1. Regional Transportation Plan 2050
   a. Martin Rivarola, MARC’s Assistant Director of Transportation, provided an update on the Regional Transportation Plan 2050 (RTP 2050) process. Steps completed include adoption of a revised regional vision statement, a needs assessment, and adoption of an Interim Policy Framework. Public engagement efforts include development of two story maps, with a third in development.
   b. Mr. Rivarola said that MARC completed transportation model sensitivity testing, where different transportation investment packages and land use scenarios were applied to the model, to observe the model’s response in predicting changes in congestion and transit use. In a trend growth scenario, the 2017 adopted forecast was used to assume that 30% of future population growth will occur within the redevelopment area, or the part of the region that was developed by 1990. A focused growth scenario assumed that 60% of population growth will occur in the redevelopment area. He explained that these two growth scenarios were paired with four transportation scenarios in the travel model. The transportation scenarios are: 1. only transportation projects in the TIP are implemented, 2. only projects in current regional transportation plan (TO2040) are completed, 3. TIP projects and the SmartMoves regional transit plan are both implemented, and 4. TIP projects and roadway capacity projects are completed. Mr. Rivarola found that growth scenarios have more impact on travel demand than the transportation investment scenarios. More roadway capacity leads to an increase in vehicle miles traveled and decrease in congestion, or vehicle hours traveled. Also, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) was expected to increase to similar levels regardless of transportation investment, and transit investment leads to significant transit ridership.
   c. Next:
      i. We’ll expand performance measures to align with the policy framework, to include new environmental, climate-related, and other measures.
      ii. We’ll use the EMME travel model, UrbanSim, Envision Tomorrow, and MOVES to expand the measures that can be used to evaluate scenarios.
iii. We’ll consider the impact of autonomous and connected vehicles and the cost of investment scenarios.
iv. Story Map Chapter 3 will report on scenario analysis.
v. Targeted engagement efforts will continue.
vi. Project evaluation criteria development. TFC participants are invited to attend a meeting on December 18 (2:30, at MARC) to ensure that local planning considerations are included.
vii. Scenario analysis will be completed and reviewed from April to October 2019.
viii. Project priorities will be finalized by December 2019.

d. Call for Projects
i. MARC staff will create a list of projects pulled from existing plans. These will be combined with projects submitted during the call for projects so that the regional plan projects gain consideration.
ii. Projects can be submitted from February to April 2019. Projects that had been submitted for the previous plan will need to be resubmitted with updated information.

2. Forecast Update
   a. Frank Lenk, MARC’s Director of Research Services and Andrea Repinsky, MARC GIS Planner, provided an updated on forecast development. They reviewed the goals of adopting the UrbanSim model, which include streamlined scenario development and improved iteration between the household model and travel model.

   b. UrbanSim inputs developed so far include block-level maximum capacity population, housing units, and employment. Planned and current development projects were collected and added to UrbanSim, and Committee participants are invited to continue to submit additional projects on an ongoing basis.

   c. The Committee viewed the evolution of model development. Initial UrbanSim model runs provided an even distribution of population change to 2020. UrbanSim staff developed place types to calibrate the model. The tract groups were based on change in housing units from 2000 to 2010. The UrbanSim place types were replaced by another version developed by MARC/TFC, which offered some improvement in calibrating the model. UrbanSim staff increased the attractiveness of Johnson County in the model to achieve the expected distribution of growth by county. This effort resulted in additional growth shifting to northeast Johnson County instead of the developing areas.

   d. Using model calibration alone didn’t produce a good model, so MARC and UrbanSim staff focused instead on respecifying the model. UrbanSim staff created a new housing location choice model in October, plus they enabled the model to incorporate decline. This model build was tested in model runs to the year 2050, with (Run 29) and without (Run 30) using place types to calibrate the model. More adjustments to the model estimation are needed to create an acceptable base forecast with realistic distribution of growth and decline. UrbanSim transferred files to MARC staff that will allow MARC to design model variable adjustments, which can subsequently be used to change the UrbanSim model for additional testing, evaluation, and respecification as needed. Mr. Lenk shared a new household location choice model specification, which creates
household groups defined by income and assumes that jobs, affordability, and the location of the income group with the next-higher income serve as attractors.

e. Questions and comments:
   i. See if the model can consider income in surrounding blocks.
   ii. Q: How is income defined? A: ACS and PUMS data are used to synthesize population at the block level. PUMS sums individual income data to accurate tract aggregates.
   iii. In some places, we would expect the location of higher-income households to remain stable.
   iv. Q: Do we need to add race as a variable?
   v. Q: Does the model allow land data to dictate type of development? A: The parcel version of UrbanSim does include a more robust model of land markets, including a developer model that runs on every parcel to determine what kind of building would be most profitable, given zoning, but the block model does not. It uses future land use to estimate residential and non-residential development capacity as measured by the maximum number of people and jobs. Work is beginning on introducing a pro-forma developer model into the block model, but that is not expected to be completed for at least one year.

3. Census 2020 Updates
   a. Ms. Repinsky shared information on the Census 2020 Complete Count Committees. Local agencies are encouraged by the US Census to encourage response to the 2020 Decennial Census, via local outreach activities and participating in a regional complete count effort.
   b. Jay Heermann, MARC’s GIS Manager, said that, through the Census Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP), city and county representatives will be asked to participate in the decennial review of block group and tract boundaries. MARC will hold county-level meetings in January 2019, and MARC will submit the changes to the Census. Mr. Lenk said that the Census will no longer provide data for transportation analysis zones, so users will need to shift to using block groups, and transportation planners should be invited to participate. Census is allowing the formation of zero-population block groups, which can more accurately define non-residential areas.
   c. Comments:
      i. Avoid organizing large complete count events if they might seem ineffective or poorly-attended. Instead, meet people where they are to encourage Census response.