OPEN MEETING NOTICE

Goods Movement Committee
Janet McRae Kansas Co-Chair
Mike Duffy, Missouri Co-Chair

There will be a meeting of MARC's Goods Movement Committee on **Tuesday, August 1, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.** in the **Sunflower Room of the Marc office 4nd Floor** 600 Broadway Kansas City, MO 64105. Those who are unable to attend in person may attend virtually join us via MARCZoom09 Address: https://marc-kc.zoom.us/j/6576214834?pwd=U0ptVVAraGVlU3psNlU4UXh2czRvZz09

Meeting ID: 657-621-4834
Passcode: 075821

A G E N D A

I. Introduction and approval of minutes

II. Complete Streets Policy Review and Update – Patrick Trouba, MARC
- Complete Streets policy video link: Complete_Streets_Policy_Presentation_Video.mp4
- Complete Streets page on MARC website
- MARC Complete Streets Policy
- National Complete Streets Coalition – 10 Elements of a Complete Streets Policy
- MARC Complete Streets Network Assessment

III. Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox Update – Selina Zapata Bur, MARC
- Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox Update video link
- **Congestion Management Process** webpage on MARC website
- Congestion Management Toolbox

IV. Transportation Projects that Support Economic Development – Committee discussion

V. Updates & Other Business

**Action Item*

Meeting Attendance Audio:
Audio:
- We encourage the use of computer audio especially if you are viewing a webcam or sharing your webcam.

Dial Toll-Free
- 877 853 5247 US Toll-free

    - 888 788 0099 US Toll-free
- One tap mobile
    - +1-877-853-5247,,3869572593#
    - +1-888-788-0099,,3869572593#

- Please use cell phones only as a last resort.

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.

Goods Movement Committee June 6, 2023, Meeting Summaries

Members/Alternates Present-Representing
Janet McRae, Miami County
Mike Duffy, Riverside
Cheryl Ball, MoDOT
Richard Greenville, KC Port
Jon Stephens, KC Port
Michael Espinoza, KDOT
Randy Rowson, CDM Smith
Davonna Morgan. Moore, CDM Smith
Chris Gutierrez, SmartPort
Juan Yin, MoDOT
Stacy Fowler, MoDOT

MARC Staff Present
Darryl Fields, Principal Planner

1) Introductions and Approval of Meeting Summary
Ms. McRae called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees. Ms. McRae presided over the meeting and conducted a room and Zoom roll call. Meeting minutes were approved as presented.

2) Overview of KC Port proposed new Marine Terminal and economic development activities.
Richard Greenville and Jon Stephens, Port KC provided an update of the proposed Marine River Terminal (MRT). Through Missouri enabling legislation Port KC is one of 15 port authorities in the Missouri. Port KC works to promote Missouri's general economic welfare by "the creation of industrial facilities, industrial parks and increased the volume of commerce…" Port Authority tools available are bonding, sales leaseback (conduit financing), port improvement districts, advance industrial manufacturing zone and tonnage/volume tax incentives. Mr. Greenville further explained economic, safety and environmental advantages of moving freight along the Missouri River. Port KC is proposing to make enhancements to the current Woodswether Port Terminal. Additionally, the Port is proposing a new MRT located along the Little Blue River in the location of the former AK Steel site. Port KC has secured funding from multiple program and agencies in development of the new MRT. It's anticipated in 2024/2025 to secure a private equity partner for a potential operation in 2025. A key component of the MRT is the use of new container on barge technology (American Patriot Holdings) allowing Kansas City to be the most northern and furthest west in-land water way location that supports container on barge. The development of the MRT provides the next step in the region's ability to meet the logistics and environmental stewardship needed by the next generation shippers/manufactures. It is important for the region to maintain its transportation logistics relevance and it is imperative the region has an ability to support containerized shipments.

Committee recommendations:

- Suggest the Port increase talking points regarding business and political support, strengths and environmental stewardship associated with freight movement along the Missouri River.
- The MRT should think strategically regarding locations of truck holding and parking areas to support reduce environmental impacts, carbon footprints and future site congestion issues.
- Committee Port tour request.

