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, December 18, 2018, 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: November 20, 2018 Minutes*
3. VOTE: 2019 1st Quarter Amendment to the 2018-22 TIP for Public Review & Comment*
4. VOTE: Policy on Unified Planning Work Program Modifications*
5. VOTE: Updated 2019 Safety Performance Targets for the MARC Metropolitan area*
6. REPORT: Regional Transportation Safety Report
7. REPORT: KCATA Strategic Plan and Regional System Redesign
8. REPORT: RideKC Bike: e-Bikeshare in Kansas City
9. REPORT: KS Transportation Vision Taskforce – Initial Recommendations
10. REPORT: Vehicle Registration Fees as a Source for State Transportation Funding
11. REPORT: Operation Green Light Program Update
12. REPORT: FHWA Climate Adaptation Grant
13. REPORT: Annual Policy Review
14. Other Business
15. 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.
Total Transportation Policy Committee
November 20, 2018
Meeting Summary

Members, Alternates Present—Representing
Councilman Chuck Adams, Wyandotte County Municipalities, KS Co-Chair
Mayor Carson Ross, Jackson County Municipalities, MO Co-Chair
Commissioner Jim Allen, Johnson County
Mike Brungardt, Johnson County Municipalities
Matt Davis, Jackson County
Tom Gerend, Kansas City Streetcar
Richard Grenville, Port KC
Tony Hofmann, City of Overland Park
Mary Jaeger, City of Olathe
Leonard Jones, Jackson County
Kent Lage, Johnson County
Gary Lathrop, Cass County Municipalities
Michael McDonald, Leavenworth County Municip.
Mark McHenry, City of Kansas City
Sherri McIntyre, City of Kansas City
Janet McRae, Miami County
Jack Messer, City of Overland Park
Davonna Moore, KDOT
Mark Randall, City of Independence
Terry Rynard, City of Kansas City
Fred Sherman, Johnson County Municipalities
Kite Singleton, Regional Transit Alliance
Mayor David Slater, Clay County Municipalities
Reginald Townsend, Cass County
Tim Vandall, Leavenworth County Municipalities
Mayor Eileen Weir, City of Independence
Doug Whitacre, Johnson County Municipalities
Beccy Yocham, Johnson County Municipalities

Others Present
Terri Griffen, Clay County
Dave Kocour, Hg Consult, Inc.
Greg Rokus, City of Raymore
Linda Rottinghaus, Affinis
Allison Smith, KDOT
Kip Strauss, HNTB

MARC Staff Present
Ron Achelpohl, Director of Transp. and Environment
Karen Clawson, Principal Planner/Air Quality
Program Manager
Amanda Graor, Chief Innovation Officer
Marc Hansen, Principal Planner
Tom Jacobs, Environmental Program Director
Martin Rivarola, Assistant Director of Transportation
Land Use Planning
Drew Stiehl, Transportation Planner I
Amy Strange, Public Affairs Coordinator II
Ray Webb, Manager of Traffic Operations
Jermain Whitmore, Program Assistant
Eileen Yang, Transportation Modeling Manager
1) Welcome/Introductions
Councilman Chuck Adams, KS Co-Chair, called the meeting to order and self-introductions followed.

2) Approval of October 16, 2018 Meeting Summary*
There were no changes to the October 16, 2018 meeting summary. Mayor Carson Ross moved to approve the meeting summary, Councilman Gary Lathrop seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

3) Proposed 2019 Unified Planning Work Program*
Marc Hansen reported that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 1) describes the transportation planning activities MARC and other agencies will undertake during the year; 2) documents the proposed expenditures of federal, state and local funds in support of applications for various planning grants; and 3) provides a management tool for MARC and the funding agencies in scheduling major transportation planning activities, milestones and products. A draft of the 2019 UPWP is available at:


Major Transportation Planning Initiatives proposed for 2019 include:
- Respond to the FAST Act – Tasks 1.1, 2.2, 3.9, 4.1, and 5.5
- DBE and Title VI program triennial updates – Task 1.1
- Creating/Planning Sustainable Places – Task 2.1
- Update of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Task 2.2
- Performance Measures and Targets – Tasks 2.2, 3.9, 4.1
- Regional Household Travel Survey Completion – Task 3.10
- Development of the 2020-24 Transportation Improvement Program – Task 4.1
- Smart Moves Implementation – Task 5.1, 5.2
- Prospect Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Implementation – Task 5.2
- Independence Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project Development – Task 5.3
- Environmental Assessment ) for U.S. 169 Corridor from I-70 and I-35 to MO 9, Including the Buck O’Neil Bridge over the Missouri River – Task 5.7

The Draft 2019 UPWP has been developed based on funding levels resulting from the passage of FAST Act and the 2010 Census counts for urbanized area populations in Kansas and Missouri.

