OPEN MEETING NOTICE

Goods Movement COMMITTEE
Janet McRae Kansas Co-Chair
Richard Grenville, Missouri Co-Chair

There will be a meeting of MARC’s Goods Movement Committee on Tuesday, December 5, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. in MARC’s Heartland Room, 600 Broadway, Ste. 200 Kansas City, MO

AGENDA

I. Introduction and approval of minutes
   - April 4, 2017 - page 3
   - May 11, 2017 - page 8
   - June 6, 2017 - page 14
   - October 3, 2017 - page 20

II. MoDOT’s Project Scenario Planning – what priorities are important to the Committee and/or the region - Gerri Doyle, MoDOT
   - MoDOT is compiling a list of projects and/or programs to share with the legislature to illustrate what additional state transportation funding could accomplish over the next ten years.

III. MO Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC)*- Darryl Fields
    - Project review and comment for submittal as regional CUFC -- Missouri

IV. Membership in the Kansas and Missouri STP Committees -- Darryl Fields MARC
    - Membership from the Goods Movement Committee on the KS/MO STP Committees

V. MARC’s Whistleblower and Conflict of Interest Policies
   - http://marc.org/About-MARC/pdf/WhistleblowerPolicy

VI. Other Business

*Voting items

Getting to MARC: Information on transportation options to the MARC offices, including directions, parking, transit, carpooling, and bicycling, can be found online. 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.

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 MARC 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). MARC programs are non-discriminatory as stated by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, call 816-474-4240 or visit our webpage.
1) **Introductions and Approval of Meeting Summary**
Ms. McRea called the meeting to order and welcomed all attendees. Introductions followed, and minutes approved.

2) **KDOT Truck Parking Study:**
Davonna Moore, KDOT and Brian Comer, HNTB, provided a presentation on KDOT’s and the Mid America Association of State Transportation Official’s (MAASTO) Truck Parking Study. Mr. Comer gave an overview of the study associated with “Truck Parking Information Management Systems” (TPIMS). The project is funded by a $25 million 2015 federal TIGER grant with states matching funds. The intended purpose is to provide a seamless system that reduces a truck driver’s time searching for truck parking and to provide safe truck parking alternatives. The System’s expected deployment is 132 public rest areas across eight (8) states by January 2019 (states: Kansas, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin). TPIMS will monitor truck parking availability and provide real-time information to truck drivers. The System is capable of disseminating information through multiple methods, including dynamic signs, smart phone applications and traveler information websites. KDOT will use cameras to do a space by space parking availability. This method is considered the most accurate. The other method states are using is “IN and OUT”. This method is similar to a parking garage but requires more maintenance and operations.

Ms. Moore gave an overview about KDOT’s deployment of TPIMS. The System will be deployed along I-70 and I-135 from Selina to Wichita. KDOT is working with the KTA to deploy the system along the turnpike system. KDOT will entertain discussions with private truck stops after an evaluation period of the public truck parking areas and the KTA’s deployment. KDOT is deploying 22 public sites and 18 messaging signs. Based on the parallel parking design at the majority of KS’s truck parking locations. KDOT decided the camera option (software monitoring developed by the Univ. of Wisconsin) was the most applicable based on accuracy and less hands-on maintenance and operations. Parking and reliability performance measures will be maintained and reported. KDOT is hoping to start construction fall of 2017.

Questions:
- In KS, will truck counts be on State owned facilities only?
The majority of states (including KS) are only deploying the system at public rest area. IA, KY and MI are interested in also deploying at private truck stops. There are institutional barriers, as driver distrust of the government’s intent, which needs to be overcome before full acceptance at private stops.

- When constructing are there particular infrastructure/utility requirements that need to be in place?
  - You need to have designated truck parking areas and overnight parking
  - Design the location/application to fit the technology (wireless or fiber) available within the area.

- Initial deployment does not include I-35 and I-335 - what was the rational and what is needed to include in the future?
  - I-335 will receive a system under the KTA. Their System may not be the TPIMS but may be a hybrid developed for the KTA.
  - Initially there were 170 sites that included I-35 but due to receiving less project funding and Indiana’s interested in I-70, I-35 was dropped to a later phase.
  - KS sites cost approximately $100,000/site. Because of private site (private truck stops) synergies, cost average about $20,000.

- How do you get trucks to move up and not waste parking space?
  - KDOT physically measured every site to ensure optimal space. KDOT is developing marketing tools, possible display messages and/or driver video feeds that encourage drives to effectively utilize parking.

- Are you planning to add other truck parking amenities as electrification or Wi-Fi access?
  - Currently KDOT has not added what it will take to add other amenities.

- Is there a reason why MO and IL are not part of the plan? Do they plan to participate?
  - MO is interested and aware but at the time there were possible funding issues. Illinois leadership felt that this may be more of a role of the private sector but leadership has changed and so are views.

- Are future phase contingent on the continuation of Tiger Grants?
  - The very essence of the project supports goals and objectives of the FAST Act by being freight friendly therefore allowing for other avenues of funding.

