documentation. Council Member Bertolino asked if the matter should be discussed in a closed session. Council Member Cullinane stated it is public information and published in the Charter so a closed session is not necessary. Council Member McGowen agreed an increase should be in order to offer more compensation for all the meetings and loss of family time while serving on the council. Council Member Bowlin commented the few hundred dollars does not matter and the amount of time used by city staff to generate the checks and mailing them is more costly than the amount of the checks. Council Member Baugus stated direct deposit is a more efficient and cost effective way of receiving compensation. Council Member Cullinane stated the money should not be a lure to serve on the Council and those who created the Charter felt no compensation was needed. Council Member Stine asked Mayor Woerther in his years of recruitment for others to serve on Council, was there ever an instance the person asked what they would get paid for serving on the council? Mayor Woerther stated he has been asked but the compensation has never been a deterrent. Council Member Stine made a motion to recommend to the City Council to double the current compensation to $4,800 for Council Members and increase the Mayor's compensation. Council Member McGowen seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken with the following results:
Ayes – McGowen, Dodwell, Bowlin, Stine; Nays – Cullinane and Bertolino; Absent – Marshall and Garritano. Whereupon Chair Bowlin declared the motion approved.

5. **Media Relations Policy (Wards All)**

City Administrator Ryan Thomas included in the packet of information a draft media relations policy to be discussed. Mayor Woerther explained many cities have a media policy in place to encourage a single spokesperson for the city's interest and some do not. Council Member Bowlin received emails from Council Member Sewell and Council Member Garritano stating they are animatedly opposed to a media policy. Council Member Levitt stated the wording is the biggest problem "speaking for the city" and definitions are vague making it look like the city is stifling communication. Council Member Bertolino stated the policy is a terrible slippery slope and can be viewed as a gag order with a Mayor authority and there is not a recent issue blown out of proportion to require a media relations policy. Council Member Cullinane concurs with Council Member Bertolino and stated a media policy does create a slippery slope. Anytime we are elected we are then identified as Council Members not private citizens. Council Member Dodwell stated her concern is the policy doesn't provide transparency and that is what the city has worked so hard to establish. Council member Dodwell suggests training and education programs rather than a policy. Council Member Stine addressed the policy issue may be attributed to action he has caused. Researching the topic he sites Seattle has a policy for Council and one for city staff to provide a communication guide. If the media relations policy moves forward, very important for constraints and sanctions still allow respected disagreement and allow freedom of speech. Council Member McGowen stated he is not a big proponent on this policy. There is a certain amount of trust necessary and at every meeting reporters will have quotes that convey messages to different opinions. A

single voice on behalf of the city seems kind of silly. Council Member McGowen made a motion to place the media policy on a work session agenda to be discussed by all Council. Member Dodwell seconded the motion. Further discussion allows residents in attendance to give public comments. Tammy Shea addressed the committee stating she is very alarmed at the possibilities of a media policy. Anytime a message has to be cleared by the Mayor it is an overreach of power. The Mayor and City Administrator need to be leaders. Ms. Shea is completely opposed to the policy. Barbara Sprenger stated it is general knowledge that the Mayor and City Administrator are the spokesperson(s) for the city and to have this type of media policy in place is a gag order. Lack of consensus for the motion Council Member Dodwell retracted the second and the motion died.

A. For Information

1. Financial Update (Wards All)

City Administrator Ryan Thomas stated hopefully everyone reviewed the 2015 Accomplishments and 2016 Budget Goals in advance of the meeting; and unless there are specific questions, discussion will begin with a brief presentation of the 2016 Budget Highlights. Additionally, the attached documents have been modified slightly, and now include a fiscal impact amount (in red text) for each 2016 Budget Highlight item.

B. For Action

1. Proposed Administration Operating Budget (Wards All)

Council Members discussed the 2016 Budget Highlights for the Administration Operating Budget and reviewed the figures for attorney fees, litigation, and possible major law suits. Questions on the Wildwood Gazette paper quality and the print house to be use was discussed. City Administrator Ryan Thomas stated the Gazette does use recycled paper and different proposals on mailing will be initiated thus the increased mailing expense. Council Member Cullinane made a motion recommending acceptance of the Proposed Administration Operating Budget. Council Member Bertolino seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

2. Proposed City Clerk/City Council Operating (Wards All)

Council Members reviewed and discussed the 2016 Budget Highlights. Council Member Marshall suggested to subsidize the cost of the recycling/electronic event by charging non-residents a fee for the televisions and monitors. Currently, the city pays for both residents and non-residents. City Administrator Ryan Thomas stated personnel changes on the full-time positions remain the same. Part-time positions include three (3) plus a possible intern(s) positions for the upcoming year. Also stated the 2016 budget includes a reduced personnel expense due to the current plan to hire a city clerk at a lower fee and retain the retired City Clerk/Deputy City Administrator on a part-time basis agreeing to cover when the City Administrator needs to be away from the office for vacations and other duties as required. Council Member McGowen made a motion recommending acceptance of the Proposed 2016 City Clerk Council Budget. Council Member Dodwell seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

3. Proposed Municipal Court Operating Budget (Wards – All)

City Administrator Thomas stated a decrease in the court budget is the result of reduced prisoner housing fees as new rules state prisoners cannot be held for more than 24 hours. Council Members discussed changes to the court and the time involved by staff and Judges with the reduced cash flow. The revenue side of the budget will be discussed at a

different meeting. Council Member McGowen made a motion recommending acceptance of the Proposed 2016 Municipal Court Operating Budget. Council Member Cullinane seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

V. Public Works

A. For Information – None

B. For Action

1. Proposed Public Works Operating Budget (Wards-All)

Director of Public Works, Rick Brown stated the 2016 Budget Highlights include the personnel changes previously discussed. Increase in roadside mowing on Route 100 and Route 109 and an increase in landscaping due to greater needs on Route 100 and Route 109. Discussion on the Pedestrian Bridge will be addressed when reviewing the Capital Improvements and Park Budgets. Council Member Bertolino made a motion recommending acceptance of the Proposed 2016 Public Works Operating Budget. Council Member Stine seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

Council member Bowlin and Council Member Bertolino addressed City Administrator Ryan Thomas complimenting him on how well prepared the packet of information for tonight's meeting is and appreciate the effort.

The committee returned to the original agenda as stated.

IV. Administration

B. For Information

1. Proposed Ballot Issue – Out-Of-State Vehicle Sales Tax (Wards All)

City Administrator Ryan Thomas stated everyone should have the memo explaining a need to coordinate efforts with the St. Louis County Municipal League along with all interested municipalities for a vote to reinstate local sales taxes on vehicles purchased out of state. If the jurisdictions(s) fail to place the question on the ballot or if it fails, out of state vehicle, tax collections will cease. The impact to the City of Wildwood would be an estimated loss of $70,000 in annual revenue. Council Member Marshall asked which ballot would it be on? City Administrator Ryan Thomas stated the April 2016 election. Mayor Woerther stated this is a state-wide issue with both the County and Missouri Municipal League helping to coordinate a unify approach changing votes from a NO to a YES to retain the tax. Council Member Bertolino made a motion recommending the proposed ballot material move forward to Council. Council Member Dodwell seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

2. Update on Abandoned Building In Pointe Clayton Subdivision (Ward 3)

Council Member Bowlin stated the matter is under legal review and will carry forward to the next meeting.

V. Public Works

B. For Action

2. Review of 2016 Public Roads, Rights-of-Way and Parks Maintenance Bids (Wards All)

Director of Public Works, Rick Brown stated sealed bids were opened on October 13, 2015 for the 2016 Municipal Maintenance Contracts. Two (2) new bids and ten (10)

existing contracts for renewal at their 2015 rates (this is an option given to current contractors in lieu of submitting a new bid). Reasons for recommendation were distributed in a memo stating it is normally necessary to award approximately 10-12 separate contracts due to the size of the City and the variety of the types of maintenance work needed. Eleven of the 12 contracts recommended for award or renewal involve contractors the City has utilized in prior years and the Department is pleased with their performance. One new bid from Traffic Control Company provides striping services and the Department is please with their unit prices. Council Member Stine made a motion recommending approval of the 2016 Public Roads, Rights-of-Way and Parks Maintenance Bids. Council Member Cullinane seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

3. Salt Storage Building Project (Ward – One)
Director of Public Works, Rick Brown is requesting a recommendation to approve a fee proposal received from Cochran Engineering in the amount of $26,500 to design the facility and develop the necessary plans and specifications to bid the project. Council Member Bertolino asked if the city is sure that the Kelpe property is where the salt storage building will be placed. City Administrator Ryan Thomas stated the city does have a verbal agreement with Kelpe. Committee requested a site specific written agreement between the City and Kelpe be presented at the December 8th, 2015 meeting. Council Member Stine made a motion to move forward with the proposal contingent upon agreement with Kelpe. Council Member Dodwell amended the motion to move forward with the proposal with the written agreement presented to the City Council meeting on the 9th of November. Council Member Stine seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

VI. Items Not Ready for Action

A. E-News/Social Media Policy (Wards – All)
B. Employee Retirement Plan Management (Wards – All)
C. Reconciliation of Hunting And Firearms Regulations (Wards – All)
D. Senior Programming Update (Wards – All)
E. Renewal of Construction Inspection Services Contract (Wards – All)

VII. Other

VIII. Closed Session For The Purpose Of Dealing With Matters Relating To One Or More Of The Following – None

IX. Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 8, 2015

X. Adjournment
Council Member Bertolino made a motion, seconded by Council Member Stine, to adjourn. The Meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
Ruth A. Waters, Receptionist/Administrative Assistant

CITY OF WILDWOOD
December 8, 2015
Minutes of the Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting
6:00 p.m. in the Community Room

Committee Members in Attendance:
Council Member Jim Bowlin, Chair
Council Member Dave Bertolino
Council Member Katie Dodwell
Council Member Joe Garritano (arrival at 6:25)
Council Member Ed Marshall
Council Member Larry McGowen
Council Member Greg Stine

Absent:
Council Member Sue Cullinane

Also Present:
Mayor Tim Woerther
City Administrator Ryan Thomas
Director of Public Works Rick Brown
Council Member Jeff Levitt
Council Member Jim Baugus

I. Roll Call

A voice roll call was taken at 6:11p.m. with the above noted in attendance.

II. Approval of Minutes

Chair Bowlin moved to postpone approval of the October 27, 2015 meeting minutes to the next meeting. This request is due to the minute's draft not being included with the online agenda items. Motion was seconded by Council Member Bertolino and with no objections, **Motion approved**.

III. Administration

A. For Information

1. Financial Update (Wards – All)
City Administrator Ryan Thomas reviewed the Sales Tax Receipts.

2. Employee Retirement Plan Management (Wards – All)
Memorandum outlining status indicated that proposals are being submitted to the City in order to recommend to this Committee.

3. Reconciliation of Hunting and Firearms Regulations (Wards – All)
City Administrator Thomas reported that the Board of Public Safety will be taking this issue up this week.

DRAFT

B. For Action

1. Abandoned Structure Regulations (Wards – All)

Chair Bowlin asked if the purpose is that if approved, Legal Counsel Robert Golterman will begin the development of the regulations. City Administrator Thomas responded that it would come to the City Council Work Session, wherein the legislation would be drafted and a request to place such on the City Council agenda would be made. Council Member Bertolino inquired as to if this issue is in direct response to the abandoned home in Pointe Clayton. City Administrator Thomas responded affirmatively, adding that it is not to say this fully addresses that particular situation as a Judge will have to make the decision for an Administrative Search Warrant. However, this regulation would be helpful in obtaining such.

Council Member McGowen suggested that respect for homeowner rights remain a priority herein, and perhaps further review would be beneficial to all. Mayor Woerther inquired as to how many instances of this type have occurred previously. Council Member Marshall responded that he believed there have been three such occurrences. Mayor Woerther then concluded that this is not a wide spread concern, but often includes responsibility to safety and clean up. Conversation towards safety concerns continued noting that the previous occurrences were rural and were danger issues, thus those types of issues should require the City's participation. Also discussed were the criteria required prior to submitting a request to a Judge for action.

Chair Bowlin suggested that the current solution may be to postpone action pending Legal Counsel Golterman providing a defined standard for warrant issuance. Others continued on that point referencing past practices and noting that this would be the next step in the process, after efforts by Code Enforcement have been exhausted. It was noted that the Pointe Clayton structure likely was not in enough distress to engage this type of action. Chair Bowlin noted that the definition of abandoned structure is critical to this regulation.

Chair Bowlin proposed postponement pending a specific definition of abandoned structure and defined standards for warrant issuance. Council Member Dodwell inquired as to the necessity of a written ordinance, in that it may restrict the City in certain instances where a defined regulation may require revision in order to apply. Chair Bowlin again motioned for postponement, seconded by Council Member Marshall, and with all committee members affirming such motion, **Motion approved**.

2. E-News/Social Media Policy (Wards – All)

Council Member Bertolino requested clarification on Section 1, line item 5 of the proposed Policy on E-Newsletter/Social Media Content provided by City Administrator Thomas. He requested that the employment opportunities in this line item, as well as other content be specific to Wildwood. He also requested striking the work "major" in line item 6.

Council Member Garritano suggested that employment opportunities retain the right to City discretion. City Administrator Thomas ensured that a valid business license would be required to ensure viability and safety. Concern was expressed as to staff time requirements to keep this all updated, wherein City Administrator Thomas agreed that high volume would be challenging.

Council Member Stine inquired as to if the City has received many requests to advertise on City platforms? City Administrator Thomas responded that requests have been low and are mostly regarding the E-Newsletter. Council Member Dodwell requested that Section 1, line item 6 strike "once per year", as this opportunity is a good outreach for local businesses.

DRAFT

Chair Bowlin motioned postponement to the next meeting pending verbiage edits and inquiries into other municipality policies. This motion was seconded by Council Member Garritano and by committee agreement, **Motion approved**.

3. Purchase of Accounting Software Upgrades (Wards – All)

Council Member McGowen offered that City Administrator Thomas and Finance Officer Dawn Kaiser would best know if this upgrade is valuable to the City. Discussion ensued relative to the merit of continuing with our current older version of Incode versus other options. Council Member Garritano expressed concerns on continued support by Incode of this older software. More thorough research was requested. Council Member Stine offered that he would motion for approval of the additional modules and recommend due diligence for further expenditures on this software. Council Member Dodwell seconded this.

City Administrator Thomas explained that the existing data would migrate to newer system. Council Member McGowen requested that Dawn Kaiser consult with RBG regarding their recommendation of the best municipality software. Council Member Dodwell reiterated that she supported approving the new modules, and then looking to the 2016 Budget for overall system upgrade. Chair Bowlin inquired as to whether they wished to keep the Motion on the floor. Council Member Dodwell expressed concern on postponing, and again motioned for approval of the modules along with continued research for upgrade. Therein, the Motion is rephrased to include the encumbered 2015 Budget funds for the requested modules now and further research prior to a future upgrade. Council Member Bertolino seconded this Motion, including compliments to the Finance Department, and therein respect for their decision to request the modules. Chair Bowlin inquired as to any objections to this rephrased Motion, and there being none, **Motion approved**.

4. Review of Compensation Study Results (Wards – All)

City Administrator Thomas reported that the subcommittee ran out of time due to the start of this meeting, but that such subcommittee agrees with the suggested ranges.