MARC hosted a conference call on August 30, 2018 with its planning partners to coordinate development of the 2019 UPWP. An initial version of the 2019 UPWP was circulated among the planning partners for comment in September 2018.

TTPC authorized the release of the draft 2019 UPWP for public review and comment at their October 16, 2018 meeting. No comments were received during the public comment period.

Kite Singleton moved to approve the 2019 Unified Planning Work Program, Commissioner Jim Allen seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

4) 2018 Ozone Season/Green Commute Challenge Update
Amanda Graor provided a summary of the 2018 Green Commute Challenge and other issues currently being monitored for the region. The 2018 Ozone Season will ended October 31. Based on preliminary monitor values, the Kansas City region’s 3-year average ground-level ozone concentration is 70 parts per billion (ppb). The 2015
National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone pollution is 70ppb, meaning the region is very close to not meeting the national health-based standard at this time.

A committee member inquired about the time frame for re-designation, and Ms. Graor responded that no re-designation is required, but the numbers change every 5 years. However, re-designation must be reflected in the work within a year, and completed in 2-3 years.

It was asked what causes the consistent fluctuation in the ozone numbers, and Ms. Graor answered that meteorology is the main variable.

Someone questioned if there is anything MARC and TTPC can do to help fight against the rise of emissions, and Ms. Graor replied that providing choices of different transportation modes, green infrastructure, and electric vehicles as outlined in the Clean Air Action Plan are some ways we can help address it.

5) Autonomous Vehicle Policy Scrum Overview
Amanda Graor provided an overview of the sessions and the outputs recommended by participants during the scrum. In October, MARC hosted professors and students from the Harvard Kennedy School to facilitate an Autonomous Vehicle Policy Scrum. “The goal of the AV Policy Scrum sessions is to develop innovative and actionable policy approaches to AV technology implementation. The AV Policy Scrums serve as hackathons or design sprints for the various facets of AV policy.” The Kansas City region was the third host of these sessions, following events held in Boston and Toronto.

The questions being asked of participants specific to the Kansas City region were:
- What infrastructure will AV fleet operators expect, how will the public earn a return on those investments and what new public value opportunities will AVs bring to the region?
- What are the necessary information flows between AV fleet operators as well as with the public sector to ensure safe, reliable and equitable operations as well as support other public interests?
- What regulatory framework best support AV fleet operations on a regional basis?

A committee member recommended that MARC help develop policy recommendation and their implementation, as well as data management & sharing.

6) Regional Transportation Plan 2050 (RTP2050) Update
Martin Rivarola reported that 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. Upcoming future steps, which include:

**November 2018**
Issue notice of 2019 RTP project selection process to agencies which sponsored TO2040 projects. Projects included in current TO2040 will be asked to be resubmitted with updated project information (scope, cost, funding mechanisms, etc.) for reconsideration.

**December 2018 /January 2019:**
MARC staff will work with Committees/stakeholders to reach consensus on appropriate solutions for regional needs.

- Develop initial MARC generated project list. Develop Project Costing process. Individually consult with system owner/sponsors regarding MARC generated project list prior to public release of list.
- Develop Project Scoring Criteria for “Call for Projects”.
- Present to Steering Workgroup/TTPC/Board to seek concurrence.

February:
- Launch “Request for comments/Call for Projects”.

Other ongoing upcoming steps in the RTP2050 development process will also include:

- Development of “Story Map Chapter 3” - Scenario Analysis report,
- Ongoing targeted engagement efforts, online engagement, focus groups & MARC committee outreach.
- For more information, please see: www.marc.org/2050

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.

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.

7) 2018 Transportation Performance Measures Update
Ron Achelpohl reported that in support of a performance-based planning process, Regional Transportation Plan 2050 includes a set of regional performance measures related to the vision and goals defined in the plan’s Policy Framework. Since 2010, MARC has produced an annual Performance Measures Report to monitor trends and help MARC and regional transportation stakeholders to better understand and evaluate progress towards achieving the plan goals.

