There will be a meeting of MARC’s Goods Movement Committee on **Tuesday, February 7, 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**

II. **National Freight Performance Measures final rule** - Jim Hubbell - MARC
   Staff will provide an overview of the final rule.
   - [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule/pm3_nprm.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule/pm3_nprm.cfm)

III. **Project selection criteria**
   - Adding additional criteria for project scoring during “call for projects”
   - Project sponsors provide answer to:
     - **Freight Movement Facilitation**
     - Points
     - | Within 1 mile of a large Industrial or retail complex | 1 |
     - | Connects to the NHS | 1 |
     - | Current or future Commercial Vehicle AADT >5% | 1 |
   - Proposed equity mileage in KS and MO associated to the Critical Urban Freight Corridor (CUFC)

IV. **Revision of the MARC’s freight website** – Committee discussion about revamping MARC’s freight website to become more user friendly and data relevant
   - Discussion about relevant data and who is the customer

V. **Other Business**

**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.
Members/Alternates Present-Representing
Janet Mc Rae, Miami County
Richard Grenville, Port KC
Michael Duffy, Riverside
Randy Rowson, CDM Smith
Jeff Schwartz, Orange EV
Marisela Ward, MoDOT
Kelly Gilbert, MO Energy Center
John Maddox, KDOT
Randy Rowson, CDM Smith

A. MARC Staff Present
Ron Achelpohl, Dir Transportation
Darryl Fields, Senior Planner

1) Introductions and Approval of Meeting Summary
Ms. Mc Rea called the meeting to order and welcomed all attendees. Introductions followed, and minutes approved.

2) MARC’s Whistleblower and Conflict of Interest Policies
Darryl Fields, MARC, discussed Committee members’ roles/responsibilities of instances related to MARC or persons associated with MARC programs using federal funds and are identified as being engaged in illicit activities. The discussion further covered Committee members actions in situation were a Committee member may derive personal benefit from actions or decisions made in their official capacity. In either case, if Members are unclear of the situation they may contact MARC staff to discuss their situation. MARC’s policies are available at the following websites:

- http://marc.org/About-MARC/pdf/WhistleblowerPolicy

Questions:
One area you may qualify because it seems to come up every time we review projects - “if I am a city or a consultant who has submitted a project to a group and it is being reviewed for funding is that considered a conflict of interest.

- As a Consultant - yes this it is considered a conflict of interest because as a consultant (person/firm) you may not derive a personal benefit from their vote. The consultant would need to recuse himself or herself from voting on the outcome of that particular project.
- Cities do not need to worry about a conflict of interest regarding project selection.

3) Revisions to the MARC freight website:
Darryl Fields, MARC, discussed MARC’s current freight website. He felt that the site did not provide enough relevant information and needs an update and lift to better support interaction. The website redesign has been on the back burner for a couple of years. The Committee was asked to provide input on what they would like to see on the website (MARC current site http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Modes/Modes/Freight). The agenda packet provided freight sites from other MPOs around the country. Staff displayed a few websites and discussed some of their high points. Mr. Fields found Memphis’s MPO to be a good site http://memphismpo.org/plans/multi-modal-
plans/all-freight-profiles by providing a mix of freight facts and an interactive map. Moving forward it is a wish to develop an interactive map that links TIP and MTP projects. The most important question from MARC staff is what is important to you the end user?

The Committee discussed age of data (how old) and how it should be displayed. This answer may be better defined by end users’ needs. Three year old data may be fine for the general public but a freight user/developer might need newer data. Some of newer data could be handled through links/widgets to other data locations.

Question:

1. If we develop an interactive site who has responsibility to maintain the site?
   a. MARC has the responsibility to maintain the site and keep it current.

2. Would it be proprietary to provide distribution hubs on a map along with its related information?
   a. No, it would not -- it is our anticipation to provide that level of detail.