3) Another Opinion of the Driver Shortage

Todd Spencer, Exec VP Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association (OOIDA), gave a presentation regarding the national truck drivers shortage. OOIDA is a national trade organization representing primarily interest of owner-operator drivers and small fleets. The Organization has been around since 1973. Impetuses for the Organization occurred due to the oil embargo of the 70’s and its impact on trucking. Current trucking is very much a small business niche industry representing approximately 90% of the trucking industry. Most trucking companies in the US is less than 20 trucks. OOIDA is headquartered in Grain Valley, MO. The idea of a driver shortage has been around since the mid-70s. Trucking is a business geared for overcapacity. The core members of OOIDA do this because they “love it.” Trucking does not really have a driver shortage the problem is driver retention. Every year estimates are that there are 400,000 new CDL registered drivers. It’s an industry that is easy to get in but because of inadequately trained truck drivers but highly regulated it is a hard industry to retain drivers, especially highly qualified drivers. Why is there a problem with retention one issue is low wages? Wages need to be adjusted to keep people interested in the job. Because of the non-regulated aspect of trucking rate competition is fierce but regulations and compliance is greater. Having increases in regulation and compliance induces greater driver stress and less williness to remain in the industry. The intense focus on hours of service and the inability to find adequate parking has also lead to increase stress and less retention. A few years ago, the Association took the head of the Federal Motor Carriers Safety Administration (Ann Ferrell) on a ride along
from Washington DC to Illinois. On the trip the diver, a multi-million mile safe driver, was within 9 minutes of being in violation of his driver service hours before he got to their destination to spend the night. Increased hours of service regulations adds to a driver’s frustration because drivers do not have an ability to plan their day. Truckers cannot predict when he may or may not be loaded or find a place to park. Driver turnover is a reflection of inadequate pay for the job that you do. The average work week for a trucker is 60 - 70 hours per week. Over-the-road drivers are expected to stay away from home for weeks at a time for pay that is “blue collar” average. The driver misses family time, special events, birthdays, etc. and after a while, you say forget it. Trucking is prone to overcapacity -- too many trucks for available work. As long as drivers are paid based on piece work/miles driven with no incentive to compensate a driver’s time (does not include Teamster drivers who do receive time compensation) there will continue to be retention issues. From an employer’s perspective this piece work/per mile charges are ideal. Until the industry realizes that driver’s time is valuable inefficiencies and retention problems will continue. There is a direct correlation between safety and experience of the driver. The more we churn drivers (new drivers into the workforce) the less safe we make our roadways.

Questions
- What are the reflection of lifestyle choose (alcohol use).
  - Professional drivers are the least tolerant of abuses that occur on the road. We spend more time worry about drug testing than understanding “what is between their ears.”
  - More attention may need to be placed on workers
- YRC is at the opposite side of OOIDA, consisting of Yellow Freight, Roadway and a number of other carriers. YRC has over 3000 drivers on the road with drivers receiving a fair wage, family health benefits and treated with dignity and respect. The supply chain seems to place a higher value on YRC drivers and this may be due to a higher level of entry. YRC’s churn is about 16% this supports Todd’s point about compensation. If you look at the Terminal at I-70 and 435 this was built at a time, when this area was part of the suburban loop, now that is no-longer the case. When you look at infrastructure that requires new pavement and geometrics these improvements could adds 15 - 20 minutes to, at least, local trips. Added travel time and changes in hours of service requirement may affect trucking companies’ abilities to adequately service their customers because drivers could possibly be out of hours. However, this is what we have to do to maintain our infrastructure. It important to note that when you take straight empirical date and make final assumptions over real world experiences you do create a problem. YRC has an over-the-road component, “sleeper teams”, and purchases over 250,000 hotel accommodations a year for its drivers. YRC, UPS, Federal Express and others have decades and decades of data and experience of driving safely overnight allowing the driver to evaluate when a driver needs rest. Federal hours of service regulations have taken control from the team drivers in determining what is in the best interest of safety about who should be driving. December of 2017 the system is going to electronic log books. This will be a very unforgiving system. Just the idea of being in a suburban community and the added 15 - 20 minutes in detour a driver can run out of hours of services and automatically be in violation.

4) Corridors of Freight Significance
Darryl Fields, MARC, gave an overview on Corridors of Freight Significance (COS) as defined through MARC’s 2009 Freight Outlook Study. These corridors were represented in a map that demonstrated how they align with the National Fright Network. The National system depicts mileage across the nation unfortunately, the national system does not capture all mileage that was deemed important to the KC region. The Corridors of Freight Significance captures freight
corridors important to the region nationally, regionally and locally. The region’s national COS are identical to the National Freight Network but includes interstates that are not in the National network - as all portions of I-35, I-435 and I-49 and regional routes as US 56, K-7, K-10 and Hwys 169, 291 and 150.

This discussion set the frame work for the next topic of Critical Urban Freight Corridors.

5) **Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC)**

Randy Rowson, CDM Smith and John Maddox, KDOT, gave a presentation regarding KDOT’s request for MARC to designate CUFC. As part a FAST Act complaint Kansas Freight Plan (updates every 5 years starting 2017), KDOT is required to identify freight projects in urban areas. These are public roads in urban areas. The freight plan identifies projects eligible for FAST Act freight formula funds and Fastlane Grants. KDOT will receive approximately $10 million for freight formula funds. To facilitate the process KDOT is requesting MPOs to designate freight projects in urban areas. Population within the adjusted urbanized boundary dictates how projects are selected. Populations 500,000 or greater the MPO selects projects in consultation with KDOT. Less than 500,000 KDOT picks projects in consultation with the MPO. These projects will make-up the CUFC for Kansas. The CUFC will consist of 75 miles shared among KS’s 6 MPOs. KDOT is requesting a dynamic list of projects that provides flexibility to move projects in and out of years based on need. As a project is completed that project will be taken off the CUFC list, not counted toward the 75 miles and new projects can be added. Suggested criteria for project selection/prioritization process are volume, performance, commodity flow and area served. Projects should be select that could start in years 2018 - 2025, on a constrained list of a long range plan and if the project is applying for a Fastlane Grant.