In 2018, many of the FAST ACT Performance Measure Targets have been finalized and have been incorporated into the report. MARC staff has been working with regional stakeholders and both DOTs to obtain the necessary data to update the federal measures to reflect their new calculation processes and new measures. MARC staff has also worked with local stakeholders and both DOTs in the development of targets for all required measures.

With each update to the performance measures report, MARC staff produces two documents: a Performance Measures Snapshot, and a Performance Measures Report. The Snapshot provides a brief summary of how each measure has changed since the last update. The Report goes into more depth and detail, providing a description of each measure, visualization of long-term performance, and interpretation of trends. A copy of the 2018 Snapshot is attached.

MARC staff will introduce the 2018 Transportation Performance Measures update, highlighting a selection of key findings and trends.
The annual Performance Measures Report provides an update on the region’s progress towards achieving the goals and objectives in Transportation Outlook 2040. The information is provided to be considered by TTPC and other MARC committees in the context of regional transportation policies and priorities.

Targets for Safety, Transit State of Good Repair, National Highway System (NHS) Bridge and Pavement Condition, and NHS Reliability measures have been adopted by TTPC.

It was noted that the bridge/roadway conditions portrayed in the report could send a bad message of funding infrastructure.

Another committee member mentioned that maintenance across the state is also an issue.

One of the committee members that serves on the Highway Committee acknowledged the concerns and commented that the Highway Committee formed the targets based on realistic availability of funding over the next 3 years. However, they will be reviewed and updated periodically.

8) Household Travel Survey Update
Mr. Achelpohl provided more detail about the scope and schedule of this initiative. MARC periodically conducts regional household travel surveys to obtain detailed information about the socio-economic characteristics and travel behavior of persons living in the Greater Kansas City region. The information collected is used as the foundation for developing travel demand forecasts, a key requirement of federal metropolitan transportation planning regulations. 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 like transportation network companies (i.e. Uber and Lyft), bike share and the KC Streetcar.

The outcome of this effort will inform future household travel data collection by MARC and ensure these efforts are accurate, cost-effective and responsive to rapidly-changing transportation behavior. 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.

There was a question about the target number of participants, and Mr. Achelpohl responded that ideally, we would like around 4,000; and will reach out to around 20,000 to 40,000.

9) Other Business
There was no further business to discuss.

10) Adjournment
With no further business the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting of TTPC will be held December 18, 2018.
ISSUE:
VOTE: 2019 1st Quarter Amendment 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 a quarterly cycle to accommodate changes to projects in the TIP.

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

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the release of the 2019 1st Quarter Amendment to the FFY 2018-2022 TIP for Public Review & Comment.
STAFF CONTACT
Marc Hansen
ISSUE:
VOTE: Policy on Unified Planning Work Program Modifications

BACKGROUND:
The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 1) describes the transportation planning activities MARC and other agencies will undertake during the year; 2) documents the proposed expenditures of federal, state and local funds in support of applications for various planning grants; and 3) provides a management tool for MARC and the funding agencies in scheduling major transportation planning activities, milestones and products.

Under federal regulations, Metropolitan Planning Organizations are allowed the flexibility to make minor changes administratively to the UPWP without having to undergo a formal amendment to ensure timely implementation of resources and avoid unnecessary delay.

The Policy on Unified Planning Work Program Modifications identifies and documents the criteria used to categorize proposed modifications to the UPWP as either a formal amendment requiring public review or comment or as an administrative modification. The policy also establishes guidance for how each type of change will be processed and incorporated into the UPWP by MARC.

The proposed policy is attached for review.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the Policy on Unified Planning Work Program Modifications.

STAFF CONTACT
Marc Hansen
Mid-America Regional Council

Policy on Unified Planning Work Program Modifications

Modifications to the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) can be made through two methods – formal amendment and administrative modification. Both formal amendments and administrative modifications are processed as needed throughout the year.

Formal amendments will be released for public review and acted upon by the Total Transportation Policy Committee (TTPC) and the MARC Board of Directors before being incorporated into the UPWP.

Administrative modifications will be processed by MARC staff following notification to the Kansas and Missouri Departments of Transportation and approval of the MARC Director of Transportation and Environment. Changes made through Administrative Modification will be noted when the next formal UPWP amendment is brought before TTPC.

