There will be a meeting of MARC’s Goods Movement Committee on **Tuesday, June 6, 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. Regional Highway Freight Bottlenecks -- Shawn Urbach MARC

Overview of regional freight bottlenecks on the National Highway System (NHS) identified by using the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS)

III. Review interactive freight map (Beta)

[http://marc-gis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=03db7764e8a14972a20d7d9fd51fdbef](http://marc-gis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=03db7764e8a14972a20d7d9fd51fdbef)

Review and comment on interactive MARC’s interactive freight map.

1. What do you like?
2. What don’t you like?
3. What’s missing?
4. Ease of use?

IV. 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.
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 willingness 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
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?
  o 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
  o 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?
  o The network will be reviewed annually.

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

• How often will the primary freight network be updated?
  o 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?
  o 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.
  o It’s believed that Lawrence is considering the same process for Baldwin City on Hwy 56.

• What is the timing to report to KDOT?
  o KDOT gave other MPOs - May 15 as a deadline.
  o 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.
  o 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?
  o 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  
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Attendees:
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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  
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Tammy Snyder, Edwardsville  
Beth Wright, Olathe  
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Lideana Laboy, Unified Government of WyCo/KCK  
John Maddox, KDOT  
Allison Smith, KDOT  
Marisela Ward, MoDOT  
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Randy Rowson, CDM Smith  
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Kate Pfefferkorn-Mansker, Pfefferkorn Eng. & Env.  
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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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>32</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>
MARC Regional Highway Freight Bottlenecks

Overview of regional freight bottlenecks on the National Highway System (NHS) as identified using the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS)

Using data extracted from an online tool called “The Probe Data Analytics Suite” found at https://missouri.ritis.org/analytics/. Staff created a summary of the top ten bottlenecked road segments for freight in the Kansas City metropolitan region. Potentially, this data may help determine freight performance and project priorities.

FHWA’s roadway freight “Bottleneck” definition:
A period of 5 minutes or more when a segment experiences reported speeds of below 60% of the reference speed (85th percentile of all observed speeds for all time periods).
The link above is to MARC’s Interactive Freight Map (Beta version). The Map is to provide the user an ability to identify major freight activities and data within the MARC region. Staff is requesting the Committee to review and comment:

5. What do you like?
6. What don’t you like?
7. What’s missing?
8. Ease of use?