ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
November 14, 2018
Meeting Summary

Members Present:
Brian Nowotny, Jackson County, Mo.
Tammy Snyder, Wyandotte County, Kan. Municipalities
Lideana Laboy, UG Wyandotte County-Kansas City, Kan. (A)
Mike McDonald, Leavenworth County, Kan. Municipalities
John Neuberger, Sierra Club
Cliff Middleton, Johnson County, KS
Sara Copeland, Clay County, Mo. Municipalities
Travis Hoover, Platte County, Mo. Municipalities
Chet Belcher, Olathe, KS
Greg Ruether, City of Overland Park, Kan.
Mike Landvik, MoDOT
Allison Smith, KDOT (A)

Alternates Present:
Eva Steinman, MoDOT (A)

Other Attendees:
Vernon Fields, Basehor, Kan.
Celia Duran, Belton, Mo.
Brian Welborn, Belton Parks and Recreation
Jean Carder, City of Louisburg, Kan.
Stephanie Sloop, Leavenworth County, Kan.

MARC Staff:
Marc Hansen
Aaron Bartlett
Martin Rivarola
Caitlin Campbell
Patrick Trouba

1. Welcome and Introductions
Kansas Co-Chair Greg Ruether welcomed the attendees and introduced the new representatives:
- Shawn Strate, KCATA Voting Member
- Jenna Hillyer, KCATA Alternate
- Chet Belcher, Olathe, Kan. Voting Member
- Cheryl Lambrecht, Olathe, Kan. Alternate

2. Election of Missouri Co-Chair
Greg Ruether opened the floor for nominations.
Motion: A motion was made to elect Brian Nowotny. Motion seconded and passed.

3. Approval of July 25, 2018 Meeting Summary
Motion: A motion was made to approve the July 25, 2018 meeting summary, as written. Motion seconded and passed unanimously.

4. Status of the Current Program
Program Balances
KDOT report from Allison Smith: Kansas TA is overprogrammed by $589,000. One project needs to be programmed for 2019, others are getting underway. CMAQ and STPP both have projects that still need to be programmed.

MoDOT report from Eva Steinman: No formal report at this time—waiting on Mike Landvik to arrive with these figures. There hasn’t been much change in the program balances since last time. Two projects were obligated at the end of the FY.
The City of Gladstone obligated approximately $500,000 and the City of Independence obligated $280,000 of TAP funds for one of their projects.

**Project Updates**
Marc Hansen stated that the Belton, Mo. Bel-Ray Connector Trail project has been pushed back. This project was originally scheduled to be implemented in 2016. The ATPC committee granted a previous extension in 2018, but this project was unable to get implemented. An updated schedule has been included in the packet. In FY 2019, the project will be able to get implemented. Currently, the City of Belton is working on right-of-way acquisition, keeping in close contact with MoDOT. Celia Duran confirmed this and asked the committee for an extension. Greg Ruether recommended granting an extension. **Motion:** A motion was made to approve an extension for the Belton, Mo. Bel-Ray Connector Trail project. Motion seconded and passed.

**5. Debrief of 2021-22 Programming Process**
Greg Ruether opened the floor for feedback on the programming process. The committee first discussed the scoring process. When asked if the committee would look over the scoring process again before the next round of funding, Marc Hansen stated that the committee could, but generally prefers to make incremental changes rather than wholesale changes to the process. However, if projects or scoring are not responding in the way that the committee hoped, then the committee would be open to making these wholesale changes. The changes that the committee put in place regarding sidewalks were successful. Marc Hansen informed the committee that MARC Staff are currently working on updating the RTP, which could have implications on this committee’s scoring process in the future.

Other committee members shared their support of the current scoring process, but would like to see more background information in the application explaining why dissimilar projects are sharing one pot of funds.

A committee member expressed that there should be clarification of what the committee hopes to accomplish with the funding in small vs. large communities.

The committee then held discussion about the inclusion of maps (depicting connectivity of the existing system) in the supporting documentation of applications. Marc Hansen stated that most project sponsors do submit maps, as it would be in their best interest to do so.

Greg Ruether stated that the programming process is very educational and that it is beneficial for the committee to see what other communities are doing. Greg urged the committee to consider letting the communities have more time to present their projects in the future.

The committee discussed the reevaluation of the Safe Routes to School Program scoring. Lideana Laboy shared her support of this reevaluation. Lideana also expressed that smaller communities may be at a disadvantage because the questions may not be wholly applicable, which might prevent communities from maximizing their scores. Marc Hansen stated that MARC Staff held a technically focused, pre-application workshop and a technical assistance symposium. MARC Staff will continue to do this, as there was good attendance. Staff is available to answer questions and are open to giving preliminary evaluations of project applications. Staff is also considering holding webinars.

Marc Hansen shared Kaitlyn Service’s notes about scoring problems. These included:

- Technical issues with the application—MARC Staff will correct. Marc asked the committee to share their own technical issues. Greg Ruether had issues with selecting project categories, specifically recreation trails and their eligibility for CMAQ funds. Lideana Laboy shared a similar problem, and expressed a desire for more clarification/guidance in the application.
- Issues with CMAQ scoring scale in regards to emission reduction bands. The scoring criteria will be updated.
- A question related to a visual preference survey that no longer exists. This question will be removed.
- Language updates—Smart Moves nomenclature will be included throughout the application. The Regional Pedestrian Policy Plan will also be included. It had not been formally approved prior to the call for projects, but is now.
• The committee will keep the Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure category as is. Most reactions to this category were positive.
• Consideration of the inclusion of speed or average daily traffic as part of a contextual look at projects that parallel roadway facilities. Can look at standards set out in MARC’s 2012 APWA Best Practices Manual.
• A question in the application pertaining to local match provided points for providing a 20% match. Since this level of matching funds is required, the scoring will be adjusted to address match levels greater than what is required.
• Reevaluation of existing system vs. system expansion.

Lideana Laboy expressed her positive impressions of the preparation of the presenters and suggested a committee review of project progression.

The committee expressed appreciation for the efforts of MARC Staff and thanked Kaitlyn Service for her hard work.

Marc Hansen noted that he will be handling this committee until a formal staff replacement can be made.

6. Regional Transportation Plan 2050 Development and Project Selection Process
Martin Rivarola presented on RTP 2050 Scenario Analysis and Project Selection. Martin stated that RTP 2050 ultimately guides all decisions regarding the allocation of regional investments.

- Completed steps overview (For more information visit www.marc.org/2050):
  - Development of RTP 2050 “road map”: The road map explains plans, objectives, timeline etc.
  - Adoption of revised “regional vision statement” to guide future integrated planning work: MARC Staff worked with various committees to adopt this.
  - Identification of transportation needs through a “needs assessment” process: This is a data driven process. The process included review of regional plans and engagement to understand regional transportation needs and gaps.
  - Adoption of an Interim Policy Framework to guide future steps in development of RTP 2050: This began with the current policy framework. There is a proposed addition of 2 new policy goals relating to data & technology and financial sustainability.
  - Public Engagement efforts, including development of a “story-telling” online platform: Currently 2 story map chapters, but there will be more in the future. Eventually, chapters will be converted into plan documents.
  - Completion of transportation model sensitivity testing/scenario analysis: Initial transportation investment packages and land use growth scenarios were tested for performance. These are hypothetical scenarios that can be used later during project selection to provide a better understanding of how the model performs.

- Timeline: Currently at the scenario analysis step, but getting ready to do project selection. Project selection will extend into Fall 2019. Completion of the entire process is expected by June 2020.

- Scenario analysis: The purpose of the initial scenario analysis work was to test the regional travel demand model with different land use growth scenarios. A redevelopment area map and Smart Moves corridor and hub map were utilized to build the scenarios. The redevelopment area map depicts areas developed by 1990. The Smart Moves corridor and hub map depicts where we envision more frequent transit service.
  - 1st “What-if” Growth Scenario: “Let it ride” is a trend growth scenario for a region of approximately 2 million people. This scenario forecasts a 30% population growth and 50% job growth.
  - 2nd “What-if” Growth Scenario: “Take the wheel” is a focused growth scenario that forecasts the doubling of our population growth in our redevelopment area (60% instead of 30%) and an 80% growth in jobs in our redevelopment area instead of 50%.

These scenarios were tested against 4 different transportation network scenarios. It should be noted that these scenarios were made extreme on purpose, and that MARC Staff does not endorse any of the scenarios.
  - Freeze frame: Assumes that population and employment grow, but no further investments are made in the transportation system beyond what’s in the 2018-2022 TIP.
  - If you build it...: Assumes that population and employment grow, and we invest in all projects in TO2040.
  - Hop on the bus, Gus: Assumes that population and employment grow, but we make no further investments in the transportation system beyond what’s in the 2018-2022 TIP for roadway system, with
implementation of expanded Smart Moves transit service. This scenario is comparable to the “Money does grow on trees” scenario. It should be noted that Smart Moves full implementation assumes and uses changes.

- Money DOES grow on trees: Assumes that all 2018-2022 TIP projects are built, and that population and employment grow, maximizing roadway capacity.

- Travel model results: Initially evaluated 4 performance measures (VMT, VHT, transit ridership, and auto use) to test how the model would respond. The daily values (pictured below) are rounded to the nearest 1000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Let it ride</th>
<th>Take the wheel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>VHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeze frame</td>
<td>56,430,000</td>
<td>1,498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hop on the bus, Gus</td>
<td>56,286,000</td>
<td>1,492,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you build it...</td>
<td>56,437,000</td>
<td>1,487,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money DOES grow on trees</td>
<td>56,870,000</td>
<td>1,440,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Takeaways:
  - Land use growth scenarios had the greatest impact on travel demand. How we grow was more impactful than the projects built.
  - Better transit equated to a shift from autos.
  - More capacity equaled more VMT, but less VHT.
  - The highway system in addition to a handful of anticipated network changes equated to only a minor change in outcomes.
  - The transit system in addition to more opportunity for network changes equated to more significant changes in outcomes.

- Next Steps:
  - Expand performance measures to align with policy framework.
  - Consider wildcards, specifically, the impact of autonomous and connected vehicles, as well as the cost of investment scenarios.

- Upcoming Steps Overview:
  - Development of “Story Map Chapter 3” - Scenario Analysis report. This will be trickier due to its technical nature.
  - Continue targeted engagement efforts, online engagement groups and MARC committee outreach.
  - RTP Project Selection (previous project selection completed in 2010):
    - This will be a hybrid approach for project selection—a combination of a data-driven generated project list and a call for projects. MARC Staff will be seeking feedback on how to craft this approach from the committee. Martin distributed a handout to the committee that described the project selection timeline. Marc Hansen stated that the total number of projects is over 400. MARC Staff will notify all project contacts with an opening date for project selection. It was noted that some projects will need to be resubmitted with updated project information. The call for project resubmission will be in November 2018.
MARC Staff will finish developing an initial project listing and a finalized scoring criteria by late Jan 2019. A call for projects will follow in February 2019 and will last until April 2019.

Martin opened the floor for questions. Martin was asked to clarify the resubmission process. Martin reiterated that all projects will need to be resubmitted regardless of an absence of changes. This will be made clear when the call is released.

Martin was asked if the project submission process would be supervised. Martin stated that MARC Staff will utilize a scoring process that is similar to its past scoring processes. The RTP 2050 Steering Workgroup spends time looking at this, as well as a variety of other committees.

Martin was asked if there would be a pre-submittal workshop. Martin stated that there would be a pre-submittal workshop in addition to a webinar.

Martin was asked if Atchison County will be a part of this process. Martin stated that no they wouldn’t, as they are not a part of the MPO.

- RTP must include financially constrained and regionally significant projects.

7. Conflict of Interest and Whistleblower Policies
Marc Hansen stated that the conflict of interest and whistleblower policies were included in the agenda. MARC Staff will investigate any appearance of improprieties. The committee was encouraged to reach out to Staff with any questions or concerns.

8. Other Business
Greg Ruether informed the committee of the need to elect a new Missouri Community Representative. Interested parties should contact Marc Hansen. MARC will advertise for this position on their website and social medias. Marc Hansen thanked John Neuberger and Craig Lubow, for their active involvement as the Kansas Community Representative and alternate. This level of involvement has not been seen from the Missouri side. Marc stated that committee bylaws do not set a term limit for Community Representatives and encouraged the committee to discuss the possibility of the addition of a Community Representative term limit to the bylaws. Marc opened the floor for discussion. Greg Ruether asked for clarification on the two-year time limit and exclusions for serving again. Marc stated that the intention would not be to exclude active participants from serving again, and that this could be made clear in the bylaws. The committee will look at the Air Quality Forum as a model.

Marc Hansen then addressed discrepancies between Missouri and Kansas co-chair requirements in the bylaws. Currently, Kansas Community Representatives may serve as co-chairs and Missouri Representatives cannot. Marc opened the floor for discussion. There was a general consensus from the committee that Missouri Representatives should be allowed to serve as co-chairs, thus making the bylaws consistent. There was also consensus that there should not be a term limit for Community Representatives if there is active participation. A draft of these changes will be distributed before the next committee meeting.

Greg Ruether suggested that the committee do a wholesale review of the bylaws. Marc Hansen stated that this could be done at the next committee meeting.

The committee then discussed parties that may be interested in a Community Representative role. Marc Hansen noted that in the event of multiple applications for a role, the committee would take a vote.

9. Adjournment:
With no further business, the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2019 at 10:30 a.m. at the MARC Office.