IV. Public Works

A. For Information – None

B. For Action

1. Renewal of Construction Inspection Services Contract (Wards – All)

Director of Public Works Brown requested a Cochran Engineering contract extension, as we normally renew annually (as long as the contractor has done good work). Motion for approval was made by Council Member Marshall and seconded by Council Member Stine with committee members in agreement. **Motion approved**.

2. Review of Construction Bids for Manchester Road Bike Lanes (Wards – All)

The recommendation is for no action at this time. Director of Public Works Brown noted that four bids were received for the project, which all exceeded estimates. He therein requested time to consider cost reductions to bring to the next meeting. Council Member Marshall inquired as to how much of cost is bike lane specific. Director of Public Works Brown responded that specifics included resurfacing and rebuilding/extending the shoulder.

DRAFT

V. Items Not Ready for Action

A. Senior Programming Update (Wards – All)

B. Alternatives to Sewer Lateral Repair Tax (Wards – All)

VI. Other

Mayor Woerther reported that he had received another request for use of the Community Room by a political group. Since this is currently against City policy, he inquired as to whether the policy needs to be changed. Council Member Bertolino expressed his support of the policy now in place to remain such. Council Member Stine noted that if the policy were to be changed, the City meetings would have to be a priority over outside groups. Since availability is already an issue, then outside groups would be a lower order of request. Chair Bowlin would prefer further data prior to making a decision.

Council Member Marshall motioned that the policy remain unchanged. Council Member Dodwell seconds the motion with all committee members in agreement. **Motion approved**.

VII. Next Meeting: January 5, 2016

VIII. Adjournment

Council Member Bertolino made a motion, seconded by Council Member Marshall, to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

DRAFT

WILDWOOD

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

Cc: Mayor Woerther and Planning/Economic Development/Parks Committee Members

From: Ryan S. Thomas, City Administrator

Date: January 28, 2015

Re: 2015 – 2019 Strategic Goals & Objectives – Status Update

At the end of each fiscal year, a status update is provided for the City Council's 5-year Strategic Goals & Objectives. With the current 5-year Strategic Goals & Objectives just adopted this past May, the attached update represents approximately seven (7) months of progress. This document will be incorporated into the final printed 2016 Municipal Budget document; therefore, I would welcome any input regarding its content at this time.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2, 2016 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting.

RST

5-YEAR STRATEGIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (2015-2019)
12-31-2015 Status Update

Adopted May 26, 2015 (Resolution 2015-17)

The Strategic Goals and Objectives are intended to serve as the priority focus of City organization time, attention and resources for Year 2015 – 2019. They address future challenges, opportunities and desires, typically require multiple years' effort to accomplish, and require priority allocation of organization resources. Following is a status update for each of the Strategic Goals, as of December 31, 2015

Goal #1: Promote and Facilitate Development of the Town Center

Objectives:

- Encourage Development of the Town Center
- Provide For Passive Green Space and Functional Public Space
- Identify Public Funding Sources for Development
- Develop Maintenance Plan for Public Infrastructure
- Engage the Services of an Economic Development Consultant

12/31/2015 Update:

The primary action during 2015 has been the development of an Economic Development Plan for the City of Wildwood, which is expected to be completed and adopted by Spring 2016. This plan will identify recommended action steps to undertake to help meet the goal of promoting and facilitating development of the Town Center. The City's Economic Development Task Force has been working closely with the firm, Houseal Lavigne, in developing this plan.

During 2015, the City of Wildwood became a member of the Wildwood Business Association (WBA) to help develop a relationship with business community. The City has also started the process of recruiting new businesses for the Town Center, mostly focused on restaurants. The City has also commenced discussions with both the St. Louis County Library District and St. Louis Science Center regarding the potential for facilities in Wildwood. During 2015, several major residential developments have started construction or been proposed within the Town Center, which should further support business growth.

The City of Wildwood has also continued its efforts to plan future infrastructure improvements within the Town Center, including the Manchester Road Streetscape Improvements, Route 100 Great Street Improvements, Route 109 Highway Improvements, Route 100 Pedestrian Bridge and Route 109 Pedestrian Tunnel. It is also pursuing the extension of Main Street to Route 109.

Goal #2: Develop a Long-term Financial Plan

Objectives:

- Identify Potential Loss of Revenue from Proposed Sales Tax Legislation
- Identify Other Potential Increases and Decreases in Revenue
- Identify Long-term Operational Expenses
- Develop a Contingency Plan for Operating Expenses
- Continue Fiscally Responsible Financial Management Practices

5-YEAR STRATEGIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (2015-2019)
12-31-2015 Status Update

Adopted May 26, 2015 (Resolution 2015-17)

12/31/2015 Update:

A Finance Committee was established in 2015 to commence discussions regarding the development of a Long-Term Financial Plan for the City of Wildwood, particularly focused on identifying the potential loss of revenue from proposed sales tax legislation, as well as other sources of revenue. The Committee is also reviewing the City's long-term operating expenses to explore options for costs reductions, or use of other funding sources for certain expenses.

With the largest financial concern involving legislation that could negatively impact the City's sales tax revenue, the City of Wildwood has continued to closely monitor such efforts at the State Capitol, and has worked closely with other area municipalities and the St. Louis County Municipal League to support more reasonable approaches for sales tax reform.

The City has also continued its fiscally responsible financial management practices, and through these practices was able to retire the debt associated with the City Hall project early, saving the City over $900,000 in long-term interest costs.

The City has also continued its aggressive efforts to secure grant funding for major capital improvement projects in the City, including over $3,200,000 in grant awards during 2015.

Goal #3: Implement the Parks and Recreation Action Plan

Objectives:

- Complete the Development of the Community Park
- Plan for Development of Future Parks and Trails
- Determine Means for Funding Future Parks and Trails

12/31/2015 Update:

The primary action in 2015 was the completion of Phase 1 of the City's award-winning Community Park, including the entry road from Route 100, all-abilities playground, dog park, pavilion and trails. Planning and design continued for Phase 2, planned for construction in Spring-Summer 2016, which will continue the entry road to connect with Pond-Grover Loop Road at Route 109, more trails, and the start of the Great Meadow improvements. Both phases received grant funding from the St. Louis County Municipal Park Grant Commission.

Planning continues for additional parks and trails projects, with the following additional projects planned for construction during 2016:

- *Al Foster Trailhead Improvements*
- *Monarch Levee Trailhead Improvements*
- *Pedestrian Bridge over Route 100 at Eatherton Road*
- *Wildwood Greenway Trail – Phase 6 (Community Park to Pond Road)*
- *Boardwalk Trail at Mercy Medical Building*
- *Bluff View Connector Trail*
- *Lake Chesterfield Connection to Rock Hollow Trail*

Planning also continues for identifying a potential location for a Town Center Village Green and other pocket parks in high-density residential areas.

Finally, a review of long-term parks and trails maintenance expenses has commenced, and the consideration of placing a Parks Sales Tax ballot measure at a future election will be discussed early in 2016.

Goal #4 : Develop Marketing Strategies for the City as a Regional Destination

Objectives:

- Conduct Research to Determine What Attracts People to Wildwood
- Identify Strategies for Promoting and Marketing Wildwood
- Establish Partnerships and Sponsorships with Organizations Holding Unique Community Assets

12/31/2015 Update:

The City of Wildwood has enhanced its use of the City website, e-newsletter and social media to promote the City of Wildwood with positive news stories and special events, and has also utilized social media to solicit input from citizens.

Through its economic development efforts, the City of Wildwood has also tried to attract new destinations, such as the St. Louis County Library District and St. Louis Science Center, and has discussed ways to enhance existing destinations, such as potential summer activities at Hidden Valley Ski. The City has also sought ways to expand its partnerships with other local non-profits, including the St. Louis Community College and Wildwood Family YMCA.

The City is also just beginning its networking with the Outdoor Industry Association, given the strong emphasis on outdoor recreation within the City of Wildwood. It will also continue to strengthen existing relationships with important local partners in this regard, including Great Rivers Greenway and the St. Louis County Municipal Park Grant Commission.

Promotion of the City is going to be given significant attention during 2016, with the development of printed marketing materials for distribution at the appropriate venues.

Goal #5: Enhance Citizen Communications and Input

Objectives:

- Expand Communication Channels
- Increase Citizen Involvement
- Enhance Positive Community Image
- Maintain Continuity in Communications

5-YEAR STRATEGIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (2015-2019)
12-31-2015 Status Update

Adopted May 26, 2015 (Resolution 2015-17)

12/31/2015 Update:

The City of Wildwood has always encouraged citizen involvement, and in 2015 sought input from its citizens on numerous occasions regarding the very important 10-year update to the Master Plan.

During 2015, the utilization of the City website, e-newsletter and social media has also been increased significantly, with continued growth expected in 2016. During 2015, the City also expanded its social media presence to include Instagram, in addition to its Facebook and Twitter accounts. The City has also increased its use of Press Releases and other communications to citizens through these same channels. With these increased communications, new communications policies are currently in development, and new training may also be considered in 2016.

During 2015, the City has also continued its Rural Internet Access Project, which is planned to continue into 2016 with additional coverage improvements.

WILDWOOD

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

Cc: Mayor Woerther and Planning/Economic Development/Parks Committee Members

From: Ryan S. Thomas, City Administrator

Date: January 28, 2015

Re: 2016 Salary Plan Update

The attached 2016 Salary Plan has been updated in accordance with the recommendations from the Compensation & Benefits Study completed by CBIZ Human Capital Services. This document will be included in the final, published 2016 Municipal Budget. Of note, two (2) recently-hired positions did not exist at the time of the study: Planning Technician and Recreation Specialist. These two (2) positions have been placed at Pay Grade 4 as a placeholder, and will be reviewed in further detail later this summer as part of the update for 2017 (under CBIZ's contract, they are to provide annual updates for a total of five (5) years).

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2, 2016 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting.

RST

WILDWOOD

CITY OF WILDWOOD, MISSOURI
2016 SALARY PLAN

Position	Grade	Salary Minimum	Salary Midpoint	Salary Maximum
City Administrator	12	$126,233	$160,947	$195,662
Director of Planning and Parks	11	$105,194	$134,123	$163,051
Director of Public Works/Engineer	10	$89,148	$113,663	$138,179
Dep. City Admin. / City Clerk	10	$89,148	$113,663	$138,179
Finance Officer	9	$77,060	$96,325	$115,590
Assistant City Engineer	8	$65,305	$81,631	$97,958
Asst. Director of Planning & Parks	8	$65,305	$81,631	$97,958
Superintendent of Streets	8	$65,305	$81,631	$97,958
Senior Planner	7	$57,946	$70,984	$84,022
Superintendent of Parks & Rec.	7	$57,946	$70,984	$84,022
Planner	6	$50,388	$61,725	$73,062
Court Administrator	6	$50,388	$61,725	$73,062
Code Enforcement Officer	5	$43,815	$53,674	$63,532
Accounting Clerk/HR Assistant	5	$43,815	$53,674	$63,532
Dep. City Clerk/Assist Court Clerk	4	$40,662	$48,794	$56,927
Code Inspector	4	$40,662	$48,794	$56,927
Planning Technician	4	$40,662	$48,794	$56,927
Recreation Specialist	4	$40,662	$48,794	$56,927
Office Assistant / Receptionist	1	$31,200	$36,660	$42,120
				revised 1-1-2016

WILDWOOD

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

Cc: Mayor Woerther and Planning/Economic Development/Parks Committee Members

From: Ryan S. Thomas, City Administrator

Date: January 28, 2016

Re: Abandoned Structure Regulations

Background

At the September 15, 2015 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting, the Board of Trustees for Pointe Clayton Subdivision presented a concern regarding a home in their neighborhood, which has allegedly been abandoned by its owner following water damage that occurred in the interior of the home. However, there is no visual evidence of a code violation from the exterior of the home; and, until such time that the home is occupied and as long as the home is secure, there is not probable cause to cite the owner for an interior code violation.

During the December 8, 2015 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting, sample regulations from the City of Hazelwood were considered, which would provide a process for issuing Administrative Search Warrants for housing code violations and/or registering vacant residential structures. During this discussion, the Committee questioned whether problems of this nature were encountered often, and under what criteria the Municipal Judge would consider issuing an Administrative Search Warrant.

As for similar problems, the City's Code Enforcement Team has identified six (6) past properties where it was determined that the Public's health, safety, and welfare were jeopardized by a housing/nuisance code violation. In each of these six (6) circumstances, the conditions were evident from an exterior inspection, and were able to be enforced to varying degrees through current regulations. The current concern in Pointe Clayton Subdivision appears to be the first instance of an alleged nuisance inside the structure, where the structure is secure on the exterior.

As for criteria the Municipal Judge would consider in issuing an Administrative Search Warrant, it generally must be supported by probable cause, which cannot be demonstrated for the current concern in Pointe Clayton Subdivision.

Recommendation
No action.

Reasons of Recommendation

1. There has not been a history of issues in the City similar to the Pointe Clayton Subdivision concern.
2. Even with an Administrative Search Warrant process established, the Pointe Clayton Subdivision concern would not meet the criteria for issuance.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2, 2016 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting.

RST

WILDWOOD

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

Cc: Mayor Woerther and Planning/Economic Development/Parks Committee Members

From: Ryan S. Thomas, City Administrator

Date: January 28, 2016

Re: E-News/Social Media Policy

Background

At its September 15, 2015 Meeting, the Administration/Public Works Committee recommended adopting a Draft Policy for determining the type of content to include in the City's e-newsletter and social media pages. This Draft Policy was ready for consideration by the full City Council, until the Planning/Economic Development/Parks Committee recommended the addition of a new Instagram social media page, which led to further discussion regarding the need for additional policies regarding user content. Therefore, the previously recommended Draft Policy has been updated to include a section regarding user content as well. Additionally, other edits to the Draft Policy were suggested at the December 8, 2015 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting, which have been incorporated herein. A survey of other area municipalities produced only a couple policies locally from the Cities of Creve Coeur and Webster Groves, which are attached.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the City Council consider adopting the **Policy on E-Newsletter/Social Media Content**, as drafted on the following page.

Reasons for Recommendation

1. The City's e-newsletter and social media pages are great tools for promoting the City and supporting local businesses and non-profits.
2. Content parameters are important for maintaining professional City communications, which are not expanded so broadly that they become less focused on the community itself.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2, 2016 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting.

RST

DRAFT

Policy on E-Newsletter/Social Media Content

SECTION 1: City of Wildwood Content

The following content shall be permitted for placement in the City's Weekly E-Newsletter and/or on Social Media Pages by the City of Wildwood:

1. Any official City communications, including City website content
2. Any public service announcements impacting the City of Wildwood
3. Community events held within the City of Wildwood (must be open to the public, and compliant with the City's zoning regulations)
4. Announcement of a new Wildwood business opening
5. Announcement of a Wildwood business employment opportunity
6. Announcement of a special event for a Wildwood business

All other requests for content placement in the City's Weekly E-Newsletter and/or Social Media Pages may be proposed to the City Administrator for his/her review and consideration.