3. I liked the way Indiana displayed their information on the first page then you can drill down. Many of the other sites where text heavy and you had to click numerous links to get requested information. http://www.indympo.org/whats-completed/regional-plans/freight-plans
   a. MARC anticipates making our site as user friendly as possible.

4. Some things I’ve seen developed for economic development groups is a sort of widget dashboard that allow users to link to that widget to receive freight related facts. Not sure how well MARC will be able to get around the “test heavy” brand
   a. This is a good idea for connectivity for the end-user hopefully information can be displayed in this manner. I hope that the freight site will have an ability to break MARC’s reliance on text heaviness.

5. It’s important to maintain a site that is user-friendly with an ability to sell freights’ regional importance to the everyday users.

6. It would be useful if we are able to provide density uses -- roads, rail, waterways, and airports.

7. It would be great to take tonnage data and overlay on a map to provide the user with a sense of how freight is flowing through the region. How the freight network fits together -- both inbound, outbound and through freight.

4) Committee expectation for 2017

Discussion focused on the 2017 work plan -- things that are required for 2017 by federal regulations. The development of an urban freight project section process for Kansas and Missouri. Within this process, we are still waiting on both state DOTs to work out a process for urban input. Additionally the Committee needs to refine our current process about how we rate projects within the project selection process related to the TIP/MTP. Another issue carried over from 2016/2015 is about truck driver retention and autonomous vehicles.

• The FAST Act discuss determine urban freight corridors in connection with State DOTS
  • KS there is 75 miles (centerline miles) to decide between TMAs (MARC and Wichita,)
  • MO there is 220 miles to decide between TMAs (MARC, St. Louis, and Springfield)
• KDOT is working on baseline approach to develop freight projects. The anticipated approach is to take a tiered project approach (Tier 1-- 0 - 5 years, Tier 2- 6 to 10 years, Tier 3 +11 years) to freight project selection/development. This allows flexibility of projects to move through the available funding/construction years, process and tiers.
• MoDOT has suggested that MARC work with the RPC to workout projects for the Kansas City region. MoDOT is still working on the concept about blending MARC and the RPC into a functioning group.

Questions
1. Any idea how fast the state will move to fund any of the FAST Lane projects? There has already been applications for the first round of funds what is anticipated for the second round?
   a. KDOT has had the first round of funds and the second round was coming up on Dec. 16, 2016. KDOT was not submitting any projects for the second round at the state level. The UG was submitting for funds associated to the Turner Diagonal.
2. What about the programmatic funds that was routed to the states for the Fast Act.
   a. The first 2 years have been programmed for I-435 and Quivira. Future funds can only come to states with FAST Act compliant state freight plans.
3. It would probably be great if we brought in some of the industry leaders to discuss issues as driver retainage.
4. An update regarding the new administration regarding infrastructure, policy and air quality.
   a. MARC has started discussion through several Committees on issues an infrastructure and air quality. As discussions on infrastructure/policy become concrete staff will ensure to include the Goods Movement Committee into the discussions.
5. The Port completed a study examining current and future freight flows and identified that deep water port freight is shifting from the west coast to the east. This is a dynamic change and increases the complexity for MPOs in freight planning. This is attributed to both a shift in coasts and things happening in a short manner of time.
6. Do we need topic question regarding other ports than Kansas City?
7. Further discussion about alternative fuels and freight movement. Working this discussion into activities related to the FHWA’s alternative fuel action plan and plans of other states. In addition, the VW settlement funds that states will receive could possibly be used as leverage for related studies, alternative fuel stations and vehicles. Input for the Committee would be advantageous to the discussion regarding an alternative fuel action plan.

5) KDOT update
John Maddox, KDOT is expecting to have its freight plan updated by July 2017 for the federal December 2017 deadline. In addition it is expected to have the 5 year rail plan to FRA by the December date. The Freight Advisory Committee met in November. Highlights of the meetings were discussions on scenario planning and potential criteria /weighting for project selection. KDOT is waiting on its consultant (CDM Smith) to complete its analysis and provide planning recommendations. The Truck Parking Management Information System (TPIMS) the federal Tiger...
Grant agreements is signed along with all other states except Iowa. KDOT is the lead agency. Currently the study is at 30% designed allowing all other states to talk with each other to move to full design and implementation. It’s anticipated the full buildout is a year away giving state opportunities to monitor, develop interactive signage, and develop sites and collect related truck parking data. KDOT has a test site at a public rest area between Manhattan and Topeka.

