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MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome & Introductions
   Gary Lathrop, Missouri co-chair, called the meeting to order at 1:32 pm and began introductions.

2. Approval May 7, 2018 meeting summary
   The May meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

3. Progress Report: Regional Transportation Plan 2050
   a) Recap of 7/17 RTP 2050 Steering Workgroup meeting
      Jim Hubbell gave a recap from the July RTP 2050 Steering Workgroup meeting. The workgroup discussed the following:
      - Review of the updated vision statement and regional policy goals
        o A modular vision that can be used wholly has been developed for the plan that describes what the KC region will look like in terms of economy, the environment, socially etc.
        o Would like to additionally focus on places—we’ve already done a good job focusing on people.
        o A sense of community is the bedrock of the vision.
        o Vision doesn’t apply solely to LRTP, but to all projects administered through MARC
        o The interim policy framework expands on regional vision and goals. When finalized, it will include goals, objectives, performance measures and strategies for each element.
   b) Regional Needs Story Map
      - Looked at performance measures in the plan, other adopted regional plans, goals and objectives of local adopted plans to develop a large set of means (8 categories).
      - Each stated need includes: need statement, current challenges for RTP to address, measures, and leadership
      - Emphasis on taking this to the street level
      - Story maps are based on “potential ways to measure” in RTP 2050 Needs Assessment, they illustrate spatial representation of high/medium/low needs, focus on transportation nexus, and they incorporate and explore with interactive story map—a web-based tool that compiles a story using maps, graphics and texts (Jim will send link).
        o Jim encouraged group to give feedback on story map, to be used during next round of public engagement.
        o Last page of story map is a composition needs analysis layer (work in progress)
   c) Discussion of approach to RTP project identification/selection
      - Jim asked what the desired outcome for RTP 2050 is—keep methodology the same, borrow practices from other areas, or a hybrid approach? There is a possibility of considering alternative methodology.
        o Update on model scenario analysis: There are 3 phases (sensitivity testing, transportation/land use investment scenarios, and connected/autonomous testing). Scenarios will be evaluated using 8 performance criteria.
      - Highlight of RTP 2050 Project Selection: Workgroup is contemplating possible ways of streamlining project selection. Jim notes that we are required to do project selection. Jim highlighted what content is supposed to be listed in a metropolitan transportation plan and noted that MARC plans require regionally significant projects/guidelines aggregated by
modes and categories. MARC selects projects through a call for projects process. Pros of MARC’s approach include a very detailed list that is familiar to partners. Cons include a “kitchen” sink that requires frequent amendments. Notably, regionally significant projects include roadway projects, transit projects, activity center/nodes, regional bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and management and operations programs.

- Alternative methodologies for project selection—looked at St. Louis, Philadelphia and Detroit. St. Louis (Connected 2045) includes major transit investment, as well as projects on state highway systems (no specifics on arterial or local streets). Philadelphia only lists “major regional projects” as large-scale projects that will have a significant impact on regional travel. Smaller-scale projects are identified in needs assessment and funding was allocated in Plan, but not specifically identified/listed. Detroit groups its “small projects” into programmatic line items in their RTP.

- Jim opened the floor for discussion. The first question asked why should we fix something that isn’t broken? Follow-up request for example from the group. Jim responded that going through programming and having estimates of future revenues, drawing them down like real money, forces local jurisdictions to lock in projects in their long-range plans (causing loss of flexibility). The LRTP is frequently amended for the purposes of bringing projects into the TIP. Programming 5-10 years in advance limits the region’s ability to respond to changing local needs.
  - Jim was asked whether this modification changes the availability of funding for projects. Jim stated that there was no impact on revenue estimates over the course of the LRTP but would give more flexibility during TIP development projects.
  - Jim was asked how financially constrained areas are dealt with. Jim brought up SEMCOG in Detroit, who estimates general buckets for projects.
  - Jim stated that he is not seeking action on this, only discussion. The next steps will be to think and revisit at steering workgroup and committee meetings. Would like a general approach ironed out by October.

- Committee is encouraged to look at the story map to see if jurisdictional needs are accurately illustrated
- Committee was reminded that this is not an exhaustive list of needs, just identifying where greatest needs are
- Committee member stated the importance of involving FTA and FHWA
- MARC staff asked for feedback on story map by August 6th
- Public Engagement will take place August – October. Objectives include delving deeper into specific needs areas with key stakeholders, and continuing to provide information to public/stakeholders about the RTP process, regional needs and priorities etc.