Questions:

- Are all CUFC criteria requirements for designation?
  - Criteria:
    - (A) Connects an intermodal facility to:
      - 1. the PHFS;
      - 2. the Interstate System; or
      - 3. an intermodal freight facility;
    - (B) Functions as an alternative route to parallel the PHFS corridor;
    - (C) Serves major freight generators
    - (D) Determined important to freight by the MPO or the State.
  - No - only need to meet one criteria.
- As a project is completed, that project comes off the corridor and another project is added?
  - Yes - the list will be reviewed annually and not static. Projects will be evaluated in tiers by years 1, 2, & 3. Theses years will be access based on some set criteria for their appropriateness and priority. Projects may move around from one tier to the other based on need.
- Other state highways not on the map, as Highway 56, how will they be handled?
  - Those roadways are considered under the category of being designated significance to the region. (Criteria D)
• Will those projects complete with other critical boundaries?
  - Those projects that are within the urbanized boundary for population’s 500,000 or more will be determined by the MPO --- State shares 75 miles between all MPOs
  - Those projects outside the urbanized boundary will be prioritized through the Critical Rural Freight Corridor (CRFC) process lead by KDOT --- State share 150 miles among the state.

• There is discussion about how KDOT will handle projects outside the urbanized boundary (City of Edgerton, Leavenworth, and Miami Counties) KDOT may allow MARC to prioritize these projects. This has yet to be decided.

• How frequent will KDOT go back and visit the network?
  - The network will be reviewed annually.

• How often is the urbanized area boundaries reviewed?
  - The urbanized area boundaries are based on the 10 year census (next census is 2020)

• How often will the primary freight network be updated?
  - FHWA has not provided detail on how often the primary freight network will be revisited.

• As an MPO, can MARC recommend to KDOT projects that are outside of the urbanized boundary but important to the MPO?
  - KDOT will accept project indorsements for projects that are within the MPO boundary but outside the urbanized boundary. Remember recommendations need to provide the project’s importance and connection to freight movement within the MPO.
  - It’s believed that Lawrence is considering the same process for Baldwin City on Hwy 56.

• What is the timing to report to KDOT?
  - KDOT gave other MPOs - May 15 as a deadline.
  - KDOT would like to give USDOT a draft plan by August/September 2017 for a final December approval.

• What is our penalty if we cannot get you a list by May 15? MARC’s May TTPC is the 16th. Making us unable to get it through the MARC process until May.
  - KDOT is aware that the submittal process may need to follow steps that require additional time and is flexible to accommodate the process.

• Would selected projects need to go the full MARC Board?
  - Projects would need to go to the Board but not for public review and comment. The end of May is the earliest MARC could provide a list of projects. MARC will have a special joint meeting of the STP Kansas Priority and the Goods Movement Committee in May to discuss the project list.
Special Joint Meeting of
Goods Movement and Kansas STP Priorities Committees
Meeting Summary of May 11, 2017

Attendees:
Janet McRae, KS Co chair, Goods Movement
Richard Grenville, MO Co chair GM, Port KC
Joe Johnson, Chair KS STP Priorities
Tim Green, Vice chair KS STP Priorities
Doug Wesselschmidt, Shawnee
Burt Morey, Overland Park
Kevin Bruemmer, Merriam
Tim McEldowney, Gardner
Greg Ruether, Overland Park
Matt Beets, Bonner Springs
Jose Leon, Roeland Park
JR McMahon II, Miami County
Geoffrey Vohs, Johnson County
Kenny Cook, Edgerton
Scott Peterson, Edgerton
Tammy Snyder, Edwardsville
Beth Wright, Olathe
Mike Duffy, Riverside
Lideana Laboy, Unified Government of WyCo/KCK
John Maddox, KDOT
Allison Smith, KDOT
Marisela Ward, MoDOT
Kelly Gilbert, MEC/KC Clean Cities
Randy Rowson, CDM Smith
Mac Andrew, SKW
Kate Pfefferkorn-Mansker, Pfefferkorn Eng. & Env.

MARC Staff:
Darryl Fields
Ron Achelpohl
Martin Rivarola
Jim Hubbell
Beth Dawson
Shawn Urbach
Marc Hansen
Terry Anderson

Welcome and Introductions
Janet McRae welcomed the attendees, thanked the KS STP members for staying to discuss an issue brought from KDOT requiring a quick turn-around and work together to create a combined list of recommended and prioritized projects that would go to TTPC next week. Self-introductions were made around the room.

Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC) Project Prioritization
Darryl Fields presented the following background and stressed to attendees that there was no new money for programming projects. The prioritization activity during the meeting would assist KDOT should money become available. Attendees were provided with a list of projects that are on a regional freight network on the Kansas side of the Kansas City area. The projects were pulled from the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Transportation Outlook 2040 and reviewed previously by the Goods Movement Committee.

Background: The FAST Act established the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN), Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) and the Nation Highway Freight Program (NHFP) to assist the nation’s economy by providing for efficient movement of freight. The Act provides $6.3 billion in formula funds over five years for states to invest in freight projects on the NHFN. In 2017, that will mean $10.5 million for the state of Kansas and $26.3 million for Missouri in formula funds. The program requires states to develop a fiscally constrained project investment plan by December 2017 that identifies statewide projects that support the national network. These projects must provide freight access and connection to the network, intermodal transportation facilities and/or ports to the interstate. In order to be eligible for funding, a freight project must be included in the state’s plan. Examples of roads not on the PHFS are
portions of I-435 in both Kansas and Missouri, the Kansas Turnpike, and I-49 in Missouri. Portions missing from the NHFN that are important to our region are US 56, K-10 and K-7.

To identify its urban freight projects, each state will develop Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs) and Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFCs). FHWA defines these corridors as “Public roads in urbanized areas which provide access and connection to the PHFS and the Interstate with other ports, public transportation facilities, or other intermodal transportation facilities.” In urban areas with population of 500,000 or more, the MPO will develop projects in consultation with the state. In urban areas with less than 500,000, the state will develop projects in consultation with the MPO. In non-urban areas, the state will identify CRFC. However, in areas within an MPO but outside of the Adjusted Urbanized Area, the MPO may also recommend CRFC projects to the state.

The Kansas Department of Transportation has initiated this process with Kansas MPOs and requested that MARC provide a list of CUFC projects for the Kansas City area by the end of May. Each state has an allocation of centerline miles: Kansas can allocate up to 75 centerline miles and up to 102 miles in Missouri that we have to share with other MPOs. Kansas can allocate up to 175 CRFC miles.

Starting in 2018, freight projects must be in the state freight plan in order to be eligible for funding. Ms. McRae recommended that sponsors note if they have a great project that would fit in this category, take action to get it in the Plan for the next formalized Call for Projects planned for next year. From now on the list will be updated annually.

There were no questions. John Maddox stated that the freight plan must be submitted, reviewed and approved by the Feds no later than December 2017. If it is not approved, the State and any other parties, could be in jeopardy of not being able to use some of the freight funds. KDOT lists the projects into Tier 1, 2 and 3 which allows movement between tiers. The plan is comprehensive and multimodal, e.g., urban and rural freight corridors, waterways, aviation, rail, and pipeline. Some of the priority criteria: mobility - connects to a freight generating facility, the number of crashes/safety, truck traffic as a percentage of the total daily traffic volume, economic development and environmental impacts. There will be an annual review and the Plan is required to have a complete update every five years which will next occur in 2022.

Discussion:
During a review of the Census Urbanized area boundary, Edgerton was determined to be outside of the urbanized area as well as the location of Gardner’s project. Both cities have one project on the list from the current TIP and could be considered for rural funds.

Consider the TIP projects to be tagged as Tier 1 projects. Reminder that there is no new money. The list would make the projects eligible to apply should the feds decide to do another round with FastLane funds.

MOTION: Tim Green moved and Burt Morey seconded to consider the projects listed from the TIP as Tier 1 projects. Motion carried.

Allison Smith shared that KDOT’s TIP project named “Various Railroad Safety Projects” is an annual budgeted bucket of funds, not a specific project, so it should be removed from eligibility for CUFC consideration.
Darryl Fields asked if projects on the Primary Highway Freight System do not need to be included in the critical urban? John Maddox indicated he would find out and let him know.

MOTION: Tim Green moved and Beth Wright seconded to remove KDOT’s project #380091 “Various Railroad Safety Projects” from the Tier 1 list. Motion carried.

Due to the timing to provide input to KDOT, a thorough ranking of a recommended project list was not possible therefore the group would create a list of projects grouped as Tier 1, 2 and 3. A prioritization process would be created for the next year.

To further assist in determining the CUFCs, Shawn Urbach presented an overall view of truck travel data from 2016 recently analyzed by staff. The data was from the Regional Integrated Transportation System. Maps were provided of the daily truck traffic and the top ten truck travel bottlenecks on the Kansas side of the metro. Bottleneck locations in ranked order: I-35 S at 75th Street, I-35 N at 75th Street, US-56 W at W 60 Street/Roeland Drive, I-435 E at Wornall Road, I-435 S at I-35/US-56, I-35 N at I-435, I-70 E at 110th St, I-35/US-56, I-435 E at Quivira Road, and I-35 S at US-69/18th Street Expressway.

Joe Johnson suggested considering the eight regionally significant projects on the Transportation Outlook 2040 list as Tier 2 and the other nine projects as Tier 3 projects. There was agreement by KDOT staff in the regional priority since the Feds also want KDOT to look at freight corridors that have a regional impact in a five-state area.

Following a brief discussion of Gardner’s project #108, 191st Street Improvements on the TO 2040 list, there was agreement to include it in the Tier 1 list.

MOTION: Joe Johnson moved and Kevin Bruemmer seconded to add Gardner’s project #108 to the recommended Tier 1 list as a rural project. Motion carried.

It was recommended to include the national projects along with the regional projects for Tier 2 otherwise I-35 and I-435 projects would not be included.

MOTION: Joe Johnson moved and JR McMahon seconded to designate projects that are regional and national/regional on the TO 2040 list to be recommended to KDOT as Tier 2 projects. Discussion: Beth Wright shared that Olathe will be talking with KDOT regarding their Johnson County project #3004, 175th to 215th Street on K-7 to see if it is possible to extend it to 167th Street and if worked out with KDOT could that be considered and not have to come back for a vote. The modification would extend the project about a quarter mile. Darryl Fields indicated he would be fine with it if KDOT did not have a problem with it. Allison Smith shared that the designation label was set when K-7 was put into the long range plan and was based on their 5-county study and did not see that KDOT would have a problem it. Motion carried.

MOTION: Joe Johnson moved and Tim Green seconded to recommend that all remaining projects on the TO 2040 list that were not previously prioritized be on the recommended Tier 3 for KDOT. Motion carried.

John Maddox asked if the Tier 2 projects could be ranked in case any could move up to Tier 1 if there is an opportunity. Attendee consensus – allow KDOT to rank based on their criteria and if funds become available, that KDOT ask for prioritization input from the committees. John may come back to the group if needed.
Darryl Fields shared that the Unified Government submitted a FASTLANE grant application on their UG/WyCo/KCKS project #407, I-70 and Turner Diagonal Interchange Reconfiguration that is listed on the TO 2040 list. The committee may need to consider making it a Tier 1 recommendation, currently recommended for Tier 3. This is the only active application MARC and KDOT are aware of.

MOTION: Joe Johnson moved and JR McMahon seconded to recommend moving the UG/WyCo/KCKS project #407, I-70 and Turner Diagonal Interchange Reconfiguration from Tier 3 to Tier 1. Motion carried.

The list of projects recommended is attached.

Other Business
With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 11:27 a.m.
## Critical Freight Corridors: Project Recommendations for Inclusion in the KDOT Statewide Freight Plan

### Tier 1 Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>343106</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>I-35 and Gardner Road Interchange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,615,000</td>
<td>$1,415,000</td>
<td>$4,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397002</td>
<td>Edgerton</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>207th St. Grade Separation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>191st St. Improvements</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$11,200,000</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,415,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,615,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,030,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tier 1 Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>KCK</td>
<td>Wyandotte</td>
<td>I-70 &amp; Turner Diagonal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349235</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>K-7, Dennis to Santa Fe, Turn Lane Additions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349242</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Lone Elm Rd, Old 56 Hwy to 151st St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$18,315,000</td>
<td>$3,785,000</td>
<td>$22,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280132</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Wyandotte</td>
<td>K-32 Turner Diagonal Interchange, Various Signs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$621,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$621,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380153</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>I-35/75th St – South of I-35/67th St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$109,500</td>
<td>$985,300</td>
<td>$1,094,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349247</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>I-35 &amp; 119th St Interchange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,696,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,770,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,466,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tier 2 Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Lenexa</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>87th &amp; I-435 Interchange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Lenexa</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>95th &amp; I-435 Interchange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Lenexa</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>95th St Improvement from Renner to I-35</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>I-35 from I-435 to 67th St, Reconstruct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
<td>$112,000,000</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3002</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>K-7 Upgrade from 43rd St to K-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$9,240,000</td>
<td>$36,960,000</td>
<td>$46,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3003</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Wyandotte/ Leavenworth</td>
<td>K-7 Intersection Enhancements, City of Lansing to State Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$16,800,000</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3004</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>K-7 Upgrade, 175th St to 215th St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$12,100,000</td>
<td>$48,400,000</td>
<td>$60,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Johnson County Gateway Project Phase 2, Various</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>$240,000,000</td>
<td>$300,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>US-69 from 167th St to I-435</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>$320,000,000</td>
<td>$400,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>K-10 Widening from I-435 to Douglas County</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$90,600,000</td>
<td>$362,400,000</td>
<td>$453,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>K7/K10 Interchange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$120,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$319,140,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,276,560,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,595,700,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tier 3 Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>I70/K7 interchange, Phases 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$6,360,000</td>
<td>$25,440,000</td>
<td>$31,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Wyandotte</td>
<td>I-70 Bridge Replacements, Lewis &amp; Clark Viaduct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$11,500,000</td>
<td>$46,000,000</td>
<td>$57,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>I70/K7 Interchange, Phases 9-15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$58,500,000</td>
<td>$234,000,000</td>
<td>$292,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>KDOT</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>I-35 Reconstruction from Old US-56 to 119th St</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$16,600,000</td>
<td>$66,400,000</td>
<td>$83,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,960,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$371,840,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$464,800,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Introductions and Approval of Meeting Summary**

Mr. Greenville called the meeting to order and welcomed all attendees. Introductions followed and there was not a quorum therefore minutes were not approved.

2) **Freight Performance Measures:**

Shawn Urbach, MARC staff, provided an overview about how the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS) calculates freight roadway bottlenecks and how the calculation intertwines into national performance measures. Enclosed are three maps KS, MO and KC region displaying the top 10 highway freight bottlenecks (depicted directionally) based on the methodology below. Data seems to demonstrate that all top 10 bottlenecks by state appear to occur only in Johnson and Jackson Counties. Caveats: data does not account for delays due to construction, emergencies, road closures, and/or weather events.

Maps represents:
- Locations (directional)
- **Impact # =** average duration X average max length X number of occurrences. This number give the ranking
  - **Avg_Max_Le** -- average miles of congested impact
  - **Avg_Durati** -- average duration time of impact
  - **Total_Dur** - total occurrences (by days, hours and minutes) over the year (365 days)

**Methodology:**

**Total Delay (vehicle-hours and person-hours)**—Actual vehicle-hours (or person-hours) experienced in the highway section minus the vehicle-hours (or person-hours) that would be experienced at the reference speed. Total delay is only possible to compute if traffic volumes have been integrated. If not, unit delay (delay per vehicle) is substituted.

- **Mean Travel-Time Index (MTTI)**—The mean travel time over the highway section divided by the travel time that would occur at the referenced speed.
- **Planning Time Index (PTI)**—The 95th percentile Travel-Time Index computed as the 95th percentile travel time divided by the travel time that would occur at the reference speed.
- **80th Percentile Travel-Time Index (P80TTI)**—The 80th percentile Travel-Time Index computed as the 80th percentile travel time divided by the travel time that would occur at the reference speed.
- **Hours of Congestion per Year**—Number of hours where vehicle speeds are below the following thresholds:
  - Freeways and Multi-lane highways: 50 miles per hour.
  - Rural Two-Lane Highways: 40 miles per hour.
  - Signalized Arterials: 30 miles per hour.
• **95th Percentile Queue Length**—developed from a distribution of queue lengths, the highway distance where the speeds of contiguous segments upstream of an identified bottleneck location are less than:
  o Freeways, Multi-lane, and Two-Lane Highways—30 miles per hour.
  o Signalized Highways—15 miles per hour.

• **Average Queue Length (uninterrupted flow facilities only)**—average highway distance where the speeds of contiguous segments upstream of an identified bottleneck location are less than:
  o Freeways, Multi-lane, and Two-Lane Highways—30 miles per hour.
  o Signalized Highways—15 miles per hour.

Questions:

• Highway 350 and US-56 are to only signalized sections that represent delays?
  o That is correct

• Do we have a reason to account for the delay on US-56? There appears to be all day congestion between at this location west of Roland Park.
  o The congestion is attributed to Johnson Drive (US-56). There is bias within the data based on commercial trucks categorization and how counted. MARC will develop filters to better reflect regional truck movement. The information provided is to give the Committee a demonstration about the methodology and possible outcomes.

• Since we have this data, whom will MARC share this with and how used?
  o How we use the data is completely up to the MPO to decide. There is an official USDOT truck travel time performance measure that state DOTs and MPOs will need to establish targets. That methodology is different from the bottleneck. MARC could do bottleneck analysis (monthly, annually, quarterly or every X number of years) to identify location and possible impacts of implemented projects on those bottlenecks over time.

• Committee members felt this is good information to share with local jurisdictions to aid with implementation of traffic signal coordination or similar type projects.

3) **Freight MAP (Bata)**

Darryl Fields, MARC staff, demonstrated the concept of a web based interactive freight map. The map provides users an opportunity to view geographically freight related activities in the region. Things included in the map were freight zones, intermodal facilities, truck routes based on federal and MARC designations, airports, alternative fuel locations, truck parking, ports, large warehouses (based on employment), distribution centers, big box retail (Costco/SAMS). Users have an ability to display locations by selecting the corresponding layer and/or us different map background views (satellite, topographical, street etc.). Map locations/layers are derived from numerous regional data, activities and studies.

Questions:

• What kind of criteria was used to define truck parking?
  o Whatever locations states’ DOTs designated in the national database as truck parking. As both states refine and defines location the map will be updated accordingly.

• Does the truck parking provide information on the number of available spaces?
  o There are a few location that have the number of spaces but the primary information is location by latitude/longitude, county, and owner (public/private). As more relevant information becomes available (number of spaces, amenities, gravel lot etc.) it can be updated to the map.
• (Asked by staff) Is there a need for users to know additional information regarding truck parking?
  o There are those users (interstate drivers) who would find information, as number of parking locations and amenities, useful but unaware about level detail needed. A lot of this is excellent information for interstate drivers to know where locations are as distribution centers.
• Might be more advantages to mark location with and without amenities. This aids drivers in determining what parking locations provide food, restrooms, etc. or simply only a place to park.
• Will this map be user friendly for the public or for policy makers? If that is the case, we should rethink the map name to encourage appropriate use.
  o Staff will submit the “almost final version” to MARC’s Public Affairs to wordsmith and provide a more visual appearance.
  o Staff needs a more definitive decision about who will use the map to better determine an appropriate interactiveness. The map is patterned after the Philadelphia MPO’s “Philly Freight Finder” https://www.dvrpc.org/webmaps/PhillyFreightFinder/ that is geared toward policy makers and economic development users. MARC can try to accommodate as many users as possible but we will reach at some point where the information is more useful to one group and not another.
  o The map/webpage should have links to other regional/national maps that better represent users’ perspective of requested travel information. This could include links to other MPOs, DOTs or other freight related/travelers’ information.
  o The map is probably geared more toward planners, policy makers and economic development because the associated information will probably be updated, at best, annually. This leave to question about information reliability for “real time” decision making.
• There is a layer for alternative fuels is diesel included? Once again, who is the intended user and how compete is the information?
  o It appears that identifiers are electric, CNG, and propane public and private fueling locations. The data is from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) and we simply imported their layers into the map.
• There is no information for toll road.
  o Nothing on the map represents tolls but it would be an easy feature to add.

4) Other Business

• Staff reminded the Committee about the annual meeting
• KDOT - information provided by MPOs regarding the CUFC will be compiled as Tier 1, 2 or 3 projects. Once the information is compiled/sorted and FHWA makes determination on mileage in Edgerton whether urban (within the MPO) or rural. KDOT will review with MARC the final project list clarifications for inclusion into the State’s Freight Plan and submittals to FHWA.
• Iowa is developing a multistate work group to develop standardized alternative fuel signs for FHWA and MoDOT has shown an interest to be involved.
Top 10 'Bottlenecks' in Metro KC, 2016
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Avg_Max_Le</th>
<th>Avg_Durati</th>
<th>Total_Dura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-35 S @ 75th St/ Exit 227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>161908</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2 h 04 m</td>
<td>31 d 17 h 44 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-35 N &amp; 75th St/ Exit 227</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109856</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2 h 19 m</td>
<td>35 d 13 h 08 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 E @ Sterling Ave/ Exit 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52138</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3 h 37 m</td>
<td>55 d 04 h 06 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 E @ Blue Ridge Cut Off/ Exit 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47794</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3 h 33 m</td>
<td>54 d 06 h 52 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-71 N @ 75th St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37023</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>53 m</td>
<td>13 d 16 h 22 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-56 W @ W 60 St/ Roeland Dr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36873</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>5 h 55 m</td>
<td>90 d 10 h 41 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-435 E @ Wornall Rd/ Exit 75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35076</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2 h 47 m</td>
<td>42 d 13 h 48 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-435 S @ I-35/US-56/ Exit 83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34493</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1 h 17 m</td>
<td>19 d 15 h 02 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-350 S @ Raytown Rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33374</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>56 m</td>
<td>14 d 08 h 27 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-35 N @ I-435/ Exit 222</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31896</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>35 m</td>
<td>8 d 21 h 50 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top 10 'Bottlenecks' in KC (Missouri Only), 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Avg_Max_Le</th>
<th>Avg_Durati</th>
<th>Total_Dura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-70 E @ Sterling Ave/ Exit 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52138</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3 h 37 m</td>
<td>55 d 04 h 06 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 E @ Blue Ridge Cut Off/ Exit 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47794</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3 h 33 m</td>
<td>54 d 06 h 52 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-71 N @ 75th St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37023</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>53 m</td>
<td>13 d 16 h 22 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-350 S @ Raytown Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33874</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>56 m</td>
<td>14 d 08 h 27 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-29/I-35 S @ US-24/ Independence Ave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30029</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>37 m</td>
<td>9 d 15 h 38 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-169 S @ I-70/ I-35/US-40/US-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29823</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1 h 58 m</td>
<td>30 d 03 h 59 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-210 E @ I-435</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29245</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1 h 23 m</td>
<td>21 d 06 h 55 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 W @ Noland Rd/ Exit 12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28607</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1 h 32 m</td>
<td>23 d 10 h 58 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-71 S @ 155th St</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27924</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>46 m</td>
<td>11 d 20 h 21 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-670 E @ I-35/ Exit 2T</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23751</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>58 m</td>
<td>14 d 21 h 59 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Members/Alternates Present-Representing
Richard Greenville, Port KC
Chris Gutierrez, Smart Port
Barb Wells, CDM Smith
David Albright, Metropolitan Energy Center
Brian Comer, HNTB

MARC Staff Present
Darryl Fields, Senior Planner

1) Introductions and Approval of Meeting Summary
Mr. Greenville called the meeting to order and welcomed all attendees. Introductions followed, and minutes were not approved (required a quorum).

