OPEN MEETING NOTICE
TOTAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE
Chuck Adams, Kansas Co-Chair
Carson Ross, Missouri Co-Chair

There will be a meeting of MARC’s Total Transportation Policy Committee on **Tuesday, February 19, 2019, at 9:30 a.m. in the Board Room on the second floor of the Rivergate Center, 600 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri.**

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. **VOTE: January 15, 2019 Minutes***
3. **VOTE: 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the 2018-22 TIP for Public Review & Comment***
4. REPORT: 18th Street Bridge Replacement Study
5. REPORT: US-169 (Buck O’Neil) Environmental Assessment Study
6. REPORT: Missouri STIP Program Allocation Policy
7. REPORT: Comments on Missouri Legislation to Update Vehicle Registration Fees
8. REPORT: Regional Transportation Plan 2050 (RTP2050) Update
9. REPORT: Operation Green Light Program 2019 Work Plan and Update
10. REPORT: Green Infrastructure Framework
11. Other Business
12. Adjournment

***Action Items

**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](http://www.marc.org).
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1) **Welcome/Introductions**
Councilman Chuck Adams, KS Co-Chair, called the meeting to order and self-introductions followed.

2) **Approval of December 18, 2018 Meeting Summary**
There were no changes to the December 18, 2018 meeting summary. Jack Messer moved to approve the meeting summary, Janet McRae seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

3) **2019 1st Quarter Amendment to the 2018-22 Transportation Improvement Program**
The proposed 2019 1st Quarter Amendment to the 2018-22 TIP includes 6 projects:

- 4 new projects to be added, including, but not limited to:
  - #180075 – K-32; Construct left turn lanes at 222nd St.
  - #280150 – I-70; Preliminary Engineering for the Turner Diagonal Interchange
  - #280151 – US-69; Intersection improvements at Central Ave
  - #380171 – I-35; Overhead sign structure on the southbound Ramp to old US-56

- 2 modified projects
  - #280144 – Repairs to RCB #534 (Mill Creek Drainage) 3.75 miles East of I-435
  - #380153 – I-35, Widening of NB & SB lanes from 0.4 miles south of 75th St to 0.2 miles south of 67th St.

Details of these projects are available for review on the Internet at: [http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Plans-Studies/Transportation-Plans-and-Studies/TIP/TIP-Amendment-Archive/Archive-assets/19Q1amend.aspx](http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Plans-Studies/Transportation-Plans-and-Studies/TIP/TIP-Amendment-Archive/Archive-assets/19Q1amend.aspx)

MARC’s Public Involvement Plan requires that proposed amendments to the TIP be released for public review and comment prior to adoption. No comments from the public were received.

Beccy Yocham moved to **approve the 2019 1st Quarter Amendment to the FFY 2018-2022 TIP**, Jack Messer seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

4) **Santa Fe, Oregon, and California National Historic Trails Concept Strategy Plan**
The plan incorporates three historic trails through the following communities:

**Jackson County:** Sugar Creek, Independence, Raytown and Kansas City

**Johnson County:** Leawood, Overland Park, Olathe, Gardner, Lenexa, Prairie Village, Westwood, and Fairway

The full report and executive summary are on the MARC website at [http://marc.org/Environment/MetroGreen-Parks/Current-Projects/Historic-Trail-Retracement](http://marc.org/Environment/MetroGreen-Parks/Current-Projects/Historic-Trail-Retracement)

The plan was prepared at the request of local government officials and with their involvement. The plan will give communities guidance to interpret the history of the national historic trails through their cities. If adopted by the MARC Board, the plan would be used as resource in evaluating and scoring projects proposed for federal transportation funding. If recommended by TTPC, the MARC Board will be asked to adopt the plan and incorporate it as part of the new Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Local communities have been asked to consider passing a resolution in support of the plan, and to determine how to incorporate the plan’s recommendations into local plans and policy documents.
A committee member questioned what ways would the communities use this, and Mrs. Nagel responded that it would help them align their trail plans with the overall system, as well as implementation. No cities have adopted the plan as of yet, but a presentation was made to the Leawood governing body and MARC is working with the city of Independence to pilot the implementation of signage and interpretation for one segment of the trail system.

Ms. Yocham moved to approve the adoption of the Santa Fe, Oregon and California National Historic Trails Concept Strategy Plan as input to future Metropolitan Transportation Plan, and for use as an Active Transportation Plan to review projects for the transportation programming process. Mayor Slater seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

5) City of Overland Park Planning Initiatives Update
Jack Messer provided updates on all of the planning initiatives. MARC During the development of ForwardOP, the City also completed two 2017 Planning Sustainable Places projects, an Event and Transportation Hub in historic Downtown Overland Park and Vision Metcalf: The College Boulevard Node. The project in Downtown Overland Park evaluated the development of a mobility hub in the Downtown along with enhancements for the Farmer’s Market and potential event space. The Vision Metcalf project evaluated improvements to transition the College Boulevard corridor between Metcalf Avenue and Nall Avenue into an active urban landscape that encourages a “third work space”, characterized by a diversity of daily experiences through open space engagement, pedestrian movement, and the introduction of retail and food amenities.

