



Long Range Transportation Plan Sub-Committee

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

Because of the Federal Certification Review meeting over lunch, TTPC will be starting later than normal this month. The Long-Range Plan Subcommittee will be meeting between 9:30 and 11:00, with TTPC following at 11:10 AM.

There will be a meeting of the MARC LRTP Sub- Committee, **Tuesday, September 22nd, 2009 9:30-11:00 AM** at Mid-America Regional Council, Board Room, Conference Center (2nd Floor), Rivergate Building, 600 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri.

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Transportation Outlook 2040- Progress Briefing
3. Briefing on Project Solicitation Results
4. Financial Capacity Analysis
5. Discuss Funding Distribution Policy
6. Other
7. Next Meeting Date & Time (Tentatively October 20th)

*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

9/22/09

1. Welcome and Introductions.

Meeting participants introduced themselves after Marge Vogt called the meeting to order.

2. Transportation Outlook 2040- Progress Briefing

Tom Gerend provided a progress briefing on Transportation Outlook 2040.

- He said that the project nomination period for TO2040 has closed.
- Staff is completing project scoring.
- Over the next few months, a project gap analysis will be conducted with MARC modal committees.
- Also over the next few months, the LRTP Sub-Committee will hold a funding distribution policy discussion.
- A discussion regarding the land use scenarios will be held at this week's Board meeting. After the Board affirms a direction, the land use forecast will be merged with the nominated projects.

3. Briefing on Project Solicitation Results

Tom provided an overview of projects submitted through the nomination process.

- 601 projects were nominated.
- The project break out is as follows:
 - roadways: 445
 - bike/ped.: 231
 - activity centers: 65
 - transit: 30
 - management/operations: 5
 - programs/studies: 3
- 562 projects were able to mapped via GIS.
- Projects had not yet been screened for eligibility. Staff and the committees will review for eligibility.
- Several projects are multi-modal. As such, there is some redundancy on the project category specific maps.
- Roadway projects are broken out by capacity/non-capacity. Most nominated projects fall within existing municipal boundary lines.
- Transit projects are generally consistent with Smart Moves (e.g. projects were submitted along Shawnee Mission, Metcalf, Prospect, and others). The Rock Island Corridor was called out in a few different project categories.
- This call for projects was a test of alignment of local and regional plans.
- A question was asked about transit connections to Amtrak. Tom said no transit connections to Amtrak were nominated.

- Many of the bike/ped. projects were tied to roadway projects. Olathe's nominated projects are a good example of this.
- Tom said staff will break out the bike/ped. projects by on-road/shared use.
- Marge asked if the bike/ped. projects will be overlaid on a map with the MetroGreen system. Tom said that staff will work on this.
- Regarding the centers/nodes category, projects submitted ranged in location from downtown KC to Metcalf in Overland Park. There is a lot of diversity in this category. The Technical Forecast Committee will review these projects.
- Nominations in the categories of management/operations and programs/studies are not mappable.
- Marge noted that this solicitation process is fascinating - It particularly highlights how communities are coming together to support regional plans such as MetroGreen and Smart Moves.
- She also asked if staff had received much feedback on the new solicitation process. She said Olathe staff mentioned to her that the application took more time and effort than it had in the past. Tom said that the process was developed within the context of the adopted policy goals, and that it made for a rational process.

4. Financial Capacity Analysis

Darryl Fields provided an overview of the financial capacity analysis.

- He said that revenues for both Kansas and Missouri comprised federal, state, MARC STP, and local funds.
- Marge asked if the information demonstrated tighter constraints. Tom said that there is some variability around the revenue assumptions. We have to ask what estimates of local contribution are reasonable.
- Marge said, regarding the local assumptions, maybe we should look at average revenue over the past five years, or something similar.
- Tom said transit revenue can be looked at a few different ways. The figure provided doesn't include Unified Government of Wyandotte County.
- Doug Wood noted that it isn't equitable to break out the KCATA and UG figures separately from the others.
- Marcia Bernard said the reporting requirements are changing soon, and that they would provide a more accurate picture.
- A discussion ensued regarding how the transit numbers are portrayed. Dick Jarrold said that the federal government views transit revenues on a project by project basis, so the group doesn't need to focus too much on how the numbers are sliced up (regional vs. transit agency vs. county). A detailed financial plan is required for any transit project.
- Tom said that the financial capacity picture is a regional aggregate – it portrays what we can afford vs. what we want.
- KS revenues are shown by policy, historically. Federal government requires we maintain what we build. MO revenues are shown by practice or policy. Shows distribution if we spend how we have in the past (over past 3 – 4 long-range transportation plans).

- Ed Ford noted that the MPO boundary has been expanded, and wondered if this changes the amount of funds provided by MODOT. Hope Visconti said that issue will be looked at by MODOT at the end of the fiscal year.
- Ron Norris asked if the assumptions are taken from general fund debt and true general fund. Is there consideration of special purpose revenues (excise tax, public/private partnerships, etc...)?
- Darryl said that general funds are based on the economic model for the region. It doesn't include excise taxes or the like - There's not a clean way to capture that.
- Marge said that there are so many unknowns, and she pointed out that there is an amendment process.
- Hope said that the percentages from the last plan are different than they are now.
- Mell Henderson said that the most important point is that we will need to defend assumptions and identify what's reasonable.
- Darryl demonstrated that there will be about \$24 billion dollars to work with for the 2040 plan (\$19.7 for highway, \$4.4. for transit). \$45 billion worth of projects were nominated.
- A 3% rate of growth was used for 2009 vs. 2040 dollars.
- Ron Achelpohl said costs and revenues are needed in year of expenditure dollars. At the September Sub-Committee meeting, staff will provide these numbers by decade.
- Worst case scenario is that there will be a shortfall of \$21 billion over the life of the plan.
- Tom said there are several options to achieve financial constraint. We can reduce the number of projects on the list, modify distribution policy, identify new funding, or have some combination of these.
- Tom noted that there is more confidence in the numbers for the projects to be implemented in the near term – A benefit is that the plan is updated every 5 years.
- Doug said it would be good to see priority placeholder projects by decade.
- Marge would like to see projects to be implemented over the next 5 years, by state.
- Hope asked how we're viewing cities that submitted a lot of projects, but don't contribute a lot to revenues.
- Tom said we're relying on committees to review the project lists in this light, and to develop a reasonable list.
- Ron N. said the first step should be to refine assumptions for the consensus gap before trying to close the gap.
- Tom said that staff will come back to the sub-committee next month with several financial scenarios.
- Doug said a 3% inflation rate is not a worst case scenario.
- Alice Amrein noted that today the Secretary of Transportation said that 5.3% is the average inflation rate.
- Doug said that our region's population increase is due to immigration. If that changes, how is that extrapolated out?

- Hope said that MoDOT didn't submit costs for operations and maintenance with their nominations.
- Joel Skelley said he'd like to see the general assumptions used for the financial capacity analysis.
- Tom said that, for next month's meeting, a different picture of the gaps based on different assumptions will be provided. Staff will talk with MoDOT and KDOT when developing those.

5. Discuss Funding Distribution Policy

Tom said that the 2040 sub-committee will have an opportunity to convey the plan's funding distribution policy direction.

- MARC's transportation funding distribution policy has been carried forward for several plans.
- Tom showed summaries of the current policy (it's very highway specific) and expenditures by year.
- He said that we are looking to align programming with the objectives of Transportation Outlook 2040, and that we have a policy based directive to do so.
- A few options for Transportation Outlook 2040's funding distribution include: 1) Maintain existing policy 2) Amend policy 3) Develop programmatic approach.
- Tom mentioned Atlanta's Livable Centers initiative as one example of a program that uses surface transportation funds to fund plans/projects in activity centers.
- Marge said the sub-committee needs to determine if the solicitation categories should be used for the funding distribution policy. Unless we get more funds, shouldn't we just be funding preservation/operations?
- Hope said that maintenance is one of MoDOT's greatest concerns. MoDOT is focused on making sure maintenance funds at least stay where they are. We will need to look at getting rid of the term "new capacity".
- Marge said it could be called "expansion and enhancements".
- Hope suggested "major projects".
- Kathy Dusenbery asked if locals are going to receive credit when they accept responsibility for a roadway that was previously on MoDOT's list.
- Darryl said that between 1995 and 2040, the region added 300 lane miles to the system. MoDOT and KDOT have a lane mile cap. They are not under that cap by much.
- Doug said that only 10 out of 100 points were dedicated to economic benefits of projects. We should be looking at projects within the context of the environment, economic justice (transit/mobility capacity) and economic benefits. This is what the funding distribution policy should be based on.
- Doug asked what would happen if we dedicated out 10% of funds for new projects and the rest goes to maintenance. Need a framework for determining these percentages.
- Marge said we need to look at real world vs. dreamland scenarios.
- Dick said he likes the idea of a hybrid of programmatic approach.
- Marge asked if looking at the list of project scores will help the committee see a direction for funding distribution.

- Tom said that staff will provide options to aid in the financial distribution discussion next month.
- Dick asked how the goals apply to this process.
- Doug said he'd like to hear more information on Atlanta's Livable Centers program.

6. Next Meeting Date & Time (Tentatively October 20th)