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MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome & Introductions
Jack Messer, Kansas co-chair, called the meeting to order at 1:31 pm and began introductions.

2. Approval of November 28, 2018 Meeting Summary
The November meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

3. 18th Street Bridge Replacement Study Presentation – KDOT/HNTB
Ben Ware, KDOT, introduced the 18th Street Bridge Replacement Study. Ben stated that KDOT was made aware of emergency repairs that were needed on the 18th Street Bridge. During summer and fall 2018, the bridge was closed to make these repairs. At this time, KDOT began the Bridge Replacement Study. KDOT hired HNTB to prepare the study.

Brian Hash, HNTB, stated that the 18th Street bridge was closed after corrosion-induced cracking was discovered on the bottom boards of the truss members over the river. As a result, emergency repairs began. The bridge was reopened to traffic in December 2018. Brian then gave a brief history of the bridge. Brian stated that the most recent emergency rehabilitation of the bridge in 2018 extended the bridge’s life an additional 5-10 years. KDOT believes that continued repair is not cost-effective.

Brian then described a three-phase approach that was utilized in developing a bridge replacement solution:

- Phase 1: Stakeholder engagement, evaluation of existing conditions & traffic, and defining study criteria. Currently at the end of this phase.
- Phase 2: Alternatives development & analysis- i.e. construction costs, construction phasing, traffic impacts, ROW impacts, and bike/ped accommodations. By the end of May 2019, HNTB and KDOT would like to have selected a preferred alternative. A final study report and public meeting will follow.
- Phase 3: Documentation- a final report will be submitted to KDOT at the end of August 2019.

Brian reiterated that this presentation is only meant to be informational. Discussion with the Highway Committee about modifications to the LRTP will come at a later date.

The floor was opened for question. Brian was asked whether there are currently any organized groups promoting or opposing bike/ped accommodations. Brian stated that there are currently no organized groups promoting or opposing bike/ped accommodations, but there has been general discussion with stakeholders.

A committee member asked Brian to consider expansion of a Southbound ramp to I-70 in Wyandotte County. A brief discussion of this proposed expansion ensued with an agreement to follow up with the committee member and KDOT.

4. REPORT: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan

a. Review “Call for Projects” Project Evaluation Criteria
Laura Machala presented on the RTP 2050 evaluation criteria, project selection process, and model results. Laura showed the committee a timeline and stated that MARC has completed the discovery & needs assessment, policy framework and scenario analysis. MARC is currently preparing to begin project selection before plan development and adoption in 2020. A copy of the evaluation criteria is available to the committee in the meeting packet. This presentation will be brought before various committees until the middle of February 2019, at which time a steering workgroup meeting will take place on February 14th. The call for projects will open on February 26th; March 6th, a pre-application workshop will be held; The call for projects closes on April 25th.
Laura provided the committee with an overview of the criteria development process. A first draft of the evaluation criteria was made available at a steering workgroup workshop on December 18th, 2018. Feedback from this workshop included shortening the number of questions and clarifying the questions, as well as defining the weight of the questions and points. MARC Staff included this feedback in the evaluation criteria draft. Due to the recent introduction of the data and technology section, MARC Staff will not be scoring this section.

b. **Discuss Highway Committee role in the evaluation process**

Laura asked the committee for their reaction to the proposed evaluation criteria. The committee had no questions or comments. Laura asked the committee to fill out the RTP 2050 evaluation criteria worksheet found in the meeting packet. Answers were to be shared with the committee via Poll Everywhere later in the meeting.

Laura then presented on MARC’s scenario analysis. Laura stated that the model tested two land use scenarios—a trend growth scenario and a focused growth scenario. Growth in these scenarios was focused mainly in developed areas in the region. These scenarios were tested against four different transportation network scenarios: “Freeze Frame”—Assumes that population and employment grow, but no further investments are made in the transportation system beyond what’s in the 2018-2022 TIP, “If you build it…”—Assumes that population and employment grow and we invest in all projects in TO2040, “Hope on the bus, Gus”—Assumes that population and employment grow, but we make no further investments in the transportation system beyond what’s in the 2018-2022 TIP for roadway system, with implementation of expanded Smart Moves transit service, and “Money Does grow on trees”—Assumes that all 2018-2022 TIP projects are built, and that population and employment grow, maximizing roadway capacity.

Takeaways: The growth scenarios had more impact than the transportation scenarios. The presence of focused growth in the redevelopment areas impacted measures like VMT and transit trips more than adjusting any of the other factors. Better transit induces a shift from autos; increased capacity produces more VMT and less VHT. There are minor changes with an increased highway system, but more changes in transit outcomes—especially with the addition of the focused growth land use scenario.