Someone asked are there any zoning modifications or other activities on the planning side that would be necessary to address different accessibility options, and Mr. Messer confirmed that they are working on different options, even using their right of way.

6) Jobs Access Surveys – Background, Findings and Next Steps
In order to bridge the gap between job seekers with transportation barriers and the employers wishing to hire them, Mid-America Regional Council, in partnership with the Wyandotte County Community Health Improvement Project, the Platte County Economic Development Council and other regional partners distributed two sets of surveys.

The Job Seeker Transportation Survey asked people looking for work how they planned to get to a job, what transportation challenges they have experienced and how those challenges affected their employment, and how willing they are to share rides.

The Workforce Transportation Survey asked employers in five industrial areas about the negative business impacts resulting from employee transportation challenges, and which broad categories of solutions would be the most appealing to them.

Survey results will inform the development of a “toolkit” of solutions for individual employers’ immediate use and potential collective solutions such as an employer shuttle or multi-employer vanpooling. The final report will be available in February.

One of the committee members inquired about the borders regarding the KCI corridor for the southern & northern most points, and Ms. O’Brien replied that it goes from Tiffany Springs to 120th Street.

There was a question if there was discussion with those employers who don’t want to provide financial incentives about the subsidies they are providing versus the ones they aren’t, and Ms. Obrien answered that they have not at the moment; but will in future discussions.
It was asked if minimum wage increase were taken into account, and Ms. O’Brien acknowledged that it wasn’t considered, as there wasn’t significant impact.

7) Regional Transportation Plan 2050 (RTP2050) Update
Martin Rivarola reported on upcoming future steps, which include:

January 2019:
MARC staff will work with Committees/stakeholders to reach consensus on appropriate solutions for regional needs.
• Develop initial MARC generated project list.
• Review Project Scoring Criteria for “Call for Projects”.

February:
• Present to Steering Workgroup/TTPC/Board to seek concurrence.
• Launch “Request for comments/Call for Projects”.

The plan identifies needs and budget federal transportation funds that the metro area expects to receive over the next three decades. Currently, TO2040 contains:
• Vision: a long-term vision for the region’s transportation system.
• Goals and strategies: what we want to achieve by the year 2040 and how we plan to do it.
• Transportation projects: major regional transportation investments to help accomplish goals.

Once adopted, updated policies/goals and strategies identified in the MTP will guide transportation investments in our region in future years. For more information, please see: www.marc.org/2050

8) Household Travel Survey Update
Martin Rivarola provided more detail about this initiative. The last regional household travel survey was completed in 2004, and since that time the region has experienced significant shifts in travel behavior due to changing demographics, generational preferences, and the emergence of new modes such as transportation network companies (i.e. Uber and Lyft), bike share and the KC Streetcar.

MARC, in partnership with KDOT and MoDOT, have contracted with Westat to conduct this work. In addition to updating regional travel behavior information, this project will include the development of a methodology for comparing household survey data with results produced by the Sidewalk Labs Replica model (and similar products using mobile device data). The project is anticipated to last approximately 12 months, and will be completed by late-2019.

Within the next few weeks, Westat will initiate testing of the survey materials by mailing test versions to 2,500 households within the region. Based on feedback on these materials, the contractor plans to distribute the actual survey materials in spring of 2019.

A committee member asked if the surveys will be mailed for those who don’t have a phone or online access, and Eileen Yang confirmed that they will be mailed out.

9) Other Business
• Mr. Rivarola informed everyone that Davonna Moore has accepted a position in the private sector, and will be leaving KDOT at the end of the month.
• Mayor Mike McDonough announced that Damon Hodges will be the new city administrator for Raytown.

10) Adjournment
With no further business the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting of TTPC will be held January 15, 2019.
ISSUE:
VOTE: 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the 2018-22 TIP for Public Review & Comment

BACKGROUND:
The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the region’s short-range program, identifying projects to receive federal funds and projects of regional significance to be implemented over the next three to five year period. MARC amends the TIP on both a quarterly cycle and as needed to accommodate changes to projects in the TIP.