Formal Amendments

The following are instances in which a formal amendment is required:

- Including additional funding
- Transferring of funds between tasks/activities which are cumulatively in excess of one percent of the current total approved CPG portion of the budget or $5,000, whichever is greater
- Addition or deletion of a project/activity
- Removing funds allotted for training allowances or transferring them to another task
- Revising the scope or objectives for a project
- The addition of certain costs that require prior federal approval (such as foreign travel)
- Changes in the source or amount of matching funds
- Changes in key persons performing the work (however KDOT would advise not tying tasks to specific staff members, only identify the agency responsible for the task if other than the MPO)
- Contracting out, subgranting, or otherwise obtaining the services of a third party to perform activities central to the work program

Administrative Modifications

Per federal regulations, Metropolitan Planning Organizations are allowed the flexibility to make minor changes to the UPWP without having to undergo a formal amendment. Administrative modifications include all revisions that are not formal amendments.

In processing administrative modifications MARC staff will:

- Notify the Kansas and Missouri Departments of Transportation of the modifications
- Prepare and publish an updated UPWP document upon approval by the MARC Director of Transportation and Environment
- Prepare a summary of administrative modification activity to be presented to the TTPC in conjunction with next formal UPWP amendment
ISSUE:
VOTE: Approve the updated 2019 Safety Performance Targets for the MARC metropolitan area.

BACKGROUND:
The current and previous federal transportation bills, FAST Act and MAP-21, respectively, included a series of requirements for Transportation Performance Management (TPM). Since the passage of MAP-21, USDOT has worked through the federal rulemaking process to establish a series of performance measures and corresponding target setting requirements. Generally, the performance measures relate to national goals of safety, infrastructure condition, air quality, and transportation system performance.

Final USDOT rules related to TPM established five performance measures for traffic safety (see attached memo for details). State DOTs are required to update safety performance targets on an annual basis for all five measures. Missouri and Kansas statewide targets for a 5-year rolling average ending in 2019 were set on August 31, 2018. MPOs have the option to (a) support the state targets, or (b) establish their own regional targets within 180 days of the establishment of state targets.

MARC has elected to update regional targets, and core reasons include the need to harmonize significantly different statewide targets between Kansas and Missouri, and the fact that trends in the Kansas City region do not consistently align with statewide trends on either side of the state line. To develop the targets, MARC staff considered historical traffic safety trends, regional plans and programs, and emerging issues such as technology. The targets were developed in coordination with State DOTs and regional partners, and are consistent with safety targets in the adopted 2018-2022 Regional Safety Blueprint. The five recommended MPO safety performance targets represent a rolling 5-year average ending in 2019:

1. Number of fatalities — 203.6
2. Fatality rate per 100 million VMT — 0.948
3. Number of serious injuries — 1022.3
4. Serious injury rate per 100 million VMT — 4.782
5. Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries — 106.0

The attached memo details recommended targets for each safety performance measure.

Through Destination Safe, MARC is working with regional partners to improve traffic safety and implement strategies in the Regional Safety Blueprint. The Blueprint identifies specific strategies related to engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency response. MARC advances these strategies by prioritizing proven safety countermeasures when programming various types of federal transportation funding.
BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
The recommended safety targets have been developed with input from the Destination Safe Leadership Team, the Transportation Safety Data Task Team, and the MARC Highway Committee.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve updated 2019 Safety Performance Targets for the MARC metropolitan planning area.

STAFF CONTACT
Martin Rivarola
Aaron Bartlett
Safety Targets for MARC Region
Updated December 2018

Safety performance measures are defined in accordance with the final USDOT rule on Safety Performance Measures, authorized by 23 CFR Part 490.

The recommended safety targets for the MARC metropolitan planning area have been updated with input from the Destination Safe Leadership Team, the Transportation Safety Data Task Team, and the MARC Highway Committee. After reviewing options, recommendations were made to maintain annual percent reduction from the Regional Safety Blueprint, and adjust the updated targets based on new data.

Targets based on a rolling 5-year average for the performance period ending in 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Baseline Period Ending 2017 5-Year Average</th>
<th>Target Period Ending 2019 5-Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of fatalities</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>203.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fatality rate per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>1097.8</td>
<td>1022.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serious injury rate per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>5.384</td>
<td>4.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above targets assume the following.

- 4% annual decrease in the number of fatalities
- 6% annual decrease in the number of serious injuries
- 6% annual decrease in the number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries
- 1% annual increase in vehicle-miles traveled (VMT)
Note: The values for 2018 and 2019 (shown in yellow) are not based on observed data. These represent the values needed in order to meet the 2019 target for a particular measure. Performance measures and targets correspond to the 5-year rolling average (shown as orange line), not the annual value.

