



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 ,May 18th, 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 March Meeting Minutes*
3. 2040 Public Comment Period Update- report on the open house
4. Recap of Board Action on Final Policy Statement and Draft Forecast (see link below)
<http://www.marc.org/2040/documents/BoardLandUsePolicyStatement4-27-10.pdf>
5. Discuss 2040 Plan Implementation
 - Alignment of programming committee project evaluation process
 - Discuss Funding set-aside proposal (see attachment provided)
 - Discuss committee structure or other considerations
6. Other

*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

05/28/10

1. Welcome and Introductions.

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

2. Review and Adopt March Meeting Minutes.

March meeting minutes were approved.

3. 2040 Public Comment Period Update – report on the open house.

- Karen Clawson said that the public comment period for Transportation Outlook 2040 started at the beginning of May and ends June 1st.
- So far six comments have been submitted via the Web and have been responded to by staff.
- Last week, MARC held a Transportation Outlook 2040 Open House. 45 people signed in. Surveys distributed and completed during the open house will be posted on the MARC TO2040 website this week. Video comments, display boards, and presentations from the open house will also be posted online soon.
- Marge Vogt asked Karen to summarize the feedback received thus far.
- Karen said she's seeing general support for the population and economic forecast, project selection process, policy framework, and performance measures, and how all of these elements are related to each other. Additional safety strategies have been suggested.

4. Recap of Board Action on Final Policy Statement and Draft Forecast.

- Mell Henderson said that Board action on the growth and land use policy direction earlier this month prompted today's LRTP Sub-Committee meeting. The Sub-Committee needs to provide information to the Board prior to their next action.
- Mell said these policies are reflective of work taking place at the local level - Two directly relate to transportation.
- There have been a few questions about what it means to "give priority to funding transportation projects serving activity centers along locally identified corridors". The City of Mission proposed modifying this policy to state that 35% of our resources will be allocated to alternative modes of transportation. The Board didn't adopt this modification, but rather instructed this Sub-Committee to look at the implications of this prior to the Board's next meeting.
- Marge said the Board policies are strategies for implementation, but there isn't much detail to them.
- Mell said the long-range plan has strategies embedded in it that haven't yet been tied to programming. That's the next discussion after plan adoption. The Board discussion prompted us to dig into this discussion early. Historically, we have gone

back and reviewed programming processes after plan adoption. The Board discussion has gone to a new level this time around.

5. Discuss TO2040 Plan Implementation.

- Ron Achelpohl said MARC implements the long-range plan by funding programs (CMAQ, JARC/New Freedom, STP/Bridge, and STP/TE).
- Near-term plan implementation needs include: overdue programming rounds, relating programming to the policy and land use vision, and incorporating additional equity issue (geographic, multimodal).
- Long-term issues include ozone non-attainment, new federal legislation, and MARC committee structure.
- In responding to Mission's request, staff did some research on how much is spent on alternative transportation modes (including and not including STP). We don't currently set aside STP/bridge funds for alternative modes.
- CMAQ sets aside 34% for transit and 14% for bike/ped.
- TE funds are entirely for alternative modes.
- Regarding actual allocation of funds, some STP funds have gone to alternative modes (more MO than KS funds).
- By current practice, less than 25% of the total amount of funds goes to alternative modes.
- One question staff has is whether Mission wants 35% of funds for alternative modes taken out of STP or if this is a total for all funding programs.
- Regarding STP programming history, 85% has gone to highways. Some of these projects include sidewalks, etc... 7% of total applications have been bike/ped. projects, 5% have been bridge and other (Rideshare), and 1% have been transit.
- In KS, there are no dedicated transit or bike/ped. allocations. 90.4% of money requested goes for highways.
- Regarding programmed funds, 96% goes to highways and 1% goes for multimodal activities (Rideshare). Less than 1/2 of the KS applicants received funding.
- Of multimodal projects submitted, 1 in 5 was funded (disproportionate to highway).
- A lot of projects are getting partially funded.
- Regarding MO, there are more multimodal applications, thus, more projects are getting funded. MO is more over-subscribed than Kansas. 14% of multimodal projects submitted get funded. Highway projects are more competitive than they are in KS.
- MO is a little more equitable than KS with multimodal projects, but there is fiercer competition.
- Suballocated funds are not the largest funds in the TIP. MARC funds a pretty significant amount of multimodal projects (not through STP, though).
- There are a few ways to address Mission's request – It's not unprecedented to establish modal targets (have not typically done this with STP).
- Kathy Dusenbery said she would rather go with a short-term approach because we can use those for now and readjust as the economy changes.
- Dick Jarrold said a short-term view is a good idea because of the new transportation bill. He noted there aren't many transit applications for STP because they typically

