

600 Broadway, Suite 200
Kansas City, Missouri 64105-1659

816/474-4240
816/421-7758 FAX
www.marc.org



OPEN MEETING NOTICE

MISSOURI STP/BR PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

September 14, 2010

1:30 – 4:00 PM

Board Room, MARC Offices

600 Broadway, Suite 200, Kansas City, Missouri 64105

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approve the August 10, 2010 Meeting Summary (attached)*
3. 2013-14 STP/BR Project Solicitation Ground Rules*
Please reference the attached materials and the following documents from the MARC website:
[MARC Board Policy Statement on Regional Growth and Land-Use](#)
[Transportation Outlook 2040 Policy Framework](#)
4. MARC Functional Classification Procedures*
Please reference the attached materials. Proposed changes are highlighted in yellow.
5. ARRA Funding
Discuss status of ARRA funding in the region.
6. Other Business
7. Adjournment

* Action Items

Next Regular Meeting: October 12, 2010

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 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 do 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, or call 816-474-4240.

Missouri STP/BR Priorities Committee
September 14, 2010
Draft Meeting Summary

Voting Members:

Chuck Owsley, Chair, City of Lee's Summit
Oliver DeGrate, Vice-chair, City of Blue Springs
Linda Clark, MoDOT
Kyle Elliott, City of Kansas City
Steve Hansen, City of Liberty
Duane Jackson, Clay County
Mike Krass, City of Raymore
Dena Mezger, City of Lee's Summit
Wes Minder, City of Kansas City
Lee Morris, Cass County
Andy Noll, City of Raytown
Earl Newill, Jackson County
John Powell, City of Independence
Dennis Randolph, City of Grandview

MARC Staff:

Ron Achelpohl	Tom Gerend
Marc Hansen	Jim Hubbell
Terry Anderson	Heidi Schallberg
Stephen Lachky	Muril Stone

Others:

Brian Faust, City of Raymore
Helen Madison, MoDOT
Jeff McKerrow, TranSystems
Ron McLinden, Transit Action Network
Michael Park, City of Lee's Summit
Steve Rhoades, Patty Banks Assoc.
Linda Rottinghaus, Affinis
Chad Thompson, City of Kansas City

1. Welcome

Chairman Chuck Owsley welcomed attendees and opened the meeting with introductions.

2. Approval of the August 10 Meeting Summary

Oliver DeGrate moved and Dennis Randolph seconded to approve the August 10, 2010 meeting summary as drafted, the motion carried.

3. 2013-14 STP/BR Project Solicitation Ground Rules

Background: In June, prior to the distribution of the 2013-2014 STP/BR Call for Projects, the committee began discussions to set ground rules for programming the funds. Website links were provided for the committee to review: Transportation Outlook 2040 Policy Framework and the MARC Board Policy Statement on Regional Growth and Land Use that was adopted by the Board on April 27th. Two of the eight policies would affect decisions made during this and future funding rounds:

- Give priority to funding transportation projects that serve activity centers along locally identified corridors.
- Increase levels of transit service along priority corridors.

Also at the June meeting, MARC staff provided the below list of proposed ground rules. The committee agreed there was a need for rules, especially since the A/B Caucus structure was no longer in place and a process would be needed on how to take the programming recommendation to TTPC to engage them more than in the past. A lengthy discussion of rule # 4 was continued to the September meeting. Ground rules:

1. Project scores are provided as information for the committee's use in decision-making. Scores should be carefully considered but should not rigidly bind the committee. Project sponsors will have the opportunity to review and comment on their scores before they are finalized for use by the committee.
2. Project presentations will also provide information for the committee's decision-making. After reviewing initial project scores, the committee may select a set of projects "on the bubble" and any other circumstances that the committee would like to invite for presentations. Presentations may impact the priority of projects for funding but should not result in adjustments to project scores.
3. Jurisdictions with multiple applications will be expected to explain the relative local priority of their projects. The committee will consider this information but will not be bound by it in developing funding recommendations.
4. Equity and fairness between large and small jurisdictions is a guiding principle of this committee. Therefore, programming recommendations for STP and Bridge funds must pass by a simple majority of votes both from the members with only one vote and from the members with multiple votes. (This is new in this committee but is used in our bi-state committees.)
5. Eligibility for other funding sources (e.g., TE, CMAQ) should not be used as justification to disqualify applications from consideration.
6. In addition to programming recommendations to TTPC, the committee will report on how its funding recommendations support the LRTP policy framework and Board Policy Statement on Regional Growth and Land Use.

MARC staff provided details in today’s meeting packet for four voting structure options and test voting scenarios reflecting how votes would pass. Staff researched the structure of many other organizations, including the European Union, to present the voting structure options. **Staff** found that other MPOs commonly use proportional voting structures.