Table 1. Number of Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>5-Year Avg. Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>175.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>172.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>171.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>178.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>181.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>191.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>203.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Fatality Rate per 100 VMT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Fatality Rate</th>
<th>5-Yr Avg. Fatality Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Number of Serious Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Serious Injuries</th>
<th>5-Yr Avg SIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1351.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1298.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>1232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>1152.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1097.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1044.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1022.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Serious Injury Rate per 100 million VMT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Serious Injury Rate</th>
<th>5-Yr Avg. SI Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>7.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>6.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual BP F&amp;SI</th>
<th>5-Yr Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>122.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>120.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>114.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>112.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TTPC AGENDA REPORT

December 2018
Item No. 6

ISSUE:
REPORT: Regional Transportation Safety Report

BACKGROUND:
The attached report addresses the 3rd Quarter, Kansas City Regional Fatalities ending September 30th.

The report tracks 15 Focus Areas identified in the Kansas City Regional Transportation Safety Blueprint: Together Toward Zero 2018-2022. Each quarterly report represents the total recorded year-to-date roadway fatalities for the 13 county area. The Safety Blueprint has a set goal of 211 or fewer fatalities in 2018. The plan promotes a multidisciplinary approach through proven strategies to reduce crashes, fatalities and serious injuries.

A total of 187 fatalities have been reported through this quarter, this is above the year-to-date 158 or fewer goal. The five-year average 2013-2017 period is 163.6. This year fatalities are up 14.3% over the five-year average. Averaging years normalizes annual variations and helps to reveal trends. The five-year rolling average changes as the last year drops off and the next year roles on.

The report compares fatalities by county for this period with the same period over the past five-years averaged. The month-by-month regional fatalities are compared to the five-year monthly average to provide a baseline. The 15 Focus Areas are categorized into Behavioral, Infrastructure and Special User. Pedestrian fatalities are atypically high; however, Impaired Driving and Distracted Driving are lower for this period. We will continue to monitor fatalities and report again in March of 2019.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
One of the regional goals of Transportation Outlook 2040 Update is to “… improve safety and security for all transportation users.”

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
The Destination Safe Leadership Team adopted the Kansas City Regional Transportation Safety Blueprint: Together Toward Zero 2018-2022.
RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Aaron Bartlett
Martin Rivarola
The 2018 goal is **211 or fewer** fatalities.

YTD fatalities are **up 14%** from the five-year YTD average.

**Q. What is the five-year YTD average?**

**A.** The five-year average for each quarterly report is an average of total fatalities for the same year-to-date (YTD) period over the previous five years (2013–2017). This report compares YTD 2018 with the same period five-year YTD average.

Produced in partnership with

Preliminary data provided by Kansas and Missouri Departments of Transportation. Some information calculated by MARC.

This document is exempt under discovery or admission as part of 23 USC § 409. The collection of safety data in the Kansas City region is encouraged to actively address safety issues on regional, local and site-specific levels. Congress has enacted a law, 23 USC § 409, which prohibits the discovery or admission of crash and safety data from being admitted into evidence in a federal or state court proceeding. This document contains wording, charts, tables, graphs, lists and diagrams for the purpose of identifying and evaluating safety enhancements in the Kansas City region. These materials are protected under 23 USC § 409. Congress' rationale behind 23 USC § 409 is that safety data is compiled and collected to help prevent future crashes, injuries and deaths on our nation's transportation system.
## Priority Issues

as identified by the Destination Safe Coalition in the Regional Transportation Safety Blueprint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral priorities</th>
<th>Infrastructure-related issues</th>
<th>Special user priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestrained occupants</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality in which the person killed was not using safety belt or restraint device.</td>
<td><strong>Lane departure</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality that involves a vehicle crossing into an adjacent lane of traffic or leaving the roadway.</td>
<td><strong>Motorists 15–24 years old</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality of a person of any age that involved a driver between the ages of 15 and 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive driving</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality involving a combination of moving traffic offenses (primarily speeding) that endanger other persons or property.</td>
<td><strong>Fixed object</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality that involves a vehicle that leaves its lane and runs into a ditch, an object or a barrier.</td>
<td><strong>Motorcycle/moped</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality of a person operating a motorcycle or moped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impaired driving</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality caused by a driver who is impaired by alcohol, drugs or other substance.</td>
<td><strong>Horizontal curves</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality resulting from a crash that occurred in a roadway change in the horizontal alignment or direction of a road.</td>
<td><strong>Motorists 65 years old and older</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality of a person of any age that involved an older adult driver over the age of 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unlicensed driver</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality caused by a driver who is not licensed or whose license is revoked or suspended.</td>
<td><strong>Intersections</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality that occurs at a road junction, where two or more roads either meet or cross.</td>
<td><strong>Pedestrians</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality of a person not in or on a vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distracted driving</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality involving a driver whose attention is diverted from the primary task of driving — manually, mentally or visually.</td>
<td><strong>Head-on collisions</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality that results from two opposing vehicles colliding.</td>
<td><strong>Large trucks</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality involving a vehicle that exceeds 10,000 pounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISSUE:
REPORT: KCATA Strategic Plan and Regional System Redesign

