



Long Range Transportation Plan Sub-Committee

Marge Vogt, Kansas Co-Chair
Ed Ford, Missouri Co-Chair

There will be a meeting of the MARC LRTP Sub-Committee, **Tuesday, February 16th, 2010 11:10-1:00 PM** at **Mid-America Regional Council, MARC Board Room, Conference Center (2nd Floor), Rivergate Building, 600 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri.**

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review and Adopt January Meeting Minutes*
3. Presentation and Review of Draft 2040 Project Listings
4. Presentation and Review of Draft 2040 Plan Content
 - *Intro/Policy Framework*
 - *Plan Strategies*
 - *Performance Measures*
 - *Other (modal chapters, appendixes, etc)*
5. Other
6. Next Meeting Date & Time (Tentatively March 23rd if needed)

*Action Item

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. The entrance to the conference area can be accessed directly from this level.

Please notify the Mid-America Regional Council 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). We will make every effort to meet reasonable requests. MARC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see www.marc.org, or call 816.474.4240.

SUMMARY

Long-Range Transportation Plan Sub-Committee

02/16/10

1. Welcome and Introductions.

Meeting participants introduced themselves after Ed Ford called the meeting to order.

2. Review and Adopt January Meeting Minutes.

January meeting minutes were approved.

3. Presentation and Review of Draft 2040 Project Listings.

- Tom Gerend reviewed the draft project listings for Transportation Outlook 2040.
- He said that staff and the committees have been working since last summer to define the project lists.
- 450 roadway projects (identified as primary project type) have been submitted.
- Staff and the committees have been analyzing the projects and applying financial constraint to the lists. The highway committee has been through this full process (gap analysis, review of staff scores, financial constraint of list, prioritization survey, and targeted workshops).
- Today, the LRTP Sub-Committee is reviewing the roadway and transit lists prior to taking them to TTPC.
- We can pay for less than half of all submitted projects.
- Kansas and Missouri roadway listings are available today. They are broken down by state and local projects. In KS, the main constraint is with major systems. In MO, the discrepancy is on both the local and state scales.
- TO2040 will include a financially constrained and illustrative list.
- Ed asked if the group was going to be reviewing the point system for the projects.
- Tom pulled up the scoring template that included the policy goals and criteria.
- Ed asked who determined the scores and whether there is an opportunity to assess why a project received a certain number of points for certain criteria. Tom said a team of staff reviewed each project. One staff member was assigned to certain criteria, and then looked at each project for that factor. More detailed scoring methodology is available for those who are interested. All applicants could review how they were scored.
- Linda Clark noted that a brand new road won't score great with these criteria.
- Ed asked how traffic lights scored in related to efficiency of the system.
- Tom said those projects scored well. He can make the detailed project information available.
- Ed asked how the criteria fared, in terms of the adaptive scenario. He also asked how projects further out from the core were able to score higher.

- Tom said the scenario discussion was a policy discussion. The scenario has not been adopted by the MARC Board. Projects weren't assessed on geography, but rather on alignment with policy goals, which are characteristics of the adaptive scenario.
- Ed said there is a major disconnect. The way for the adaptive to succeed is to fund more projects closer to the core.
- Allison Smith said that MARC didn't have control over which projects were submitted.
- Ed said we should have made a formal decision about the adaptive scenario, then looked at the projects. He said that 169 Highway is a poster child for the adaptive scenario and should have scored higher.
- Ron Achelpohl said one project criterion was how supportive projects were of activity centers (part of the adaptive scenario). He said that some activity centers are located outside the core. 60% of new growth is anticipated for greenfield development in the adaptive scenario.
- Ed said that he is upset with the projects that made the cut.
- Lee Ann Kell asked Ed which projects he is referring to.
- Ed said 92 Highway shouldn't have scored as high as it did.
- Lee Ann said 92 Highway didn't score higher than Shoal Creek.
- Ed said that if we fund projects like 92, then the list is not aligned with the adaptive scenario.
- Allison noted that this list is just for the long-range plan, and doesn't dictate funding at this point.
- Ron mentioned that the 92 project talked about going from 2 to 3 lanes, and included bike lanes. It also connects activity centers. In programming, it would make more sense to look at smaller components. Projects aren't presented in the same way they will be during funding rounds. Projects that were recommended are consistent with the adaptive scenario.
- Tom said that Tiffany Springs is a local project that is near the top of the constrained list.
- Marge asked where the issue of priority comes in.
- Ron said that for TO2040, the issue is whether projects are on the list or not, and whether they are constrained or illustrative. He said that prioritization comes with funding.
- Marge said projects get funded through DOTs and via the little funding MARC gets.
- Ron said the list in the plan gets used for a lot of purposes.
- Tom said that what we want to determine is if the draft listing is the right list. We're not talking about priorities. We're looking at constrained vs. unconstrained.
- Mac Andrews said that not all communities have adopted or are supportive of the adaptive scenario. They started this process in August. In the last highway meeting, KC folks started engaging themselves in the process and ended up not liking the list.
- Ed said the 169 interchange project didn't get points. That's nuts.

- Linda said KCMO staff should be communicating better with Ed about this process. None of the four projects he referenced scored less than the 169 project did.
- Dick said that all of Ed's projects are on the list. What we do for the transportation alliance list is a different process.
- Linda said that both 169 projects are more localized. MoDOT would look at cost sharing for those.
- Ed said that MoDOT has resisted these projects for years.
- Linda said the parkway hasn't been built yet, but that doesn't mean it's not a priority.
- Ron said K7 could be looked at as a best practice. 169 could have a corridor study.
- Linda said a 169 corridor study was done in the 80s. It doesn't prioritize higher than other areas.
- Tom said that after the Board adopts the forecast scenario, there will be time to ensure alignment of funded projects with a vision.
- Ed said we are doing it backwards. Why didn't we adopt the scenario and then choose projects?
- Marge asked if we should see if the projects fit with the 40% redevelopment/60% greenfield split identified in the adaptive scenario.
- Tom said we haven't adopted the forecast yet. We have analyzed projects with both scenarios. There is some alignment between the baseline scenario and investments, but there are some areas with growth and no new transportation investments. With the adaptive, you will see less growth in unincorporated areas - There is pretty close correlation between growth and transportation investments.
- Ed said that he still thinks we're not putting the money where our mouth is because the 169 project is supportive of the adaptive scenario.
- Tom said 40% of all growth occurring as redevelopment, as identified in the adaptive scenario, is a stretch. Even under the baseline scenario, there is a close correlation between growth and the projects. Not getting investments where growth isn't identified.
- Ed asked why we are doing transportation projects on 92 Highway and not on 169.
- Linda said there are existing traffic problems on 92.
- Ed said the congestion on 92 is nothing compared to the problems on 169.
- Linda said we're not comparing apples to apples. We're talking about system efficiencies.
- Tom said this discussion is crossing the MO priorities process with the TO2040 list.
- Dick asked if scores would change with adoption of the baseline or adaptive scenario.
- Tom said no. The project selection criteria were tied to goals/objectives that are pretty consistent with the adaptive scenario. The criteria aren't based on geographic locations.
- Ron said the programming exercises are unique.

- Ed said they have to build MoDOT's system with a cost share.
- Linda said cost shares work against them (cited Botts Road).
- Ed said that's the only tool we have to bring to the table, and we're blowing it.
- Kathy Dusenbery said that he can't have it both ways. The adaptive scenario was used to argue against the Tomahawk project, and 92 takes you to Tomahawk.
- Alison asked if the list is going to be inputted into the transportation model. That would be helpful to see.
- Tom said that staff is in the process of doing this. The project lists have been fluid. Where we do have congestion, solutions weren't identified.
- Alison said that if we're not addressing congestion, then we need to look at other projects. This mirrors TLINK. There are other local projects to look at.
- Marge said local projects aren't totally funded with local dollars.
- Alison reiterated that we need to look at the model.
- Linda said we need to look at areas of congestion.
- Tom said the model doesn't do a good job with localized areas. It assesses levels of service and congestion of major areas. Staff is running model with both scenarios.
- Linda said that it won't change the projects much to look at the model.
- Tom said that the model anticipates congestion on 435 in both scenarios. Need management solutions there. Traditional projects weren't submitted for 435 because it is built out.
- Tom said the plan is to give TTPC a high level overview of what was discussed here next month.
- Linda said that she will work with Ed on 169, as long as it's on the list.
- Ed said that a decision needs to be made on 169 sooner than later, and that transportation expenditures need to be based on the adaptive scenario.
- Marge said that the adaptive scenario is about more than just roads. It's about education and quality of life. If it happens in the core, you'll see more roadway investments there.
- Tom said that we need to be able to make the linkages clear and have confidence in it. The modal committee work will help tell the story. Not all questions are answered through TO2040. Programming alignment is next.
- Marge said that where we start putting in policies, the adaptive scenario could fall apart.
- Linda asked what we do in the meantime. Cities have already been sprawling.
- Ed said he recently read a story about St. Louis, and that's where we're headed.
- Dick said that a paradigm shift by the DOTs is needed.
- Linda said that MoDOT is all about safety. It's not all about levels of service.
- Marge said that she is seeing a shift. The market is changing. Cities can't afford roads, schools, sewers. Local policies will make the shift. Don't force it. These things are happening already.

4. Presentation and Review of Draft 2040 Plan Content.

- Tom provided an overview of the draft chapters. He talked about the new elements, composite summary lists, and performance measures.

- He said this conversation will transition to TTPC next month, in advance of releasing the draft content to the public in April. The Board has questions about how close we can get to the 40% redevelopment number by 2040. Staff has been talking to folks about what they're willing to do. Some communities are already doing things related to this.
- Linda asked about KCMO's reaction to the adaptive scenario.
- Ed said that his colleagues are behind the adaptive scenario. The health of the core is important to the region.
- Ed Peterson said the push and pull is about re-evaluating the growth model. A big picture re-evaluation would be a major achievement. Don't focus on streets so much right now.
- Marge said this could fall apart because nobody likes to be told what to do.
- Tom said the Board will provide policy guidance. They are scheduled to discuss this on March 2nd. Nobody argues with the direction, but they do disagree about how we get there.
- Ed said there needs to be a more honest discussion at the Board.
- Marge asked how we all can work together. Need to recognize strengths we all bring to the region. Need trust among one another.
- Ed said we need cooperation like they have in Denver.
- Linda said the roadway system here is way too big, and that more people should take transit.
- Marge said that all of these things are falling into place with the economic downturn and other factors.
- Tom said we need more input on the draft project listing. Need consensus to advance this to TTPC.
- Dick asked if the transit list is done. Tom said yes.
- Alison asked if Tom could email the transit list to the group. Tom said yes.

5. Next Meeting Date & Time (Tentatively March 23rd if needed).