Discussion:	
- The current configuration - with simple majority of votes of members present at meeting	One mbr expressed this is not equitable, others are fine with this.
1. Proportional membership – one vote per 5,000 population with simple majority of votes of members present at meeting.	Not practical to have a 225 member committee.
2. Weighted voting - with simple majority of weighted votes of members present at meeting.	Doable but would need role call & computer to handle 244 weighted votes. (KC would have 4 mbrs w/90 votes)
3. Dual majorities – with simple majority of votes of members present at meeting from both groups of multi-vote jurisdictions AND single-vote jurisdiction.	Doesn’t seem as democratic as our current system. One of the groups can block a vote.
4. Majority votes + Majority population - with simple majority of weighted votes of members present at meeting, representing at least 50.1% of regional population.	Staff sees this as equitable. Has elements of other scenarios; no one jurisdiction can veto a vote; would need a role call; votes would pass as long as the majority of reps in room vote to pass something; would need 14 largest jurisdictions to agree for minimum passage. Staff provided voting examples of what jurisdiction combinations would pass and meet the population threshold.

Noted that the population numbers on the handout does not reflect the revised 2009 population estimates that were released two weeks ago on September 1st. Staff will update the list.

Ron McLinden stated that the ATA has one vote on this committee; jurisdictions have votes based on population. ATA’s ridership would equate to Lee’s Summit’s population. Linda Clark added that MoDOT also has only one vote with 100 percent of the region’s (not equitable for MoDOT or ATA) and added that MoDOT has received their fair share of funds in the past.

Dena shared the desire to keep the process simple but could live with option three; Linda agreed. Chuck shared how the former Group B caucus worked well even though there were many jurisdictions and perhaps the Group A jurisdictions are hesitant, not having experienced that dynamic. There is no perfect voting system.

Good projects will score well and typically receive funding if funds are available.

MOTION: Steve Hansen moved and Jeff Fisher seconded to continue using the current voting configuration for this next round of programming. Discussion: Stan Harris and Oliver DeGrate stated a preference of option 3 with dual majorities. Chairman Owsley reminded attendees of the following points: the scoring process has improved through the years, selecting regionally significant projects is the goal, and this is not a political committee but a technical committee. The motion carried with 12 in favor and 6 opposed.

This vote completes the approval of all six proposed ground rules for this upcoming programming round.

Linda Clark recommended that ground rule #3 be modified in the future to include that no jurisdiction can submit applications that total more than the amount available. Since the ground rules have already been approved, this will be a future discussion.

Dena stated that we can revisit this if the 2013-2014 funding round does not go well. Ron Achelpohl shared that staff will send the scores to project sponsors for their review and then will provide to the committee.

4. MARC Functional Classification Policies/Procedures

Last month Jim Hubbell reported on proposed changes to the official functional classification policies and procedures document for committee review with a goal to approve the changes during today’s meeting; however, approval is being delayed to give MARC staff time to review a recently found October 14, 2008, FHWA memorandum with the subject: Information: Updated Guidance for the Functional Classification of Highways. Copies were provided to attendees. Staff is

concerned regarding the process timing. You cannot move a project from the future functional classification map to the official map without NEPA review and approval. Putting a project on the functional class does not guarantee a Federal Highway and MoDOT review within the necessary timing. Jim shared that East-West Gateway has to remove one of their projects from their TIP and they plan to request that it be grandfathered back in the TIP. Stan Harris shared that TTPC charged us with developing a smooth transition process moving projects from the future to the current functional class list. Linda Clark shared that sponsors could start their non-existing road projects with the NEPA process. Ms. Clark shared that MoDOT will do a courtesy NEPA review and you can go ahead and put the project on the functional class and approval will occur shortly after; she sees this as a workload issue. Sherri McIntyre shared concern that we might create a loophole we can't get out of. MARC staff will further review, hold discussions with FHWA and MoDOT and adjust the language of the policy based on input from stakeholders and bring back to the committee.

5. ARRA Funding

Helen Madison provided and reviewed the latest status list with attendees and stated that all ARRA funds have been spent. Attention was directed **to four columns regarding ARRA suballocated funds: the original funds**, the adjustment amounts, the second adjustment (change orders and OJT allocations and remaining funds due to projects receiving low bids), and the final funding. Noted that MoDOT opened up Independence's 39th Street - Noland to Chrysler project to sweep up any remaining available funds by swapping the STP with ARRA dollars they received, creating \$1,072,973.76 of STP funds available.

Helen stressed that ARRA is not over for projects still in construction. She needs to receive the 1589 Report by the third of the following month the report is based on.

6. Other Business

Ron Achelpohl provided copies of MARC's Conflict of Interest Policy Governing all Boards, Commissions, Committees and Subcommittees document that the Board approved last year. MARC is required to review the policy each year with committees.

With the Group A/B Caucuses gone, staff created a draft committee roster identifying voting members and alternates for review. Attendees were asked to provide updates to Terry Anderson.

MoDOT has been contacted by FEMA that funds are available for emergency repairs from declared disasters in Cass, Ray and Jackson counties. Contact FHWA to pursue funds or contact FEMA if the needed repair is not on a functionally classified road. Ms. Clark suggested that this keeps agencies from double-dipping funds.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Next meeting: Tuesday, 1:30 p.m., October 12, 2010