BACKGROUND:
KCATA has undertaken a strategic plan (Mobility Momentum 2021) that outlines a three-year work plan for the agency. The main objectives are to transform the Agency into a regional authority (work that has largely already been completed), create and deploy “mobility as a service” concepts to fill transportation gaps, and develop innovative funding models. The work plan contains three strategic areas of focus (ridership, revenue, and relationships) with 25 tactics for improvement. The Agency will track metrics quarterly. The vision established by the plan is to “deliver innovative solutions that enhance mobility and improve our community.” As indicated by its name, Mobility Momentum should be fully executed by 2021. The primary goals for FY 2019 are: 1) Improve customer satisfaction to 92%, 2) Reduce costs by 3%, 3) Reduce safety & security incidents by 15%, and 4) Improve employee engagement.

The Regional System Redesign, which the Agency will select a consultant to develop in 2019, will rethink mobility in the Kansas City area by 1) Enhancing end to end travel, 2) Implementing Smart Moves 3.0, 3) Implementing the KCATA Strategic Plan, 4) Building on existing innovations, 5) Integrating mobility systems, and 6) Using multiple modes and providers. By redesigning the system consistent with the Smart Moves vision, the metro area can have more fast and frequent service that will reduce travel time for most people. For those areas that are not as cost effective to serve with traditional transit, the Agency intends to explore non-traditional service options to provide mobility. A consultant will be selected to help come up with alternatives and develop the implementation plan. KCATA held a preproposal workshop on 12/11/18 and expects to begin the effort in February 2019.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information Only.

STAFF CONTACT
Laura Machala
ISSUE:
REPORT: RideKC Bike: e-Bikeshare in Kansas City

BACKGROUND:
The KCATA and BikeWalkKC have partnered with Drop Mobility to bring e-Bikes to Kansas City. By spring 2019, around 150 e-bikes will join the region’s bikeshare fleet.

Branded under the RideKC brand as “RideKC Bike,” this mobility solution will add an additional transportation option for users who may be uncomfortable bicycling on city streets without electric assistance up large hills or on streets with heavier traffic.

Dick Jarrold and Eric Rogers will share more information on this new partnership, what it means for the BikeWalkKC-KCATA partnership moving forward, and how this new asset will improve mobility in greater Kansas City.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Drew Stiehl
ISSUE:
REPORT: KS Transportation Vision Taskforce - Initial Recommendations

BACKGROUND:
The Kansas Legislature initiated the Joint Legislative Transportation Vision Task Force, comprised of 35 members from across the state. Senator Carolyn McGinn and Representative Richard Proehl served as co-chairs for the task force, which featured 12 legislators, 14 transportation stakeholder/industry leaders, five local government officials and four ex officio members. Johnson County Commissioner Jim Allen, MARC TTPC member, served as a Task Force member.

From August to November 2018, the task force convened nine regional meetings to gather stakeholder input, and members participated in a two-day session to draft recommendations.

The Task Force has completed their statewide meetings and has developed initial recommendations from their assessment of testimony provided from August to December. They are scheduled to issue a final report to the Legislature in January. A high-level overview of task force recommendations is included in the next page. Key recommendations are to provide adequate funding to maintain the state highway system, complete all projects recommended in the TWORKS program, increase funding for other modes, consider restricting use of transportation taxes to transportation uses, and consider new sources of revenue for transportation needs in the state. More information is available at: http://www.kslegresearch.org/KLRD-web/Committees/Committees-JtLegTrnsptrnVisionTF.html

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Martin Rivarola
Ron Achelpohl
Joint Legislative Transportation Vision Task Force

The Task Force:

The Kansas Legislature initiated the Joint Legislative Transportation Vision Task Force, which is comprised of 35 members from across the state. Senator Carolyn McGinn and Representative Richard Proehl serve as co-chairs for the task force, which features 12 legislators, 14 transportation stakeholder/industry leaders, five local government officials and four ex officio members. From August to November 2018, the task force convened nine regional meetings to gather stakeholder input, and members participated in a two-day session to draft recommendations.