Rail crossing date input update - KDOT is upgrading its rail crossing paper process to an electronic internet base process. KS has over 6000 crossing historically updated every 5 years. This process is expected to reduce reporting to 3 years. The assessment will be complete by KDOT’s district staff. It’s assumed that the software may be tweaked to cover other data collection opportunities for fixed objects/applications (i.e. sign locations).

Transload facility update - Garden City is about 80% complete. Last part of the puzzle is connecting the switch to the BNSF mainline (expected first part of 2017). Great Bend just started; expected clients are wind energy and aggregate. KDOT has not started a round 2 phase. High tech weigh station (weigh in motion) along I-70. This project is not in connection with the redesign of toll booths on I-70.

Question
1. Will the information collect from TPIMS allow the driver to get granular information as hotel locations, stop amenities, etc?
   a. In KS the information will only be on public rest areas some state are providing private rest stop information.

MoDOT update
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National Freight Performance Measures final rule

- https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule/pm3_nprm.cfm

Three related NPRMs together establishes a set of performance measures for State departments of transportation (State DOT) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) to use as required by Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). The measures proposed is for State DOTs and MPOs:

1. To assess the performance of the Interstate and non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) for the purpose of carrying out the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP):
2. To assess freight movement on the Interstate System;
3. To assess traffic congestion and on-road mobile source emissions for the purpose of carrying out the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program.
4. To include a discussion that summarizes 1, 2 and 3 of the national performance management measures proposed rules and the comprehensive regulatory impact analysis (RIA).

The two proposed measures to assess freight movement on the Interstate System are:
1. Percent of the Interstate System Mileage providing for Reliable Truck Travel Time, and
2. Percent of the Interstate System Mileage Uncongested. The proposed measure to assess traffic congestion is Annual Hours of Excessive Delay per Capita.
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- **Project Selection Criteria**

  Project sponsors answer questions to the following set of questions (see table). Based on their answer sponsors receive a corresponding number of points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freight Movement Facilitation</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile of a large Industrial or retail complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to the NHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current or future Commercial Vehicle ADT &gt;5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  *ADT -- average daily truck

  **Scoring Criteria** - staff uses the following guide to score projects

  Local delivery truck traffic does not constitute significant freight movement. To receive freight points the project location must meet at least one of the following:

  - On a designated National, Regional, or Local Corridor = 5 pts
  - Direct connection to A, B, C, D, F (does not include E) = 5 pts
  - Any 4 combination of A thru F but not all = 4 pts
  - Any 3 combination of A thru F = 3 pts
  - Any 2 combination of A thru F = 2 pts
  - Within mile of a significant freight corridor or A thru E = 1 pts

  Within a mile of:

  A. Top twenty warehousing site by square footage
  B. Top twenty manufacturer by number of employees
  C. Presence of a rail/truck or air/truck intermodal facility
  D. Presence of a Foreign Trade Zone
  E. Area with two out of four transportation modes: air, barge, rail, truck
  F. Located within a mile of a significant freight corridor, i.e., roadway with greater than 500 trucks/day

  The Goods Movement Committee designated a regional network:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Designation</th>
<th>Highway</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>River</th>
<th>Air</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Roadways with greater than 4,000 trucks/day</td>
<td>Primary Corridor per AAR</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Roadways with 1,000 to 3,999 trucks/day</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>KCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Roadways with 500 to 999 trucks/day</td>
<td>Less than 10 trains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2 are somewhat related but not completely. Staff is requesting the Committee to evaluate:

- If there should be a closer connection between the two categories.
- If staff should ask project sponsors to provide commercial truck ADT and %

**Critical Urban Freight Corridors -- proposal/formula**

**Requirement:**

The FAST Act requires MARC in cooperation with the States are required to 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.