don't receive funding. STP funds are not available for transit operations, but CMAQ funds are available for this.

- Kathy asked about giving priority to centers and corridors projects.
- Ron A. said most of MARC's criteria relate to locations. With the new plan, there will be a new map. This is one of the many factors we look at. There is not a prioritization of centers right now.
- Marge said there were concerns that the map didn't reflect all centers. New centers will emerge. If a certain center is not on the map, will we have to delay the process until we figure it out/add it?
- Ron A. said we may not give full points for a project like that, but could flag it.
- Marge said it's about locals identifying where the centers are.
- Frank Lenk said there are 900 centers and corridors on the map. We haven't said no to any centers that have been suggested by locals. The bigger question is whether we're looking at projects "going by" a center or whether we're looking at which projects function as connecting points to make a more livable, efficient region.
- Marge said this is a very significant question.
- Ron McLinden said that many of the 900 nodes are aspirational. Need to prioritize nodes to guide investments. Focus on corridors/nodes that have transit. Haven't yet heard "place making" as a term. This is a theme of federal policy right now. Need to contribute to making those places good places to live and work.
- Doug Wood asked if we have the authority to use STP funds for transit operations. It was verified that these funds are for capital expenses and that no one is asking to change the rules to use these for operations.
- Doug said that the money has been spent well to mitigate congestion even though the majority has been spent on highways. He said that Mission's proposal is problematic. How to implement the adaptive scenario is what we should look at. Transit has a role, but it is not the sole mechanism. Implementation should be about what to do with the nodes. We should define nodes - A node includes economic activity (entertainment, industrial, commercial).
- He also said that we need to talk about decentralization. Downtown Kansas City is unique, but not a place where people migrate. We should talk about livable communities as a way to relieve congestion.
- Alice Amrein said she disagrees with Doug. We're at a crossroads. Have to make changes by changing policies. We currently don't give our residents many transportation options. Transit has submitted applications for STP funds, but the committees have said they won't fund those projects.
- Doug said he has an objection to Mission's specific request, but he's not opposed to increasing the amount of funds going to alternative modes. Where we are on the spectrum is the question. Land use planning is more important than transit for implementation of the adaptive scenario.
- Hope Visconti agrees with Alice. She was surprised/excited by the conversation that is occurring on the Board level. It has to happen at the Board level for changes to be made. It's disheartening that the presentation today hangs its hat on the fact that there's not enough money available to fund alternate modes. TE funds are skewed because a lot of those funds go to aesthetic projects (monuments, landscaping).