SECTION 2: External User Content

The following external user content is prohibited from being posted on the City's Social Media Pages, including the "Community Voice" and "Wildwood Listens" features on the City Website, and may be subject to removal:

1. Profane language or content
2. Content that promotes, fosters or perpetuates discrimination of protected classes
3. Sexual harassment content
4. Solicitations of commerce or advertisements including promotion or endorsement, unless consistent with the City of Wildwood content, as described in Section 1
5. Promotion or endorsement of political issues, groups or individuals
6. Conduct or encouragement of illegal activity
7. Information that may tend to compromise the safety or security of the public or public systems
8. Content intended to defame any person, group or organization
9. Content that violates a legal ownership interest of any other party, such as trademark or copyright infringement
10. Making or publishing of false, vicious or malicious statements concerning the City, any City employee, and/or any elected or appointed City official
11. Violent or threatening content
12. Disclosure of confidential, sensitive or proprietary information

Prohibited external content shall be promptly documented (screenshot/printout), and then removed immediately by the City.

Individuals (e.g., friends, fans or followers) who continue to post prohibited content may be banned from posting on the City's Social Media Pages or Website.

City of Creve Coeur Social Media Policy

1. The sites will be used to transmit information on items such as: special events, upcoming meetings, traffic announcements, re-sending news items and recreation news.
2. All information available, excluding pictures, on these sites will also be available on the city's website.
3. Hate speech, obscenity, profanity, spam, and endorsements of goods and services will be prohibited. The Public Information Officer will strive to delete any comments that violate policies.
4. Create settings (on Facebook) so that the city's wall is not open for posts. However, Creve Coeur fans could still comment on any of the items we post.
5. Photo albums will be of official city functions only.
6. The city will not follow (Twitter) or favorite (Facebook) other individuals, organizations or people. This could be construed as an endorsement.
7. If a comment is made that is official city business (such as a service request), the Public Information Officer will respond by directing the individual to the city's website and/or by providing contact information for the correct department in the Government Center.
8. Comments will be reviewed by the Public Information Officer every working day.
9. City staff will place a minimum of two items weekly on each site and will strive to place an item daily.

Social Media Policy & Guidelines

City of Webster Groves

Introduction:

Social media is content created by people using highly accessible Internet based publishing technologies. Social media software tools allow groups to generate content and engage in peer-to-peer conversations and exchange of content (examples are Blogger, Twitter, Wikispaces, YouTube, Flickr, Facebook, etc.)

The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for use of social media at the City of Webster Groves. If you are a City employee or contractor creating or contributing to blogs, microblogs, wikis, social networks, virtual worlds, or any other kind of social media both on and off of the City domain, these guidelines are applicable. The City expects all who participate in social media on behalf of the City to understand and to follow these guidelines. These guidelines will evolve as new technologies and social networking tools emerge.

Rules of Engagement When Using Social Media:

1. **Use official accounts for official business.**
   Be sure to use the City email address, not personal email.
2. **Write what you know.**
   Ensure you write and post about your area of expertise. If you publish outside of the City, use a disclaimer like "The postings on this site are my own and don't necessarily represent the City of Webster Groves' positions, strategies, or opinions."
3. **Be transparent.**
   Your honesty, or dishonesty, will be quickly noticed in social media environments. When blogging or commenting about your work at the City of Webster Groves, use your real name, identify that you work for the City, and be clear about your role.
4. **Perception is reality.**
   In online social networks, the lines between public and private, personal and professional are blurred. Just by identifying yourself as a City of Webster Groves employee, you are creating perceptions about the City. Be sure all content associated with you is consistent with your work and with the City's values and professional standards.
5. **Be judicious.**
   All statements must be true and not misleading and all claims must be substantiated and approved. What you publish will be around for a long time, so consider the content carefully. ***Don't publish anything you wouldn't want your mom, coworker, clergy, or supervisor to read!***
6. **Your responsibility.**
   What you write is ultimately your responsibility. Participation in social computing on behalf of the City is not a right and it therefore needs to be taken seriously and with respect. When responding, be sure you are the <u>correct person in your department</u>.

7. **It's a conversation.**
   Talk to your readers like you'd talk to real people in professional situations. Avoid bureaucratic or formal language. Consider open-end content that invites response and comments. Stay professional-don't be combative.
8. **Did you mess up?**
   If you make a mistake, admit it. Be upfront and quick with your correction. If you're posting to a blog, you may choose to modify an earlier post—just make it clear that you have done so.
9. **If it gives you pause, pause.**
   If you're about to publish something that makes you even the slightest bit uncomfortable, don't shrug it off and hit 'send'. Take a minute to review these guidelines and try to figure out what's bothering you, then fix it. If you're still unsure, check with your manager. Ultimately, the decision about what you publish is yours—as is the responsibility. So be sure.
10. **Follow the rules.**
    Employees who fail to comply with these policies are subject to disciplinary action, including dismissal.
11. **Moderating comments.**
    In some social media formats such as Facebook and Twitter responses, you may encounter comments which cause you concern as a moderator or responsible party. If user content is positive or negative and in context to the conversation, then the content should be allowed to remain, regardless of whether it is favorable or unfavorable to the City. If the content is ugly, offensive, denigrating, and completely out of context, then the content should be rejected and removed.

Topic Taboos:

Do not write any content or postings that involve or are related to the following:

1. Items involved in litigation or could be in the future.
2. Nonpublic information of any kind.
3. Illegal or banned substances and narcotics.
4. Pornography or other offensive illegal materials.
5. Defamatory, libelous, offensive or demeaning material. Don't engage in a combative exchange.
6. Private/personal matters of yourself or others.
7. Disparaging/threatening comments about or related to anyone.
8. Personal, sensitive, or confidential information of any kind.
9. Content that promotes, fosters, or perpetuates discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, age, religion, gender, marital status, status with regard to public assistance, national origin, physical or mental disability, or sexual orientation.

Keep in mind:

1. Departments are ultimately responsible for establishing, publishing, and updating their pages on social media sites. When possible, content should always link back to the City website for more information. (Compliance with ADA.)
2. Check the sites often, and at least daily. Submit Sunshine Requests or other types of record requests that same day to the City Clerk via email at nakazonok@webstergroves.org.
3. Personal use of social media during work hours is prohibited. Please also be mindful of your use of social media outside of work hours. While the City has no intention of unreasonably controlling your activities or communications outside work hours, the City has the right to manage its public image and protect its confidential information. Therefore, the City expects you to comply with the above-mentioned guidelines.
4. Departments should only utilize City approved social media networks for hosting official City social media sites.
5. Use of sites that are not Section 508 web accessible shall contain "simple" text links to identical material on a compliant website or other social media network.

WILDWOOD

Memo

To: Administration & Public Works Committee

From: Dawn Kaiser, Finance Officer

CC: Ryan Thomas, City Administrator

Date: 01/15/2016

Re: Purchasing of Accounting Software Upgrade and Additional Modules

---

At the December 8, 2015 Administration and Public Works Committee meeting a request was made to approve the purchase of an upgrade to the City's accounting software and purchase additional modules to improve data management, reporting capabilities, and reduce staff time required for data entry and data management. The committee agreed to earmark (encumber) 2015 residual funds to feasibly purchase software upon staff satisfactorily addressing the committee's concerns. Below is a list of questions extracted from the minutes of the meeting:

1. Does Tyler Technologies anticipate stopping support on our current Version of Incode (8) in the foreseeable future?

   Tyler will continue to support Incode (8) but their goal is to upgrade their clients to at least Incode (9). Since Incode (9) does not offer the functionality provided by the major upgrade to Incode (10), staff recommends upgrading directly to Incode (10) provided that the Committee agrees that sticking with Incode is the most feasible option for the City.

2. If the City purchases the Business License, Inventory, and Fixed Assets modules but does not upgrade to Incode (10) will the modules migrate to Version (10) if purchased at a later date?

   The new modules will work in Version 8 and will migrate to Version 10 if we purchase it at a later date.

3. Is there better software available for Cities? Inquire with Auditors to see if they are aware of a different software package that would be more suitable for the City's needs.

   According to the Ted Williamson, Partner at Rubin Brown and in charge of the City's audit, he is not aware of a particular package used by their clients. He suggested reaching out to other cities for more direct feedback.

As a member of the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) I participate in an email network whereas members ask and answer questions such as this so I was able to gather information regarding which software cities in the network use. It appears that the majority of Cities in our area use Incode. In fact, in 2012-2013 several cities including DesPeres, Richmond Heights, Maplewood, Manchester and Brentwood formed a group to research Software options because the software each of them were using (Fundware) was becoming obsolete and would soon not be supported by its provider.

According to Tracy Hanson, Finance Director of DesPeres, the committee participated in demonstrations of the following accounting software packages:

Accufund	BS&A
Dynamics GP	Financial Edge
Incode	Innoprise
Sage 100	Serenic Navigator
Springbrook	

The team drafted an RFP and the proposals ranged from $68,000 to $463,292 for the first year of purchase including implementation and maintenance. According to Tracy's memo, the group selected Incode with an average purchase price of $142,931. The majority of the group selected the following modules:

General Ledger	Payroll Human Resources
Financial Reporting	Fixed Asset
Purchase Orders	Grant Tracking/Project Costing
Accounts Payable	Bank Reconciliation
Cash Receipting	Business Licensing
Accounts Receivable	

As stated in the December 3, 2015 memo to the Committee, staff is requesting the following modules be added to our current Incode Software and if agreed upon the Upgrade to Incode Version (10) which will eliminate a need for a second conversion of data if purchased at the same time. The following prices include initial license fees, implementation, migration, data conversion, and other expenses related to get the upgraded package up and running. Annual license fees are listed separately.

	Initial Costs	**Annual License Fees**
Incode 10 Upgrade	40,436.00	1,000.00
Business License	16,057.00	688.00
Inventory	6,120.00	756.00
Fixed Assets	6,215.00	481.00
	68,828.00	2,925.00

Recommendation

Staff recommends the purchase of the Business License, Inventory, and Fixed Asset Modules from Incode as these functions are currently maintained in Access data bases and Excel spreadsheets. Including these functions in of our accounting software package will improve data management, reporting capabilities, and reduce staff time required for data entry and data management. In addition, staff recommends the purchase of the upgrade to Incode Version (10) as it has improved reporting capabilities and functionality.

Incode software is developed by Tyler Technologies (established 1966) and was written specifically for government fund accounting.

The City currently uses the following modules of Incode Version (8):

General Ledger	Payroll
Financial Reporting	Bank Reconciliation
Purchase Orders	Court
Accounts Payable	

Tyler Technologies manages and maintains each of these functions completely; there are no third-party vendors involved. For example, the City of Chesterfield uses Logos provided by New World Systems for accounting functions, Kronos software for payroll, and Incode for Court. In staff's opinion, one complete package, such as Incode for all functions allows easier data sharing and maintenance.

Finally, the cost of the upgrade to Incode Version (10) is substantially less than purchasing a different software package and time lost for conversion problems should also be considerably less.

Funding the Purchase

As approved at the last Administration and Public Works Committee, encumbered residual 2015 Budget Funds may be used to purchase the Business License, Inventory and Fixed Asset modules if so approved. And, a Budget Amendment shall be required to the 2016 Budget to finance the purchase of the upgrade to Incode Version (10) is so approved.

Additional Information

Additional information regarding other cities that use Incode Software and other accounting software packages is available upon request. Please let me know if you have any other concerns that you would like addressed.

DJK

WILDWOOD

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

Cc: Mayor Woerther and Planning/Economic Development/Parks Committee Members

From: Ryan S. Thomas, City Administrator

Date: January 28, 2016

Re: Employee Retirement Plan Management

Background
Since 1996, the ICMA Retirement Corporation has managed the Employee Retirement Plan for the City of Wildwood, for which the following concerns have been raised by employees:

1. Limited fund choices
2. High plan fees and fund expenses
3. Limited financial advisory services

Other the course of the past few months, Finance Officer Dawn Kaiser and I have interviewed multiple firms that would potentially take on the role of financial advisor and fiduciary for the administration of the City's Employee Retirement Plan, and each firm has sought competitive quotes from multiple plan platforms in an effort to provide the best possible options for the City's consideration. The following three (3) firms were interviewed for the role of financial advisor/fiduciary:

1. Cutter & Company
2. Mass Mutual Financial Group
3. Retirement Plan Advisors

Recommendations
1. Cutter & Company is recommended to serve as financial advisor and fiduciary for the City's Employee Retirement Plan.
2. OneAmerica is recommended for the retirement plan platform (record keeper), including a managed plan option through Artesys.

Reasons of Recommendation

1. Cutter & Company has an excellent track record as a financial advisor and fiduciary, with a very reasonable fee of 0.25%, which is structured into the plan fees (paid by the employee).
2. Cutter & Company's role as fiduciary reduces liability to the City in this capacity.
3. OneAmerica was one (1) of eight (8) plan platforms considered, but offered the lowest overall fees without limiting fund choices: 0.45% average fund expense ratio + 0.09% record keeping/administration fee. Others considered by Cutter & Company were Nationwide, Lincoln, Voya, Daily Access, John Hancock, Alerus and Mutual of Omaha.
4. The overall average plan costs (including fees from both Cutter & Company and OneAmerica) total 0.88%, compared to 1.37% for the current plan (certain fund choices under the City's current plan are in excess of 2.00%).
5. Once the total managed assets exceed $3,000,000 (it is very close now), the overall average plan costs would be further reduced to 0.79%.
6. Both Cutter & Company and OneAmerica have a local presence, and regular meetings with employees would be offered.
7. For employees desiring a hands-off approach, an optional managed plan option will be made available through the firm Artesys.

If desired, representatives from Cutter & Company, OneAmerica and Artesys have offered to make themselves available for a formal presentation. Also attached for your information is a letter from Cutter & Company and a sample of possible fund choices to be offered (these would be evaluated regularly for possible improvements).

Once a recommendation is forwarded to the City Council and new agreements are executed, the required 60-day termination notice to ICMA Retirement Corporation will be necessary, which would likely result in completion of the migration by the end of April 2016.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2, 2016 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting.

RST

CUTTER & COMPANY

The Opportunity You Deserve

Dawn Kaiser, Finance Officer
Ryan Thomas, City Administrator
City of Wildwood
16860 Main Street
Wildwood, Mo. 63040

Dawn & Ryan:

In our initial meeting, five major areas of concern were identified:

- Help in meeting the fiduciary/best practices requirements & choosing an appropriate fund lineup of both active & passive fund alternatives for your participants
- Ease of website use and tools similar to what your employees now enjoy
- Plan expenses must be competitive
- A strategic & tactical "do it for me" money management alternative to target date & lifestyle funds
- Education & investment advice for your staff via in person meetings when requested

My value to your plan includes:

- Ability to keep you abreast of what the competition is doing over time or if a better mouse-trap comes to market. Retirement plans are a core business for me—not a sideline.
- No conflicts of interest; for example, I do not participate in revenue sharing or manager fees; my 25 basis points on assets is my total compensation. I am an independent fee based advisor and fully transparent working with mutual fund companies like Fidelity, bank trust companies, insurance companies, etc., —I work for you!
- Annual performance and fund lineup/monitoring report via FI360 software keeping you abreast of how competitive your fund lineup is in terms of performance, style drift, internal manager or policy changes, etc. Occasional regulatory updates or industry periodicals available to you.
- Willingness to meet, educate, and advise your staff with individual meetings when requested in addition to enrollment meetings.
- 35 years of experience brought to the table—retirement plans, financial planning, & money management are areas of my expertise.

