



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, October 20th, 2009 11:10-1:00 PM** at **Mid-America Regional Council, Westview Room, Conference Center (2nd Floor), Rivergate Building, 600 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri.**

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review and Adopt September Meeting Minutes*
3. Update on Project Solicitation and Modal Committee Work
4. Financial Capacity Analysis*
 - Consider Approval of Plan Revenue Assumptions
5. Discuss Funding Distribution Methodology
6. Other
7. Next Meeting Date & Time (Tentatively November 17th)

*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

10/20/09

1. Welcome and Introductions.

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

2. Review and Adopt September Meeting Minutes.

September meeting minutes were approved.

3. Update on Project Solicitation and Modal Committee Work.

Tom Gerend provided an update on project solicitation and modal committee work.

- Tom said that staff has been conducting an initial assessment of project submittals by categories with modal committees.
- All project submittal information, by category, is available to each committee.
- Project numbers and costs by state were presented: 256 projects in KS and 344 in MO; \$6.554 billion in KS and \$12.303 in MO.
- Tom then reviewed information for road/highways projects:
 - 363 road/highway projects were submitted, totaling \$9.52 billion.
 - This does not convey operations and maintenance projects.
 - The list of projects captured most previously identified needs.
 - Project scores are posted online. This is a piece of information for committees to use when reviewing projects. The scores were largely dependent on the quality of sponsor information. Because of this, we see some groupings of scores by jurisdictions.
 - We've heard folks spent more time than in the past thinking about project submittals. Because of the information requested through the application, we now have good data to work with in the future.
 - Staff asked project sponsors to view scores and submit clarifying information. The deadline is short for this review. Dick Jarrold inquired about the short time frame, as there are a lot of projects to review. Tom said we don't want a full blown second submission. We're trying to ensure an accurate project list.
 - Doug Wood asked about the flexibility of the list in the future. He said that none of the recommendations coming out of the 5-county study are included. Tom said that we are working closely with KDOT on this study. KDOT did provide information on those projects as part of their TLINK process. Tom said that the plan can be amended. We need to talk about the approach for this.
 - Doug asked if there could be funding problems with an amendment.
 - Tom said that typically there is an amendment because a project is moving fast.
 - Mell said that in the past, the plan has identified study corridors.

- Tom said that some studies are being included in the plan because we received some through the solicitation process, even though we didn't specifically call them out as eligible projects. Linda Clark said we need to talk about how to include other studies, since some folks didn't know these were eligible.
- Ron McLinden asked how project gaps will be filled.
- Tom said it is preferential to have a project sponsor, but MARC can include placeholder projects.
- Tom reviewed information for transit projects:
 - Dick said some projects aren't represented on the list because they are operating expenditures. This list only includes capital projects.
 - Tom said 29 of the projects submitted support Smart Moves.
 - The transit projects are high dollar investments, totally \$3.86 billion.
 - There was a lack of submissions supporting commuter corridors.
- Tom reviewed information for bike/ped. projects:
 - He showed an assessment of the bike/ped. projects coupled with the MetroGreen corridors.
 - The bike/ped. committee meets next week to review the list.
 - There is some overlap between the roadway and bike/ped. projects (177 roadway projects included bike/ped. elements).
- Tom reviewed projects submitted in the activity centers and nodes category:
 - Projects submitted under this category include road diets, streetscape improvements, and bus rapid transit corridors.
 - Projects submitted in this category can help advance the adaptive land use scenario.
 - There has been consensus to develop a forecast around the adaptive scenario. Staff is modeling both the baseline and adaptive.
 - Tom showed maps that included submitted projects overlaid with each scenario.
 - Need additional information about which projects support the adaptive scenario.
 - Investments in this category align with both scenarios in different ways.
 - Ron Mc. said that he is concerned about showing capacity projects outside the urban area if we're going with the adaptive scenario. What does this say to the development community?
 - Tom said that K-7 is a unique corridor that grows under both scenarios. It will be a policy decision about how well projects align with the adaptive scenario.
 - Doug said that the adaptive scenario should find favor. Reality is a chicken and egg scenario r.e. roads and development. Need a program to revitalize the residential piece in existing areas. What good is a road without people?
 - Tom said staff has done some preliminary modeling. Congestion differs significantly between scenarios. The adaptive scenario yields similar congestion levels as today.
 - Doug said a nodes concept is the greatest hope of revitalizing neighborhoods.
 - Ron Mc. said the model doesn't reflect changes in personal travel preferences. It needs to include drug stores, libraries, etc... (finer grain of

necessity). He doesn't have confidence in the model. Tom said it is the best available information.

