

600 Broadway, Suite 200  
Kansas City, Missouri 64105-1659

816-474-4240  
816-421-7758 FAX  
marcinfo@marc.org  
www.marc.org



## OPEN MEETING NOTICE

### KANSAS STP PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

February 8, 2024

9:30 AM

**This meeting will be held in a hybrid in-person/virtual format from the Westview Room in the MARC offices at 600 Broadway, Suite 200 in Kansas City, Missouri, 64105 and online via Zoom.**

---

### AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approve the November 9, 2023, Meeting Summary\*
3. Status of the Current Program/KDOT Updates\*  
*Discussion of program balances and programmed project status*  
*Consideration of a scope modification request from the City of Leawood for the Tomahawk Creek Parkway project programmed for 2024. Please reference the attached letter.*
4. 2024 Programming Update\*  
*Consideration/approval of revised bridge category scoring criteria. Please reference the attached information.*  
*Discussion of upcoming schedule, committee assignments, and excluded uses of funds.*
5. Operation Greenlight Program Update
6. Connected KC 2050 Update  
*Staff will brief the committee on the status of the update to Connected KC 2050 and upcoming development activities*
7. Other Business
8. Adjournment

\* Action Items

Next Scheduled Meeting: May 9, 2024

**Getting to MARC:** Information on transportation options to the MARC offices, including directions, parking, transit, carpooling, and bicycling, can be found [online](#). If driving, visitors and guests should enter the Rivergate Center parking lot from Broadway and park on the upper level of the garage. An entrance directly into the conference area is available from this level.

**Parking:** Free parking is available when visiting MARC. Visitors and guests should park on the upper level of the garage. To enter this level from Broadway, turn west into the Rivergate Center parking lot. Please use any of the available spaces on the upper level at the top of the ramp.

**Special Accommodations:** Please notify MARC at (816) 474-4240 at least 48 hours in advance if you require special accommodations to attend this meeting (i.e., qualified interpreter, large print, reader, hearing assistance). MARC programs are non-discriminatory as stated by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, call 816-474-4240 or visit our [webpage](#).



CITY of  
**Leawood**

January 31, 2024

Mid America Regional Council  
Attention: Marc Hansen  
600 Broadway, Suite 200  
Kansas City, MO 64105

TIP # 344034, Tomahawk Creek Parkway (College to Roe)

Marc,

The City of Leawood requests the STP Committee consider allowing Leawood to Split the Tomahawk Creek Parkway project into two separate projects. Successfully splitting the current project would result in two projects in the TIP, one with federal aid and the other without. These projects will provide the same scope plus additional grading to reduce flooding. They will be bid separately but constructed concurrently.

This request is due to a portion of the existing roadway being located outside the right-of-way on City of Leawood Section 6F park land. Establishing new right-of-way will involve an 8 to 12 month review and approval process. That would delay this project beyond the 2024 obligation year.

KDOT has confirmed they do not have an issue with splitting the project but asked that the TIP be updated. In discussions with the LWCF Grant Coordinator at Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks, they do not anticipate additional LWCF issues if we were to split the project and complete the proposed scope of work on the park land outside the right-of-way.

In order to avoid delays the City of Leawood respectfully request the STP Committee consider this change in the TIP.

Sincerely,

Brian Scovill, P.E.  
City Engineer  
City of Leawood

Cc: David Ley, Director of Public Works

Split Tomahawk Creek Parkway (College to Roe), TIP # 344034 into two separate projects as follows:

**South Job**

Federal Aid Tomahawk Creek Parkway 115<sup>th</sup> to Roe

Engineering/2022/Non-Federal/Local \$635000

ROW/2024/Non-Federal/Local \$50,000

Construction/2024/Non-Federal/Local \$1300000

Construction/2024/Federal/STBGM-KS \$3,760,000

Description:

The improvements will include constructing a roundabout at the Town Center Dr and Tomahawk Creek Pkwy intersection, raising certain portions of the roadway out of the regulated floodplain, constructing new roadway pavement and/or mill and overlay existing roadway, adding fiber optic conduit and cable, adding bike lanes for each direction from 115<sup>th</sup> to 119<sup>th</sup>, sidewalk improvements for ADA and trail connections from the west side of the Parkway to the trail system, and Tomahawk Creek channel improvements.