Laura stated that MARC Staff considered autonomous and connected vehicles in their modeling work. Staff tested two ownership models to simulate 100% autonomy:

- **Private Ownership Scenario:** All vehicles on the road are autonomous, privately owned and maintained, access dependent on mobile devices, low share mobility, and a high need for parking.
- **Fleet Ownership Scenario:** All vehicles on the road are autonomous, shared mobility, high performance optimization (due to platooning and routing), access not dependent on owning a mobile device, subscription-based costs, and no parking requirements (presence of parking waiting areas).

Takeaways: Focused growth land use scenario + fleet ownership scenario = 102% increase in transit trips and an increase in population and employment within the redevelopment areas. Current land use scenario + private vehicle ownership scenario = increase in VMT and VHT, increases in auto and transit trips (largely due to population increase). These are evaluated against TO2040 ‘no build’. Per capita results show a 178% growth in transit (focused growth scenario + fleet ownership scenario) and a 37.7% increase in transit (current land use scenario + private vehicle ownership scenario). Per capita, VMT decreased in the focused growth scenario + fleet ownership scenario—the only time MARC Staff saw VMT decrease during this modeling process. The focused growth scenario will be the most useful in reducing VMT. The model supports Staff assertions that the usage of a fleet ownership scenario is most beneficial for our region. Staff is currently working to utilize the models in informing project selection and evaluating regional goals. Laura then informed the committee that Staff is currently developing project lists to ensure submitted projects reach regional goals.

Laura polled the committee on the RTP 2050 evaluation criteria via Poll Everywhere. Feedback will be used by MARC Staff in developing question scoring. Highway Committee poll result averages were as follows:
Laura opened the floor for questions. A committee member asked if poll results have varied drastically throughout committees. Laura stated that results have not varied as much as assumed. Laura was then asked about the location of the pre-application workshop. Laura replied that the workshop will take place in the MARC board room. Supplementary rooms may be utilized in addition to a webinar format.

c. Review Congested Location Analysis
Eileen Yang presented MARC’s Regional Congested Location Analysis. Eileen stated that the purpose of this analysis was to identify the most congested locations in our regions in 2040, and to ensure that these locations have been considered in the LRTP. Using the Regional Transportation Forecast Model and the TO2040 ‘no build’ scenario, MARC Staff identified locations with high peak hour traffic activity. Road segments were identified with the help of KDOT and MoDOT and evaluated based on the V/C ratio. Eileen stated that Staff provided a list of these locations to both DOTs. A follow up meeting has been scheduled for February to solidify the project list.

Eileen then displayed a map with the top 15 future congested locations.

Eileen stated that the model was also run with consideration for autonomous vehicles. The model showed a correlation between 100% autonomy and an increase in roadway capacity.

The floor was then opened for questions. A committee member asked Eileen why the model indicated that autonomous vehicles would solve congestion on I-35. Eileen replied that MARC’s model illustrated demand vs. capacity. Autonomous vehicles caused roadway capacity to increase more than volume; Capacity increased 30%. Eileen was then asked to clarify the model’s range of V/C ratios across the CMN and selection of the top 15 future congested locations. Eileen stated that the range was between 1.0 and 2.0 with an average between 1.1 and 1.2. U.S. 69 from Blue Valley Parkway to 151st Street had the highest V/C ratio.

5. Discuss 2019 Work Plan
Marc Hansen outlined a draft of the Highway Committee’s 2019 work plan found in the meeting packet. Marc highlighted the emphasis on RTP 2050 and then opened the floor for questions. There were no questions from the committee.

6. Other Business

a. Issue 1st (semiannual) Call for Functional Classification Changes
Marc Hansen reiterated the Highway Committee’s role in reviewing and approving functional classification changes and the implications these changes have on programming. Marc stated that MARC’s functional class map must be referenced when applying for funding. Functional classification changes are accepted on a semi-annual basis. The form can be found on MARC’s website. Jack Messer stated that approval of functional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points (Avg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness &amp; Fiscal Sustainability</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Plans, Policies &amp; Strategies</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers &amp; Corridors</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Opportunity</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Choices</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classification changes will take place in May. Marc encouraged the committee to contact him with any questions during the submission process and then opened the floor for questions. The committee had no questions.

The committee then held a brief discussion about MARC’s ongoing recruitment process for open positions within the Transportation Department.

7. **Adjourn**
The meeting was adjourned at 2:38 by Jack Messer.

Next meeting: March 27th, 2019 at 1:30 pm