4. Financial Capacity Analysis

- Tom said we'll be surveying committees and applying financial capacity to projects.
- Darryl Fields presented two revenue scenarios.
- There is a \$4 billion gap between submitted projects and projected revenues with scenario A. Scenario A provides about \$14.8 billion to build projects.
- The main difference between scenarios A and B is that locals provide more funds in scenario B. Scenario B provides about 25.3 billion to build projects.
- Staff recommends going with scenario A because it is more conservative and realistic.
- Lee Ann asked about the definition of operations and maintenance (O&M). She said the estimation doesn't include operations and maintenance for transit.
- Darryl said he developed maintenance costs by combining numbers from MoDOT for per lane mile maintenance costs + maintenance costs provided on the applications. This results in \$7.3 billion over 30 years. He said the transit maintenance costs are hard to calculate.
- A discussion ensued regarding transit operations and maintenance costs and revenues.
- It was noted that \$19,000 per land mile for maintenance is too low. MoDOT's O&M budget is for snow removal, etc... No money is set aside for bridges/resurfacing.
- MoDOT said it will take \$650 million per year to reach their goal of 85% of roads in good condition.
- It was noted that MoDOT and KDOT's O&M numbers are dramatically different.
- Ron Achelpohl said the upper end may be \$10 billion for O&M. We aren't reporting transit O&M.
- Linda Clark wants to see the math behind these numbers. The DOTs and MARC need to work this out.
- Tom said this is an off-the-top approach.
- Hope said MoDOT may have submitted other projects (more bridges) if they had known the target O&M revenue projection was no longer valid.
- It was noted that we can't consider approval of assumptions.
- Lee Ann asked how inflation is captured.
- Darryl said everything is currently in 2009 numbers. Numbers will be inflated by 3% in plan.
- Tom said they will be looking to ensure KDOT's maintenance figures are as conservative as can be. Need to be conservative in local revenue assumptions, as well.
- Doug said that at some point MARC needs to work on separate bi-state funding source for transit.
- Alice said we don't say we are going to make roads pay for themselves, so why would shouldn't say the same of transit.

- Doug said that, in KS, there is not enough money to maintain the existing system. It was noted that all entities are in the same boat.
- Dick said the underlying assumption is that there's a funding source for new BRT.
- Ron said the regional sales tax was the transit story in last plan. Need to develop a new scenario.
- Tom said this is a financially constrained plan. Can also talk about vision for more service, etc... How to make better decisions about the money that is available?

5. Discuss Funding Distribution Methodology

- The funding distribution method is subject to the outcome of the financial capacity analysis.
- Looking at aligning resources with policy goals.
- Options: amend high level policy distribution, develop programmatic approach to address needs/opportunities, or a combination of these.
- Ron Mc. asked where this discussion will take place. He said it needs to be discussed now.
- Tom said it starts with this committee. The committee will spend majority of time with this topic next month.
- Doug said that a multi-modal, goal based approach may be needed. To facilitate this, we need to be looking at how to prioritize projects to develop activity nodes and transit corridors. Need way to determine which do this.
- Tom said this may be the ultimate solution.
- Doug said a vast majority of the population wants to live close to where they work. Look at nodes in that context. Capital projects should complement this realization.
- Hope said the revenue gap is not necessarily a bad thing. In their applications, locals didn't talk about how their projects exceed revenues.
- Ron Mc. said the projects submitted under the nodes/centers category represent the tip of the iceberg, as far as what we need to do to advance the adaptive scenario.

6. Next Meeting Date & Time (Tentatively November 17th)