**d) Next steps**
- TTPC and MARC Board review (august)
- Targeted engagement and MARC Committee (august-october)
- Finalization of initial scenario analysis (summer-fall)
  - Eager to use regional travel demand model a lot more in this plan update
- Preparation for RTP2050 project selection (fall)

**4. Consider proposed targets for FAST Act performance measures**
- Jim gave brief background on Map 21 and Fast Act transportation performance management requirements
- Jim gave an overview of MARC TPM workgroup input/guidance for establishing performance targets in KC metropolitan planning area
TPM workgroup was comprised of staff from KDOT, MoDOT, Marc, KCMO, Independence, Overland Park, Freight (OOIDA), HNTB, HDR, and CDM Smith.

Workgroup considered KS and MO statewide targets and regional trends. There was consensus in favor of developing regional targets. The selected approach considers regional experience/trends, connecting them with statewide targets. Target deadline for MPOS is Nov. 16, 2018; State DOTS May 20, 2018. TTPC and Board will act by October to meet this deadline.

- The floor was opened for questions. Jim was asked hypothetically if we could make our plan less robust. Jim stated that no, the decision to set regional targets doesn’t make more work. There was previous discussion at the last TPM workgroup on target setting. There is no need to worry much about the targets we set because we can revisit them in a couple of years. Methodology and logic was utilized to derive sensible targets. Targets can be revisited in the future.

a) System Condition (PM2)

- Recap defining PM2. See agenda for targets.
- Jim highlighted 4 steps that were used to create targets:
  1. Consider regional NHS condition trends/experience (separately for KS and MO)
  2. For statewide targets, calculate ratio of target to most recent years
  3. Develop regional targets specific to assets in KS/MO by applying corresponding state’s ratio to regional measure for most recent year
  4. Calculate single regional target as weighted average of state specific targets from step 3.
- Discussion about the purpose of the target. Target opens dialogue at the state and regional levels. This is acceptable, even though funding has already been programmed—the purpose is to get states into a behavior of performance-based planning and programming. Focus should be more on aspirational.
- What happens if we don’t meet our targets? There are no punitive consequences, but administrative consequences. We would then have to explain why we didn’t meet it, and describe what will be done differently.
- In performance measure report, we will still continue to track both sides of the state line separately.
- Discussion about targeted numerical thresholds. Argument for setting the bar lower—there is no level of analysis for our chosen number. The number is arbitrary. Targets should be set so they can be met. Argument against setting the bar lower—this is even less optimistic, like we aren’t holding ourselves to standard. Current targets seem most representative and achievable by the region as a whole.
- Jim highlighted actual targets for PM2.
- Discussion amongst the committee about political narrative of setting a lower target. Setting a lower target is difficult, there needs to be an aspirational goal. Aiming too low could result in giving off an impression that there is no need for more funding because goal was exceeded. Statement by committee member that mandate wasn’t to set aspirational goals, but to predict what happens.
- Clarification of 7/25 committee meeting goals. Overall question for today: Lowest common denominator vs. weighted average. Jim asked that the committee come to a consensus. Committee member moved for an informal show of hands. Co-chair, Gary, asked for a vote.
- Vote- leave condition targets as they are or change them (by show of hands): Consensus that targets should be left as they are
Jim highlighted NHS pavement condition targets. For good interstate targets, Missouri has more aspirational targets than Kansas. For poor interstate targets, both KS and MO are fairly equal.

Committee voted (by show of hands) to approve NHS system condition targets as recommended by MARC TPM workgroup.

b) System Performance (PM3)

Jim addressed system performance measures
- % reliable person miles travel on interstates
- % reliable person miles travel on non-interstate NHS
- Level of truck TT reliability (LOTTR) on interstates (and index, not a percentage).

Discussion about the similar target setting methodology between PM2 and PM3. Only exception is the tool to calculate does not separate KS and MO. Historical trend data is not comparable (change in vendor/specification), so 2017 is only data point available.

Co-Chair, Gary, moved that committee recommends these PM3 targets as is. Motion seconded. All in favor: group consensus. Motion passed.

5. Follow up on staff proposal for Regional TSM&O Working Group

Acknowledge discussion and instructions to come with recommendations. Due to staff workloads and other factors, a solid recommendation was not developed. Recommendation will be brought back at September meeting.

6. Other Business
None

7. Adjourn
Adjourned at 3:03