15415 Clayton Road • Ballwin, MO 63011 • Member FINRA, SIPC

phone: 636 537-8770 • *fax:* 636 537-8779 • www.cutterco.com

Regarding one of the providers we discussed; OneAmerica & Artesys, their value proposition is:

1. OneAmerica provides a high quality menu of name brand funds and excellent ongoing fund due diligence reporting. They also offer an independent contractual co-fiduciary relationship with Mesirow Financial. Both OneAmerica and Mesirow will supplement my own due diligence efforts, as well that of your own as an investment committee. In short, more than one voice will be heard during the fund selection and monitoring process.
2. The appeal of an overall portfolio "reset" with the added benefit of a tactical money management system (Artesys) for your employees that do not wish to direct their own funds or participate in a static asset allocation fund (like a target date fund).
3. They have a client centric service model and have over 50 years of experience in the tax exempt employer market and service over 5,000 tax exempt employers nationally with local ongoing support from an experienced and tenured staff. They provide high quality employee education materials (including personalized account projections), many of which that can be branded to the City. They also offer a customized website landing page (cityofwildwoodretirement.com) and an excellent participant website.
4. They have the ability to recordkeep your plan(s) in a 401(a)/457 "combo" arrangement with <u>one</u> record keeping source for both plans, <u>one</u> contribution remittance, <u>one</u> enrollment booklet/form/process, <u>one</u> website experience, and <u>one</u> participant statement.
5. OneAmerica is a financially strong organization with a deep and long term commitment to the retirement plans business with competitive plan expenses.

It has been a pleasure to learn about your vision and retirement plan needs. I look forward to being part of your team and helping building a future for you & your associates.

Best Regards,

William L. Meyer, AIF, CLU, ChFC
President

CUTTER & COMPANY

Returns as of 9/30/2015

	AUL		
Fund	**1 Year**	**3 Year**	**5 Year**
AUL Fixed Account	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
BlackRock US Debt Index Fd 31	2.74%	1.43%	2.68%
Lord Abbett Total Return I	1.33%	2.09%	3.86%
Prudential High-Yield Z	-1.30%	4.09%	6.34%
American Funds American Blanaced R4	-0.12%	9.09%	10.11%
TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index 2010 Retire	-0.39%	4.99%	6.30%
TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index 2015 Retire	-0.61%	5.60%	6.81%
TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index 2025 Retire	-1.53%	7.04%	7.98%
TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index 2030 Retire	-2.00%	7.75%	8.57%
TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index 2035 Retire	-2.56%	8.38%	9.04%
TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index 2040 Retire	-3.08%	8.66%	9.30%
TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index 2045 Retire	-3.12%	8.65%	9.27%
TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index 2055 Retire	-3.16%	8.64%	
Invesco Diversified Dividend Investor	4.78%	13.57%	12.86%
SSgA S&P 500 Index SL Ser F	-0.89%	12.12%	13.07%
DFA US Targeted Value R2	-4.27%	12.22%	11.82%
Lord Abbett Growth Leaders I	3.85%	16.49%	
American Century Mid Cap Value Inv	0.49%	13.84%	12.84%
BlackRock Mid Cap Equity Index Fund 31	1.12%	12.18%	11.90%
TIAA-CREF Mid-Cap Growth Retire	0.47%	12.11%	12.09%
Columbia Sm Cap Index	3.26%	12.46%	13.52%
Vanguard VIF Small Co Gr	2.67%	12.67%	13.67%
Federated International Leaders Instl	-4.56%	9.34%	6.84%
TIAA-CREF International Eq Idx Retire	-8.19%	5.68%	4.00%
Deutsche Real Estate Securities	9.09%	8.75%	11.67%
Average	-0.18%	8.77%	8.96%

WILDWOOD

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

Cc: Mayor Woerther and Planning/Economic Development/Parks Committee Members

From: Ryan S. Thomas, City Administrator

Date: January 28, 2015

Re: Alternative to Sewer Lateral Repair Tax

With the failure of the sewer lateral repair tax ballot issue in April 2014, some residents are still seeking alternatives to insure their sewer lateral lines. This is not a problem unique to our region, and has been a need for many residents across the entire United States. Recognizing this need, the National League of Cities developed a Service Line Warranty Program in partnership with Utility Service Partners, Inc., which is a voluntary program for residents seeking protection against what could become very costly repairs. A municipality must elect to participate in this program, but there are no costs to the municipality to do so. If the City of Wildwood elects to participate in this program, the National League of Cities would handle all communications to residents about the program with a message approved by the City. The cost to residents is $7.75/month if paid monthly, or $90/year if paid annually, for the sewer lateral warranty program, which covers up to $4,000 per incident + an additional $4,000 if the incident impacts the street + an additional $500 if the incident impacts a sidewalk. The resident only has to call Utility Service Partners, and they will send out a local, Wildwood contractor to address the problem, with no out-of-pocket costs, unless the coverage limit is exceeded.

The program also offers a water lateral warranty program for $5.75/month if paid monthly, or $66/year if paid annually; and an interior plumbing warranty program for $6.99/month if paid monthly or annually. The resident can elect which coverage he/she wishes. Additionally, the program returns royalties of 50¢ per service per month back to the municipality, which it can utilize for special programs in the community, such as low-income assistance or anything else it chooses.

More information, including a sample listing of current municipal partners, is attached. Additionally, a representative from the National League of Cities could attend a future City Council Meeting to provide a formal presentation and to answer questions if desired. Otherwise, all that is needed is a

Resolution authorizing the program for an initial 3-year term, from which the National League of Cities and Utility Service Partners will proceed with implementing and managing the program.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2, 2016 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting.

RST



NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES | Business Partner Programs



NLC SERVICE LINE WARRANTY PROGRAM

BRINGING PEACE OF MIND, ONE COMMUNITY AT A TIME



NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES

Bringing Savings and Solutions to Cities

NLC SERVICE LINE WARRANTY PROGRAM

BRINGING PEACE OF MIND, ONE COMMUNITY AT A TIME

HOME PROTECTION SOLUTION

The NLC Service Line Warranty Program, administered by Utility Service Partners, Inc. (USP), is an affordable home protection solution for your residents offered at no cost to the city. It helps city residents save thousands of dollars on the high cost of repairing broken or leaking water or sewer lines. The city also receives a share of the revenues collected.



PEACE OF MIND

Residents who have not set aside money to pay for an unexpected, expensive utility line repair, now have an opportunity to obtain a low-cost warranty that will provide repairs for a low monthly fee, with no deductibles or service fees. The work is performed by licensed, local plumbers who will call the customer within one hour of filing a claim. The repair is performed professionally and quickly, with a local plumber dispatched no later than 48 hours after claim is filed, but typically within 24 hours. USP provides a personally staffed 24/7 repair hotline for residents, 365 days a year.

BENEFITS

- NO COST to your city
- Generates revenue for your city
- Affordable rates for residents
- 24/7 customer service
- Trusted local contractors
- Simple implementation process
- Fewer citizen complaints
- Repairs performed to local code

IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The program will be offered to all cities in the 48 contiguous states and rolled out over an 18-month period in six-month intervals. Once your city agrees to participate in the program, start up is simple. The program is designed for a quick launch, taking up little of your city employees' valuable time. USP administers the program and is responsible for marketing, billing, customer service, and performing all repairs to local code.

MORE INFORMATION

To learn more about this program, visit NLC's website at www.nlc.org or contact Emma Lieberth at lieberth@nlc.org or 202-626-3075.

This program is offered by Utilities Service Partners, Inc. (USP).
USP is solely responsible for the implementation and operation of the program.

NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES

NLC SERVICE LINE WARRANTY PROGRAM BENEFITS

CITY

Provides non-tax revenue stream without any investment

Reduces calls to city/public works when a homeowner's line fails

Contractors undergo rigorous vetting process to ensure repairs meet city code

Reduces costs associated with sending public works to residents' homes to assess lateral line issues

Keeps money in the local economy by using contractors in the metro area

Contractors must be current with insurance and required licenses

RESIDENTS

Affordable utility line repair solution for families on a budget

Educates homeowners about their service line responsibilities

Prevents aggravation of having to find a reliable, reputable plumber

Peace of mind – with one toll-free call, a plumber is dispatched

Keeps money in the homeowner's pocket; without warranty, repairs cost $1,300 to $4,000 or more

No service fees or deductibles, paperwork or forms to complete

ACCOLADES & ACCOMPLISHMENTS

BBB

BBB Torch Award for Marketplace Ethics

Trust • Performance • Integrity

2013 Winner
Western Pennsylvania Better Business Bureau®

- **Accredited Better Business Bureau member with A+ rating for nearly a decade**
- **2013 Western Pennsylvania Better Business Bureau Torch Award winner for Marketplace Ethics**

- **More than 97%** of all submitted claims are approved
- **A customer satisfaction** rating that has **exceeded 95%** for more than a decade
- **9 of 10 customers surveyed** have recommended the program to friends, family and neighbors
- The **only** utility line warranty program endorsed by the National League of Cities

Learn more about the program online at www.utilitysp.net or call 1-866-974-4801.

NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES

Utility Service Partners, Inc.

Program Administrator

NLC Service Line Warranty Program Highlights

- Nearly 200 cities participating nationwide
- No cost to or liability for the city to participate
- Healthy, ongoing annual revenue stream for the city
- Educates homeowners about their lateral line responsibilities
- The only utility line warranty program endorsed by the National League of Cities (NLC)
- Utility Service Partners (USP) handles all marketing and management of the program
- 24/7/365 bilingual customer service
- All repairs performed to city code by local, licensed contractors
- Reduces calls from residents to City Hall for lateral water and sewer line issues
- Homeowner billed by NLC Service Line Warranty Program
- USP is a North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Shared Services Program Partner
- City provides residents an affordable solution that covers cost of repairs to water and sewer lines for which the homeowner is responsible
- Saved more than 60,000 homeowners across the country over $45 million in utility line repair costs
- Public funds are not used in the marketing, distribution or administration of the NLC Service Line Warranty Program
- The NLC Service Line Warranty Program must be supported by the city into which it is being introduced before any warranty offer letters are mailed to homeowners in the community

PARTICIPATING CITIES (SAMPLE OF OVER 200)

LARGE	SMALL
Atlanta, GA	Dayton, OH
Madison, WI	Northglenn, CO
Phoenix, AZ	Franklin Park, IL
San Diego, CA	Overland Park, KS

NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES

Notes on The National League of Cities
Service Line Warranty Program

Utility Service Partners, Inc.
Program Administrator

NEWS & NOTES

An Invitation from Clarence Anthony

Executive Director, National League of Cities



Our goal at the National League of Cities (NLC) is to be a resource and advocate for your city and its residents. The National League of Cities Service Line Warranty Program is one of our partnership programs that can offer your residents a home protection solution while also addressing the aging infrastructure in your city.

You know as well as anyone, that our cities still face difficult economic times and as city leaders we must find creative, innovative ways to assist and strengthen our communities. In 2010, NLC recognized the growing problem of aging infrastructure and the dire need to find a solution for not only cities, but residents as well. As a result, NLC and Utility Service Partners created the NLC Service Line Warranty Program to help city residents save money, ease the frustration over utility line failures and introduce a new service offering to your community.

The NLC Service Line Warranty Program is offered at no cost to city, municipal and utility partners and helps residents save thousands of dollars on the cost of fixing broken – or leaking – water or sewer lines.

The National League of Cities is proud to partner with Utility Service Partners because we've found it to be the most reputable and reliable program – one that will educate your residents on their water and sewer line responsibilities.

Serving the Public

Jim Hunt, Past President, National League of Cities



As I ended my 27-1/2 year career in municipal government, one of the things that I missed most was the relationships developed with city officials throughout the country. When I was asked to work as an advisor to the National League of Cities Service Line Warranty Program I was very pleased since I had followed the growth and development of this NLC Program and saw the positive results to member cities.

As I now meet with cities in all parts of the country, many are excited to look at this public/private partnership and provide the opportunity for their citizens to be protected from catastrophic expense associated with failed water and sewer lines. The National League of Cities continues to provide quality programs to member cities which address critical problems for our citizens and I am proud to be a part of the team.

Jim Hunt, Past President of the National League of Cities and Advisor to the National League of Cities Service Line Warranty Program.

NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES

Utility Service Partners, Inc.

Program Administrator

NLC Service Line Warranty Program: Homeowner Testimonials

- Letter from Atlanta homeowner to Felicia Moore, City of Atlanta Councilmember

Dear Felicia,

I am writing to you about the sewer line warranty that you recommended for your constituents. On Christmas Day my sewer line backed up into my house and into my tub! I could not flush toilets or take a shower or wash dishes or clothes or even my hands. It turned out to be due to a clogged sewer line in my front yard.

Thanks to you, I had the warranty and did not have to pay for the $2000 plus repair! Thank you! The warranty company had good customer service and the local plumbing company that they sent to do the work, Atlanta Plumbing Plus, WAS AMAZING! They did a wonderful job and were very respectful of my property (and my anxiety about the situation).

Thank you so much Felicia for always looking out for us!" – *Cindy, Atlanta, GA*

- "Thank you so much. Your service was awesome in a time of need. I am forever grateful for the service you provide. Again, thank you!!" – *Felecia B., Decatur, AL*

- "We were very impressed with the concern shown from all involved and the quick responsiveness that we received. Thank you so much for the great service!" – *Ron D., Wexford, PA*

- "This is such a great service; one would be crazy not to pay for such a warranty. It is very affordable." – *Leticia E., Odessa, TX*

- "Excellent service! I have recommended SLWA to my entire community on nextdoor.com!" – *David H., Beckley, WV*

- "Having water and sewer line coverage is a Godsend. When I bought my home and turned on the water, there was a leak in the alley that the city said I was responsible for – the repair cost a small fortune. Thank you for this protection. It really eases my mind!" – *Patricia G., Abilene, TX*

- "The contractor was prompt, knowledgeable and neat in his work! I am so glad I had the services contract; it saved me money!" – *Donald & Judy K., Rock Falls, IL*

- "The positive experience with Service Line Warranties from my water line problem made my decision to enroll in the sewer line program a no-brainer!" – *Nila N., North Little Rock, AR*

Continued on back of page.

NLC SERVICE LINE WARRANTY PROGRAM: HOMEOWNER TESTIMONIALS

Continued

- "The professionalism of your company is as good as it gets. Thank you! I will be a life-long customer." – *Craig P., Englewood, CO*
- "I couldn't believe how easy it was and how quickly it was handled. We had an issue on Father's Day and it was completed that day. The service company was amazing!" – *Elina P., Berkley, MI*
- "Absolutely would recommend the program. It's nice that the city was proactive in making this available at a reasonable cost." – *Virginia P., Dayton, OH*
- "The Village of Brookfield recommended this warranty coverage and I believe all homeowners should consider having it." – *Michael P., Brookfield, IL*
- "Everyone should have your warranty service wherever it is available." – *Robert S., Marietta, GA*
- "Couldn't survive without your services! It's the best money I've ever spent on home services." – *Rose S., Greenville, SC*
- "It was a confusing day – plumbing problems, no one at home, calling from work. Everyone from our village to SLWA worked with me quickly and efficiently. Everyone was very pleasant and helpful. Hope it doesn't happen again soon, but if it does, we know we can count on your service!" – *Robert W., Hanover Park, IL*
- "Glad the city made this recommendation and that I purchased the warranty. Everyone from the warranty people to the contractor was fantastic! – *Julie M., Mooresville, NC*
- "I like the purpose of your company; you are honest and caring and the quality of work is superb. Thank you!" – *Ramona N., Lawton, OK*
- "Awesome warranty for the price – why would you NOT get it? We got both – sewer and water!" – *William P., Phoenix, AZ*

NOTE: Service Line Warranties of America (SLWA) is the consumer brand of the National League of Cities Service Line Warranty Program.

