OPEN MEETING NOTICE

MISSOURI STP PRIORITIES COMMITTEE
February 14, 2017
1:30 PM
Board Room, MARC Offices
600 Broadway, Suite 200, Kansas City, Missouri 64105

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Approve the January 10, 2017 Meeting Summary*

3. MoDOT Updates

4. MARC Programming & Project Evaluation Process
   Ongoing discussion of issues identified with the project programming and evaluation process. Additional information will be distributed in advance of the meeting.
   - Application/Funding Caps & Minimums
   - Definition of Regional Significance

5. Committee Chair and Vice-Chair Elections

6. STP Reasonable Progress

7. Adjournment

* Action Items

Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting: March 14, 2017

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. **Welcome and Introductions**
Vice-Chair Patty Hilderbrand, serving as Interim Chair, welcomed the attendees and introductions were made.

2. **Approval of Meeting Summary**
MOTION: Dena Mezger moved and Chad Thompson seconded to approve the January 10, 2017 meeting summary. Motion carried.

3. **MoDOT Update**
Eva Steinman reported that the STP funding balance for the state is around $23M as of the end of last year and we haven’t obligated anything since then. In response to an inquiry, she shared that Don Wichem is still their District 4 Interim Director.

4. **MARC Programming & Project Evaluation Process**
Last month Marc Hansen provided an estimated monthly topical timeline from January 2017 through January 2018 to make any process adjustments based on possible changes that were mentioned during the debrief of the last programming round. The goal is to finalize any process changes by the fall to give staff time to modify the online application prior to the 2021-2022 Call for Projects. The Total Transportation Policy Committee (TTPC) and the MARC Board will be kept apprised of any changes throughout the process.
Today began discussions on the first two topics:

a) Application/Funding Caps and Minimums. This topic had more interest on the Kansas side. Marc Hansen provided an analysis (see attached) showing totals for each of the past four Missouri STP Committee funding rounds starting with FFY 2013-2014 of all project applications and those that were programmed. Shown here are the averages of the four rounds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Funding Requested</th>
<th>Total Programmed</th>
<th>Percent of Request Met</th>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$186,941,329</td>
<td>$49,640,229</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Request</td>
<td>Average Award</td>
<td>Median Request</td>
<td>Median Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,071,561</td>
<td>$2,676,032</td>
<td>$1,638,250</td>
<td>$1,647,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Request</td>
<td>High Award</td>
<td>Low Request</td>
<td>Low Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
<td>$10,475,711</td>
<td>$148,528</td>
<td>$141,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This committee has a pretty good history of programming projects that are above the median score.

Comments/suggestions to the question “Would the process be improved if you knew there was a minimum percentage amount you would get if selected for funding?"

• Everyone hopes to receive some level of funding when they apply.
• Setting a minimum of 50 percent may not work – often need to adjust the scope.
• Changing the scope would change the score.
• Several agreed with continuing the current process of a project by project discussion and decision; some projects may have more local funding available.
• Having a minimum or a cap would make sponsors submit projects that are flexible or scaled appropriately.
• Small communities may not have other resources available and would need to get a loan.
• Is it a priority to fund the best projects or spread the available funds around the region?
• There was consensus to discuss each project and work out the funds as we have done. Trust is involved. Sponsors don’t want to adjust the scope on the fly without their Board or Council’s approval.
• A regionally significant project would likely cost more and would not want a set cap.

Do you want to formalize a limit of a scope change when a project is programmed a lower funding than requested?

• Consider establishing a limit to changing the scope or vet the project cuts. We have not heard back on what scope changes have been made. KCMO phases their large projects or keep the elements in tact; Lee’s Summit looks for funds from other sources when they receive less funds than requested.
• Agreed that the committee needs to ask questions about the potential scope changes.

Is there a budget/cost estimate that can be provided along with the application?

• Depends on how solid the local funding is although the budget may not be established yet until the project has been approved for funding.

Staff wants to help include pieces of information that have been missing from the application that would help the committee with the programming process easier.

b) Regional Significance Definition. During the recent debrief, interest was expressed in creating a better definition of regional significance and apply it to the scoring process. The Transportation Outlook 2040 definition was provided; however, Marc explained portions of it is probably not the best definition for the committee’s use since we were not looking at activity centers back in 2010 when the policy was adopted. The Federal definition mainly relates to areas in a non-attainment for air quality purposes, looking at emissions impact and our area is not in that situation. The criteria is for projects on principal arterials and interstate highways which are not the type of projects requesting STP funds through the committee. Staff checked with some peer MPOs and found they only use the definition required for conformity purposes.

