



**OPEN MEETING NOTICE**  
**MISSOURI TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE**

There will be a meeting of MARC's Missouri Transportation Enhancements Subcommittee on **Wednesday, February 1, 2012, at 2 p.m. in the Westview Room** on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Rivergate Center, 600 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri.

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. Application limits (percentage cap and project funding maximums)
3. Scoring criteria equity (for project types and community size)
4. Scoring procedure modifications
5. Definitions
6. Other business

**Getting to MARC:** For information on transportation options to the MARC offices, including directions, parking, transit, carpooling, and bicycling, visit <http://marc.org/mapandparking.htm>. 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.

**Special Accommodations:** 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 programs may not discriminate against anyone on the basis of race, color or national origin, according to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see [http://www.marc.org/transportation/title\\_vi.htm](http://www.marc.org/transportation/title_vi.htm), or call 816-474-4240.

**Missouri Transportation Enhancements Subcommittee**  
**February 1, 2012**  
**Meeting Summary**

**In attendance: Art Gough, Dennis Randolph, Elizabeth Beckett, Jeff Fisher, Richard Shipley, Wes Minder, Heidi Schallberg**

Dennis Randolph will be the subcommittee chair since Lee Morris is no longer on the committee.

***Discussion: Scoring criteria equity (project types and community size)***

- The scoring criteria encouraged trail projects over sidewalks with more points for more modes. Some projects applied as trails that would have been better suited as sidewalks. Sidewalks are usually not eligible if they are part of a cross section of a larger project.
- Scoring on safety/education category – the criteria were not vetted as much since committee has only had one application in the past scored in that category. Those projects scored high in this round.
- “Regionally significant” can be different for smaller communities. *Transportation Outlook 2040* can help in that activity centers should help smaller communities show regional significance.
- Education for applicants would help. MARC does preapplication workshops. MARC also has some very limited capacity for Small Cities program grant writing support based on staff availability. Some jurisdictions were more involved with the long-range plan process and were more familiar with the activity centers, etc.; those not as involved in the long-range plan may not have been as familiar. That will be an ongoing education process for MARC.
- Staff didn’t receive many questions from applicants. The application is not intended as a quiz on finding activity centers – staff can help with that basic information, but they have to hear from applicants with questions to be able to help.
- Smaller communities not necessarily disadvantaged in the process – any jurisdiction could be disadvantaged if they don’t have experience with the process as an applicant.
- Recommendation to have applications from previously funded projects available online as examples with scores, along with the application template.
- Look at other methods for contacting MARC with application questions – is online chat a possibility for the application

***Discussion: Application limits***

Project cap of \$500,000

- Origin of \$500,000 cap was Bruce Watkins Drive in the 1990s.
- Seems like this region does a lot less phasing than others, so nothing goes until every problem is solved on the project when less phasing is done. Encouraging phasing could help spread the funding around.

- Add as a question to the application: *Is this project phased?* That could help deal with problems more effectively and get jobs done on time. If funding segments, the project sponsor would likely return for more funding in the future, and the committee could end up funding mostly continuations of phased projects down the road. A lot of funded projects are already segments.
- KC has a larger budget so can match more with increased federal funding. There probably are only a few more cities that could come up with that larger local amount. It might be counterproductive to raise the project cap.

#### Number of applications

- Is the process really broken enough to need fixing?
- As number of applications increases, the process becomes a multiple day event, and many committee members can't block off that much time, especially for the smaller funding amounts.
- Is it legal to limit applications by population, like with membership?
- Typically communities may not have more than 3-4 applications. It's typically an issue of having the local match if they received funding for multiple projects.

#### ***Discussion: Committee procedure modifications***

- Process may not really be that broken
- TE committee has had more in-depth scoring review in the past. When there is more time in a round, it's easier to review scoring – STP was able to do that with applicants before the committees met because of more time in its round. With more time, TE could do that up front instead of in the committee process.
- Each round has been different, and the committee has worked through it. Each round will likely continue to be different. Last round spread the funding around well.
- Prescreening applications for eligibility could be useful.
- Ask for prioritized projects from those with more than one application. KC started with 30 potential applications for the last round, which was then whittled down to 15 to meet the 105% limit. With six council districts, they try to have the same number of applications from each district.
- Subcommittee for scoring wouldn't work as well for this – how would you select the members/jurisdictions? CMAQ is a different structure – TE committee size works well so not as much reason for a scoring/evaluation subcommittee
- Concerns about presentations being more about arm twisting or slick presenters – subcommittee members didn't want those, just information and facts.
- Presentations weren't as useful in this last round – whole process was too rushed
- Field checks as alternative to presentations. Field checks can be more neutral and consistent than presentations; could have a checklist to use during field checks. Field checks can help smaller communities that may not look as strong on an application.
- Field checks were not done in last round because there was not enough time given by MoDOT for this committee's process. A longer timeline for the round takes care of some of these issues.

- Request or require photos from applicants.
- Committee could go through the applications, scoring and field check information as background, then have time for questions about the applications. Could go case by case, if committee has questions, and submit those to staff so applicants could answer.
- Questions for applications may be more about phasing and timing for connections – could add a question to the application to get at that. It's often dependent on funding.
- With scoring and field checks, presentations really aren't needed and they don't want to sit through them.
- An application still needs to have quality thought put into it.

#### *Destination Safe Coalition Process Model (memo outlined process)*

- Destination Safe Coalition makes recommendations for safety funding from MoDOT and KDOT for education and enforcement projects.
- Uses a combination of scoring criteria and member votes for project rankings.
- May be a very different program from TE, but the structure is a framework TE could consider to replace more in-depth scoring review by committee.
- Applications are scored using the criteria and then ranked.
- Applicants make presentations (there are many fewer projects than TE), and members can ask questions.
- Instead of going through scoring in more details, each member has X number of votes for projects but can't stack all votes on one project. But when committee members don't see a project's perceived value reflected in the scoring, votes are an opportunity to influence the ranking.
- Votes are tallied in meeting and incorporated into the final scores. That revised ranking is used for committee discussion for funding recommendations.

#### **Subcommittee recommendations to the committee for discussion**

##### *Scoring criteria equity*

- 1) Post applications from previously funded projects available online as examples with scores, along with the application template, to assist newer applicants who may be unfamiliar with the process.

##### *Application limits*

- 2) In favor of retaining the \$500,000 project limit. It helps with phasing and getting smaller segments done. More federal funding also means more local match a community must provide.
- 3) Could limit applications by **105% X available total funding/\$500,000 = cap on total number of applications for any jurisdiction**. The cap would be floating based on available funding in each round, and round up if needed. Example: KC would have had 13 applications instead of 15 in the last round. Note: If there are no presentations and in-depth scoring review, the number of applications doesn't matter as much.

### *Committee process modifications*

- 4) Do field checks in place of presentations. A subcommittee could assist with field checks. Report on field checks to the full committee instead of requiring presentations. If the committee has questions for an applicant, either call the applicant during the meeting or have questions submitted ahead of time to allow for answers.
- 5) Have a prescreening – eligibility synopsis
- 6) Incorporate committee member votes into project rankings by using the Destination Safe Coalition scoring process structure as a model. TE shouldn't have the committee votes increase a score more than 10%. Could look at using voting equipment, like remotes to use in polls.