Learn more about the program online at www.utilitysp.net or call 1-866-974-4801.

NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES

Service Line Warranty Program

Utility Service Partners, Inc
Program Administrator

With nearly 200 city and municipal partnerships across the United States, the National League of Cities (NLC) Service Line Warranty Program administered by Utility Service Partners, Inc. (USP) is designed to educate homeowners about their service line responsibilities while providing an affordable solution to cover expensive repairs to their water and sewer lines when leaking, clogged or broken. The NLC Service Line Warranty Program has helped more than 60,000 homeowners across the country save over $45 million in service line repair costs. The NLC serves as a resource for city leaders and advocate for more than 19,000 cities, villages and towns across the country.

Municipal Partners in Descending Order of Occupied Households

Account Name	Total Occupied Households	Account Name	Total Occupied Households
Total Occupied Households > 100,000		**Total Occupied Households <= 49,999**	
City of Phoenix-AZ	517,750	City of St. Clair Shores-MI	26,476
City of San Diego-CA	484,180	City of Avondale-AZ	23,574
City of Las Vegas-NV	211,991	City of Casper-WY	23,102
City of Kansas City-MO	193,304	City of Anniston-AL	22,330
City of Atlanta-GA	187,021	City of St. Louis Park-MN	21,778
City of Mesa-AZ	166,417	City of Moore-OK	20,727
City of Madison-WI	103,055	City of Harrisburg-PA	20,610
City of Plano-TX	100,583	City of Roseville-MI	19,579
Total Occupied Households 50,000 to 99,999		City of Berwyn-IL	18,906
City of Ft. Lauderdale-FL	75,069	City of Rowlett-TX	18,477
City of North Las Vegas-NV	66,594	City of Stillwater-OK	18,028
City of Dayton-OH	58,103	City of DeSoto-TX	17,655
Total Occupied Households <= 49,999		City of Fairfield-OH	17,520
City of Abilene-TX	43,669	City of Quincy-IL	17,218
City of Midland-TX	42,356	City of Hutchinson-KS	17,130
City of Lewisville-TX	37,890	City of Wilkes-Barre-PA	16,937
City of Odessa-TX	37,134	City of York-PA	16,242
City of Lawton-OK	34,993	City of Hurst-TX	14,713
City of Hendersonville-NC	33,000	City of Englewood-CO	14,310
City of Daly City-CA	31,252	City of Northglenn-CO	13,889
City of Bryan-TX	28,152	City of Duncanville-TX	13,476
City of North Little Rock-AR	26,512	City of East Point-GA	13,325

NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES

Service Line Warranty Program

Utility Service Partners, Inc.
Program Administrator

Account Name	Total Occupied Households	Account Name	Total Occupied Households
Total Occupied Households </= 49,999			
Town of Mooresville-NC	12,618	City of Columbia Heights-MN	7,908
Borough of State College-PA	12,559	City of Beckley-WV	7,897
City of Riviera Beach-FL	12,464	Village of Brookfield-IL	7,440
Town of Lexington-SC	12,266	Village of Maywood-IL	7,400
City of Lauderdale Lakes-FL	11,986	City of Union City-GA	7,348
City of Aberdeen-SD	11,458	City of Clarksburg-WV	7,217
Village of Hanover Park-IL	11,126	Village of Westchester-IL	6,937
City of Waxahachie-TX	10,597	City of Papillion-NE	6,843
City of Trotwood-OH	10,502	City of Albemarle-NC	6,580
City of Marshalltown-IA	10,398	City of Berkley-MI	6,574
City of Riverside-OH	10,225	City of North Chicago-IL	6,495
City of Prairie Village-KS	9,845	Borough of West Chester-PA	6,373
City of Garden City-KS	9,192	City of Pickerington-OH	6,359
City of Denison-TX	9,132	Village of Franklin Park-IL	6,150
City of Woodstock-IL	9,106	City of Rockport-TX	5,900
City of Kingsville-TX	9,049	City of Buffalo-MN	5,759
City of Rock Springs-WY	8,919	City of Harper Woods-MI	5,757
City of Dodge City-KS	8,904	City of La Marque-TX	5,466
City of Kyle-TX	8,849	City of Bucyrus-OH	5,287
City of Griffin-GA	8,734	City of Uvalde-TX	5,280
City of Derby-KS	8,409	City of El Dorado-KS	5,258
Town of Little Elm-TX	8,304	City of Gaffney-SC	5,094
City of Fairmont-WV	8,157	Village of Richton Park-IL	5,013
City of District Heights-MD	8,142	City of Ottawa-KS	4,996

This is a sampling of the nearly 200 cities across the country that have introduced the National League of Cities Service Line Warranty Program to homeowners in their community. For more information, please call 1 866.974.4801 or go to www.UtilitySP.net to learn more about the program.

WILDWOOD

Department of Public Works

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

From: Rick C. Brown, Director of Public Works

Date: January 28, 2016

Re: Bids for Manchester Road Resurfacing and Bike Lane Project

Background

On Friday December 4th, the Department opened sealed bids to construct the Manchester Road Resurfacing and Bike Lane project. The project, which will improve Manchester Road from west of Route 109 to Route 100, is federally funded and has a construction budget of $1.2M. It should be noted that 80% of the project's construction cost, up to $960,000, will be reimbursed by MoDOT.

The bids received for the project are as follows:

Contractor	Amount
NB West	$1,341,147.27
Krupp Construction	$1,363,425.45
Gershenson Construction	$1,367,627.75
Spencer Construction	$1,632,913.52

Recommendation

The Department is recommending award of the contract to the low bidder, NB West Construction. However, because the contactor's bid came in above the project budget, we are proposing a strategy to reduce the project cost. First, we are proposing to reduce the overlay thickness by ¼" and to reduce the project limits by 500 feet. This should reduce the project cost by about $50,000. In addition, we will challenge NB West to find additional cost savings such as using a less expensive asphalt mix or reducing the use of retaining walls. Finally, because the project's unit prices for asphalt are indexed to the current price of fuel, it is possible that some savings may result if fuel prices continue to fall and remain low through the summer.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The Department is satisfied that we received competitive bids for the project.
- Because MoDOT has provided bid concurrence, we don't recommend re-bidding the project as the construction schedule would be jeopardized and there is no guarantee that bids would be lower.
- We have identified a strategy to reduce project costs by $50,000 (and possibly more).

Planning Tomorrow Today™

16860 Main Street ♦ Wildwood, Missouri 63040 ♦ 636-458-0440 phone ♦ 636-458-6969 fax

Due to the increased project cost of $141,147, it should be noted that a mid-year budget adjustment may be necessary for this project; however, the Department feels the budget increase can be offset by the remaining balance of $110,000 from last year's Road and Bridge Capital Maintenance program.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2nd, 2016 Administration/Public Works Committee meeting.

RCB

WILDWOOD

Department of Public Works

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

From: Rick C. Brown, Director of Public Works

Date: January 27, 2016

Re: Review of 2016 Concrete Street and Sidewalk Replacement Contract

Background

Each year, the Department solicits bids for the replacement of substandard concrete street slabs and sidewalks throughout many of the City's subdivisions. As part of the 2016 Road and Bridge Fund budget, $910,000 was allocated for concrete street replacement and $100,000 for concrete sidewalk replacement. For the past several years, the Department has combined both the street and sidewalk work into a single contract.

For the 2016 combined project, a total of four (4) contractors submitted bids, with the lowest received from J.M. Marschuetz Construction for a total base bid of $908,100. (See bid tabulation attached). With an estimated $25,000 needed for construction inspection and material testing services, the total project cost is estimated at $933,100, which is 7.6% below the project budget.

Recommendation

The Department of Public Works recommends authorizing a contract with J.M. Marschuetz Construction for the 2016 Concrete Street and Sidewalk Replacement Contract, in the amount of $908,100, with a $75,000 contingency for additional work as identified by the Department.

Reasons for Recommendation

- J.M. Marschuetz Construction submitted the lowest bid.
- J.M. Marschuetz Construction successfully completed this project for the City last year.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2nd, 2016 Administration/Public Works Committee Meeting.

RCB

WILDWOOD

FY 2016 Concrete Street Slab Replacement

Bid Item	Units	Qty	J.M. Marschuetz		Kelpe Contracting Inc.		M & H Concrete		R.V. Wagner, Inc.		
Bids received Wednesday, January 27th, 2016			**Unit**	**Extended**	**Unit**	**Extended**	**Unit**	**Extended**	**Unit**	**Extended**	
7" Concrete Street Removal – Replacement w/ 7" Non-reinforced, 7.27 sack, PCCP	Sq. Yds	20,000	$41.75	$835,000.00	$42.75	$855,000.00	$44.00	$880,000.00	$58.00	$1,160,000.00	
4" concrete sidewalk removal - replacement non reinforced 6 sack, PCCP	Sq. Ft.	5,000	$5.50	$27,500.00	$4.25	$21,250.00	$5.60	$28,000.00	$6.50	$32,500.00	
6" concrete sidewalk removal - replacement non reinforced 6 sack PCCP	Sq. Ft.	2,000	$7.00	$14,000.00	$4.75	$9,500.00	$6.10	$12,200.00	$7.00	$14,000.00	
6" Driveway Apron Removal – Replacement w/ 6" Non-reinforced, 6 sack, PCCP	Sq. Ft.	500	$7.00	$3,500.00	$5.50	$2,750.00	$6.20	$3,100.00	$8.00	$4,000.00	
6" concrete vertical PCCP curb	Lineal Ft.	1,000	$4.00	$4,000.00	$11.00	$11,000.00	$10.00	$10,000.00	$14.00	$14,000.00	
Full Depth Saw Cutting	Lineal Ft.	8000	$1.25	$10,000.00	$2.25	$18,000.00	$1.80	$14,400.00	$2.50	$20,000.00	
8" asphalt driveway removal - replacement	Sq. Ft.	500	$9.00	$4,500.00	$8.00	$4,000.00	$8.00	$4,000.00	$7.00	$3,500.00	
Trucated dome mats (red 2' x 4')	Per Mat	20	$105.00	$2,100.00	$160.00	$3,200.00	$200.00	$4,000.00	$200.00	$4,000.00	
Over-Excavation/concrete lugs	Per hour inc equipment w/operator	100	$75.00	$7,500.00	$80.00	$8,000.00	$95.00	$9,500.00	$150.00	$15,000.00	
				$908,100.00		**$932,700.00**		**$965,200.00**		**$1,267,000.00**	

WILDWOOD

Department of Public Works

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

From: Rick C. Brown, Director of Public Works

Date: January 27, 2016

Re: Consultant Supplemental Agreement Request for Manchester Road Streetscape, Phase 3

Background

As you know, last year the Department successfully obtained federal funding for the Manchester Road Streetscape Project, Phase 3. That funding will allow the City to be reimbursed for 80% of eligible project costs up to a maximum amount of $1.3M, which is about 50% of the estimated construction cost.

A disadvantage to federal funding is that it results in project oversight from MoDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). This creates additional project requirements not associated with a City funded capital improvement project. For that reason, our design consultant, Thouvenot, Wade & Moerchen, Inc. (TWM) has requested a supplement to their existing agreement with the City. Because our agreement predates the federal funding, it does not account for the additional work required by the MoDOT and FHWA oversight. Specifically, TWM, Inc. is required to complete the following additional tasks:

- Submittal of project plans to MoDOT for review and approval. This includes four (4) submittals during project milestones. Each submittal requires TWM to respond to review comments provided by MoDOT.
- Preparation of additional environmental review documentation and necessary coordination.
- Inclusion of additional federal clauses, restrictions, job special provisions, and contract requirements within the project bid documents (i.e. the Bid Manual).
- Additional work to follow MoDOT's bidding process and associated requirements such as the preparation of MoDOT review checklists, development of project certifications, and request for bid concurrence.

I should also note that the federal funding restricts when the City can begin construction of the project as the construction funds can't be utilized until 2017 at the earliest. Due to this fact, our existing agreement with TWM will also be modified to reflect this schedule.

Recommendation

The Department recommends approving a supplemental agreement with TWM for the amount of $10,869.05.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The Department evaluated TWM's request and we concur that the proposed work is above and beyond TWM's current agreement with the City.
- The proposed work is necessary and must be completed in order to receive federal funding and to comply with the City's existing funding agreement with MoDOT.
- Finally, the Department reviewed the amount requested by TWM and we believe that it is reasonable given the magnitude of work involved.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2nd, 2016, Admin / Public Works Committee meeting.

RCB

SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT NO. 1
TO
ENGINEERING SERVICES CONTRACT

THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT, made and effective this ____ day of _____, 20_____ by and between the City of Wildwood, Missouri, a municipal corporation hereinafter referred to as "City", and Thouvenot, Wade & Moerchen, Inc., hereinafter referred to as "Consultant", with a business address of: 720 Olive St., Suite 200A, St. Louis, MO 63101.

The parties hereto entered into an agreement on June 18, 2014 in which the Consultant has agreed to provide professional services in connection with the design of the City's Streetscape Project along Manchester Road, which was to be completed by October 31, 2015.

WITNESSETH: That the parties hereto, for the considerations hereinafter set forth, agree as follows:

I. SCOPE OF SERVICES

Additional services shall be provided by the Consultant in accordance with all the provisions of this Agreement, including the General Conditions of the original contract, for the project which are incorporated herein by reference, and which terms shall prevail over any conflicting terms that may otherwise be adopted herein as part of any attachment, or any other documents submitted by Consultant. Services to be added to the original contract are listed in Attachment A.

II. COMPENSATION

These additional services shall be in the amount not to exceed Ten Thousand Eight Hundred Sixty Nine dollars and Five Cents ($10,869.05) without further authorization. The total design services shall be in an amount not to exceed Three Hundred Six Thousand, Five Hundred and Sixty Nine dollars and Five Cents ($306,569.05). Attachment B outlines the cost breakdown for this Supplement Agreement.

IV. SCHEDULE OF WORK

The parties hereto agree to supplement the agreement by amending the Schedule of Work by extending the completion date of the contract as follows:

PS&E: Shall be submitted to MODOT by a mutually agreeable date, but in no case later than June 1, 2017.
Construction Phase: Shall be completed in accordance with the contractors schedule for construction.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have signed Supplemental Agreement #1 as of the effective date of Contract first above written.

Consultant	City of Wildwood
BY: _____	BY: _____
TITLE: _____	TITLE: _____
	ATTEST: _____
	DATE: _____

WILDWOOD

Department of Public Works

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

From: Rick C. Brown, Director of Public Works

Date: January 27, 2016

Re: Old State Road Conceptual Plan

Background

During 2015, the Department met with representatives from the St. Louis County Department of Highways & Traffic and the City of Ellisville regarding a potential joint project between the three (3) entities to improve Old State Road, between Pierside Lane and Old State Spur. This was a project originally planned to occur over ten (10) years ago by St. Louis County, but which never moved forward due to funding constraints.

