

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

October 5, 2022
Meeting Summary

Attendees

Alex Lopez, City of Independence	Leslee Rivarola, City of Basehor
Allison Smith, KDOT Planning	Maddie Waldeck, City of Basehor
Bailey Waters, KCMO Public Works	Mario Vasquez, City of KCMO
Bradley Hocevar, City of Edwardsville	Mark Lee, City of Bonner Springs
Brian Nowotny, Jackson County (Co-Chair)	Matt Davis, Jackson County
Brian Shields, City of Overland Park	Michael Webb, City of Edwardsville
Bryant DeLong, City of North Kansas City	Michele Sillsbee, City of Osawatomie
Charles Soules, City of Smithville	Randall Gorton, BHC Public Works
Jackie White, City of Independence	Richard Allen, City of KCMO
Jenny Kramer, KDOT Bike & Pedestrian	Rodney Riffle, Johnson County
John Neuberger, Sierra Club (Co-Chair)	Steve Casey, City of Lee's Summit
Kelly Wray, Cass County	Tim Nebergall, City of Gladstone
Kirk Rees, City of Paola	Travis Hoover, Platte County
Krystal Voth, Leavenworth County	Zachary Baker, City of Olathe
Lauren Wolf, City of Prairie Village	

MARC Staff

Lauren Winter
Martin Rivarola
Patrick Trouba

Agenda:

- **Welcome**
- **VOTE: September 2022 ATPC Summary**
- **Introduction of new ATPC members and alternates**
- **Presentations of remaining projects**
- **VOTE: Committee acceptance of scores**
- **Funding discussion**
- **Adjournment**

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Approve the August 10th, 2022 Meeting Summary –

No objections and summary was approved.

3. Introduce New ATPC Members and Alternates

- a. Kelly Wray (M) – Cass County
- b. Kirk Rees (M) – Miami County & other municipalities
- c. Michele Silsbee (A) – Miami County & other municipalities
- d. Maddie Waldeck (M) – Leavenworth & other municipalities
- e. George Brajkovic (A) – Leavenworth & other municipalities
- f. Lauren Wolf (M) – Johnson County & other municipalities
- g. Andrea Fair (A) – Johnson County & other municipalities
- h. Mark Lee (M) – Wyandotte County & other municipalities
- i. Bradley Hocevar (A) – Wyandotte County & other municipalities

4. Presentations of Remaining Projects

a. Kansas City, Missouri

- i. Blue Parkway/Swope Parkway (Martin Luther King Boulevard)
 - 1. Implement improvements to address pedestrian safety concerns in PSP Study – primarily with sidewalks, crosswalks, and bus stops.
- ii. Limits are from Elmwood and Prospect Ave.
- iii. Total TAP request: \$750,000
- iv. Total match: \$450,000
- v. Considered phaseable and scalable

b. Overland Park, Kansas

- i. Indian Creek Trail under US 69
 - 1. 10 feet trail extension from Corporate Woods to residents west of US 69.
- ii. Total TAP request: \$1,200,000
- iii. Total match: \$300,000
- iv. Not considered phaseable or scalable

5. Approve Acceptance of Scores

- a. Comments
 - i. **Travis Hoover-** There are certain legacy projects that have received high scores and considerable funding for 20 years. However, projects that attempt to fill in the missing links of these projects seem to be scoring much lower.
- b. No objections and scoring was approved.