The proposed 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the 2018-22 TIP includes 9 projects:

- 1 new project to be added:
  - #280152 - I-70 & Turner Diagonal Interchange in Wyandotte County
- 8 projects to be modified for revisions to the budget, schedule or scope:
  - #180074 - Rehabilitation on bridge #026 on K-92 in Leavenworth County
  - #280136 - Surfacing on I-70 from Quarry Road bridge to 38th Street bridge
  - #280142 - Rehabilitation on bridge #042 (42nd St), 0.2mi north of old K-32
  - #280145 - Rehabilitation on bridge #043 (Speaker Rd), 0.39mi north of old K-32
  - #280148 - Surfacing on I-70 from 18th Street to I-670
  - #380155 - Surfacing on I-435 in Johnson and Wyandotte Counties
  - #380159 - Rehabilitation on bridge #234 on K-10 in Johnson County
  - #380163 - Rehabilitation on bridge #103 (151st St), 8.05mi north of Miami County

Details of these projects are available for review on the Internet at:
http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Plans-Studies/Transportation-Plans-and-Studies/TIP/TIP-Amendment-Archive/Archive-assets/19SA1amend.aspx

MARC’s Public Involvement Plan requires that proposed amendments to the TIP be released for public review and comment prior to adoption.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the release of the 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the FFY 2018-2022 TIP for Public Review & Comment.

STAFF CONTACT
Marc Hansen
ISSUE:  
REPORT: 18th Street Bridge Replacement Study

BACKGROUND:  
The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) has recently launched a study to explore future replacement of the 18th Street Bridge in Kansas City, KS. The 18th Street Bridge Replacement Study will evaluate improvement alternatives to replace the 18th Street Expressway (US-69) bridge over the Kansas River. The study will consider multiple factors and ultimately recommend a Preferred Alternative.

The study process and recommendations will be documented in a Concept Study Report. The concept study will be organized into three primary phases which include: Baseline conditions, Alternatives Development and Analysis, and Preferred Alternative Documentation.

A Concept Study Report will be prepared to document the concept study process. Final stakeholder briefings will be conducted in addition to a Public Meeting Open House to share the Preferred Alternative and selection process.

Representatives from KDOT and HNTB, the consultant firm supporting the study, will brief the Total Transportation Policy Committee on the scope, timeline, and future steps related to this study.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS  
MARC’s policy on bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on Missouri and Kansas River bridges applies to this study area.

COMMITTEE ACTION  
Highway Committee has been briefed on this study. A briefing to the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee is scheduled for March.

RECOMMENDATION  
None. Information Only.

STAFF CONTACT  
Martin Rivarola
ISSUE:
REPORT: US-169 (Buck O’Neil) Environmental Assessment Study

BACKGROUND:
The Federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires assessment of the impacts of a transportation project on the human and natural environment. The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) has recently launched an Environmental Assessment (EA) study, in partnership with the City of Kansas City, MO for study of improvement alternatives of the US-169 (Buck O’Neil) Bridge across the Missouri River. In addition, various public agencies and the public at large will be engaged in the study process.

This EA study will evaluate the impacts of the proposed Buck O’Neil bridge project on a number of resources including historic resources; endangered species and their habitats; community facilities; residences and businesses; and public spaces. The purpose of a new or rehabilitated river crossing is to facilitate the safe movement of people and goods along US 169 while improving mobility, connectivity, and accessibility across the Missouri River.

Representatives from MoDOT will brief the Total Transportation Policy Committee on the scope, timeline, and future steps related to this study.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
MARC’s policy on bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on Missouri and Kansas River bridges applies to this study area.

COMMITTEE ACTION
Various planning committees, the TTPC and the MARC Board of Directors have previously been briefed on and provided feedback to a precursor “Planning & Environmental Linkages” study, Beyond the Loop, which has informed this EA study.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information Only.

STAFF CONTACT
Martin Rivarola
ISSUE:
REPORT: Missouri STIP Program Allocation Policy

BACKGROUND:
In 2003, the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission originally adopted a formula for distributing construction funds in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to help manage conflict and tension between the urban and rural parts of the state by providing predictability in how these resources would be allocated. While this formula has never been entirely satisfactory to either urban or rural interests and had minor updates in 2006 and 2016, it has enabled a credible framework for MoDOT to work with partners around the state to plan and program projects.

Arising from a variety of concerns including declining anticipated future revenues, declining fund balances and the deteriorating condition of state-system pavements and bridges, MoDOT staff presented a draft recommendation to change the program distribution formula at a Commission workshop in Jefferson City on February 5, 2019. The executive directors of MARC, East West Gateway Council of Governments in St. Louis and Ozarks Transportation Organization in Springfield sent a joint letter to the Commission after the workshop on February 5, and staff from the three organizations provided comments at the Commission’s regular meeting on February 6, 2019, requesting to defer final action on the proposed changes to provide the Commission’s statewide planning partners an opportunity to review, understand and comment on the changes, however, the Commission voted to accept the changes as proposed by MoDOT. MoDOT shared information about the adopted program changes at the Statewide Planning Partners meeting in Jefferson City on February 8, 2019.

The STIP program changes will take effect in SFY 2022 and will deduct costs for engineering, the statewide Transportation Alternative Program and federal open-container penalties prior to distributing remaining funds through the Safety, Asset Management (AM) and System Improvement (SI) programs in the STIP. Funds for the Safety program will be reduced from $35 million per year under the previous formula to $29 million per year, the AM program will replace the previous Taking Care of Our System program and will increase from $362 million per year to $583 million plus three percent annual growth. Within the new AM program, a new Major Bridge (MB) program will replace the former Statewide Interstate and Major Bridge (SWMB) program with reduced funds from $125 m/year for SWMB to $94 m/year for MB. The remaining funds will then be distributed to the new SI program which replaces the previous Flexible Funds program.

