OPEN MEETING NOTICE

MISSOURI STP PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

November 12, 2019
1:30 PM
Board Room, MARC Offices
600 Broadway, Suite 200, Kansas City, Missouri 64105

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approve the October 8, 2019 Meeting Summary*
3. MoDOT Updates
4. Program Management*
   • Consideration of a request for schedule modifications from Independence. Please reference the attached materials.
   • Highway Infrastructure Program Funding
   • Reasonable Progress Report
5. ConnectedKC Long-Range Plan Development Update
6. Operation Greenlight Budget Report
7. 2019 Ozone Season Report
8. MARC Conflict of Interest and Whistleblower Policies
9. Other Business
10. Adjournment

* Action Items

Next Scheduled Meeting: December 10, 2019

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**

Patty Hilderbrand welcomed the attendees and self-introductions were made around the room.

2. **Approval of Meeting Summary**

MOTION: Andy Noll moved, and Sara Copeland seconded to approve the October 8, 2019 meeting summary as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **MoDOT Updates**

Mike Landvik updated the committee on the current balances of local funds and the two cost-share programs.

Current balances as of the end of FFY 2019:
- MO STP: $8.5M; higher than normal due to swapping STP funds with available Omnibus/HIP funds.
- CMAQ: $2.7M

Traffic Engineering Assistance Program (TEAP): MoDOT occasionally/annually distributes funds to entities to contract out small traffic engineering studies for entities who don’t have staff to do that work. Central office made their selections and formal announcements would be made soon after agreements and letters are ready.
Two current cost share programs (details provided at previous meeting):
The Governor’s Transportation Cost Share program. $50 million general revenue funds from the state assembly with 10 percent set-aside for statewide economic development focused projects. The call for projects was August 1st through October 1st.

- Up to 50 percent match of construction costs; however, projects selected for the set-aside funds may qualify for up to 100 percent of construction cost if there is a big economic impact to the state.
- Any public/local road or bridge project satisfying a transportation need, including off-state system roads.
- Funds are for construction costs only.
- New projects only - could not apply for funds for a project in the STIP to offset those funds.
- 45 applications were received statewide with funding requests totaling $95M; including six from the MARC region: two from Kansas City, MO, one from Grandview, Lee’s Summit, Parkville, and Raymore.

MoDOT’s traditional cost share program:
- Application due date was October 18 for the current round
- Project must be on the state system
- Available funding varies $25-45M per year
- $10M per project limit
- Funds are not limited to construction costs
- 50/50 match and may qualify for additional funds
- Economic development component is looked at; not as emphasized as the Governor’s program.

MoDOT is currently reviewing the projects and selections for both cost-share programs will be made on December 12.

Highway Infrastructure Program/Omnibus funds: The MARC region is to receive almost $5.1M, perhaps enough for two projects that are certain to easily reach obligation before the deadline of September 30, 2022. The committee can discuss options during the next meeting or two. Patty Hilderbrand added that when the previous HIP funds were available, the committee selected an existing STP programmed project, Kansas City’s Woodland project, thus reducing the amount the program was over programmed. We usually review the current program prior to programming the next round and decide whether to apply the HIP funds to an existing project. Any roadway project that is eligible for STP is eligible for HIP funds.

4. Program Management
Marc Hansen provided a current list of FFY 2020 2022 STP programmed projects. The list reflects the changes approved by the committee last month: advanced $1.975 million of Grandview’s FY2021 I-49 Frontage Road to FY2020 and Independence offset that by delaying their FY2020 $2M US-24 Highway Complete Streets project to FY2021. The list of FY2020 projects programmed for obligation is still $34,826,561. MoDOT shows we had a balance of $8.5M coming into FY2020 and obligation limitation authority has been higher lately than anticipated during recent funding rounds. When we are ready to program FY2023/2024 we may be able to expand the program slightly.

a. Independence request. A request from the city of Independence was included in today’s meeting packet regarding their $2M FY2021 24 Highway Complete Streets project and their $4.2M FY2022 Truman Connect project. MoDOT determined that the US-24 corridor from MO-291 to Sterling Avenue was one of the top safety needs in the Kansas City District and asked to work with the city so the City applied and received cost share funds for fiscal years 2021 and 2022 to make safety improvements to the corridor. The City requested that the committee consider advancing $1.5M of the Truman Connect project from FY2022 to 2021 in order to meet the funding timeline for MoDOT’s portion of the cost share. The $1.5M would complete the funding of US-24 which would leave $2.7M for the Truman Connect project staying in FY2022. This request is more of a timing modification; the original scope of both projects would end the same as they were programmed. Mr. Landvik added that it would be a MoDOT Let project.
**MOTION**: Mark Trosen moved and Michael Park seconded to amend the scope of the FY2021 US-24 Highway Independence project to include a portion of the scope and $1.5M from the Truman Connect project creating a total funding on US-24 of $3.5M in FY2021 and leaving a balance of $2.7M on the Truman Connect project in the existing programming in FY2022. With no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

b. **Highway Infrastructure Program Funding**

Marc Hansen reviewed that as Michael Landvik mentioned, the MARC region is expected to receive almost $5.1M. The funds must be obligated no later than September 30, 2022. Going through the process of selecting a new project would be difficult to meet the obligation timeline. When last year’s HIP funds were available, the committee selected a current project that could use the full amount of funds since the program was over programmed. At a future meeting, the committee will decide whether to apply the funds on one or two projects. Administration of the funds should not impact the project’s progress and is an administrative modification to the TIP. Marc asked sponsors to review their current programmed STP projects and consider if interested in volunteering to swap their STP with the HIP funds, freeing up STP funds for the committee to use later. In 2020 we will be programming FY 2023 and 2024.

Patty asked that since this is the second year in a row that HIP funds have been available, is this expected to be an ongoing thing or take it as we get it? Michael replied it’s a take it as we get it situation.

Sherri McIntyre asked if Kansas City volunteers a project, could KCMO receive the funds even though Kansas City is not eligible to receive dollars in the FY2023/2024 round as well as the other cities who did not ask for funding during the Buck O’Neill Bridge funded round? Marc indicated he didn’t have an answer and the committee would need to discuss. Two decisions are needed: identify one or two projects that can obligate the HIP funds before the end of FY 2022, then decide how to program or use the available $5.1M STP funds.

Noted possible projects that could swap STP for the HIP funds:
- Kansas City’s $5M FY 2020 Paseo Gateway Intersection project -- progressing on schedule.
- $10M FFY 2021 Buck O’Neill Bridge replacement is expected to obligate the summer of 2020. Michael will check if swapping STP for HIP is possible for the project.
- Grandview’s $5.75M FY2020 I-49 Frontage Road
- Kansas City’s $5.1M FY2020 Noland & M-350 Intersection

There appeared to be a consensus to use the available HIP funds on one project. Further decisions were tabled pending research by MoDOT staff determining if funding schedules would allow the swap. The decision can wait for the next meeting or two.

Confirmed that the released $5.1M of STP funds would go to the STP balance.

Dennis Randolph shared his desire for a procedural swap, not add a new project, that the STP funds be returned to the STP balance to reduce the over programming. The Chair asked members to think about their preference of what to do with the funds for future discussion. Michael Parks agreed with using it to reduce the over programming. Michael Landvik will double check the current amount of available FY2020 funds to share at the next meeting. Dennis added that the committee should focus on the new programming round coming in 2020 for FY2023/24 projects, that any STP balance should be included, and he does not want large blocks of funds to be taken off the top as in the past.

c. **Reasonable Progress Report**

Marc Hansen noted that none of the projects had obligated – still early in the fiscal year.
5. **ConnectedKC Long-Range Plan Development Update**

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP 2050) has been rebranded to be called, ConnectedKC 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. Many committee members have been involved in the Plan’s process. Martin Rivarola provided an update; several key points are as follows.

- The Plan provides guidance to all the planning and programming work as an MPO. It is a required document that must be updated every ten years.
- The Plan will impact the STP programming with some process changes: the January Call for Projects is being delayed to June 2020, following the adoption of the Plan, and secondly, we plan to institute an early prequalification process through the planning and policy committees.
- Policy goals and outcomes we hope to achieve: access to opportunity, transportation choices, economic vitality, healthy environment, and public health and safety. These policy goals make up the bulk of the scoring criteria used during programming processes.
- Looking at new sources of funding the transportation system, especially if we are looking to move away from the current fossil fuel-based system.
- Since the process will have new efficiencies, the programming recommendations will be ready to go to the TTPC in December, only one month later than previous rounds.
- A planning committee workshop was held last month to help prioritize the projects.
- Currently ranking the 419 applications as high, medium, or low. About 56% are roadway projects.
- Please take the public survey and encourage your networks to take the survey found at [www.marc.org/2050](http://www.marc.org/2050).
- There are three public meetings remaining, with the final one at MARC on November 19th.
- The process change/schedule recommendations will be taken to the TTPC next week.
- Sponsors were asked to be prepared to submit a letter of intent before July 2020.

6. **Operation Greenlight Budget Report**

Ray Webb, MARC’s traffic operations manager, reported. The committee asked for annual reviews of the Operation Greenlight activities since OGL receives STP funds off the top of each funding round; currently $980,000 MO STP each for 2019 and 2020 OGL budgets. Currently have 15 partners on the Kansas side, 10 partners on the Missouri side, plus KDOT and MoDOT. They would be happy to add all the metro area signals on their GIS map; partnership not required. If interested, please send the coordinates of your signals.

OGL staff have been using TranSuite software since 2005. They are in the process of selecting a new software system and are evaluating the top three.

OGL has a new technology plan. spend $200,000 per year on components. In 2019 they responded to 752 incidents.

Ray shared the emerging technologies – select cars have an Intersection Assistant.

Contact Ray with any questions at [rwebb@marc.org](mailto:rwebb@marc.org).

7. **2019 Ozone Season Report**

Doug Norsby, MARC’s Air Quality Planner III, presented a report on the 2019 ozone season provided from Weather or Not, forecasters who monitor the air quality. This is of interest to the committee since ozone relates to the CMAQ projects the committee prioritizes. The ozone season is from March to October and ozone is determined by temperature and moisture. The last few years there has been concern that the region might exceed the standards since we hit the design value of 70 one year, but the last five years have been good. This year the higher amount of rainfall kept us to zero exceedances and no ozone alerts; the lowest since 2015/16. A review by the State and EPA determines the degree of violation(s) of the air quality standard. Design values are calculated on a three-year rolling average so this year’s zero exceedances will be helpful if next year has less rain with high temperatures.
Q: if you exceed that level what are the implications if we are found in violation over time? What might we need to do that we aren’t now?
A: There would be limitations on transportation projects and transportation actions that relate to conformity. You need to treat pollution as a budget and offset emissions estimated to come from a project or you don’t get the funding.

8. **MARC Conflict of Interest and Whistleblower Policies**
MARC staff highlights these two policies every year with committees that are charged with decision-making:
- **Conflict of Interest**: for committees that make decisions regarding federal, state and local government funds and private contributions.
- **Whistleblower**: explains the process to report a concern or possible wrongdoing of someone employed by MARC.

9. **Other Business**
Alysen Abel announced an upcoming joint lunch meeting of the APWA and WTS on Thursday.

10. **Adjournment**
With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

**Next Meeting**: December 10, 2019
Ron Achelpohl  
Director, Transportation & Environment  
Mid-America Regional Council  
600 Broadway, Suite 200  
Kansas City, MO 64105-1659  

Re: 24 Highway Complete Streets (TIP# 628140) & Truman Connect (TIP# 628142)

Dear Ron,

The City of Independence was awarded $2,000,000 in 2020 STP funding for the 24 Highway Complete Streets project, which was to add multi-modal facilities along the south side of 24 Highway from MO-291 to River. The project included sidewalks, street lighting, storm water improvements, retaining walls, trees, bicycle facilities and transit stop improvements. This amount of funding only allows the City to do a portion of the original project requested in the STP application. In addition, the City of Independence was approved for $4,200,000 in 2022 STP funding for the Truman Connect project. Part of the Truman Connect project includes completing the unfunded remainder of the 24 Complete Streets project. The amount associated with this portion of the project is $1,500,000, which would leave $2,700,000 in STP funds for the Truman Connect Project for 2022.

As design for the 24 Highway Complete Streets project was beginning the City was approached by MoDOT about the need for safety improvements for the 24 Highway corridor from MO-291 to Sterling Ave. MoDOT determined that the 24 Highway corridor was one of the top safety needs in the Kansas City District and desired to collaborate with the City of Independence to address this need. As a result, the City applied for Cost Share funds and was approved for the funding in fiscal years 2021 and 2022.

With this letter, and as was discussed at the October 8, 2019 STP Committee meeting, the City of Independence is requesting that the STP funding for the 24 Highway Complete Streets project of $2,000,000 and $1,250,000 of the Truman Connect STP funding be used along with the City local match that would have been necessary for these projects, in order to complete this cost share project. The City also requests that the 2020 funding for the 24 Highway Complete Streets project be delayed to 2021 and that $1,500,000 of the STP funding for the Truman Connect project be advanced to 2021 in order to meet the funding timeline for MoDOT’s portion of the cost share.

The project overall scope would be adjusted to converting 24 Highway from MO-291 to River Road from the existing 4-lane section to a 5-lane section with CTWLTL, along with compete streets improvements such as sidewalks, street lighting, storm water improvements, retaining walls, trees, bicycle facilities and
transit stop improvements. The new scope will also include improvements of several intersections as well as access management of many of the commercial entrances along the corridor.

In effect, with the use of these STP and local match funds along with funds from MoDOT, the project will accomplish the same improvements as originally requested in both STP applications. Additionally, the project will be expanded to address one of MoDOT’s greatest safety needs in the District, thus accomplishing much more than originally intended. The proposed funding breakdown is as follows:

**MoDOT Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Staff Cost/CE Contribution</td>
<td>$624,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2021 Cost Share Funding</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2022 Cost Share Funding</td>
<td>$1,991,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MoDOT Cost Share Amount</td>
<td>$5,116,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020 STP Funds (moved to 2021)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 STP Funds (moved to 2021)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Match</td>
<td>$1,616,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City Cost Share Amount</td>
<td>$5,116,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for forwarding this request to the MO STP Committee for consideration. Please call (816)325-7606 or email at tgramling@indepmo.org if you or anyone has any further questions.

Sincerely,

Tim Gramling

Public Works Director – City of Independence
Mid-America Regional Council
Conflict of Interest Policy
Governing all Boards, Commissions, Committees and Subcommittees

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) is dedicated to building a stronger metropolitan region by promoting regional cooperation and developing innovative solutions to regional challenges. MARC strives to operate in an open and transparent way that inspires confidence that the organization is an effective steward of public resources. The purpose of this conflict of interest policy is to ensure that participants on the MARC board and committees have clear guidance when a participant in any MARC decision-making process could have a conflict of interest and what the appropriate action would be in those circumstances.

It is in the best interest of the MARC Board of Directors, Mid-America Head Start and all other boards, commissions, committees and subcommittees to be aware of and properly manage all conflicts of interest and any appearances of conflicts of interest. This conflict of interest policy is designed to help directors, officers, employees and volunteers identify conflicts of interest and disclose them to the appropriate authority. It is also designed to provide a procedure to appropriately manage conflicts in accordance with legal requirements and the goals of accountability and transparency in all MARC operations.

The MARC Board, and boards that work through MARC such as the Mid-America Solid Waste Management District, make decisions in a number of program areas that impact the availability of federal, state and local government funds and private contributions. This conflict of interest policy is intended to support those decision-making processes.

This policy is intended to supplement but not replace any state or federal laws that govern conflicts of interest in public, non-profit, and charitable organizations.

1. Interested Person

Any member of a MARC board, commission, committee or subcommittee charged with decision-making or making recommendations for funding, who has a direct or indirect financial interest, as defined below, is an interested person.

2. Financial Interest Defined

A person has a financial interest if the person has, directly or indirectly, through business, investment, or family:

   a. An ownership or investment interest in any entity with which MARC has a transaction or other financial arrangement,
   b. A compensation arrangement with MARC or with any entity or individual with which MARC has a transaction or arrangement, or
   c. A potential ownership or investment interest in, or compensation arrangement with, any entity or individual with which MARC is negotiating a transaction or arrangement.
For purposes of this policy, “family members” includes spouses, parents, children, and siblings (including those related by marriage), as well as significant others and any other person who resides with the committee/board member.

3. Procedure

In connection with any actual or possible conflict of interest, an interested person must disclose the existence of the conflict of interest to members of the committee considering the proposed action or recommendation.

A person who has a conflict of interest in a certain matter shall not participate in the discussion of that matter except to disclose material facts and to respond to questions. Such person shall not attempt to exert his or her personal influence with respect to the matter, either at or outside the meeting.

The interested person shall abstain from any votes on funding recommendations, contracts or transactions in which there is an interest as defined above, and shall abstain from any votes for all meeting minutes or other records of the meeting.

4. Gifts, Gratuities and Entertainment

MARC committee members and directors shall avoid accepting, directly or indirectly, any rebate, gift, money or anything of monetary value from an organization or vendor that could benefit from a MARC committee action regarding funding recommendations, vendor selection or other transactions. From time to time, vendors may pay for meals apart from a bid process.

5. Committee Representation

MARC makes decisions on federal and state funding that benefits local communities within the Kansas City region. The MARC Board and many of its committees are composed of local officials representing the communities that may benefit from MARC Board decisions. It is not a conflict of interest for a board member or a committee member, who are also elected officials or local government staff members, to advocate for or vote on issues that will affect their jurisdiction. If an elected official serves on another public board by virtue of their elected office, it is not a conflict of interest for that elected official to participate in discussions and vote on matters affecting that other public body.

In the past, smaller communities have at times been represented by consulting engineers on committees which rely on both technical and community considerations to make funding recommendations. Private consultants or other private parties shall abstain from any discussion or vote on all matters before the committee that might pose a conflict of interest due to a relationship between the project applicant and the private consultant. The private consultant or party should limit any participation in discussion to answering questions asked by other committee members. Individual committees may adopt specific procedural requirements for participation by members and others present at meetings.
6. Disclosure, Notification, and Review Policy

Each director, officer, and committee member shall disclose any relationships, positions or circumstances in which he or she is involved that he or she believes could contribute to a conflict of interest when and if such situations arise.

If a board member or committee member is unsure as to whether or not a conflict of interest exists, it is their responsibility to consult a MARC staff member associated with that committee to make a determination. If after such consultation, the individual is still unsure, then a determination will be made by the executive director of MARC.

If the board of directors, the Head Start Policy Council or other commission or committee has reasonable cause to believe a member has failed to disclose actual or possible conflicts of interest, that body shall inform the member of the basis for such belief and afford the member an opportunity to explain the alleged failure to disclose.

This policy shall be distributed annually to all decision-making bodies associated with the Mid-America Regional Council, including but not limited to the Mid-America Head Start, for their review.

Adopted by the MARC Board of Directors, August 25, 2009 (Updated September 26, 2013)
Mid-America Regional Council
Whistleblower Policy

Policy Objective:
MARC is committed to lawful and ethical behavior in all of its activities and requires all staff to act in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations and policies and to observe high standards of business and personal ethics in the conduct of their duties and responsibilities.