**North Job**

Non Federal Aid Tomahawk Creek Parkway College to 115th

Engineering/2022/Non-Federal/Local \$665000

ROW/2024/Non-Federal/Local \$50,000

Construction/2024/Non-Federal/Local \$5300000

Description:

The improvements will include raising certain portions of the roadway out of the regulated floodplain, constructing new roadway pavement and/or mill and overlay existing roadway, adding fiber optic conduit and cable, adding bike lanes for each direction, sidewalk improvements for ADA and trail connections from the west side of the Parkway to the trail system, and Tomahawk Creek channel improvements.

## STBG Bridge Category Scoring Criteria Comments and Responses

### Comment #1

Thank you for sharing this information.

I'm disappointed to see:

- Climate action is not mentioned or included in this scoring. Transportation is one of the highest emissions categories, and solutions of reducing VMT (with walkability, bikeability, transit, rideshare, etc.) and electrifying vehicles (charging infrastructure, incentives, etc.) should be included on this scorecard.
- Safety category does not explicitly include safety for people walking and people biking.
- Environmental points are lower than the previous iteration. Infrastructure resiliency, mitigating environmental impacts, climate action, and disaster preparedness are critical so we can maintain these durable infrastructure assets as long as possible even with more extreme weather.

I'm glad to see:

- The Transportation Choices section remains at 10 points, and people who walk, bike, and roll are included for bridge projects. Consider adding access to quality transit.
- Economic Vitality: Serves regional activity & Employment centers - significant points available for walkability, highest development intensity, and planning sustainable places is excellent. Consider adding language similar to the LEED rating system for surrounding density, diverse uses, walk score, etc. <https://www.usgbc.org/credits/new-construction-retail-new-construction-hospitality-new-construction/v41/lt104>

### Response to Comment #1

Thank you for your recent comments on the proposed revisions to the STBG Bridge Category Evaluation Criteria. I appreciate your thoughtful review of the revisions and suggestions for improvements. Your comments will be presented to the workgroup and at the February meetings of both the Kansas (February 8) and Missouri (February 13) STP Priorities Committees as they consider the adoption of the revised criteria.

I wanted to take this opportunity to provide you with some additional thoughts and context about the criteria and the proposed revisions that will hopefully address some of your concerns. The STBG evaluation criteria consists of two sets of factors. The first, "All Projects" are factors by which all project proposals submitted for consideration are scored. The second consists of factors applicable to the individual project proposal category (i.e., Bridge, Capacity, etc.). The document sent out represents this second set of factors and is specific to the bridge category.

The "All Projects" section consists of factors that address considerations such as Place Making, Project Development Status (readiness of plans, right-of-way, etc.), Equity, Environmental Justice, and Energy Use and Climate Change. This last factor includes VMT reduction and reduction in the use of carbon-based fuels mentioned in your comments. I have included the criteria applicable to this phase for your reference.

Although not specifically mentioned, pedestrian and bicyclist safety considerations can be addressed as part of the "Data Driven Analysis & Countermeasures" section. This component encourages applicants

to review the current conditions and develop a design that incorporates elements that specifically address the safety related issues on the bridge. Common countermeasures affecting bicycle and pedestrian safety include considerations such as bicycle lanes, walkways, and enhanced lighting. The ability to tie an analysis of the safety issues to the proposed project is especially important to the Bridge category as it is often difficult to accurately attribute other safety considerations such as crashes to bridges due to their specific locations and often shorter lengths as opposed to a roadway segment.

One of the primary modifications the workgroup desired to make was the additional emphasis on the primary drivers for a bridge project, poor condition, and structural deficiencies. The addition of points to the Condition category required reductions in other areas, and after discussion, the workgroup elected to remove consideration of the functional classification of the roadway along which the bridge is located entirely and reduced the points available related to Metrogreen Implementation. The “Environmental Lands” section, an analysis and discussion of the resource conservation and restoration opportunities and impacts of the project on watersheds, remains unchanged at 10 points.

Thank you again for your comments, suggestions, and interest in the scoring criteria. I hope I have addressed your concerns, but please let me know if you have any remaining questions or need additional information.

**Comment #2**

After review of this document, I would respectfully request that the rating and functionality play a larger role in this selection.

37 points are dedicated to the actual need/condition of the bridge and that bridge has to be closed and have a sufficiency rating less for 40 to receive the total of 37 points (7 load limits, 30 Bridge Condition).

Load Limits vs Structurally Deficient: The load limit scoring is very technical and requires knowledge that most owners are not going to readily have on hand.

However, It would make it easier on the owners to simply note if a bridge is structurally deficient or not. This structural evaluation appraisal is on the SI&A sheet (shown below) and takes into account the structural viability of the bridge. The factors that determine this deficiency are evaluated by qualified in-service bridge inspectors and It becomes a simple yes or no for the owner.