As a result of these past discussions, St. Louis County is now agreeable to moving forward with the development of an updated Conceptual Plan for this project conditioned upon a cost share agreement with St. Louis County, Ellisville and Wildwood. Because Old State Road is a County maintained roadway, the County has agreed to pay for 50% of the plan cost with Ellisville and Wildwood responsible for the remaining 50%. The split between Ellisville and Wildwood would be based on the length of the project within each respective city. Thus, because 70% of the project is within Wildwood and 30% is within Ellisville, the cost share would be as follows: St. Louis County 50%, Wildwood 35% and Ellisville 15%. St. Louis County estimates that a consultant contract for the updated Conceptual Plan would cost around $30K-$40K; thus, Wildwood's cost would be $10,500 - $14,000.

St. Louis County has recently requested Statements of Qualifications from several engineering firms to complete the updated Conceptual Plan. They have indicated a willingness to include Ellisville and Wildwood in the selection process.

It should be noted that the development of the Conceptual Plan will include an open house public meeting to gather public feedback and comment regarding the plan. Once a date has been set for the meeting, the Department will notify City Council Members and assist in notifying the public through the City website, social media and its mobile message boards.

The County plans to have the updated Conceptual Plan completed by the end of the year. This would position the County to submit an application through the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) next winter for federal funding to complete the project's engineering, right-of-way acquisition and construction. Based on past discussions, the TIP funding application would presumably include a similar cost share for the required 20% local project match.

Recommendation

The Department is recommending that the City enter into a cost share agreement with St. Louis County and Ellisville to fund the development of an updated Conceptual Plan for Old State Road. The maximum expected obligation to the City would be $10,500 - $14,000.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The cost to update the Conceptual Plan is a reasonable expense for the City.
- The cost share arrangement will help ensure that the City has greater input with St. Louis County regarding the design of the improvements.
- Without a cost share agreement with Ellisville and Wildwood, it is anticipated that St. Louis County will not move forward with this project.

It should be noted that this will not obligate us to fund construction of the improvements. Assuming the project moves forward, that would require subsequent approvals by the Admin/Public Works Committee and City Council.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2nd, 2016, Admin/Public Works Committee meeting.

RCB

WILDWOOD

Department of Public Works

MEMORANDUM

To: Administration/Public Works Committee Members

From: Rick C. Brown, Director of Public Works

Date: January 27, 2016

Re: STP-S Funding for Route 109

Background

Recently, additional federal funding was announced under the Surface Transportation Program - Suballocated (STP-S) for the St. Louis region. STP-S federal funding can be utilized for a variety of transportation projects including pavement preservation, bridges, highway expansion, congestion mitigation, safety, and bicycle / pedestrian improvements. Sponsors must be able to provide a minimum of a twenty percent funding match. The deadline for submitting funding applications to the East-West Gateway Council of Governments is March 3rd, 2016.

Recommendation

For STP-S funding consideration, the Department is recommending the City sponsor a project which would improve Route 109 from Route 100 to New College Avenue. The project scope would include the following and is shown graphically on the attached exhibit.

- Widen Route 109 to 4-lanes from Route 100 to (Old) Manchester Road and provide a raised median for access management.
- Construct a new multi-lane roundabout at the Eastbound Route 100 ramps.
- Construct a new multi-lane roundabout at Main Street.
- Aesthetically enhance and provide pedestrian and bike accommodations to the Route 109 Bridge over Route 100. (Note we've recently been informed that MoDOT is also programming a new project to re-deck and widen this bridge to 4-lanes at a cost of $2.3M.)
- Provide pedestrian and bike accommodations along Route 109.
- Provide continuous/aesthetic overhead lighting from Windsor Meadow Blvd to (Old) Manchester Road. (This lighting could be similar or the same as the lighting installed in the medians along Route 100 under the Great Streets project.)
- Provide internally illuminated LED signs for the existing signals on Route 109 at New College Avenue and Route 109 at (Old) Manchester Road.
- Provide Wayfinding signs along Route 109 at New College Avenue, (Old) Manchester Road, and Main Street and on Route 100 at Pond Road (if approved). Wayfinding signs would be identical to that installed on Route 100 as part of the Great Streets project.

We were also notified that our recent TAP application for federal funding to construct a new pedestrian tunnel under Route 109 just south of Route 100 was tentatively approved by the East-West Gateway Council of Governments. Therefore, our STP-S application will assume that the TAP funding is already approved and thus the pedestrian tunnel would be constructed as a separate project planned in conjunction with these improvements.

The unfunded cost of the improvements to Route 109 has been estimated to be about $5,200,000. The Department is recommending the city provide a 20% local match, which would equate to about $1,040,000. (Note that our cost estimates for this project are currently being evaluated and are still subject to some change.)

Reasons for Recommendation

- This project will continue the recent improvements on Route 109 which have slowed traffic, improved traffic flow and safety, as well as provided improved bike and pedestrian facilities within the corridor.
- This project will promote and facilitate development of the Town Center, provide for a Main Street roundabout connection, and enhance the appearance of Route 109 through Town Center.
- By obtaining federal funds we can leverage our existing capital improvement funds (our local match would be 20%). We can also leverage the fact that MoDOT is also programming a $2.3M project to re-deck and widen the Route 109 overpass over Route 100 to 4-lanes.
- By sponsoring this project, the City has the opportunity to directly influence future improvements to Route 109 (recognizing that MoDOT will ultimately approve the project design).

Attached for your information is the Project Development Workbook for the STP-S funding program, which includes the scoring criteria. Final applications are due on March 3, 2016, and will require a City Resolution in support of the application.

I will be available for any questions or comments at the February 2nd, 2016, Admin / Public Works Committee meeting.

RCB



LEGEND

- ROUTE 109 CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS
- PEDESTRIAN CULVERT UNDER ROUTE 109 AND 10'-0"(10') SHARED USE PATH - TAP FUNDING PENDING
- POTENTIAL AREA FOR WATER QUALITY FEATURE
- BY OTHERS

SCALE

0 100 200 300



TYPICAL SECTION - ROUTE 109
MANCHESTER ROAD TO MAIN STREET
(LOOKING SOUTH)



TYPICAL SECTION - ROUTE 109
BRIDGE ACROSS ROUTE 100
(LOOKING SOUTH)

WILDWOOD

HRGreen

ST. LOUIS COUNTY

EXHIBIT 1

ROUTE 109 CORRIDOR FUTURE IMRPOVEMENTS

Project Development Workbook

FY 2017-2020 Local Program

Surface Transportation Program – Suballocated (STP-S)

Gateway Tower
One Memorial Drive, Suite 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2451

EAST-WEST GATEWAY
Council of Governments

Creating Solutions Across Jurisdictional Boundaries

December 2015

Table of Contents

I. New Project Application Process

II. FY 2017-2020 TIP Development Guidelines
- A. Introduction
- B. Geographic Scope
- C. General Policies
- D. Project Sponsorship
- E. Project Requirements

III. Surface Transportation Program - Suballocated (STP-S)
- A. Program Summary
- B. Project Eligibility

IV. STP-S Project Development and Selection Process
- A. Project Identification and Development
- B. Project Evaluation
- C. Project Selection
- D. Policy on Reasonable Progress

V. Congestion Management Report

Appendix A Eligible Activities for STP-S program
Appendix B Congestion Management Strategies
Appendix C Environmental Justice and Project Utilization Index
Appendix D Glossary of Terms
Appendix E Roadway Safety Audit
Appendix F Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) for Sidewalk Evaluation
- Environmental Justice – Project Utilization Index (PUI)

I. New Project Application Process

Project sponsors interested in proposing projects for consideration under the Surface Transportation Program – Suballocated (STP-S) Program should do so by submitting an application by **Thursday, March 3, 2016, 4:00 p.m**. The STP-S New Project Online Application form can be accessed at: http://www.ewgateway.org/tiponlineapp/stp2016.pdf

The application is completed on the East-West Gateway (EWG) website. This file stores vital project information that is used to evaluate the projects. It's important that the data entered into our online application matches the completed project application delivered to EWG.

Project sponsors wanting feedback on applications may submit a preliminary copy by February 4, 2016. Simply mark preliminary on the application by that date if you desire comments. Due to volume of applications, each sponsor may receive no more than three preliminary application reviews (for all funding categories). East-West Gateway staff will review the applications submitted and comment by e-mail. Staff will return comments by February 18, 2016. If submitting a preliminary application for feedback, a final application must be submitted by March 3, 2016.

An application fee is required for each project that is submitted for consideration. The application fee is ½ of 1% of the federal funds being requested. For example, a sponsor requesting $800,000 in federal funding would be required to pay a $4,000 application fee. If the project is not recommended for funding, the application fee will be refunded. Counties (including the City of St. Louis) and states make annual contributions to East-West Gateway and as such a credit equal to their annual contribution is applied against their application fees.

Sponsors are encouraged to read the guidelines included in this workbook regarding project eligibility, the selection process, and the Policy on Reasonable Progress. Evaluation of individual projects, including air quality conformity, will utilize information provided in all areas of the application. Please provide all information as completely as possible. Additional relevant project data may be attached and is encouraged. If any of the information requested is unclear, incomplete, or missing, or if there are questions of applicability, contact Jason Lange in MO: (314) 421-4220 or IL: (618) 274-2750. Staff will provide assistance upon request.

A completed project application consists of one (1) printed original application, signatures, and supplemental information <u>and</u> one (1) electronic copy in Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) format containing the project application/signatures/supplemental information. Do not send or include multiple files, send one .pdf. Failure to provide supporting documentation for the evaluation areas will result in zero points for that area.

The printed original application must be postmarked by Thursday, March 3, 2016. Hand delivered originals and the electronic copy must be submitted by 4:00 p.m. on Thursday March 3, 2016. Electronic copies may be emailed, burned on a CD/DVD, or stored on a

removable disk drive in Adobe Acrobat file (.pdf). Applications received after the deadline will not be accepted. Early submissions are appreciated. Only use binder clips when submitting the printed project application/signatures/supplemental information. Sponsors may divide sections using tabs. **Please make sure applications are NOT bound or stapled.**

Project applications should be addressed to:

East-West Gateway Council of Governments
Attn: Transportation Planning Dept. - STP-S
Gateway Tower
One Memorial Drive, Suite 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102

Electronic submissions not included with final application should be emailed to: jason.lange@ewgateway.org. The subject should read: <Your City> - <Project Title> Application. For example: Subject: Big City - Main Street Intersection Application.

While sponsors are encouraged to provide as much additional relevant background information as they deem necessary, no project will be evaluated unless the application submitted by March 3, 2016 includes:

- Completed Project Application - Marked 'final'
  - Please note that the application form for new project submittals (STP-S New Project Application form) is available online only. http://www.ewgateway.org/tiponlineapp/stp2016.pdf
- Project application fee (½ percent of federal funds requested)
- Project application checklist (with signature)
- Supplemental materials including as necessary: pavement ratings, bridge ratings (from state DOT), accident data (summary of police reports), Level of Service Calculations). Failure to include required data will result in zero points in the associated category
- Location map
- Letter of permission from owner of facility (required if sponsor does not own roadway)
- Congestion Management Study, if required
- Estimate of Project cost* – download excel file from TIP application page
- Crash Summary Form* – download excel file from TIP application page (if necessary)
- ITS project consistency statement* (if necessary) – found on TIP application page
- Letter of project support from third party providing financial support (if necessary)
- Project Schedule
- Financial Certification of Matching Funds Signatures
- Person of Reasonable Charge Certification signatures
- Title VI Certification signatures

- Reasonable Progress and Right-of-Way Certification signatures (Missouri Projects Only)
- Typical section showing current and proposed improvements including bike/ped facility widths, lane widths, shoulder widths, # of lanes, etc. (One cross-sction should show current, the second should show proposed)

Other required information includes:

- Operations and Maintenance form

Only one Operations and Maintenance form is required per sponsor regardless of the total number of projects submitted.

*Changes to STP-S application/evaluation since last round. Details follow in workbook.

- Crash Summary Form (.xls) – Sponsor must complete this form to gain points in safety. No form = zero points. Form found on TIP application page
- ITS project consistency statement required if ITS elements in project.
- Estimate of project cost (formerly detailed cost estimate) is required to be submitted as an excel file as well as included in the application.

II. FY 2017-2020 TIP Development Guidelines

A. Introduction

The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) as enacted by Congress and signed by the President on December 4, 2015 includes regulations for categorical funding programs for highway projects and provides flexibility in the funding of all transportation projects. Opportunities are provided to fund roadway, transit, and other transportation projects from a number of funding categories.

Under FAST, a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is required to develop fiscally constrained long-range transportation plans and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP). The East-West Gateway Council of Governments, as the MPO for the St. Louis region, selects projects in accordance with principles and framework identified in the long-range transportation plan for the region, *Connected2045*. These projects must be consistent with the region's goals, objectives, and priorities in consultation with the states. The development of the FY 2017-2020 TIP is guided by metropolitan transportation planning, FAST, Section 1201.

B. Geographic Scope

The entire eight-county metropolitan area will be included in the FY 2017-2020 TIP. The area includes Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair counties in Illinois; the City of St. Louis; and Franklin, Jefferson, St. Charles, and St. Louis counties in Missouri.

C. General Policies

General policies established in FAST are followed in the programming of local transportation projects submitted for the FY 2017-2020 TIP.

- Project funding in the FY 2017-2020 TIP shall not exceed the anticipated available funds.
- The TIP will be limited to a single four-year period and be fiscally constrained.
- Procedures for the evaluation, selection, and programming of new projects in the FY 2017-2020 TIP will be based on policies and criteria approved by the EWGCOG Board of Directors and will be consistent with the provisions, regulatory guidance, and intent of FAST
- Projects will be programmed in specific federal funding categories suballocated through the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. The funding categories included in this workbook are the Surface Transportation Program (STP-S) for Missouri and Illinois.
- Illinois - STP-S funds are available only for construction (not construction engineering) in FY 2020. Sponsors will be asked to revise the financial plan page and schedule in the application if applicable.
- Missouri - STP-S Funds are available starting in FY 2018 (preliminary engineering only), FY 2019 (except construction), and FY 2020 for three phases of work: preliminary engineering, right of way acquisition, and construction (including construction engineering). Sponsors will be asked to revise the financial plan page and schedule in the application if the financial plan does not match the funding availability.

D. Project Sponsorship

Projects must have an appropriate government sponsor. Sponsors include but are not limited to states, counties, municipalities, and transit districts. Not-for-Profits must seek an appropriate government sponsor to act as sponsor for their project. Sponsors are encouraged to coordinate planning efforts and improvements with other governmental entities, agencies, and organizations. Missouri project sponsorship is defined in the Local Public Agency Manual (136.1.2.2)

E. Project Requirements

Responsibilities associated with project sponsorship through the project development and implementation process include:

- Providing an application fee of ½ of one percent of the total federal funds requested for each project, in compliance with a policy of the EWG Board of Directors. For example, if a sponsor is requesting federal funds in the amount of $800,000 for a particular project, then the application fee for that project would be $4,000. The application fee will be refunded if the project is not selected for inclusion in the FY 2017-2020 TIP. The refund occurs after approval of the FY 2017-2020 TIP.
- Ensuring the proper documentation is submitted with the formal application. See checklist at the end of the project application. This includes all relevant data to support measures of facility conditions as well as relevant supporting data from such sources as the US Census.

- Securing at least 20% local matching funds in Missouri and 25% local matching funds in Illinois and providing operations and maintenance information
- Reporting and maintaining all records and receipts as required by the procedures established by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and appropriate state transportation agency.
- Sponsor is compliant with laws and regulations including, but not limited to: FAST, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970
- Sponsors must document a 'Person of Responsible Charge'. Missouri sponsors must have at least one staff person that has completed Local Public Agency Basic Training. Information on classes is available here: http://www.modot.org/business/lpa/cert_train.htm
- Sponsor of selected project required to attend one public open house meeting (Missouri local public agency sponsors)
- Sponsor commits to ongoing maintenance of facility following end of federal-aid work

Where applicable, projects must comply with the Regional ITS Standards as set forth in the document titled Bi-State St. Louis Regional ITS Architecture, July 2015 (found at: bit.ly/EWGITS) as well as the Congestion Management Process (CMP). The CMP (found at: bit.ly/EWGCMP) is an objectives-driven and performance based approach to defining and managing congestion that makes the transportation system performance and congestion management a core activity, as opposed to an isolated standalone process and function. The project application should identify what CMP goals/objectives the project addresses and how they will be achieved. Projects with ITS components are required to complete the ITS project consistency statement.

It is the policy of EWGCOG to encourage involvement by the public sector and citizens in the transportation decision making process for the St. Louis region.

The same project application is used for Missouri and Illinois projects.

III. Surface Transportation Program - Suballocated (STP-S)

A. Program Summary

FAST has authorized funding through the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP). FAST prescribes minimum levels of STPBGP funds that must be spent in the metropolitan area, called Suballocated or STP-S funds. The Missouri portion of the region receives funds based on the state of Missouri's federal funding allocation. The Illinois portion of the region receives funds based on the state of Illinois's federal funding allocation.

Projects in the STP-S category will be selected by East-West Gateway in consultation with the states. This funding category has the widest array of eligible projects. Some of

the projects that can be funded in this category include road resurfacing and reconstruction, bridge improvements, traffic flow improvements, capital improvements to intelligent transportation systems (ITS), public transit projects, carpool projects, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. Utility relocations associated with a project may utilize federal funds as well. See **Appendix A** for a listing of eligible activities for STP-S funds.

B. Project Eligibility

Two criteria determine project eligibility.

1. The improvement or service must be consistent with the regional priorities outlined in *Connected2045*, the long-range transportation plan for the St. Louis region.
2. Road improvements must be on a public road (existing or planned) that is federally functionally classified as an urban collector (minor or major), a rural major collector, an arterial, or an expressway. Funding for bridge replacements or rehabilitations is limited to deficient bridges. The list of bridges eligible for STP-S funding can be found at: bit.ly/STPbridge2015 or bit.ly/BRMbridge2015. Bridge projects using STP-S funds are not restricted to the roadway classification requirement and can be on any public road. Bridge projects on routes classified as local roads or rural minor collectors may include reasonable approach roadway necessary to connect to the existing road and to return the new grade to normal ground. Also projects listed in paragraphs (4) through (11) in **Appendix A** are exempt from functional class requirements. More information on roadway functional class is available at: www.ewgateway.org/trans/funcclass/funcclass.htm

IV. STP-S Project Development and Selection Process

A. Project Identification and Development

Figure 1



The development, selection, and implementation of STP-S projects is a process involving agencies at the local, state, and federal levels. Interaction, coordination, and consultation are required for a project to go from development to implementation. **Figure 1** illustrates the process projects must go through and the agencies involved in funding a project through the STP-S program.

Project sponsors are responsible for developing the potential STP-S projects and submitting the projects to the East-West Gateway Council of Governments for review and evaluation. Project submissions should be completed according to the guidelines described in this workbook.

Once EWGCOG staff, in consultation with the states and citizens of the region, has reviewed, evaluated, and ranked the STP-S candidate projects, projects recommended for funding are presented to the Board of Directors for approval. Approved projects are then included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is reviewed by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency to determine project eligibility and compliance with air quality requirements. After the approval of the TIP by these federal agencies, projects included therein are eligible to receive federal funds. Project sponsors then work directly with the state department of transportation or federal agency to arrange for reimbursement of project expenses.

B. Project Evaluation

Working together through the MPO and in consultation with the states, committees of local government representatives are responsible for selecting projects in the local STP-S program.

For both the Illinois and Missouri portions of the region, EWGCOG staff evaluates local projects relative to how well they address the ten principles and strategies outlined in *Connected2045*. In addition, each project is evaluated based on utilization, cost effectiveness, and need, with consideration given to equity among the many jurisdictions within the region. Then projects are ranked based on these criteria.

Following is a detailed description of the evaluation and ranking process that EWGCOG staff uses to determine the best investment of federal transportation funds to locally sponsored projects:

(a) Projects undergo a screening process to determine project and sponsor eligibility, availability of local matching funds and a feasible financial plan, and financial need.

(b) Council staff evaluates local projects submitted for inclusion in the TIP with respect to how well they would meet each of the six project priority areas and be consistent with the ten principles that make up the framework of *Connected2045*. These six priority areas constitute an inclusive and strategic framework to ensure that the needs of transportation system users constitute the principle reference

points for regional decision-making. The six project priority areas (in order of regional significance) and the goals of each are:

i. **Preservation of the Existing Infrastructure** - Achieved by managing and maintaining current roadway, bridge, transit, and intermodal assets.
ii. **Safety and Security in Travel** - Achieved by decreasing the risk of personal injury and property damage on, in, and around transportation facilities.
iii. **Congestion Management** - Achieved by ensuring that congestion of the region's roadways does not reach levels that compromise economic competitiveness.
iv. **Access to Opportunity** - Achieved by addressing the complex mobility needs of persons living in low-income communities and persons with disabilities.
v. **Sustainable Development** - Achieved by accommodating all users and modes of travel
vi. **Efficient Movement of Goods** - Achieved by improving the movement of freight within and through the region by rail, water, air, and surface transportation modes

Only one priority area may be selected as a primary priority area and the primary priority cannot be changed. Council staff has refined these performance measures and incorporated them into the evaluation process for local transportation projects submitted for TIP consideration. The performance measures are intended to be indicators of the magnitude of need of a submitted improvement.

To receive points in each area, the sponsor is required to provide supporting documentation along with the project application submittal. This information includes:

Preservation

-Pavement – Pavement condition rating number must be listed in the system condition box on page 9 of the application. Documentation must be provided to show how the pavement condition was reached. LPAs with a pavement management system may include a printout of the pavement management database showing the rating of the facility and in. If a pavement management system is used, the LPA must reference the software used in the application. LPAs without a pavement management system must use a visual rating system (for example, PASER). If a visual rating system is used, this system must be referenced in the application. If a visual rating system is used then the pavement must be rated at locations at a uniform distance. Photographs of the pavement at the rating locations are required as well as a map showing the rating locations.

-Bridge – Bridge rating must be listed in the system condition box on page 9 of the application. A printout of the state's bridge inspection report is required. If a bridge inspection report is not available, contact EWG staff for assistance.

-Signal/Transit/Port/Freight – Provide supporting documentation to document the condition

-Bike/Ped – Average PSR rating must be listed in the system condition box on page 9 of the application. If project is on a local road or minor collector the maximum points a project can receive in preservation is one unless project is located within ½ mile of a PUI grid of 3. See appendix F of the workbook for information on evaluation of sidewalks.

Safety

-Road/Intersection – Crash Summary Form – Sponsor must complete this form to gain points in safety. No points will be awarded if the documentation is not provided. This form must be downloaded from TIP application page

-Bridge – LPA must include state inspection report

-Transit/Other – Provide supporting documentation to document the condition

-Bike/Ped – Proposed facility must meet criteria to gain points. Points gained based on minimum widths

Congestion

- Road/bridge/intersection - To gain points, the LPA must show calculations showing peak hour level of service and document that the parts of the project that would include the level of service (i.e center turn lane). ITS Project Consistency Statement must be completed if project impacts ITS. Statement can be downloaded from TIP application page.

- Transit/Education/etc. – Provide supporting documentation to document the condition

Access to Opportunity

- LPA must indicate on Page 12 of the application what transit route is within ½ mile of project. A map showing this route must be attached. EWG Staff determines what areas are within environmental justice area. This information is in Appendix F

Sustainable Development.

- To gain 3 or 5 points, the LPA must indicate the project is within ½ mile of a PUI of 3 or higher. The LPA must include a reference from an approved plan to the project or type of project. The LPA must not include the entire plan. If the reference in the plan is not readily found then the LPA will get zero points.

Goods Movement

-Improvement must be freight specific

(c) Facility utilization is part of the criteria for determining a project's benefits. To cut across modes (roads, transit, etc.), the unit of measure used for utilization is Person Miles of Travel (PMT). PMT is a function of vehicle occupancy, number of vehicles, and project length. Points are added to the project's score depending on where the PMT falls within a specified range.

(d) Cost effectiveness is determined for each project by dividing the annualized amount of total federal funds requested for project implementation by the total project score.

(e) Finally, all projects are ordered by cost effectiveness. Projects that are identically ranked are arranged by cost, from lowest to highest. If two projects have an identical cost effectiveness measure, the project requesting a lesser amount of federal funds will be determined to have higher priority.

In Illinois, locally sponsored projects receive significant review from committees of elected officials established in each of the three counties. These committees in turn make recommendations to the Illinois Transportation Planning Committee, which then ranks projects using the established project evaluation criteria as a tool. The Missouri Transportation Planning Committee follows a similar process in reviewing the project rankings developed by the EWGCOG staff.

The following set of principles assists EWGCOG staff and the planning committees in each state in reaching consensus on the program of local projects:

1. All projects must be consistent with clean air requirements and conform to the state's implementation plans for air quality.
2. All projects must have a financial plan that demonstrates how the sponsor will pay for the project.
3. Projects must have a reasonable, demonstrated degree of political and community support.
4. Provisions are made to encourage reasonable program equity among the counties.
5. Efforts are made to obtain maximum advantage of flexibility in the use of financial resources and ensure full use of federal, state, and local funds available to the region.
6. Each county (including the City of St. Louis) should have at least one project.

Funds anticipated for local projects are committed to the highest ranking projects. Adjustments are made to ensure each county has at least one project.

C. Project Selection

Project selection involves setting the priority list of eligible projects for funding through the STP-S program. These priorities are established locally and are based in large part on the project's consistency with *Connected2045*. Decisions regarding project selection are accomplished through the regional transportation planning process involving the East-West Gateway Council of Governments, Missouri Department of Transportation, Illinois Department of Transportation, local transit providers, and the citizens of the region.

Two significant factors play a role in setting priorities for projects:

- Cost Effectiveness
- Project/Program Priority in the long range transportation plan

Cost effectiveness is used in the project selection process as a primary measure to establish priority. Projects that are highly cost effective have a higher priority than ones with a low cost effectiveness. This measure is used as a means of comparing various types of projects in a common way: cost per unit of benefit. Once projects are evaluated, they are ranked relative to cost effectiveness.

As illustrated in **Figure 2**, each of the evaluation areas are based on performance measures set in *Connected2045*. Projects above the "Budget Line" on the priority scale are considered "high priority" projects and will be included in the list of projects recommended for inclusion in the TIP. Projects recommended for inclusion in the TIP through the STP-S project selection process are presented to the Transportation Planning Committees (TPCs), the Interagency Consultation Group (IACG), the Executive Advisory Committee (EAC), and the Board of Directors of the EWGCOG. Additionally, public participation requirements will apply to the projects recommended for inclusion in the TIP.

Figure 2



D. Policy on Reasonable Progress

There has been increased concern in recent years regarding the implementation of projects programmed in the TIP. For various reasons, some projects have not progressed toward implementation several years after being programmed. The policy on Reasonable Progress has helped increase the number of programmed projects that are implemented in a timely manner. The implementation status of projects in this and previous TIPs is accounted for and reported through the Project Monitoring and Tracking Process.

For projects or programs included in the TIP, “reasonable progress” will have been made if the project has advanced to the point of obligating all federal funds programmed for that project in the current fiscal year, regardless of the phase of work (i.e., Preliminary Engineering (PE), Right of Way Acquisition (ROW), or Plans Specifications and Estimates (PSE)/Construction). If a project fails to obligate the programmed federal funds by September 30 of the current year, the funding for that year will be forfeited and returned to the regional funding pot. Actual progress toward implementation is measured against the schedule submitted by the project sponsor in the project application.

Reasonable Progress Policy Enforcement

Projects that do not obligate all federal funds for use by the September 30 suspense date will be removed from the TIP, and the federal funds associated with those projects will be returned to the regional funding pool for redistribution. The removal of projects from the TIP will require no further Board action and the sponsor would have to repay any federal funds already spent if the funding is forfeited.

If a project is realizing delays that will put the federal funding at risk of forfeiture (i.e., not meet a September 30 deadline), the project sponsor will have the opportunity to ask for consideration of a “one-time extension” in their project schedule. The one-time extension can only be requested for the implementation/construction phase of the project. The extension request will only be considered once a year, and has to be made before June 1 of the current fiscal year of the TIP.

To be considered for this extension the sponsor has to demonstrate on all counts: a.) The delay is beyond their control and the sponsor has done diligence in progressing the project; b.) Federal funds have already been obligated on the project or in cases that no federal funds are used for PE and/or ROW acquisition, there has been significant progress toward final plan preparation; c.) There is a realistic strategy is in place to obligate all funds.

One-time extensions of up to three (3) months may be granted by East-West Gateway staff and one-time extensions greater than three (3) months, but not more than nine (9) months, will go to the Board of Directors for their consideration and approval. Projects requesting schedule advancements will be handled on a case-by-case basis (subject to available funding) and are subject to the Board adopted rules for TIP modifications.

Reasonable Progress Project Monitoring

An extensive monitoring program has been developed to help track programmed projects and ensure that funding commitments and plans are met. Monthly tracking reports are developed and posted on the East-West Gateway website, utilizing project information provided by the project sponsor, IDOT and MoDOT District offices. Additionally, project sponsors are contacted, at least every six months, by EWGCOG staff for project status interviews.

VI. Congestion Management Report and Regional ITS Architecture

Additional analysis is required by all project sponsors proposing a project to increase the carrying capacity for single occupant vehicles by adding through lanes or constructing a new road where the road is or will be classified on the Federal Roadway Functional Classification as an Arterial or above and extends for more than one mile or the whole distance between major route intersections. A major route intersection is where both of the intersecting roads are classified as an arterial or above.

This documentation must be submitted by the sponsoring agency and show that proper consideration of demand management strategies to address the congestion problems have been given.

To meet this requirement, an evaluation of the impact to SOV capacity of reasonable demand management strategies that fit in the corridor must be completed. The evaluation should estimate the ADT that can be reduced by the demand management strategies. If the remaining future ADT, after taking into account the reduction of SOVs as a result of reasonable demand management strategies, is sufficient to justify the increased capacity, the project is eligible to be added to the TIP.

