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MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome & Introductions
   Jack Messer called the meeting to order and began introductions.

2. Approval of March 28, 2018 meeting summary
   The March 2018 meeting summary was approved unanimously without any changes.

3. APPROVE: Transportation Outlook 2040 Amendment #6 (see attached report)
   Jim Hubbell provided background information and a summary of the proposed Amendment #6 to Transportation Outlook 2040. The amendment involves modifying project 346 in Olathe, expanding the scope to include reconstruction of the 119th Street/I-35 interchange. A break in access study has recently been completed in relation to the interchange project, and in order to approve that study the project needs to be in the financially constrained metropolitan transportation plan.

   There were no questions or discussion, and a motion to approve Amendment #6 passed unanimously.

4. APPROVE: Policy recommendations in support of Regional ITS Architecture (to include a brief presentation and discussion of the key elements of recently updated Architecture)
   Cliff Heise with Iteris gave a brief presentation on the process to update the Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture. The architecture is related to the topic of Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSMO), the theme of a presentation given to the Highway Committee by Mark Sommerhauser (KC Scout) in March. Essentially, the Regional ITS Architecture describes how ITS technologies connect and communicate with one another, outlines a logical sequence for implementation, and explores integration opportunities among the various technologies that exist now and may be implemented in the future.

   Federal regulations require the development of a Regional ITS Architecture, and as ITS evolves, the Architecture needs to be periodically updated. The process to update the Kansas City regional architecture involved stakeholder engagements and was guided by a steering committee comprising representatives from various, multimodal transportation agencies and local governments in the region. Enhancements to the architecture include the integration of autonomous and connected vehicle (AV/CV) technologies, additional considerations for freight movement and incorporation of the mobility hubs concept from Smart Moves.

   The second part of this agenda item involved discussion related to a policy statement proposed by MARC staff in support of ongoing maintenance and implementation of the Regional ITS Architecture. The architecture itself is a technical document and does not need to be approved like a plan, for example. The proposed policy statement essentially would essentially (1) reinforce the Highway Committee’s role in planning in a way that supports TSMO and (2) endorse the creation of a Regional TSMO working group to support implementation and maintenance of the Regional ITS and fill the known gap in supporting implementation of TSMO in the region.

   The proposed policy statement appears below.

   The MARC Highway Committee is committed to ensuring consistency between the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional ITS Architecture, including the Implementation Plan.
When the RTP is updated or amended, consistency with the ITS Architecture will be reviewed and confirmed, as appropriate, for projects under the purview of the Highway Committee.

Furthermore, the Highway Committee supports the designation by TTPC of a specific, multi-modal group of regional stakeholders responsible for overseeing the use and maintenance of the ITS Architecture. Ideally, this group would be broadly focused on advancing transportation management and operations in the MARC planning area.

Summary of discussion

- The proposed TSMO working group would not be an official MARC transportation planning committee, but would be formally recognized and given a specific role in guiding development and implementation of TSMO strategies and projects.
- Consistency between the MTP and ITS Architecture would be fairly broad and high level, relating generally to sequencing and ensuring technologies are implemented in a fashion (over time) that is consistent with the architecture. Projects to be included in the TIP are determined to be consistent with the architecture based on MARC staff review.
- There is concern that a focus on consistency with the architecture could eventually turn into scoring criteria that favor ITS projects and put smaller jurisdictions at a disadvantage when competing for sub-allocated funds.
- A concern/question was shared as to whether the proposed TSMO working group would serve as a resource for smaller communities without staff expertise/resources for developing and enhancing operational capabilities. This role/function of the working group should be explored and detailed.
- A review of consistency between MTP projects and the architecture wouldn’t be seen so much as enforcing a requirement as an opportunity for identifying which projects present an opportunity to incorporate ITS elements (then to ensure consistency when more project detail is developed).
- The intent of a multi-modal TSMO working group sounds like a model similar to Destination Safe: an opportunity to convene diverse stakeholders and disciplines around a common theme and area of interest.
- Randy Johnson with KC Scout offered that just about any transportation project could have an ITS component. The specific technology depends on the context.
- Concerns over the additional staff time for MARC and member organizations to attend another meeting.
- Smaller jurisdictions would like to see a TSMO working group serve as a resource for cities/counties that don’t have in-house TSMO capabilities (traffic engineering, etc.).
- Concerns over the possibility that a TSMO working group could slow/delay the process of developing or amending the MTP.
- How much of an overlap would the TSMO working group have with Operation GreenLight steering committee? Internal discussions have considered the possibility of expanding the scope of OGL, but there would be challenges and it may not be a perfect fit.
- There are concerns over the Highway Committee going too far into the weeds of TSMO, and a desire to keep HC discussions at the policy level.
- If the creation of a TSMO working group is not urgent, perhaps MARC staff could go back and develop one or more scenarios for the creation of this entity and present them to the Highway Committee. The Committee would like to see examples from other regions and understand more details about the roles and responsibilities.
Summary conclusions:

- Highway Committee agrees there is a need to address TSMO from a more comprehensive, regional standpoint.
- There is a general consensus that operations should reside more at a technical staff level (than a policy/executive level).
- There is concern and hesitation over creating yet another MARC meeting.
- There is consensus that the role of regional TSMO coordination does not fit well with an existing MARC committee. This lends us to a stakeholder group approach.
- There is concern over TSMO becoming a requirement for project (application/funding).
- Direction to MARC staff to develop a proposal to be considered by the Highway Committee in July.

5. **REPORT: Overview of process to develop Highway Committee advisory priorities for programming 2021-2022 STP funds**

Jim Hubbell gave a quick overview of the process the Committee will follow on May 23, 2018 to develop advisory priorities for programming of sub-allocated STP funds in 2021-2022. Advisory priorities are used by the programming committees (STP in this case) to distinguish among projects that score generally in the middle range of the distribution. The primary purpose of advisory priorities is to reinforce the connection between goals/objectives in the long-range plan and programming of projects in the TIP.

Jim briefly recapped the process that was followed in 2016. He shared a summary of trends in the most recent Annual Performance Measures Report. Furthermore, he offered some possible options for refinements or modifications to the process used to develop advisory priorities.

In past rounds of developing advisory priorities, the Highway Committee has limited its focus to “traditional” roadway projects—capacity, bridge, management & operations and safety. There was a request to include all STP project applications in the list considered for advisory priorities in this round. The full range of projects are important, since various project types can ultimately impact the street/highway system.

It is incumbent on Committee members to become familiar with the project applications and their intended benefits. There was a request for MARC staff to help the Committee come to a consensus on narrowing the list of priorities and bring guidance on how to make its recommendation most useful to the programming committees.

6. **Other Business**

MARC staff reminded attendees to register for the Regional Assembly scheduled on June 8th.

7. **Adjourn**