**Objective**
To develop an equity formula that provides the region an equitable share of the CRFC mileage in KS (75 miles) and MO (220 miles):

- Kansas - MARC share of 75 miles between the other 5 MPOs
  1. MARC
  2. Lawrence
  3. Topeka
  4. Wichita
  5. St. Joseph
  6. Flint Hills

- Missouri - MARC share of 220 miles between the other 8 MPOs.
  1. MARC
  2. Jefferson City
  3. Columbia
  4. East-West Gateway
  5. Joplin
  6. Northwest Arkansas (Springdale AR)
  7. Springfield
  8. St. Joseph
  9. Cape Girardeau

Staff propose a formula that consist of State GDP, Population Truck count and VMT. The example below is to engage the conversation and provide an example of possible factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>MO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional portion of State GDP</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck count</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final percentages are multiplied to the mileage to establish MARC’s share
75 miles * 7% = 5.25 miles in KS or 220 miles *4% = 8.8 miles in MO

Weights provided are example only and staff is waiting on actual truck counts and VMT.
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• MARC freight website possible data links

All modes outbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Missouri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>100,967</td>
<td>$4,049,464,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>85,219,128</td>
<td>$50,805,512,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>23,425,677</td>
<td>$5,733,756,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>2,290,751</td>
<td>$10,545,459,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>24,721</td>
<td>$8,281,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111,061,245</td>
<td>$71,142,474,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 10 by truck by Tons -- KS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Truck</th>
<th>Dest</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td>14,769,587.00</td>
<td>$69,747,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (KS Part)</td>
<td>Natural sands</td>
<td>8,591,595.70</td>
<td>$51,468,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (KS Part)</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td>6,018,927.25</td>
<td>$33,694,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (KS Part)</td>
<td>Nonmetal min. prods.</td>
<td>5,099,114.75</td>
<td>$347,769,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rest of KS</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td>2,782,752.93</td>
<td>$43,778,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rest of MO</td>
<td>Cereal grains</td>
<td>2,263,950.44</td>
<td>$245,241,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Waste/scrap</td>
<td>1,938,324.15</td>
<td>$6,085,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Nonmetal min. prods.</td>
<td>1,824,594.12</td>
<td>$196,192,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St. Louis MO-IL (IL Part)</td>
<td>Chemical prods.</td>
<td>1,610,712.40</td>
<td>$717,303,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Mixed freight</td>
<td>1,420,979.25</td>
<td>$2,015,085,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 10 truck by Value -- MO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dest</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Motorized vehicles</td>
<td>1,952,213.23</td>
<td>$9,707,026,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Chemical prods.</td>
<td>353,276.90</td>
<td>$1,625,445,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>734,915.31</td>
<td>$1,298,105,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>313,101.03</td>
<td>$1,027,876,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul MN-WI</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>30,778.75</td>
<td>$ 963,435,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (MO Part)</td>
<td>Mixed freight</td>
<td>624,582.00</td>
<td>$ 958,495,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC-VA-MD-WV (DC</td>
<td>Plastics/rubber</td>
<td>28,371.15</td>
<td>$ 776,251,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City UT</td>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>89,532.81</td>
<td>$ 687,173,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City MO-KS (KS Part)</td>
<td>Mixed freight</td>
<td>479,002.11</td>
<td>$ 641,351,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional OB all modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>111,061,245</td>
<td>$ 71,142,474,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>76,271,804</td>
<td>$ 69,709,495,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187,333,049</td>
<td>$ 140,851,970,521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional OB number of Trucks and Trains by year and average per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>4,380,542</td>
<td>3,137,429</td>
<td>7,517,971</td>
<td>20,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>6,586</td>
<td>3,802</td>
<td>10,388</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>