• Have seen it as projects that are multi-jurisdictional on roadways, bike trails that are on a plan and a major bridge that would impact the region, connecting facilities.
• Should the TTPC or MARC Board provide a definition of a regional activity center?
• Keep the definition flexible.
• Regional based on population? We typically don’t have a project that affects the entire region and may not see a true regionally significant project every year.
• There are some single jurisdictions with high traffic volume on their major roads.
• A project that is for the greater good for the entire region is regionally significant.
• Add the question in the application asking the sponsor to explain how the project is regionally significant or have sponsors share during the committee review of each project.
• Prefer an inclusive definition, not exclusive.
• Sponsors submit applications they feel are significant to their community. TTPC may be hesitant to create a definition prior to the next long range plan is developed. The application does include some points already. Perhaps discuss when programming the projects; perhaps a tie-breaker. May need a policy that identifies the key issues we want to discuss during the programming. Bridges don’t score well but often are regionally significant.

Information will be provided for the next topics of discussion and will provide a revised schedule.

5. Committee Chair and Vice-Chair Elections
Since the chair position was vacant and it is time for re-elections (every 2-years), elections will be held during the March meeting. If interested in serving in one of these positions, please let Marc know.

6. STP Reasonable Progress Review
Marc Hansen provided a current handout reflecting the status of the FFY 2017 STP Program. Since it is early in the year there has not been much activity yet. As Eva shared, our balance of available funds is $23-24M and we have about $32.5M remaining to obligate. Since we are over programmed, sponsors will want to obligate their projects as early as possible or you may have to slide to the next year. $1.7M have obligated so far: the Planning Sustainable Places program and a State project on M-291.

Staff have been working with the city of Independence regarding their $150,000 Independence Transit Stop Improvements project determining if it is a MoDOT or FTA administered project. There is a general agreement that the funds will be transferred to the FTA for their administration due to their transit connections. We will be working with Independence and the KCATA to identify the proper place to transfer the funds and can be considered as obligated.

There are two CMAQ projects programmed for this year totaling $984,000. Staff have not received any concerns.

In response to a request to see dollar amounts we are over programmed by year, Marc explained that with the last programming round we reached a zero balance and with this current round, any projects that aren’t obligated before the funds run out, will be shifted to 2021 and the committee will have less money to program for FFY 2021-2022. We will continue to work with MoDOT and obligate as many projects as we can.

Patty asked sponsors to let Marc know if you become aware that your project won’t make the cut off this year and need a one-time delay. We will put it on the agenda so everyone is informed Marc added that if you have projects in later years that you need to move forward, let him know and we may be able to move some funding around and accommodate everyone at the same time.

7. Other Business:
The MARC recently issued a Call for Nominations for the 2017 Regional Leadership Awards. Submit nominations online by March 16th. Awards will be presented during MARC’s Regional Assembly (date to be confirmed).

Marc Hansen asked attendees to send an email to staff if your agency has a change of the member/alternate representation on the committee.

8. Adjournment:
With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: March 14, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programming Round</th>
<th>Total Requested</th>
<th>Total Programmed</th>
<th>% of Request Met</th>
<th>Apps</th>
<th>Average Request</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Median Request</th>
<th>Median Award</th>
<th>High Request</th>
<th>High Award</th>
<th>Low Request</th>
<th>Low Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$244,756,000</td>
<td>$56,118,465</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$3,653,075</td>
<td>$2,244,739</td>
<td>$1,778,000</td>
<td>$983,450</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$9,902,842</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$57,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$113,274,000</td>
<td>$44,642,450</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$2,574,409</td>
<td>$1,625,000</td>
<td>$1,533,400</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$245,938,000</td>
<td>$59,800,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$2,999,244</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$2,875,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>$143,797,316</td>
<td>$38,000,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$3,059,517</td>
<td>$1,948,421</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$173,110</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Round Avg</strong></td>
<td>$186,941,329</td>
<td>$49,640,229</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,071,561</td>
<td>$2,676,032</td>
<td>$1,638,250</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
<td>$10,475,711</td>
<td>$148,528</td>
<td>$141,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charts below represent funding amounts requested and awarded relative to project evaluation score.