MARC staff is still reviewing information about the new allocation formula but estimates that these changes will result in a transfer of approximately $135 million or 5% of the statewide program from the three large urban areas to rural districts from 2022 to 2024, with a total reduction of $31 million or 8% for the Kansas City area’s portion of the STIP over these three years.

MoDOT staff will provide additional information about the new STIP allocation policy at the meeting.
COMMITTEE ACTION
MoDOT reviewed changes to the STIP program allocation policy with the Missouri STP Priorities Committee at their meeting on February 12, 2019.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
Projects that are currently in the STIP will be held harmless by these program changes.

These changes will not impact the distribution of suballocated federal funds including Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) or Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information Only.

STAFF CONTACT
Ron Achelpohl
### Construction Program Funds Distribution Summary
($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>KCR</th>
<th>KCU</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>SWR</th>
<th>SWU</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$222</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>$866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$156</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$274</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Amounts do not include engineering
- Distributions based on MHTC funding allocation in place in each given year
- Amounts do not include statewide safety funding
- Amounts include asset management deficit funding
## SFY 2020-2024 Funding Distribution
### Right of Way and Construction Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Funds for Distribution</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,033,319</td>
<td>$1,053,597</td>
<td>$850,366</td>
<td>$813,707</td>
<td>$816,596</td>
<td>$4,567,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Engineering**
- $176,035
- $173,729
- $0.00
- $0.00
- $0.00
- $349,764

**Engineering Markup factor**
- $0.170
- $0.165
- $0.00
- $0.00
- $0.00
- $0.170

### RW and Construction Funds Available for Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Interstates &amp; Major Bridges</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Funds for Programming</td>
<td>$857,284</td>
<td>$879,868</td>
<td>$850,366</td>
<td>$813,707</td>
<td>$816,596</td>
<td>$4,217,821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Funds for Programming</td>
<td>$29,038</td>
<td>$29,229</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$145,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remaining Taking Care of The System/Asset Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Funds for Programming</td>
<td>$267,189</td>
<td>$268,884</td>
<td>$583,000</td>
<td>$600,490</td>
<td>$618,505</td>
<td>$2,338,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Flexible Funds/System Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Funds for Programming</td>
<td>$467,352</td>
<td>$487,367</td>
<td>$144,666</td>
<td>$171,317</td>
<td>$0.691</td>
<td>$1,271,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Available RW and Construction Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Funds for Programming</td>
<td>$886,039</td>
<td>$879,469</td>
<td>$850,366</td>
<td>$813,707</td>
<td>$816,596</td>
<td>$4,228,177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. 2020 SWIMB funds distributed based on approved 2017 apply for 2020 round; 2021 SWIMB funds distributed based on approved 2018 apply for 2021 round
2. Includes $10 million in Asset Management Deficit funds in 2020 and 2021
3. Includes $4.8 million in Asset Management Deficit funds in 2020 and 2021
4. Includes $5.1 million in Asset Management Deficit funds in 2020 and 2021
5. Includes $1 million in Asset Management Deficit funds in 2020 and 2021

---

**2/7/2019**
ISSUE:
REPORT: Comments on Missouri Legislation to Update Vehicle Registration Fees

BACKGROUND:
With the defeat of Proposition D in Missouri, one alternative option that has been discussed by lawmakers is an increase to the vehicle registration fees and a switch from a scale based on taxable horsepower to a scale based on fuel economy (MPG). Missouri is currently the only state to base VRF on horsepower. However, vehicle registration fees based on fuel economy—where higher fuel economy means higher fees—may be a disincentive to increase market saturation of electric and hybrid-electric vehicles. Two bills are currently filed in the state of Missouri that attempt to update vehicle registration fees to be based on fuel economy.

Staff will report on analysis of the proposed fee schedule for vehicle registration fees and share a comment letter approved by the Air Quality Forum for submission to

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
MARC’s Clean Air Action Plan strategies call for increased use of electric vehicles in the region. This comment letter expresses concerns regarding possible disincentives that may result from the proposed vehicle registration fee schedule for owners of fuel-efficient vehicles (including electric vehicles) and discourages potential buyers.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
The MARC Air Quality Forum reviewed and APPROVED this comment letter.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Karen Clawson
February 12, 2019

Senator Doug Libla, Chair of Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety Committee
Senator Gary Romine, Vice Chair of Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety Committee
Senator Kiki Curls, Vice Chair of Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety Committee
Senator Justin Brown, Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety Committee
Senator Bill Eigel, Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety Committee
Senator Cindy O’Laughlin, Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety Committee
Senator Brian Williams, Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety Committee

Re: Proposed changes to motor vehicle registration fees in Missouri

To Whom It May Concern:

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) Air Quality Forum, created in accordance with Section 174 of the Clean Air Act to coordinate the development and implementation of air quality policy in the Greater Kansas City region, offers the following comments on efforts to increase transportation funding through an update of the motor vehicle registration fee system.