6. Discussion: Funding

- a. Funding Amounts Available – greater than expected:
 - i. **Kansas TAP:** \$7.5 M available / \$8.3 M requested
 - 1. Includes projects that requested higher than \$750 K program cap. If projects stay at cap, requested amount is \$5 M.
 - ii. **Missouri TAP:** \$18 M available / \$18.6 M requested
 - 1. Includes projects that requested higher than \$750 K program cap. If projects stay at cap, requested amount is \$16.2 M.
 - iii. **Kansas bike/ped CMAQ:** \$701 K available / \$480 K requested
 - iv. **Missouri bike/ped CMAQ:** \$761 K available / \$3.7 M requested
- b. Possible Funding Approaches:
 - i. Fund as many projects as possible where TAP request is capped at \$750 K
 - ii. Fund up to 80% of eligible costs by score of MTP alignment then score
 - iii. Fund a certain amount of bike/ped elements of projects submitted for STBG
 - iv. Award unprogrammed 2023/2024 TAP to previously funding (but unobligated) 2023/2024 projects
- c. Discussion Comments:
 - i. **Charles Soules** – requests a reduction in funding request out of fairness to other projects and not knowing of the program cap.
 - ii. **Jackie White** – Many of their projects were scaled back to fit within the cap restraints. Allowing more funds towards other projects doesn't seem equitable for those that appropriately planned their projects. Seems fairer to put additional funding towards STBG projects rather than changing rules for TAP.
 - iii. **Mario Vasquez** - Considerable changes in the price of construction in the past year that could be influencing higher funding requests. It is realistic that many of these projects are already scaled back as much as possible. Suggests raising the cap for considered projects as well as looking at previous approvals of the committee to support past projects more.
 - 1. **Krystal Voth** – In somewhat of agreement with above comment. Many projects have changed their scope in accordance with the set cap. The more equitable option is approach two so some projects can receive more funding without raising the overall cap. Changing the cap now would mean allowing municipalities to resubmit for scoring to possibly receive more funding.
 - iv. **Travis Hoover** – Not a good idea to fund more projects at a lower amount because managing underfunded projects can be difficult and likely to not be completed.
 - v. **Patrick Trouba** – If cap is not raised, excess funds could go back to previous projects that haven't been obligated yet or redistribute more money to projects that haven't hit the cap. \$1.7 M would remain in approach one.
 - vi. **Brian Nowotny** – It's important to keep to a cap but is supportive of considering raising the cap. Many of these projects need more relief because of higher bidding and construction expenses.

1. **Jackie White** – Instead of raising the cap, remaining funds could be divided equally among jurisdictions to offset inflation. Changing the rules of engagement in the middle of the process is not equitable.
- vii. **Charles Soules** – Approach two would disadvantage small communities because it is unlikely that their projects can be carried out with only 80% funding.
- viii. **Martin Rivarola** – There are several projects, in both Kansas and Missouri, that are requesting funding for CMAQ as well. TAP requests would be adjusted if CMAQ funding is awarded to these projects.
- ix. **Krystal Voth** – Could we choose different approaches for Kansas and Missouri since they have different conditions? Or does it have to be the same?
 1. **MARC** – Different approaches could be given to each state. Missouri TAP awards seem to be smaller percentages of the overall projects compared to Kansas.
- x. **Krystal Voth** – What would it potentially look like if we fund each community one project at 80% (specifically of Kansas)? Is there enough money to do that?
 1. **Patrick Trouba** – It's hard to predict what that would look like right now without running the numbers but it's an option. Each community has their own priorities but would probably be awarded by score.
- xi. **Alison Smith** – Above is allowed as long as funds are not being given to a previously obligated project. In agreement that rules should not be changed mid-stream. These new conditions could have potentially changed who applied to begin with and doesn't seem to be the most equitable. For previous projects, once the project has been obligated and capped, we can't add additional funds. It's important to look at the proposed let dates.
- xii. **Leavenworth County** – The projects that met regional policy standards and got obligated in time are then being penalized. Those that were not able to get their projects moving fast enough are not able to get additional funding. Going back to previous funding rounds doesn't seem to be fair and poses additional issues.
- xiii. **Jackie White** – An easy option is to take the remaining funding and divide it by the number of applicants to disperse it evenly. Another option is to create a questionnaire to allow applicants to make a request for addition funding from left over amount. In agreement on not going back to other funding years because it will create more problems.
- xiv. **Travis Hoover** – Also in agreement on not going back to additional funding years. In approach one, may make sense to look to projects that are over matched and applying for multiple programs when distributing additional funds.
- xv. **Patrick Trouba** – Seems like the general consensus is that we should be looking forward the future instead of past projects. Also, seems that people are okay will increasing the cap as long as all the projects get funding.
- xvi. **Mario Vasquez** – It always feels wrong when high scoring projects are treated the same as low scoring projects. What is the point in making an effort to improve the project if it's treated like all other projects?

1. **Krystal Voth**– All the projects on the Kansas side were either scored aligned or highly aligned. We’re discussing what to do with excess money, not making funding cuts.
 2. **Charles Soules** – Doesn’t disagree that higher scores should get more money. But, smaller communities don’t have the resources, like transit and LLI, to even attempt to get those points.
- xvii. **Brian Nowotny** – How can we get more information about approach three and the funding through STBG?
1. **Martin Rivarola** – Information is collected about the percentage of total project costs being allocated towards bike/ped improvements. We could look at those numbers and determine the impact of \$1.7 M towards those for the next meeting.
- xviii. **Patrick Trouba** – Will look into funding projects up to 80% or up to the \$750 K cap and if that forces sponsors to add more local match. More information will be provided at the next meeting.

7. Meeting Adjourned

NEXT MEETING IS OCTOBER 26, 2022 (Special Meeting)