Questions:
What was the environmental cleanup cost related to the AK Steel site?

- Remediation is approximately $3.7 million but this may be handled through creative environmental engineering alternatives/processes. The hard part of environmental cleanup is the unknown – the Port now knows what is needed.

What impact is expected form navigation issues as low/high water?

- Climate change and water management is always a concern, to their credit, the Corp of Engineers has invested a portion of the $260 million allocated by Congress for the in-land water network to correct the Missouri River navigation channel and levies along the river. This coupled with UDOT designating the Missouri River as M-29 Inland Water way designation, coupled with Port KC's ongoing river discussions is going a long way to keep the River's flow significant in the Corp's mind. Last year was the 1st time in several years that there was 12 months of navigation on the Missouri River.
- There is strong bi-partisan support for increased flood control and continued freight movement along the nation's in-land water way network.

Will the Port own and operate the inland barge?

- No, American Patriot Holdings will own and operate – the company is currently building 6 vessels (3 for the Mississippi River and 3 for the Inland waters).

Port KC received $2 million for rail crossing improvements from the Biden Administration – is this for improvements in the Port?

- No, these funds are for 3 rail line crossing improvements related to river front/Berkley Park's redevelopment. This improvement should help neighborhoods, Berkley Park and rail roads within the East Bottoms of KCMO.

Missouri Unfunded Needs – the Committee had a $50 million freight allocation to prioritized unfunded freight need if fuds became available. The Committee recommended $22 million for the MRT and Woodswether improvements allowing the Port KC to decide improvement priority. The Committee felt it is too difficult to define Port priorities.

Missouri Unfunded Needs - Multimodal (Freight)*	
Project	**Cost**
Independence Avenue Rail Bridge Construction (KCMO & Terminal RR)	$ 20,000,000
Canadian Pacific RR grade-separated crossing (Birmingham Rd @ Holt Dr) (City of Liberty)	$ 8,000,000
Missouri River Terminal/Woodswether port improvements (Port KC)	$ 22,000,000
Mexico City Ave Extension**	~~$ 10,000,000*~~
Total	$ 50,000,000

* GMC revised the 2023 project list. Mexico Ave Extension was added as an Unfunded Need Priority.

**GMC recommended this project as a priority freight supportive project. However, MoDOT indicated that Roadway Projects are not eligible for multi-modal list. Given this project is not on Missouri system, it is also not eligible for Tier I/III road/bridge list as an Unfunded Need.

Original Unfunded Needs Ranked List

# of Projects	Agency	Location	Description	Estimate (in millions)
1	KCMO and Terminal Railroad	Kansas City, MO	Independence Street Rail Bridge Construction	$24.00
2	City of Liberty	Liberty, MO	Canadian Pacific Railroad grade-separated crossing (Birmingham Road @ Holt Drive)	$9.15M

3	Port KC	Independence/Kansas City, MO	Marine River Terminal (MRT) - Rail Connection and working Track	$43.00
4	Port KC	Independence/Kansas City, MO	MRT - Road Access, Interstate connection and entry Gate	$45.00
5	Port KC	Independence/Kansas City, MO	MRT - Dock rehab and improvements	$23.00
6	Port KC	Independence/Kansas City, MO	MRT - Site Clearing, earthwork	$33.00
7	Port KC	Kansas City, MO	Woodswether - New Dock	$28.00
8	Port KC	Kansas City, MO	Woodswether - Railcar Unloading conveyor	$0.30
9	Port KC	Kansas City, MO	Woodswether - Grain Loading infrastructure	$1.50
10	Port KC	Kansas City, MO	Woodswether - Paving	$2.00
11	Port KC	Kansas City, MO	Woodswether - Rail improvements	$2.00
12	Port KC	Kansas City, MO	Woodswether - Storage dome and conveyor rehab	$0.10
13	Port KC	Kansas City, MO	MRT - Storm water, sanitary and fire main, installation, design and material cost.	$12.00
Total				$189.90

3) Regional projects that support economic development – due to time this will be pushed to a later meeting.