The Charge:

The Kansas Legislature broadly charged the task force with the following:

Evaluate the state’s transportation system, the way it uses state highway funds, and whether funding levels are sufficient.

Seek local input on existing and emerging transportation needs.

Make recommendations on the state’s future transportation system needs and the structure of the State Highway Fund.

What We Heard:

More than 300 stakeholders provided testimony at nine regional task force meetings across the state. Through these discussions, the following themes have emerged:

There are unmet transportation needs across the state.

Transportation investments generate economic growth, create jobs, enhance safety and improve mobility and quality of life for citizens.

Recent funding reductions have caused needs to go unmet, and the state must provide a steady, consistent source of revenue going forward.
Moving Kansas Forward

The Challenge:

In 2010, the Kansas Legislature passed the Transportation Works for Kansas (T-WORKS) plan to protect Kansans’ investment in their infrastructure, generate economic growth and expand mobility across the state. Since its passage, approximately $2 billion of revenue has been transferred out of the State Highway Fund, the result of this transfer has been the following:

- Preservation work, which extends the life of the highway system, has not kept pace with needs causing system health to decline.

- T-WORKS projects, including 21 highway modernization and expansion projects, are delayed and cannot be completed if transfers continue at the recent pace.

- The State cannot seize emerging economic opportunities or meet future transportation needs without a stable funding source.

The Recommendations:

Following the nine regional meetings to gather stakeholder input, the task force convened for two days to develop recommendations for Kansas transportation going forward. The following are tentative recommendations crafted by the task force:

- Kansas must provide adequate, consistent and stable transportation funding.

- The remaining 21 T-WORKS projects should be completed.

- Kansas should provide the necessary investment in highway preservation to improve system health.

- While the previous highway project selection process worked well, minor modifications to include factors such as practical improvements, cost sharing and priority corridors should be considered.

- Kansas must invest in transit, rail, aviation, and bicycle/pedestrian paths to provide a quality transportation system that serves all Kansans.

Stay Tuned:

The task force will release a final report of the recommendations in early 2019. The report will be available at www.kslegresearch.org under “Recent Publications.”
ISSUE:
REPORT: Vehicle Registration Fees as a Source for State Transportation Funding

BACKGROUND:
Both the states of Kansas and Missouri are considering funding options to support ongoing transportation needs throughout the state.

Missouri
With the defeat of Proposition D, 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.

Kansas
The Kansas Joint Legislative Transportation Vision Task Force has completed their statewide meetings and has developed initial recommendations from their assessment of testimony provided from August to December. Supporting a recommendation to increase overall funding, one option being discussed includes a special fee on electric vehicles (EV). Currently, 20 states institute such fees for EV and hybrid-EVs, with some states providing discounted vehicle registration rates for these types of vehicles.

MARC recognizes the need to increase transportation funding in both states and supports all users paying a fair share for maintenance and further development of the transportation system. However, with data from the 2018 ozone season showing that the Kansas City region is one part per billion (ppb) away from violating EPA health-based ozone standard, all funding alternatives should consider potential impacts to air quality and contribution to carbon emissions that impact our climate.

Staff will report on vehicle registration fees as a potential funding source and possible impacts.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.
Vehicle Registration Fees Fact Sheet

All 50 states require motor vehicles to be registered and titled with the state’s transportation agency or department of motor vehicles.

**Basis for Vehicle Registration Fees (VRF)**

Registration fees vary from state to state but are usually based on a flat fee or one or a combination of the following:

- Vehicle weight
- Vehicle age
- Vehicle value
- Fuel economy (MPG)
- Horsepower

- Weight, age, and value are the most common basis for fees.
- Missouri is the only state to scale VRF on taxable horsepower.
- Oregon is the only state to use fuel economy to scale VRF.

**Registration and Title Fees By State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat Rate</th>
<th>Weight-Based</th>
<th>Value-Based</th>
<th>Age-Based</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

![Map showing registration and title fees by state](image-url)
Additional Fees for Electric Vehicle and Hybrid-Electric Vehicles

Some states include an annual fee on electric and hybrid-electric vehicles, largely to make up for the loss in gas tax revenue. Most fees go into a state motor fuel tax fund, however some states direct revenues into a special EV infrastructure funds.