APPRAISAL	
DEFICIENCY STATUS	Not Deficient
(72) BRIDGE ROUTE ALIGNMENT	7
(71) WATERWAY ADEQUACY	8
(113) SCOUR VULNERABILITY	5
(67) STRUCTURAL EVALUATION	5
(68) DECK WIDTH APPRAISAL	4
(69) HORIZ. UNDERCLEARANCE APPRAISAL	N
SUFFICIENCY RATING	86.20
(36A) BRIDGE RAILS	1
(36B) RAIL TRANSITIONS	1
(36C) APPROACH GUARDRAILS	N
(36D) APPROACH GUARDRAIL ENDS	N

It seems to address failing infrastructure that the overall condition (sufficiency rating and structurally deficient) should weigh at least 50 points.

It would also be helpful if there was a section for functionally obsolete, this is listed in the same "deficiency status" area as structurally deficient on the SI&A. Bridges can be both, however structurally deficient takes priority. Structurally deficient speaks to failing infrastructure and functionally obsolete speaks to a bridge that no longer meets today's standards (i.e. lane width).

Thank you for the opportunity to make comments.

### **Response to Comment #2**

Thank you for reviewing the proposed revisions. I will share your comments with the workgroup and both the full Kansas and Missouri STP Priorities committees for their consideration.

I would note that the proposed revisions add points to the Condition criteria and rework the Safety criteria to focus on elements more applicable to bridges (such as load limits) than the previous traffic crash considerations. The workgroup did discuss adding additional weight to the condition category, but ultimately decided on a 10-point increase in the category.

### **Comment received in response**

I know how much work the committees put into this and appreciate the time they take away from their regular duties to come up with ways to put scores to the regional priorities.

Thanks and have a great week!

GO CHIEFS!

**Kansas STP Priorities Committee**  
**February 8, 2024**  
**Meeting Summary**

**Voting Members Present/Representation**

Nate Baldwin, Olathe, Chair  
Celia Kumke, Vice Chair  
Lorraine Basalo, Overland Park  
Stephanie Boyce, Mission  
Vernon Fields, Basehor  
Tim Green, Lenexa  
Mark Lee, Bonner Springs  
Tim McEldowney  
Keith Moody, Roeland Park (alt.)  
Bill Noll, Leavenworth County  
Donnie Scharff, Roeland Park  
Brian Scovill, Leawood (alt.)  
Troy Shaw, Kansas City  
Ryan Sims, Johnson County (alt.)  
Loren Snyder, Shawnee

**Other Attendees:**

Art Gough  
Gunnar Hand, UG of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, KS  
Mark Hoppe, Affinis  
Joe Johnson, De Soto  
Dan Miller, Lamp Rynearson  
David Nolte, JEO Consulting Group  
John Sullivan, Westwood  
Krystal Voth, Basehor

**MARC Staff:**

Marc Hansen  
Ron Achelpohl  
Megan Broll  
Beth Dawson  
Cedrick Owens

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Nate Baldwin welcomed the attendees and asked new committee members to introduce themselves, then proceeded with the meeting.

**2. Approval of Meeting Summary**

Mark Lee moved to approve the November 9, 2023 Meeting Summary as presented, and Lorraine Basalo seconded the motion. The motion passed.

**3. Status of the Current Program/KDOT Updates**

MARC Principal Planner Marc Hansen shared updates on the 2024 STBG Program, noting the starting balance was unusually high at \$5.7m, due in part to projects in Bonner Springs, De Soto, and Leawood being deferred from 2023. Additional details on the issues encountered by the Leawood project at Tomahawk Creek Parkway were included in the meeting packet, and the City of Leawood has requested to split the project into two phases to avoid loss of funding. All projects on the 2024 schedule have or are expected to obligate funding (including both phases of the Leawood project), spending all but about \$189k.

Mr. Hansen reviewed the program and anticipated balances for 2025 and 2026, noting allocated funding is estimated and additional projects would be added in the future. Mr. Hansen requested any projects needing to move forward in the program schedule to contact MARC, who will continue to coordinate with KDOT. Mr. Hansen clarified Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funds can be used for design/engineering.

Mr. Hansen detailed the proposed changes to the scope of the Tomahawk Creek Parkway project, explaining the reason the City of Leawood is requesting to split the project into two phases and how they intend to apply allocated funding. Both projects would be documented in the TIP. Tim Green moved to approve the scope modification request by the City of Leawood to the Tomahawk Creek Parkway project. Vernon Fields seconded the motion, and the motion passed.

**4. 2024 Programming Update**

Marc Hansen informed the committee they would be programming for FFY 2027-2028, and noted that those years are currently outside of the window of current federal transportation legislation; although the transportation funding bill has not yet passed, these years need to be programmed in order to continue moving projects through

the development timeline in order to use that funding in a timely manner. MARC generally expects 2% increases to funding allocations; CRP funds are programmed for four years at a time, and CMAQ funding is set by policy through KDOT and doesn't change much from programming cycle to programming cycle. Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds are typically overprogrammed to help expend allocations, and Surface Transportation Set-Aside (TAP) funds are programmed by the Active Transportation Programming Committee (ATPC).

Mr. Hansen reviewed the Call for Projects phases and timeline, and the schedule for programming funding recommendations. The first phase of the project application is a narrative questionnaire to state the goal of the project, and allows an opportunity for MARC staff to provide feedback and support to strengthen the application; the second phase of the application is the full technical project proposal. For the first time, CRP and CMAQ will use the same application. CMAQ is currently programmed by four separate committees (including KS STP Priorities Committee) and CRP is programmed by a workgroup.

Considering federal requirements for implementation have changed and smaller jurisdictions may have fewer resources available, Mr. Hansen asked the committee if they should continue to exclude using funds for design/engineering, Right of Way (ROW), and utility relocation. The committee noted the past few program cycles have been very competitive, so adding additional uses of funds may not be of much benefit for this committee. Committee members agreed that flexibility on a case-by-case basis to allow for those kinds of uses would be appropriate, but do not want to award standalone applications for design funds. Once awarded (and if needed), allowing a project to use those funds for other purposes would be eligible for committee review in coordination with KDOT.

Mr. Hansen announced the scoring criteria committee had met several times, and concluded the current criteria makes an assumption that bridges are on the federal aid system, which may cause an unfair evaluation of bridges that aren't on the system but are important to the transportation in their respective areas. The scoring criteria committee developed revisions, and Mr. Hansen explained the proposed changes and rationale, which included updates to modal/complete streets criteria, freight criteria, and activity centers with inclusion of criteria for projects off the federal aid system. Bridge condition rating remains the scoring section.

Celia Kumke moved to approve the revised bridge scoring criteria, and Mark Lee seconded the motion. The motion passed.

##### **5. Operation Green Light Program Update**

Cedrick Owens, Traffic Signal Analyst II with Operation Green Light (OGL) Program, shared an overview of the program, which partners with KDOT, MoDOT, FHWA, KC Scout, and 27 operating agencies across Missouri and Kansas. OGL coordinates across jurisdictional boundaries to help manage traffic signal timing, which improves safety, reduces idling and emissions, and makes the traffic system more efficient and less expensive. Mr. Owens gave examples of the kinds of data OGL collects, and traffic flow interventions staff can implement to respond to accidents, special events, and construction projects. OGL leverages federal STBG funds to cover just over half of the operations costs for the signals in its system (with partner agencies paying the remaining cost), and Mr. Owens shared the project budgets for the program through 2028. These funds come off the top, increasing to \$3.8m in 2027-2028. Mr. Owens noted increases to OGL's operations budget were largely due to inflation and adding crowdsourcing, which gives the region performance measures without having to invest in detection equipment that is expensive and difficult to maintain. Crowdsourcing describes the use of real time information for operations to optimize the use of roadway facilities through a variety of sources, speeding up the performance measure process that previously required extensive time, labor, and effort to produce time-constrained results. OGL was recently awarded over \$700k through the USDOT SMART Grant, which will help fund crowdsourcing efforts in five key corridors around the region, and will have a fundamental impact on OGL's work.



## **6. Connected KC 2050 Update**

Marc Hansen informed the committee of recent work on the Connected KC 2050 Update, which is due in June of 2025. A call for new projects and updated information on existing projects just closed, and preliminary evaluations are complete and scoring reports have been distributed. Mr. Hansen briefed the committee on ongoing public outreach efforts like regional pop-up events, surveys, and targeted presentations. Immediate next steps include identifying and evaluating projects that were not resubmitted to ensure they were not omitted accidentally, and project prioritization for updated and new projects. All submitted projects are available for public review and comment, and analysis of scoring will be shared in upcoming months. More information is available at <https://connectedkc.org/2025-update/>.

## **7. Other Business**

MARC Regional Leadership Awards nominations are due by March 1, 2024.

## **8. Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned.

## **Next Meeting:**

May 9, 2024