2) KDOT’s Truck Parking Information and Management System (TPMS):
Brian Comer, HNTB, Provided an overview/presentation of the eight state (Mid America Association of State Transportation Official’s (MAASTO)) $25 million Tiger Grant Truck Parking Project. The project’s objective is to provide a seamless system that reduces a truck driver’s time searching for truck parking and to provide safe truck parking alternatives. One primary purpose of the project is to help alleviate truck drivers’ hours of service needs by reducing time needed to find safe and appropriate places to park. KDOT is currently talking with the Turnpike to expand the system. The initial Grant was not sufficient to complete the project as designed. FHWA provided an additional $6.25 million to complete the system. There are 139 public and private sites that participate in the system with the majority of states using public rest areas. Michigan, Iowa and Kentucky have also deployed with private truck stops. The private stops are developing their own application therefore parking information my not necessarily be real time and accuracy cannot be guaranteed. It’s anticipated that in the near future the technology and coordination will be expanded to the other states’ private truck stops. Real time parking information is collected and updated every 5 minutes and pushed out to reporting devices as electronic road signs. Information provides the number of spaces available. The system is developed in a way that allows flexibility in parking space capture technology but the reporting software must provide 85% to 95% accuracy every 5 minutes. All states have had their letting with construction occurring through 2018. The system is schedule to open early 2019. The Mid-America Freight Coalition will be the states’ central data warehouse for all truck parking data.

Questions:
What about conversations with Missouri and Illinois?
• There are currently coordination call with Missouri and Illinois. The project’s design allows other states to implement by phase approaches in both design and technology. At the time of the Tiger application MO and IL did not have the required local match to participate.

Why is IA not using signs?
• IA assumes that signs are a thing of the past and there are other means that will become more prevalent to disseminate information as apps, cell phones and/or in-cab technologies.

Will autonomous vehicles impact the project?
• The project is committed for 5 years and based on an assumption that truck platooning will come first; states will still need a methods to provide adequate parking information.
3) **Membership in the Kansas and Missouri STP Committees**
Agenda item tabled due to low Committee turnout

4) **Freight MAP (Bata)**
Darryl Fields, MARC, attempted to demonstrate the web based interactive freight map. Staff was unable to demonstrate final project because MARC’s internet was down.

The map provides users an opportunity to view geographically freight related activities in the region. Things included in the map were freight zones, intermodal facilities, truck routes (based on federal and MARC designations), airports, alternative fuel locations, truck parking, ports, large warehouses (based on employment), distribution centers, big box retail (Costco/SAMS). Users have an ability to display locations by selecting the corresponding layer and/or us different map background views (satellite, topographical, street etc.). Map locations/layers are derived from numerous regional data, activities and studies. Since the last demonstration MARC added measuring tools (radius and linear).

Questions:
Requested to make a presentation to the SmartPort Board to allow a different set of eyes an ability for comments and input.

5) **KS Critical Urban Freight Corridor (CUFC) Update**
Darryl Fields, MARC gave an update on the status of KS- CUFC. There was a joint meeting of the Goods Movement Committee and the KS - STP Priority Committee to settle on a set of projects to move forward a CUFC. The Committees agreed on the proposed projects to forward to TTPC for approval. TTPC concurred and the projects were submitted to KDOT for final coordination. KDOT coordinated with FHWA on a final list that is to be included into the State’s Freight Plan. MARC will submit the final list to FHWA by the end of December 2017.

Question:
Will there be an opportunity next year to amend the suggested CUFC.

- By all indications, MARC will have an opportunity to amend the CUFC yearly. Also as projects are completed the mileage returns to the region for reallocation. Keep in mind that CUFC status means that corridors identified as a CUFC has an ability to use federal freight funds for project development. These are not extra funds to the region just a reallocation of existing STP fund similar to interstate safety.
- KDOT’s freight plan is out for public comment and will be submitted to FHWA for approval in November.

6) **Other Business**
David Albright MEC (Missouri Energy Council) gave an update on a number of clean energy programs and initiatives:
- FAST Act designation for alternative fuel corridors application will occur November 30. Missouri has already mapped out their corridors KDOT may enlist the assistance of the Metropolitan Energy Center to assist.
- MEC has an ongoing project to identify 3 fast fill CNG station. Currently there are no fast fueling station along I-70 from Kansas City to Denver. The first location is Sapp Brothers on I-49 in
Harrisonville; the second location will be somewhere near Salina KS on I-70 and; the third location (TBD) will probably west of Hayes KS along I-70.

- There is a new DERA project with UPS to help convert their fleet to CNG.
- Additional information on these and other projects is available at www.metroenergy.org

Questions:
Are there any hydrogen stations?
- No, but MEC has been asked to map hydrogen potential.