4) Other Business

Michael Espinoza is KDOT's new Freight and Rail Program Manager. Prior to KDOT Mr. Espinoza was a BNSF locomotive engineer for over 10 years. He has worked in Sioux City IA and Kansas City. He replaces the retired John Maddox.

KDOT will have its annual call for projects rail service improvement program (July). The Rail Service and Short Line Programs will be combined into a single ($10 million) program.

MoDOT has provided MARC with access to it's MoFAS fright movement database developed from an update of the Statewide Freight Study. The database will allow access to Missouri freight movements data as tonnage, commodities and fright corridors.

Agenda Item II

MARC's Complete Street Policy

- Item for review Smart Growth America Complete Streets Elements https://smartgrowthamerica.org/10-elements-of-complete-streets/
- What elements of a complete streets policy are more important to you?
- How well is each mode served by our policy through MARC's planning process?
- What would you add to or remove from the Complete Streets Policy? Why?
- What role(s) could the Complete Streets Network Assessment play in the Complete Streets
- Policy? How should gaps be prioritized?
- How should we integrate green streets/green infrastructure treatments into the Complete Street Policy.

A survey for committee members and stakeholders to give additional input can be found https://forms.office.com/r/Vn6h1jFffR .

Agenda Item III

Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox Update

MARC's Congestion Management Policy describes MARC's Congestion Management Process, a systematic way of monitoring, measuring and diagnosing the causes of current and future congestion on a region's multi-modal transportation systems; evaluating and recommending alternative strategies to manage current and future regional congestion; and monitoring and evaluating the performance of strategies implemented to manage congestion. The CMP also responds to requirements set forth by federal transportation legislation (23 CFR 450.320).

A policy update is required in coordination with updates to the metropolitan transportation plan, and review and update of the Congestion Management Toolbox is recommended at least every four years. Staff have provided the following discussion questions to help committee members and stakeholders prepare comments on updating the policy and toolbox:

- Which elements currently in the Congestion Management Policy are working well, and why?
- Are there elements you would add or change in the Congestion Management Policy? Why?
- The Congestion Management Toolbox details a wide range of alternative strategies to manage congestion.
- Are there any strategies you would add to the toolbox, and if so, please describe.

A survey for committee members and stakeholders to give additional input can be found https://forms.office.com/r/Vn6h1jFffR .

Agenda Item IV

Regional projects that support economic development

Currently MARC does not have a process to adequality score freight or economic develop projects. Therefore, projects containing these attributes find it difficult to compete for program funds. MARC is currently reviewing the existing project scoring process. This is an appropriate time for the GMC to review the "Economic Vitality" scoring sections and provide recommendations that best support review and soring of economic/freight projects.

5.1 Transportation Choices/Public Health -- 10 Points	
Facilitation of Other Modes	
10	
Improvement in 3 modes level of service	10
Improvement in 2 modes level of service	5
Improvement in 1 modes level of service	2
Pedestrian LOS Bicycle LOS Transit LOS	

5.2 Economic Vitality -- 15 Points	
Supports the Regional Freight Network	
5	
On a designated National, Regional, or Local Freight Corridor or Direct connection to A, B, C, D, F (does not include E) or Average daily truck traffic greater than 500	5
Any combination of 4 of A thru F	4
Any combination of 3 of A thru F	3
Any combination of 2 of A thru F	2
1 of A through F	1
Within a mile of: A. Top twenty warehousing site by square footage B. Top twenty manufacturer by number of employees C. Presence of a rail/truck or air/truck intermodal facility D. Presence of a Foreign Trade Zone E. Area with two out of four transportation modes: air, barge, rail, truck	
F. Located within a mile of a significant freight corridor, i.e., roadway with greater than	500 trucks/day
Local delivery truck traffic does not constitute significant freight movement	
Serves Regional Activity & Employment Centers	
10	
Project serves activity center * found to be of highest development intensity and walkability, and/or Project implements elements & recommendations of "Planning Sustainable Places" or corridor demonstration projects from "Creating Sustainable Places" initiatives, and/or Project sponsor is able to clearly and objectively document how served activity center has increased in intensity and walkability in order to warrant a higher intensity status.	10
Project serves activity center found to be of higher development intensity walkability. Project sponsor is able to clearly and objectively document how served activity center has increased in intensity and walkability in order to warrant a higher intensity status.	6
Project serves any activity center	4
None of the above	0