- 20 states charge a fee for EV and/or hybrid-EVs (Including Missouri).
- 9 states are considering legislative actions to enact fees on EVs.
- 9 states have voted down legislation for fees on EVs (Including Kansas (2017)).

Regional Comparison of VRF Basis and EV Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Basis for VRF</th>
<th>Fees for EV</th>
<th>Fees for Hybrid-EV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Horsepower</td>
<td>$75/yr.</td>
<td>$37.50 (PHEV)/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois*</td>
<td>Flat fee</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa*</td>
<td>Vehicle value + weight</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Flat fee + Vehicle value</td>
<td>$75/yr.</td>
<td>$75/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma**</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>$100/yr.</td>
<td>$30/yr. (PHEV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Flat fee</td>
<td>$100/yr.</td>
<td>$100/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Flat fee</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Vehicle value + age</td>
<td>$50/yr.</td>
<td>$50/yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EV discounts: Illinois discounts registration for EVs by $35, Iowa discounts $15-25 depending on age of vehicle.

**Oklahoma’s HB 1449 was deemed unconstitutional (procedural) and was struck down by the Oklahoma Supreme Court in October 2017.
ISSUE:
REPORT: Operation Green Light Program Update

BACKGROUND:
Operation Green Light (OGL) is a regional effort to coordinate the operation of over 700 traffic 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 software. OGL also hosts on its server 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.

Better traffic signal timing reduces unnecessary signal delay, resulting in improved traffic flow and air quality. The total annual program operating costs for OGL are approximately $1.1 million and utilize federal Surface Transportation Program and other funds coming from the 26 partner agencies.

Staff will provide an update on recent program accomplishments and upcoming projects at the meeting.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Ray M. Webb
ISSUE:
REPORT: FHWA Climate Adaptation Grant

BACKGROUND:
In June 2017, the Board adopted the regional Climate Resilience Strategy. One recommendation in the report was to conduct a detailed climate vulnerability assessments in the transportation sector. In February 2018, MARC received a $150,000 grant to advance that work through the FHWA Resilience and Durability to Extreme Weather Pilot Program.

MARC is working in partnership with Kansas State University to model flood risks to transportation facilities in the Blue River watershed, and then to evaluate watershed mitigation strategies to offset identified risks. The project was framed in ways to integrate with the Integrated Blue River Watershed Feasibility Study being carried out in partnership with Johnson County, Kansas and Kansas City, Missouri. Project recommendations will be evaluated for inclusion in the watershed study, in the regional transportation plan, and the regional hazard mitigation plan, as appropriate.

Staff will provide an overview of the grant, with potential future implications for the regional transportation plan.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Tom Jacobs
TTPC AGENDA REPORT

Month 2018
Item No. 13

ISSUE:
REPORT: Annual Policy Review

BACKGROUND:
MARC strives to operate in an open and transparent way that demonstrates that the organization is an effective steward of public resources. The MARC Board, TTPC, and a number of other committees are responsible for developing and approving project funding allocations to specific projects.

The committee processes ensure that federal, state and local funds available to the metropolitan area are invested in ways that benefit the region and local communities. The MARC Board of Directors has approved the attached Conflict of Interest and Whistleblower policies, to provide guidance to the participants in MARC committees regarding conflicts of interest and actions to take in those circumstances, and on processes to report any wrongdoing in the administration of MARC’s work.

Members of the MARC Board of Directors and the committees that support the Board are expected to review the policies annually.

The policies are intended to supplement, but not replace, any state or federal laws that govern conflicts of interest in public, non-profit, and charitable organizations and that govern the reporting of wrongdoing.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION:
None.

RECOMMENDATION:
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT:
Ron Achelpohl
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.

If such a report is made regarding a member of the board, committees or commissions, the following steps will be taken:

- MARC staff, including the Executive Director, will review the information and attempt to clarify if a conflict of interest exists or if additional information is needed. MARC staff will contact the board/committee member and discuss the issue. In most cases, the issue may be one of clarifying a relationship or disclosing it for future decision-making processes.

- If the conflict is one that could raise questions by funding agencies or others regarding MARC’s decisions, the issue will be discussed with the MARC board officers to determine appropriate disciplinary and corrective action.

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 and May 23, 2017)*
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.
• 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.