- She said if we're taking this presentation to the Board, we should talk about what various funds could be used for (transit, b/p). Look at what would happen if we aligned our funding with the values in the LRTP.
- Kenneth Bernard said that we need to change policies and our way of thinking for the disabled population and ever-growing aging population. These populations can't get where they need to go because appropriate systems are not there.
- Kathy said communities need help making pedestrian connections. Also, transit stops don't have shelters or benches.
- Dick wondered, in light of Mission's proposal, if we could talk about a target versus a set aside.
- Marge asked what these pots of funds can be used for and what the match is for them. She said you could get in the situation of being driven by allocation, not need.
- Dick said congestion is occurring further and further out.
- Marge said the suburbs are providing sales tax to the state.
- Dick said, regarding the evaluation criteria, a transit bench won't outscore a roadway project.
- Ed Ford said these are bleak days for Kansas City. The forecast envisions more sprawl because it is based heavily on past trends. The Board policy statements aren't as reflective of this as they should be.
- Gary said a 35% benchmark for alternative modes takes money from one underfunded project and gives it to another underfunded project.
- Ron M. likes what Hope said about programming values. It's important for highway money be spent on livable centers/nodes.
- Doug said that if we think in terms of redevelopment, transit will come.
- Frank said south KC shows growth in adaptive. The forecast doesn't go as far as we'd like in revitalizing the core.
- Ron A. said staff will do additional TE analysis and will look at other opportunities to respond to more multi-modal funding. STP has the most potential for change. The same discussion we're having today needs to happen with other committees.
- Ron A. said work has started with the priorities committees to make sure the LRTP policies are incorporated into the process. Have tried to make transit competitive with highways (number of persons served). Haven't added weights to the draft criteria yet.
- Livable community pilot projects became eligible in STP in 2005 – 2006. This category is similar to the activity centers category in LRTP. We may see applications for this STP category this time around.
- Marge asked why there are no economic vitality criteria for transit.
- Ron A. said this should be included for all categories.
- Dick said in some categories, it is impossible for transit to get all points.
- Dick asked about pedestrian projects.
- Ron A. said those would go in the operations and maintenance or activity center category. There are a lot of projects to fund. It's hard to make a category for each one.
- Hope said if pedestrian projects are in operations and maintenance, they wouldn't get many points.

- Ron A. said it took about a year to start over with criteria.
- Mell said there appears to be a comfort level with modifying what we've been doing and moving ahead with a call for projects. Are there any other instructions we should pass along to committees?
- Ron M. said the linking group should weigh in.
- Marge said she's not opposed to moving ahead with the modified criteria. With TLINK, they looked at numbers of dollars and jobs created with projects. Does "supporting a center" tell us much about the economic impact of a project?
- Ron M. said it is a short term approach to sustainability.
- Doug said the numbers don't add up to 100%. Need to look at where we can put values in with redevelopment. "Priority funding to centers" should include redevelopment and infill. If you affect Johnson County sewers, you can affect land use policy.
- Ron said 100% is an arbitrary target. Staff will fix/balance this.
- Marge said sewers are a local decision. It's a touchy issue. We need to move forward.
- Marge said that every project should be based on information on pages 3 and page 11 of the STP criteria handout. If you follow that, you'll get there. Have different criteria for each mode. Forgot about place making goal.
- Allison said that other MPOs have a check list that is used when projects are submitted for the TIP.
- Ron A. said that, when programming, we need to program projects in the time-frame they're dedicated for. This is less concern in the long-range plan.
- He said that system performance for roads and transit are different – they don't compete well with each other. The evaluation won't be perfect.
- Dick said a future discussion needs to occur r.e. who does the scoring. Engineers like numbers. It's hard to do an apples to apples comparison with the variety of projects we're looking at. The STP committees are primarily engineers.
- Hope said that a lot of times the scoring is used as a guide, not as an exact project predictor.
- Dick said the scores often don't reflect the committee's preference for projects.
- Ron A. said the criteria is not sufficient in and of itself.
- He said we need to identify what we'll say to the Board. He senses the committee is comfortable with proceeding with a call for projects, but we need to re-evaluate the criteria/committees soon.
- He said that all committees need to consider centers, multi-modal aspects. We're not sure how to weight centers yet.
- Ed wants an economic development/sustainability conversation.
- Ron A. wants to wrap up the process by end of year. A call for projects will likely go out after July 4th. There will be a CMAQ call, too. This committee could look at additional details in June.
- Kathy said a definition for nodes is needed.
- Doug said a node should have at least one economic activity.
- Franks said this is not the way they are defined – They have different classifications.

6. Next Meeting Date & Time. If held in June, Tuesday, June 15.