5.3 Environment --20 Points	
Environmental Lands	
10	
Applicant provides a map identifying priority natural resource conservation and restoration opportunities along the project corridor and in project watershed	1
Applicant specifies which conservation areas will be protected, articulates how, and what resources will be required	2
Applicant specifies which natural resource areas will be protected and restored, articulates how, and identifies what resources will be required	4
Applicant also articulates a compenensive plan to conserve and restore natural resources on a watershed or sub-watershed scale with explicit linkages to other community and environmental assets	10

MetroGreen Implementation	
10	
Applicant clearly explains how project implements MetroGreen	10
Applicant clearly explains how project enhances connectivity to MG	5
Project does not implement or enhance connectivity to MetroGreen	0

5.4 Public Health --5 Points	
Reduces Ozone Precursor Emissions	
Reduces urban heat island effect through materials or landscaping Decreased energy/fuel use Alternative fuel use Multi-modal/increased bike/ped access Traffic flow/congestion mitigation	One point for each strategy

5.5 Safety -- 20 Points				
Crash Severity		**5 Year Crash Rate**		**Data Driven Analysis & Countermeasures**
7		5		8
Data: TNC: Total Number of Crashes FC: Fatal Crashes IC: Injury Crashes PDO: Property Damage Only SR: Severity Ratio PSS: Project Severity Score **Formula:** SR= (9 x FC) + (3.5 X IC) + (1.0 X PDO)/TNC PSS= 5x(SR-1)	7= >90% 6= 75-89% 5=60-74% 4=45-59% 3=30-44% 2=15-29% 1=<14% All project PSS will be grouped into equal frequency and assigned points based on scale	Road Segments R=1,000,000 x C/365 x N x V x L Intersections R=1,000,000 x C/365 x N x V R=Crash Rate per 100 million VMT C=Total number of crashes in the study period N=Number of years of data V=Traffic volume L=Length of segment (mi) * Normalized per 100 million VMT	5= >80% 4= 60-79% 3= 40-59% 2= 20-39% 1= <19% All project PSS will be grouped into equal frequency and assigned points based on scale	**Countermeasures:** • 3 or more top contributing factor safety countermeasures selected (3) • 2 top contributing factor safety countermeasures selected (2) • 1 top contributing factor safety countermeasure selected (1) **Analysis & Explanation** • Safety analysis has been conducted with data driven process explained, and all the safety countermeasures selected are explained. (5) • Safety analysis has been conducted with data driven process explained, or all the safety countermeasures selected are explained. (4) • Safety analysis has been conducted with data driven process explained, but only some of the safety countermeasures selected are explained. (3) • Safety analysis has not been conducted and only some of the safety countermeasures selected are explained. (2) • Safety analysis has been conducted but none of the safety countermeasures selected are explained. (1) • Safety analysis has not been conducted and none of the safety countermeasures selected are explained. (0)

5.6 System Condition -- 10 Points	
Useful Life	
10	
>25 Years or project includes replacement or rehabilitation of a bridge with a sufficiency rating of 70 or less	10
20-24 years	7
15-19 years	4
<15 years	0

5.7 System Performance (a) -- 6 Points			
Congestion Management & System Efficiency			
6			
On Congested CMS Segment	3	CMS Toolbox strategies deployed	1 point/strategy up to 6 maximum
On CMS Network	1		

5.7 System Performance (b) -- 6 Points			
Current LOS		**Future LOS**	
3		3	
E or F	3	E or F	0
D	2	D	3
C	1	C	1
A or B	0	A or B	0

5.7 System Performance (c)-- 8 Points			
Current AADT/Lane		**Future AADT/Lane**	
4		4	
>10,001	4	>10,001	4
5,001 - 10,000	3	5,001 - 10,000	3
2,501 - 5,000	2	2,501 - 5,000	2
0 - 2,500	1	0 - 2,500	1

Agenda Item IV

Updates and Other Business: