

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 26, 2022

To: Region 10 RTAC and Alternates

From: Mary Rump, Transportation Director

Re: Next RTAC Meeting – **August 17, 2022 @ 1:30 pm**

The agenda for the August 17th RTAC meeting is attached. Please remember that we will meet via Zoom. Some agenda items have been highlighted below.

Item 3.1 Review TAP Application Review Process – The committee will continue to discuss changes to the TAP application review process.

If you have any questions about the materials enclosed, please give me a call. I look forward to seeing you on August 17th.

Enclosures

**Region 10
RTAC
Wednesday, August 17, 2022 @ 1:30 pm
Via Zoom**

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81397315114?pwd=NGpNNUxiTUZOSXJZMkRmREdJWEU0UT09>

AGENDA

page(s)

- 1.0 Call to Order
- 2.0 Routine Matters
 - 2 .1 Approval of agenda
 - 3-4 .2 Approval of minutes
 - .3 Public comment
- 3.0 New Business
 - .1 Review TAP Application Review Process
- 4.0 Old Business
- 5.0 Adjournment and Set Next Meeting Date – TBD.

If requested, ECICOG make reasonable accommodations for people planning to attend the meeting. Please call (319) 365-9941 or email mary.rump@ecicog.org to make a request.

**Region 10
RTAC Meeting
July 6, 2022
Via Zoom**

The following members participated:

Brad Freidhof, Johnson County
Becky Soglin, Johnson County
Matt Amelon, Iowa County
Zach Rozmos, Washington County
Brad Mormann, Jones County
Randy Burke, Linn County
Ted Doscher, Linn County
Mike Dauber, Cedar County
Rob Fangmann, Cedar County
Lisa McQuillen, Jones County

Members Absent:

Mark Pingnot, Benton County
Randy Scheel, Benton County
Nick Amelon, Iowa County
Richard Young, Washington County

Staff present:

Mary Rump

Others participating:

1.0 Call to Order

Mormann called the meeting to order at 1:02pm.

2.1 Approval of Agenda

M/S/C (Doscher, Soglin) to approve the agenda. All ayes.

2.2 Approval of Minutes: The wrong minutes were attached, so this item has been tabled.

2.3 Public Comment: None

3.1 Review TAP Application Process

The committee reviewed the current application process. There was concern that the same counties were receiving funds each year and the committee wanting to consider a process that would result in geographic equity. Following considerable discussion, the committee identified two possible options: 1. Award additional points to the total score of each application if a county hadn't been awarded funds in previous years, and 2. Award additional points to each application comparison if a county hadn't been awarded funds in previous years. The committee asked Rump to update a recent review spreadsheet to show how the following bonus point options would have impacted the scoring results:

For direct comparisons, add 1 point to each score if the county hadn't received an award in the past 3 years, add 2 points if the county hadn't received an award in the past 5 years, and add 3 points if the county hadn't received an award in the past 10 years.

For total scores, add 3 points to the total score if a county hadn't received an award in the past three years, add 5 points if the county hadn't received an award in the past five years and add 10 points if the county hadn't received an award in the past ten years.

4.0 Old Business

None

5.0 Adjournment and Set Next Meeting Date

Rump will send out a poll to schedule the next meeting, and an updated spreadsheet of previous application review scores summarizing the impact of bonus points noted above.

M/S/C (Freidhof, Rozmus) to adjourn the meeting at 1:51 PM. All ayes