We recognize that revenues for Missouri’s state highway system are insufficient and that the continued erosion of state fuel tax revenues, due in part to increased fuel efficiency of the vehicle fleet, is a significant factor. We support efforts to increase and “future-proof” funding for transportation in the state, seeking funding solutions that are fair — when possible, tying sources of revenue to their use and ensuring that everyone pays their share.

Recently, transportation funding discussions among state leaders have focused on addressing decreasing fuel tax revenues by changing the method used to determine vehicle registration fees. We agree that the current system of basing vehicle registration fees on taxable horsepower is antiquated and should be updated, but we are concerned that a registration fee based on miles per gallon — in which owners of more fuel-efficient vehicles are charged higher fees — creates a disincentive for owners of fuel-efficient vehicles and discourages potential buyers.

Encouraging the use of more fuel-efficient vehicles directly supports strategies outlined in MARC’s Clean Air Action Plan and is critically important to both the Kansas City region and the State of Missouri for several reasons:

1. **Non-attainment of federal pollution standards would impact jobs and economic development.** The Kansas City region has struggled to meet the EPA’s National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone pollution for many years. While the region is currently designated in attainment for the 2015 standard, monitored values indicate we are barely attaining this standard and must continue to work to reduce...
ozone precursor emissions from all sources to remain in compliance. Increased fuel efficiency and use of alternative fuels have helped the Kansas City region remain in compliance with the ozone NAAQS until now. Falling out of compliance would increase the regulatory burden on businesses, discouraging economic development.

2. **Increased fuel efficiency reduces emissions that harm public health.** The EPA sets pollution standards at levels designed to protect public health. Motor vehicle registration fees that serve as a disincentive to fleet owners and individual vehicle owners would result in higher levels of harmful emissions, with a detrimental impact on public health in the region, particularly for vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly and those with existing respiratory conditions.

3. **Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is important to our climate.** The transportation sector is the leading generator of greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. The largest sources of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions include passenger cars and light-duty trucks, which account for over half of the emissions from the transportation sector. Encouraging fuel efficient vehicles and the electrification of the vehicle fleet are paramount in efforts to bring greenhouse gases to levels that help stabilize our climate.

We support updating Missouri’s current system that ties vehicle registration fees to vehicle horsepower, but we feel strongly that miles per gallon is not an appropriate fee basis. Currently only one other state (Oregon) uses miles per gallon to determine vehicle registration fees; however, Oregon has balanced this with a rebate program designed by its state legislature to encourage higher adoption of zero-emission vehicles to reduce air pollution.

On behalf of the MARC Air Quality Forum, we encourage legislators to consider alternative fee options — many used by neighboring states — such as vehicle weight, vehicle value or vehicle age. We believe that a vehicle weight basis provides the closest tie between the funding source and use of the revenue.

As transportation funding discussions continue, we would be happy to provide additional research and background necessary to help legislators make informed decisions. Please contact Karen Clawson, MARC Air Quality Program Manager at 816-701-8255 or kclawson@marc.org if we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Scott Burnett
Country Legislature, Jackson County, Missouri
MARC Air Quality forum Co-Chair

Angela Markley
Commissioner, Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas
MARC Air Quality forum Co-Chair
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Item No. 8

ISSUE:
REPORT: Regional Transportation Plan 2050 (RTP2050) Update

BACKGROUND:
The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) is responsible for developing and maintaining a metropolitan transportation plan (MTP) to guide federal investments and serve as a blueprint for managing the region's transportation system. Transportation Outlook 2040, the current MTP, was adopted in 2015 and the next plan will be due by June of 2020. MARC is now working to develop the regional transportation plan for 2050, “RTP2050”. The RTP must include financially constrained regionally significant projects. As a major next step towards completion of RTP2050, MARC will be deploying a process to develop this listing of projects over various months in 2019. At the upcoming TTPC meeting, MARC Staff will further report on upcoming future steps, which include:

- **February**: Launch “Call for Projects” (Tentative February 26th)
- **March**: Pre-Application Workshop (Tentative March 6th)
- **April**: Close “Call for Projects” (April 25th)

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
The plan identifies needs and budget federal transportation funds that the metro area expects to receive over the next three decades. Currently, TO2040 contains:
- **Vision**: a long-term vision for the region’s transportation system.
- **Goals and strategies**: what we want to achieve by the year 2040 and how we plan to do it.
- **Transportation projects**: major regional transportation investments to help accomplish goals.