The analysis must follow the framework of the *St. Louis Region Congestion Management Process Mitigation Handbook* and be included with the project application. The Congestion Mitigation Handbook provides a systematic approach and guidance for considering alternative strategies to address congestion. The handbook is available through EWGCOG and can be obtained by contacting Jason Lange in MO: (314) 421-4220 or IL: (618) 274-2750. The report should state whether or not the sponsor has considered all reasonable available strategies to manage the facility before choosing the proposed improvement. If the strategies are not being included, the report should state why. The strategies are included in **Appendix B**.

Projects with ITS elements must complete the ITS Project Consistency Statement. The statement is found on the TIP application web page.

APPENDIX A – Eligible Activities for STP-S program

(1) Construction of—

(A) highways, bridges, tunnels, including designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under section 14501 of title 40;

(B) ferry boats and terminal facilities eligible for funding under section 129(c);

(C) transit capital projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49;

(D) infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements;

(E) truck parking facilities eligible for funding under section 1401 of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 137 note); and

(F) border infrastructure projects eligible for funding under section 1303 of SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note).

(2) Operational improvements and capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs.

(3) Environmental measures eligible under sections 119(g), 328, and 329 and transportation control measures listed in section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi) of that section) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408(f)(1)(A)).

(4) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, including railway-highway grade crossings.

(5) Fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs in accordance with section 137 and carpool projects in accordance with section 146.

(6) Recreational trails projects eligible for funding under section 206, pedestrian and bicycle projects in accordance with section 217 (including modifications to comply with accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.)), and the safe routes to school program under section 1404 of SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note).

(7) Planning, design, or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

(8) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System and a performance-based management program for other public roads.

(9) Protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) for bridges (including approaches to bridges and other elevated structures)

and tunnels on public roads, and inspection and evaluation
of bridges and tunnels and other highway assets.
(10) Surface transportation planning programs, highway
and transit research and development and technology transfer
programs, and workforce development, training, and education
under chapter 5 of this title.
H. R. 22—29
(11) Surface transportation infrastructure modifications
to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access
into and out of a port terminal.
(12) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion
pricing, including electronic toll collection and travel demand
management strategies and programs.
(13) At the request of a State, and upon Secretarial
approval of credit assistance under chapter 6, subsidy and
administrative costs necessary to provide an eligible entity
Federal credit assistance under chapter 6 with respect to a
project eligible for assistance under this section.
(14) The creation and operation by a State of an office
to assist in the design, implementation, and oversight of publicprivate
partnerships eligible to receive funding under this title
and chapter 53 of title 49, and the payment of a stipend
to unsuccessful private bidders to offset their proposal development
costs, if necessary to encourage robust competition in
public-private partnership procurements.
(15) Any type of project eligible under this section as
in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the FAST
Act, including projects described under section 101(a)(29) as
in effect on such day.

Appendix B - Congestion Management Strategies

Potential Congestion Management Strategies	
Strategy Class	**Representative Strategies/Measures**
Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Measures	Ridesharing (carpool/vanpool) Alternative Work Arrangements (telecommuting, flex-time, compressed work week) Transit and/or Shared Ride Subsidies Parking Management Guaranteed Ride Home Programs
Traffic Operational Improvements	Traffic Signal Improvements (timing improvements, demand-responsive signals, coordinated systems, computerized systems) Roadway geometric Improvements (turn lanes, acceleration/deceleration lanes, channelization) Time-of-Day Restrictions (turn restrictions, truck restrictions) Ramp Metering Commercial Vehicle Improvements Construction Management
High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Measures	HOV Lane Priority HOV Signal Priority HOV Access Priority (ramp by-pass) Support Facilities and Services (park-and-ride facilities)
Public Transit Capital Improvements	Exclusive Right-of-Way (rail, busways, bus lanes) Bus By-Pass Ramps Fleet Expansion Vehicle Replacement/Upgrades Transit Vehicle Management Systems Park-and-Ride Facilities Mode Change facilities (transit centers, transit rail stations)
Public Transit Operational Improvements	Transit Service Improvements (frequency, stop frequency, vehicle type, operating hours) Transit Routing Changes (modifications, expansion) Transit Coordination/Marketing Transit Information Systems Fare Reductions or Packages Traffic Operations (signal preemption, turnouts, rail crossing coordination)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	Infrastructure Improvements (bike lanes, paths, sidewalks) Support Services (bike racks and lockers, bike route maps)
Congestion Pricing	Road User Fees Parking Fees
Growth Management Strategies	Land Use Policies/Regulation Design Standards
Access Management	Driveway Control Median Control Frontage Roads
Incident Management	Detections Response Clearance Information/Routing
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	Advanced Traffic Management Systems (ATMS) Advanced Traveler Information Systems (ATIS) Advanced Public Transportation Systems (APTS) Commercial Vehicle Operations (CVO)
General Purpose Lanes	Freeway Lanes Arterial Lanes

APPENDIX C – Environmental Justice and Project Utilization Index

Environmental Justice (EJ)

To gain five points in the Access to Opportunity priority condition in the project application, the project must be located within a census tract or block group with above median proportions of racial minorities, poverty, disabilities, zero car households, or seniors. The map below shows EJ areas.



Project Utilization Index

Using current or forecast data, the GIS tool allows us to develop project utilization index (PUI) within EWG region that meet or exceed threshold levels of land use (i.e., population, employment, and retails) and transit (i.e., LRT stations, bus stops, METRO and MTC transit centers). All datasets and their output are classified by manual breaks based on the combination of our best knowledge and judgment. Then, each range is assigned to the scores (0-5).



APPENDIX D – Glossary of Terms

Average Daily Traffic (ADT): The average number of vehicles passing a fixed point in a 24-hour time frame.

Bridge Sufficiency Rating: A rating of the structural soundness of a bridge conducted by the state department of transportation.

Carbon Monoxide (CO): A gas without color and odor which is toxic because too much of it can dangerously reduce oxygen in the bloodstream.

Congestion Management Process (CMP): Replaced the Congestion Management System (CMS) concept. SAFETEA-LU requires that each Transportation Management Area (see definition of TMA) address congestion management through a *process* that provides for effective management and operation of new and existing transportation facilities through the use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies. Unless they are part of a CMP, future highway projects that significantly increase capacity for single occupant vehicles (SOVs) generally are ineligible for federal funds.

East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWGCOG): The council of governments, regional planning commission, and federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the St. Louis region. As MPO, East-West Gateway is responsible for the planning and coordination of federally-funded transportation programs in the region, and related short and long-range planning.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): EPA is the source agency of air quality control regulations affecting transportation.

Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST): Enacted by Congress and signed by the President in December 2015

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): Division of the U.S. Department of Transportation which funds highway planning and programs.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA): Division of the U.S. Department of Transportation which funds transit planning and programs.

Fiscal Year (FY): Federal fiscal year that begins October 1 and ends September 30 of the next calendar year.

Functional Class: Functional classification is the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide. Examples include: interstate, expressway, principal arterial, minor

arterial, collector, rural minor collector, and local street. Usage of federal funds can be limited by the roadway functional class.

Highway: Term applies to roads, streets, and parkways, and also includes rights-of-way, bridges, railroad crossings, tunnels, drainage structures, signs, guard rails, and protective structures in connection with highways.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP): New SAFETEA-LU program structured and funded to make significant progress in reducing highway fatalities. Replaces the 10% set-aside for safety in the Surface Transportation Program (STP-F) under TEA-21. Increases funding for infrastructure safety and requires strategic highway safety planning.

Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT): The department charged by Illinois state law with the responsibility of highway construction.

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA): IEPA is the state environmental protection agency that monitors and enforces the regulations pertaining to air quality control and transportation.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS): Uses state of the art technology to improve travel on a region's major roadways

Level of Service: Measure of the quality of flow of a transportation facility. Level of service definitions generally describe traffic conditions in terms of speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience. It is characterized by a letter from A to F, with LOS A being the best operating conditions and LOS F being the worst.

Madison County Transit (MCT): MCT is the transit service operating agency of the Madison County, Illinois Transit District. The District funds MCT as well as Metro bus services and ACT paratransit through a 1/4-cent sales tax.

Major Transportation Investment Analysis (MTIA): A study, required by ISTEA, to evaluate alternative transportation solutions to a corridor or subarea transportation problem.

Metro (formerly Bi-State Development Agency): The federally designated mass transit operator for the St. Louis region.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO): The organizational designated by law with lead responsibility for developing transportation plans and programs in urbanized areas of 50,000 of more in population. The East-West Gateway Council of Governments was incorporated in 1965 as the metropolitan planning organization for the City of St. Louis; Franklin, Jefferson, St. Charles, and St. Louis counties in Missouri; and Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair counties in Illinois.

Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT): The department charged by Missouri state law with the responsibility of highway construction.

Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MoDNR): MoDNR is the state agency with the responsibility to monitor and enforce the regulations pertaining to air quality control and transportation.

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21): By transforming the policy and programmatic framework for investments to guide the system's growth and development, MAP-21 creates a streamlined and performance-based surface transportation program and builds on many of the highway, transit, bike, and pedestrian programs and policies established in 1991.

Off-System Bridge Funds (BRO): An annual allocation of Bridge funds available to Missouri counties for bridge replacement or rehabilitation projects on off system roadways. These funds are distributed to counties by the state.

On-System Bridge Funds (BRM): A allocation of Bridge funds available to Missouri counties to replace or rehabilitate a bridge on a roadway functionally classified as a collector or above. These funds are programmed by the EWGCOG.

Project Utilization Index (PUI): A measure of landuse (i.e population, employment, and retail) and transit (i.e. MetroLink stations, bus stops, transit centers).

Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU): Legislative initiative by the U.S. Congress reauthorizing and restructuring funding and planning for highway and transit programs. SAFETEA-LU authorizes increased levels of highway and transportation funding beyond ISTEA and TEA-21.

Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV): A SOV is a vehicle used to get just one person to a destination.

State Implementation Plan (SIP): A required planning document prepared by states and submitted to EPA for approval. SIPs identify state actions and programs to implement designated responsibilities under the Clean Air Act.

Surface Transportation Program (STP): A categorical funding program that can be used for a wide variety of purposes, including: roadway construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation; roadway operational improvements; capital costs for transit projects; highway and transit safety improvements; bicycle and pedestrian facilities; scenic and historical transportation facilities; preservation of abandoned transportation corridors; advanced truck stop electrification systems; projects relating to intersections that have disproportionately high accident rates and have high congestion; environmental restoration and pollution abatement; and control of terrestrial and aquatic noxious weeds and establishment of native species. Funds are distributed to

states based on each state's lane miles of Federal-aid highways, total vehicle miles traveled on those highways, and estimated contributions to the Highway Trust Fund.

Surface Transportation Program - Enhancement (STP-E): A 10% set aside of the statewide STP apportionment that must be used for non-traditional transportation projects.

Surface Transportation Program - Suballocated (STP-S): A minimum amount of the statewide STP apportionment available to metropolitan areas over 200,000 population. These funds are programmed by the EWGCOG.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): The official list of projects that are programmed for implementation over the next four years.

Transportation Management Area (TMA): All urbanized areas over 200,000 in population. Within a TMA, all transportation plans and programs must be based on a continuing and comprehensive planning process carried out by the Metropolitan Planning Organization in cooperation with states and transit operators. The TMA boundary affects the responsibility for the selection of transportation projects that receive federal funds.

Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): A standard area-wide measure of travel activity. Most conventional VMT calculation is to multiply average length of trip by the total number of trips.

Vehicle Occupancy Rate (VOC): Persons per passenger vehicle. Average Daily Traffic (ADT): The average number of vehicles passing a fixed point in a 24-hour time frame.

APPENDIX E - Roadway Safety Audit

A Road Safety Audit (RSA) is the formal safety performance examination of an existing or future road or intersection by an independent, multidisciplinary team. It qualitatively estimates and reports on potential road safety issues and identifies opportunities for improvements in safety for all road users. The FHWA works with State and local jurisdictions to integrate RSAs into the project development process for new roads and intersections, and also encourages RSAs on existing roads and intersections.

The aim of an RSA is to answer the following questions:

- What elements of the road may present a safety concern: to what extent, to which road users, and under what circumstances?
- What opportunities exist to eliminate or mitigate identified safety concerns?

Public agencies with a desire to improve the overall safety performance of roadways under their jurisdiction should be excited about the concept of RSAs. Road safety audits can be used in any phase of project development from planning and preliminary engineering, design and construction. RSAs can also be used on any sized project from minor intersection and roadway retrofits to mega-projects.

Most State DOTs have established traditional safety review processes. However, a road safety audit and a traditional safety review are different processes. It is important to understand the difference between the road safety reviews that are commonly performed and newer road safety audits. The main differences between the two are shown below:

What is the difference between RSA and a Traditional Safety Review?

Road Safety Audit	Traditional Safety Review
Performed by a team independent of the project	The safety review team is usually not completely independent of the design team.
Performed by a multi-disciplinary team	Typically performed by a team with only design and/or safety expertise.
Considers all potential road users	Often concentrates on motorized traffic.
Accounting for road user capabilities and limitations is an essential element of an RSA	Safety Reviews do not normally consider human factor issues.
Always generates a formal RSA report	Often does not generate a formal report.
A formal response report is an essential element of an RSA	Often does not generate a formal response report.

Please refer to the Federal Highway Administration's RSA section at http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/rsa/

APPENDIX F – Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) for Sidewalk Evaluation -

Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) for Sidewalk Evaluation

For projects that are replacing existing sidewalks, the sponsor is required to evaluate the current sidewalk conditions. Replacement sidewalks would be evaluated with preservation as the main priority, while new sidewalks would be evaluated with safety as the main priority. If project is a hybrid (new sidewalk where none exist and sidewalk replacement) please contact Gateway staff for additional guidance.

The PSR provides a visual rating system for sidewalks. Due to the subjective nature of condition assessment, it is recommended that a team independently rates each sidewalk, and then reveals and explains their rating to each other. After negotiating a rating, the PSR rating is assigned and recorded. It is recommended that the team independently assigns a priority level to each block section. Each side of the block should be evaluated and then combined for a final score.

Condition, not related to curb and sidewalk distresses, should be surveyed for each block segment. An example of a PSR sidewalk evaluation is below:

Street	Cross Street 1	Cross Street 2	Side	Rating	Length	Notes
River St	Creek Rd	Brook Ave	North	2	200 feet	School
River St	Creek Rd	Brook Ave	South	n/a	n/a	
River St	Brook Ave	Culvert Way	North	1	200 feet	
River St	Brook Ave	Culvert Way	South	2	200 feet	
River St (all)	Creek Rd	Culvert Way	Both	1.7	600 feet	

Location Notes. Location notes should be made to provide insight into the surroundings of each block segment. These notes should include reference to residential, retail/business,churches, schools, and vacant buildings or properties. These notes will supplement the assessments given.
Pictures. Pictures should be taken to document each block's condition. The primary focus should be placed on blocks with one or more distresses present, or blocks with a priority level of one or two. These photographs will supplement the assessments by providing visual support for the recommendations.
Map. A map showing the evaluation locations shall be included with application. The evaluation locations must be made at a uniform distance.

The following pages may be used to guide in the sidewalk evaluation.

Table 7: Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) Description and Example

PSR Rating	Description	Example
0	Totally deteriorated	
1	Poor condition	

PSR Rating	Description	Example
2	Below average to average condition. 2.5 is considered average	
3	Good to above average condition	

PSR Rating	Description	Example
4	Very good condition	
5	Brand new or excellent condition	