This policy is intended to:
- Encourage individuals to bring ethical or legal violations to the attention of an internal or external authority so that action can be taken to resolve the problem.
- Establish guidance and procedures for staff (paid and volunteer) or others to report illegal, unethical or inappropriate behaviors or practices, in good faith, without fear of retribution.
- To provide a constructive process for individuals to report issues of concern.
- Emphasize the importance of adherence to MARC’s standards of conduct.

Overview:
A whistleblower is a person (often an employee) who raises a concern about serious wrongdoing occurring in an organization. Examples of misconduct that might lead to whistleblowing include the violation of laws, rules or regulations; fraud, mismanagement or corruption; or direct threats to the public interest, such as health or safety violations.

In general, whistleblowing refers to reporting misconduct outside the normal chain of command. Most workplace issues are, and to the extent possible, should be resolved by working with direct supervisors and department directors as described in the Issues Resolution policy. However, if an individual, acting in good faith, has reasonable grounds for believing that serious wrongdoing is taking place that has not been addressed or cannot be addressed through normal channels, he or she has the option of “whistleblowing” without fear of retribution.

Examples of the types of situations a whistleblower might report may include, but are not limited, to the following:
- A violation of law.
- Questionable accounting or monitoring practices.
- Discrimination based on protected classes.
- Fraud, waste or mismanagement.

Examples of problems that can be addressed through normal issues resolution procedures may include, but are not limited, to the following:
- Disagreements or misunderstandings between employees.
- Issues related to employment or working conditions.
- Personality conflicts.
- Working relationships between employees or employees and supervisors.

See the Issues Resolution policy for more information.

Reporting Procedures
Individuals may report misconduct, without fear of retribution, through the following procedures:
- For internal employee relations issues, seek assistance from supervisors, department directors or Human Resources staff as described in the Issues Resolution policy.

Updated October 2013
• For issues related to harassment, immediately report to a supervisor, department director, executive director or Human Resources as described in the Harassment-Free workplace policy.
• For all other issues related to suspected fraud, theft, harassment or other illegal activity, contact a supervisor, department director, executive director or call the “WeTip” hotline at 1-800-782-7463 or go online to www.wetip.com.
• For issues related to suspected mismanagement or waste of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds, call 1-877-392-3375 or go online to www.recovery.gov.

After the Report:
Response procedures for whistleblower reports will vary according to how the report was made.
• Reports related to ARRA funding will be addressed by the U.S. Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board.
• Reports to the “WeTip” hotline are forwarded to designated members of MARC’s management team (i.e., the Executive Director, Finance and Administration Department Director, Human Resources Manager, and MARC Board Chair) for review and resolution.

All reports will be acknowledged promptly and handled with due care and diligence. Those who receive the reports have the full authority to investigate all concerns raised, and may use other resources such as legal counsel, accountants, private investigators or others as reasonably necessary to conduct a full and complete investigation. Reports and concerns will be kept confidential to the extent possible.

If a report is found to be of merit or is substantiated, MARC management will take appropriate steps and will adhere to the federal rules for that grant, if applicable. No employee who, in good faith, makes a whistleblowing report will be threatened, discriminated against or otherwise subject to any retaliation or adverse employment consequences. Any staff member who attempts to retaliate against someone who reported a concern in good faith may be subject to discipline.

Allegations that prove to have been made maliciously, recklessly, with gross negligence, or with the foreknowledge that the allegations are false, will be viewed as a serious offense and may result in disciplinary action against the reporting employee.

Any situation involving an issue relating to harassment should be reported immediately to the employee’s supervisor, department director, executive director or Human Resources. Specific information relating to MARC’s policy regarding a harassment-free workplace can be found on the MARC intranet under Policies. Complaints of this nature are taken very seriously and will be fully investigated.