Once adopted, updated policies/goals and strategies identified in the MTP will guide transportation investments in our region in future years. For more information, please see: [www.marc.org/2050](http://www.marc.org/2050)

COMMITTEE ACTION
Sustainable Places Policy Committee, Air Quality Forum, Regional Transit Coordinating Council, Highway, Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Aviation, Goods Movement, Technical Forecast Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors have all participated in prior discussions to support this work.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information Only.

STAFF CONTACT
Martin Rivarola
ISSUE:
REPORT: Operation Green Light Program 2019 Work Plan and Update

BACKGROUND:
Operation Green Light (OGL) is a regional effort to support the operation of 735 traffic signals while supporting over 1500 signalized intersections on high-volume, inter-jurisdictional arterial roadways with 26 agencies throughout the Kansas City region. Administered by MARC, the OGL program provides and maintains real-time data communications with each intersection and manages the regionally shared Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) software.

OGL also hosts on its servers over 100 closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras for many of the area agencies that support the oversight of traffic signal operations, identification of signal malfunctions and incident management.

OGL continues to grow in its capacity to coordinate operations with the Kansas City Scout freeway management system to support traffic incident management activities ranging from unplanned events to regional roadway construction work.

Staff will provide an update on 2019 planned activities including signal timing efforts on a variety of corridors, latest partnerships, and details regarding the sharing of traffic signal data to 3rd party vendors specifically the recent MoDOT efforts with Audi/Traffic Technology Services.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Ray M. Webb, PE PTOE
ISSUE:
REPORT: Green Infrastructure Framework

BACKGROUND:
MARC has long engaged in a broad range of regional green infrastructure conservation efforts, including efforts focused on MetroGreen, stormwater, urban forestry, stream protection, green/complete streets, and the regional natural resources inventory. Each of these efforts is integral to Planning Sustainable Places, the Climate Resilience Strategy, Clean Air Action Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan. However, these efforts are programmatically disconnected, and typically funded at a level that does not align with the potential benefits.

Since 2016, MARC has developed a three-part Green Infrastructure Framework, including an Atlas, Playbook and attendant policy recommendations. The framework offers a set of goals, an integrated planning approach, playbook case studies (including the Rock Island Corridor), and a set of policy recommendations.

The approach is intended to inform the Regional Transportation Plan in a variety of ways. First, if offers guidance and specificity related policy goals associate with climate resilience, natural resource protection, public health, environmental justice, centers and corridors, and alternative transportation. Second, it aligns with key regional strategies such as green and complete streets and transit-oriented development. Third, it provides a basis for the development of regional projects and strategies to advance future implementation. And finally, the approach is intended complement and strengthen previous efforts in ways that support achievement of environmental and transportation goals - at the same time.

Staff will provide an overview of the framework, and request committee endorsement of the framework at its March meeting, if appropriate.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Informational Only.

STAFF CONTACT
Tom Jacobs
Fulfilling our regional vision requires great commitment and care, and a new level of cooperation among public, private and nonprofit organizations. A well-informed relationship between people and nature is necessary to grow thriving communities in the Heartland.

The Green Infrastructure Framework offers a planning and design approach to grow communities in ways that simultaneously tend to neighborhoods, jobs and nature. For example, we can care for every drop of water by increasing the health of the soil that it falls upon; catching it, cleaning and reusing it when it falls on hard surfaces; and making sure it doesn’t carry pollutants into streams. Similarly, when developing a parcel of land, we should strive to maintain the ecosystem services the land currently provides, ensuring that the landscape is sequestering carbon and creating habitat, buildings and structures are not making the air hotter, and people can gather and learn about the design process that make each place unique.

As green infrastructure becomes part of the mosaic of all local land uses, it can be designed and managed in ways that meet local needs while providing both local and broader community environmental benefits. When green infrastructure is an integrated part of land use, it can also have a significant and positive impact on mobility planning. Forests, streams, wetlands and prairies provide ecological benefits as well as great walking and biking environments. Linking communities through trails and complete green streets not only increases quality of life and economic vitality, but also provides health benefits and increases equitable opportunities to access education and jobs.

Integrated processes — especially those with new approaches — require a wide variety of participation and perspectives. Adoption of commonly held policies provides consistent guidance across jurisdictions, sectors and practices in the region. During the Regional Green Infrastructure Policy Study, three overarching policy recommendations emerged from stakeholder discussions: creating model ordinances; updating stormwater management guidelines and engineering standards; and linking conservation and transportation planning.

Participants framed progress on these three priorities within a larger context of supporting strategies. They noted substantial needs regarding regional collaboration, leadership development and capacity building, communications and education, tools and data, integrated regional/local planning, funding, and implementation of multi-benefit projects.

Implementation of the study’s recommendations will focus on convening and mobilizing the diverse communities of our region to use the data and tools at our fingertips and create new policy to support resilient decision-making together.

“Greater Kansas City is a region of opportunity. Its robust economy, healthy environment and social capacity support the creativity, diversity and resilience of its people, places and communities.”