Are you looking at anything east on I-70?
- No not with these programs - there are a couple of program east on along I-70 with school districts in Blue Springs and Grain Valley. These are propane and CNG expansions.
- EPA will introduce sure power (?) deployments in Cameron (public school project) and Joplin (freight company project)

**KDOT Update:**
1. Freight plan update and rail plan update are out for public review through October 20. They are located on the KDOT freight and rail webpage.
2. FHWA Kansas Division Office is reviewing FINAL draft of freight plan.
3. Both the freight plan and rail plan will be submitted to the USDOT (freight) and FRA (rail) around November 15, 2017.
4. KDOT will be submitting two INFRA grant applications: one in coordination with the KYLE Railroad (and Colorado DOT) and the other with the South Kansas and Oklahoma Railroad (and Oklahoma DOT).
5. KDOT will be involved with one TIGER 9 grant application – Phase 3 of the BNSF/AMTRAK Southwest Chief line improvement project.
6. Currently one rail project under construction.
8. The Truck Parking Information Management System (TPIMS) is in final design phase. Construction will begin within the next several months, with testing taking place in late 2018. The system will go live on January 4, 2019.
9. The MAASTO Subcommittee on Highway Transport took place in Kansas City last week. This MAASTO subcommittee focuses on over-dimensional and super-load movements.
10. Doing final updates to the web-based railroad crossing data collection application. The next round of data collection will begin in November/December 2017.
11. The Kansas Freight Advisory Committee held its final meeting of 2017 on August 24 in Topeka. The committee will meet next in March/April 2018.

**Critical Urban Freight Corridors -- Missouri**
The December meeting MARC will have a list of Missouri Critical Urban Freight Corridors for Committee approval. The process will be different in MO and will not require a joint meeting with the MO-STP Committee. Reason all of the MO projects are included within the list that have freight components and will not need prioritization.
Agenda Item II

**MoDOT’s Project Scenario Planning – what priorities are important to the Committee and/or the region**

MoDOT has been asked to compile a list of projects and/or programs to share with the legislature to illustrate what additional state transportation funding could accomplish over the next ten years. For this exercise, MoDOT will assume that approximately $409 million would be available for state highway projects and that $91 million will be available for multimodal projects in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

MoDOT intends to work with available MARC committees to review a list of projects based Transportation Outlook 2040, priorities previously identified for Amendment 7 and other projects. The deadline for this work is December 15, 2017.

**State System Prioritization Process**

A. Continuing discussion of a process for determining state system priorities on an ongoing basis

B. Discussion of a MoDOT scenario planning exercise to determine illustrative priorities in advance of the 2018 legislative session
MO Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC)

Requirement
MARC in cooperation with the States are required to develop the Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC): “Public roads in urbanized areas which provide access and connection to the Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) and the Interstate with other ports, public transportation facilities, or other intermodal transportation facilities.”

Rule
- In urbanized areas with populations of 500,000 or more individuals, the MPO, in consultation with the State, may identify, designate, and certify the CUFC routes.
- In urbanized areas with populations of 500,000 or less, States, in consultation with the MPO, may identify, designate, and certify the CUFC routes.

Criteria
- Designation Is in an urbanized area, regardless of population; and
- Connects an intermodal facility to:
  - The primary highway freight system;
  - The Interstate System; or
  - An intermodal freight facility;
  - Is located within a corridor of a route on the primary highway freight system and provides an alternative highway option important to goods movement;
  - Serves a major freight generator, logistic center, or manufacturing and warehouse industrial land; or
  - Is important to the movement of freight within the region, as determined by the metropolitan planning organization or the State.

- MARC share of 102 miles between the other 8 MPOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  MARC</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Jefferson City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Columbia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  East-West Gateway (St. Louis)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Joplin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Northwest Arkansas (Springdale AR)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Springfield</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  St. Joseph</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Cape Girardeau</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP #</td>
<td>MTP #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 39.2

*Multiple phases
Membership in the Kansas and Missouri STP Committees

Kansas STP Priority Committee - voting membership
The Kansas STP Committee establishes transportation priorities for the state's metropolitan Surface Transportation Program (STP) federal funds.

The Committee is authorized by the MARC’s Total Transportation Policy Committee (TTPC) to provide project funding recommendations to TTPC for federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) traffic flow funds sub-allocated in Kansas to the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) by Federal and/or State policy and to assist in monitoring and reporting on the progress of projects funded through these programs.

The Kansas STP Priorities Committee meets regularly on the second Thursday during the second month of each quarter.

For additional information, please see the use the following link or contact MARC staff:
http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Committees/Transportation-Committees/STP-Priorities-Kansas

Missouri STP Priority Committee - voting membership
The Missouri STP Committee establishes transportation priorities for the state's metropolitan Surface Transportation Program (STP) federal funds.

The Committee is authorized by TTPC to provide project funding recommendations to TTPC for the federal STP and CMAQ traffic flow funds sub-allocated in Missouri to the MPO by federal and/or State policy and to assist in monitoring and reporting on the progress of projects funded through these programs.

The Missouri STP Committee meets regularly on the second Tuesday of each month at 1:30 p.m.

For additional information, please see the use the following link contact MARC staff:
http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Committees/Transportation-Committees/STP-Priorities-Missouri
MARC’s Whistleblower and Conflict of Interest Policies

**Whistleblower Policy:**  [http://marc.org/About-MARC/pdf/WhistleblowerPolicy](http://marc.org/About-MARC/pdf/WhistleblowerPolicy)

The policy is intended to:

- Encourage individuals to bring ethical or legal violations to the attention of an internal or external authority so that action can be taken to resolve the problem.
- Establish guidance and procedures for staff (paid and volunteer) or others to report illegal, unethical or inappropriate behaviors or practices, in good faith, without fear of retribution.
- To provide a constructive process for individuals to report issues of concern.
- Emphasize the importance of adherence to MARC’s standards of conduct.

**Conflict of Interest Policy:**  [http://marc.org/About-MARC/pdf/Conflict-of-Interest-Boards](http://marc.org/About-MARC/pdf/Conflict-of-Interest-Boards)

The purpose of the policy is to ensure that participants on the MARC board and committees have clear guidance when a participant in any MARC decision-making process that could have a conflict of interest and what the appropriate action would be in those circumstances.