— Regional vision adopted by the MARC Board of Directors, May 2018
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

After two community stakeholder workshops, participants developed and prioritized a set of over 50 policy and planning recommendations. Three overarching policy recommendations emerged from stakeholder discussions:

1. Develop a package of model, local green infrastructure-friendly ordinances.
2. Update local stormwater management planning guidelines and engineering standards.
3. Better link conservation and transportation planning.

Descriptions of each recommendation, along with additional context and rationale, are provided below.

1. MODEL ORDINANCES

MARC will work with local governments and area stakeholders to develop model ordinances to eliminate barriers to green infrastructure, or conversely, to incentivize its application. Key policy questions were raised for the following local government ordinances:

**Trees and urban forestry**
Under what conditions, and to what degree may trees be protected during the development/redevelopment process? What tree replacement policies should be required to sustain ecosystem services? What are the roles and responsibilities of different city departments in protecting, planting, maintaining and monitoring the urban forest? What incentives or practices enable the community to protect and enhance its urban tree canopy?

**Weeds and landscaping**
Native plants create habitat, improve water and air quality, and sequester carbon. Yet, in some instances, landscaping ordinances effectively constrain, or even ban their use because of the definition of a weed, or maximum plant height requirements (e.g., 6”–18”). How can we clarify the establishment and management of native landscapes without sacrificing other community health and safety goals?

**Invasive species**
A variety of invasive species, from Bradford pear trees to bush honeysuckle, have substantially impaired the quality and health of natural ecosystems. What regulations might govern or restrict the use of invasive species to achieve stated policy goals?

**Green infrastructure-focused planning and zoning**
Local planning and zoning regulations may impede the application of ecologically-sensitive site design. What planning guidelines are needed to facilitate multi-benefit projects and supplement engineering design standards and specifications, ensuring that public and private infrastructure creates multi-benefit, contextually-sensitive solutions?

Recommendation:
Develop a suite of model ordinances related to trees, weeds, landscaping, invasive species and other relevant planning/zoning regulations, using an inclusive stakeholder process. Ideally, this process would be piloted in one or more local communities that are interested in adopting appropriate revisions. It would also complement stormwater standards and specifications described on the next page.
2. STORMWATER ENGINEERING STANDARDS AND PLANNING GUIDELINES

In 2003, the Kansas City Chapter of the American Public Works Association (APWA) adopted standards for stormwater management known as Section 5600, while also endorsing the MARC/APWA Manual to Protect Water Quality. Those efforts were the product of a collaborative, regional effort to reduce flood risks and protect water quality in the aftermath of the 1998 flood. Since that time, substantial changes in technology, best management practices and integrated planning/design approaches compel the region to revisit these standards.

These standards are silent on several key policy questions, including:

- What stormwater management requirements should be instituted for redevelopment projects?
- How can stormwater management practices advance complementary community goals related to transportation, housing, parks, public health, food security, ecosystem vitality or social equity?
- What standards should be required to ensure proper maintenance of green infrastructure?
- To what degree do stormwater standards prepare the region to be more climate resilient?
- How are stormwater management standards embedded within emerging goals of “one water” or integrated watershed management?

Recommendation:

Update existing standards and planning guidelines, rooted in the approach articulated within the Green Infrastructure Framework. Implement a multidisciplinary, cross-sector stakeholder process to fund, scope, develop and adopt amended engineering standards and planning guidelines.

3. LINKING CONSERVATION AND TRANSPORTATION

In 2008, the MARC Board of Directors adopted an Eco-Logical Action Plan. The integration of green infrastructure into transportation policy, programs, projects and practices creates an opportunity to address mobility and environmental quality at the same time. Four key efforts provide important antecedents for this agenda:

- To date, approximately 350 miles of MetroGreen™ corridors have been developed, with another 90,000 streamside acres protected by stream buffer requirements.
- Regional complete street policy includes “green” streets within its purview.
- MARC’s Planning Sustainable Places program provides a platform for integrated environmental, land use and transportation planning.
- Pilot native landscaping efforts along highway rights of way provide habitat for migrating monarch butterflies.

Opportunities exist to build from previous successes. While stream buffers and greenways are protected, most area streams are designated as impaired. Integrated land use/transportation projects are increasing in visibility, but the environmental dimensions have been largely unaddressed. And, while transportation facilities are one of the region’s most significant classes of runoff-generating impervious areas, no requirements exist to protect water quality from transportation facilities.
Recommendation:
Fully integrate green infrastructure conservation and restoration goals into the regional transportation plan, policies, program, performance measures, and project evaluation criteria.

Opportunities exist to:
- Include green infrastructure-focused projects on the project list for the long-range transportation plan.
- Strengthen evaluation criteria in the project selection process to provide incentives for inclusion of green infrastructure in transportation facilities.
- Allocate additional funds in the Planning Sustainable Places program to support projects focused at the nexus of green infrastructure, transportation and land use.
- Link water quality approaches with transportation planning and design by developing stormwater quality requirements for transportation facility design, along with an in-lieu fee system for projects unable to implement water quality protection measures within their project area.
- Convert targeted transportation rights of way to native landscaping, with a focus on multi-benefit solutions that simultaneously advance environmental, watershed and mobility goals.

ADDITIONAL STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

Participants in green infrastructure workshops and planning sessions framed the three priority strategies within a larger context, identifying substantial opportunities regarding regional collaboration, leadership development and capacity building, communications and education, tools and data, integrated regional/local planning, funding, and implementation of multi-benefit projects.

Regional collaboration and leadership
A formalized collaborative, cross-sector regional forum is needed to address connected policy, planning and funding needs. The forum could provide regional leadership and facilitate higher levels of coordination among area conservation agencies and organizations.

Data and tools
Planning tools are foundational to the advancement of this framework. Investment in tools and data like the Natural Resources Inventory, performance metrics and indicators, and geospatial analysis is critical for the region to identify and address integrated ecosystem, human health and social equity values and needs.

Communication and education
Many barriers to green infrastructure implementation are related to uneven public and professional understanding and support. In response, a comprehensive communications strategy is needed, along with strategic professional development with a focus on green infrastructure maintenance, and certification programs for construction and maintenance standards. In addition, public recognition of exemplary efforts provides wider understanding of successful practices and replicable models.

Integrated planning
At the regional scale, multiple plans reflect the importance of green infrastructure conservation and restoration. At the local level, comprehensive plans may include green infrastructure elements in each topic area of recommendations to explicitly identify how green infrastructure may help address local goals and objectives. Interjurisdictional cooperation on integrated watershed management, or “one water” plans, offers another substantial opportunity to address water quality and quantity goals along with other community goals.

Project implementation
Stakeholder discussions focused on land use, watersheds, transportation and parks as key areas of momentum, potential funding and public influence. Opportunities to advance more integrated, multi-benefit projects exist within each of these realms. These opportunities include development of common ordinances for land use and zoning, as well as standards for public streetscapes and landscapes. Coordinating nonprofit education and advocacy programs with projects on public land and waterways also provides visibility and access to projects, creating wider educational benefit and recreation opportunities.
The maps shown below reflect an integrated approach to green infrastructure planning, accounting for ecological value, ecological impact or need, and social need. Close-up views are shown for the northern section of the Rock Island corridor, which was a subject of analysis for the Green Infrastructure Playbook. Maps were developed from the regional natural resource inventory and from census data.

**ECOLOGICAL VALUE**

The Ecological Value map serves to identify areas where multiple ecological value criteria overlap, and where green infrastructure networks could be most effective for protecting and improving existing high value resources. Darker areas reflect a higher number of good quality attributes for conservation. Lighter areas suggest areas that may be better suited for potential restoration, mitigation, or development compatibility.
Higher resolution imagery allows a clearer view of the relationship between the built and natural environment, and community needs. Playbook analysis identified opportunities for sustainable development activities at certain nodes, to create community linkages and to make environmental improvements along the corridor.
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NEED / ECOLOGICAL IMPACT

This map identifies areas with ecological degradation, where green infrastructure installations may reduce the degradation and/or negative impacts to ecological and human health.
SOCIAL NEED

This map prioritizes areas with disadvantaged or vulnerable populations using criteria such as zero-vehicle households, minority population, low educational attainment, poverty, population decline, and population with poor access to parks.

Rock Island Corridor Detail
Data overlayed on aerial for orientation.
INTERSECTION OF ECOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL NEED

The value of green infrastructure exists in the potential it has to enhance the health and well-being of our communities. Locations where ecological needs intersect with social needs become ideal places to focus attention and investment. In these places, the connection between the ecological functions of the land and the communities who live there are most direct. These places are illustrated in the maps below. Social needs can be varied and wide-ranging and depend greatly on the context and history of a place. In general, measures of community health, mobility, economic opportunity, and equity can provide a measure of social need.

The quantitative analysis used was an intersection analysis to view ecological value and need and social need jointly and holistically. This is a trivariate map, where each unique color represents a different combination of intersection. Light pink indicates the presence of high value ecological resources and conservation needs, but no other need intersection. Green and blue indicate ecological need for restoration and social need, respectively. Darker shades are used to represent greater intersection: dark teal for areas of social need and restoration intersection, dark pink for social need and conservation intersection, and orange for restoration and conservation intersection. Gray indicates an intersection of all three needs.
The Here We Grow brand has been created to encompass all green infrastructure initiatives at the regional level. We are happy to share this logo to incorporate into your green infrastructure projects and messaging. Please contact us for your copy.

The Green Infrastructure Framework and Green Infrastructure Playbook can be found at marc.org/giFramework. The full report on Policy, Planning and Action will join previous work in the near future.

PROTECT against harmful pollutants and climate change
PRESERVE your neighborhood for future generations
RESTORE natural areas to increase recreational activity

Tom Jacobs
Director of Environmental Programs
tjacobs@marc.org • 816-701-8352