Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. RTP2050 Project prioritization process
   • Project scoring
   • Financial capacity
3. Programming policy discussion
4. Public engagement and outreach timeline
5. Next meetings
Project Prioritization Update
Call for projects

• Opened Feb. 26-April 25
• Projects posted for public review & comment on May 7.
• Scores finalized early July
  • Scores available at www.marc.org/2050
  • Network/land use growth scenarios to be presented at Aug. 13 RTP2050 Workgroup Meeting
## Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th># of applications</th>
<th>Cost in 2019 $(in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway/Roadway</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>417</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,050</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee role

- Assist with project prioritization
- Assist in plan strategy development
Why am I up here?

1. Review financial planning requirements
2. Share key assumptions
3. Preview preliminary revenue and cost projections
4. Discuss new revenue sources to consider
5. Next steps
Financial plan requirements

- Per 23 CFR 450:
  - Account for “reasonably available” revenues
  - Account for capital, operating and maintenance costs for existing and future major roadways and transit facilities
  - Financially constrain proposed investments
Financial plan structure

Separate analyses for

- State highway systems
- Major local projects
- Transit
Key assumptions

Annual revenue growth rates
- Federal – 2.9% per FAST Act
- Kansas State System – 1.5% per T-WORKS
- Missouri State System – 1.9% per MHTC fund distribution policy & STIP
- Local – 2.5% per Census of Governments
- Transit – 1.8% per National Transit Data Base (NTD)

Annual Cost Inflation Rates
- Highways - 4% per FHWA Construction Cost Index
- Transit – 1.8% per NTD
Expected revenues

**State**
through 2050:
- Kansas = $6.2 billion
- Missouri = $4.9 billion

**Local**
through 2050:
- Kansas - $11.7 billion
- Missouri - $12.5 billion
Transit revenues

$7.3 billion through 2050

Billions

- Other
- Local
- State
- Federal
Operations & maintenance (O&M)

KDOT
- O&M = $2,560/mile
- 1,960 miles = $342 million

MoDOT KC District
- O&M = $7,049/mile
- 2,878 miles = $2.5 billion
Operations & maintenance (O&M)

Kansas
- Local = $7,049/mile
- 2,443 miles = $1.5 billion

Missouri
- Local = $7,049/mile
- 4,130 miles = $2.5 billion
Transit O&M

$5.1 billion for existing system through 2050

[Bar chart showing $4.19 billion, $0.74 billion, and $0.21 billion for MO, KS, and Street Car respectively.]
## System reconstruction & rehab costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>35%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td>$1.85</td>
<td>$2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-NHS Federal Aid</td>
<td>$2.07</td>
<td>$5.17</td>
<td>$7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2.81</td>
<td>$7.02</td>
<td>$9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missouri</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-NHS Federal Aid</td>
<td>$2.97</td>
<td>$7.43</td>
<td>$10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4.07</td>
<td>$10.18</td>
<td>$14.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- FHWA’s: “Highway Economic Requirement System (HERS)"
- Reconstructing existing lanes
- 4% construction rate

*Billions **$

*[Billions **$]
# Project application costs

$15.1 billion through 2050

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th># of applications</th>
<th>Cost in 2019 $ (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway/Roadway</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>417</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,050</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Map of project types](https://marc.org/2050)
New possible funding options

- Regional transportation tax on Internet Sales
  - Regional VMT Tax
  - Tolls – I-35 and I-70
  - Region-based fuel tax
Regional transportation sales tax (Internet)

1/4 of a cent: $15.27
3/4 of a cent: $40.64
Regional VMT tax

- $6.54
- $38.50
- $15.00
- $20.00
- $25.00
- $30.00
- $35.00
- $40.00
- $45.00

Billions

$0.017  $0.10
Tolls

- I-35 @ 33 miles
- I-70 @ 25 miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-35</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KS - I35 vs MO - I70
Proposed 4% fuel tax

Based on Missouri HB 1157

Missouri 4 cent Gas Tax

- City (15%): $0.88
- County (15%): $0.88
- MoDOT (70%): $4.13

---
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Staff questions

- Are revenue assumptions reasonable?
- Are O&M costs reasonable?
- Are there other new revenue mechanism we should consider or avoid?
Financial next steps

- Rebuild system impacts
- Finalize cost
- Apply final cost – what can we build?
Programming Policy Discussion
Background

- MARC uses the transportation plan to guide investments of federal funds.
- The plan includes policies to balance regional and local goals.
- Project scores reflect relationships to the plans.
- How well have recent programming cycles (STP, CMAQ, TAP) aligned with plan guidance?
STP TAKEAWAYS — POSITIVES

- Project scores significantly influence project selection.
- Influence of project scores on project selection increased in this round.
- 67% of entities seeking funding have received it over the last two funding cycles.
- PSP related projects fared better when compared to all submitted projects.
STP TAKEAWAYS — ROOM FOR GROWTH

• Median score of submitted and funded applications has decreased from previous round
• “One-project per agency” practice leads to skipping many high-scoring projects, which tend to be:
  • Complete Streets
  • Transit Accessibility & Capital
  • Bicycle / Pedestrian
• “One-project per agency” practice disproportionately negatively impacts funding of projects in large core entities.

CMAQ TAKEAWAYS — ROOM FOR GROWTH

• Alternative Fuel, Diesel Retrofit & Outreach/Other category is undersubscribed
Regional Transportation Plan 2050

What is a Regional Transportation Plan?

The Regional Transportation Plan serves as a blueprint for managing the region’s transportation system. Required by the federal government, this plan identifies transportation improvements for the next 20 to 30 years. For the Kansas City region, the current RTP is called Transportation Outlook 2040. MARC is developing a new plan for 2050 for the Kansas City region, called Regional Transportation Plan 2050.

The RTP will consider:

- Projected population and employment growth.
- Maintenance of transportation facilities.
- Safety.
- Quality of life.
- Preserving the human and natural environment.
- Climate change and energy use.
- Public health.
- New technologies and innovations in transportation.
- Current and future transportation needs (air, bicycle, bus, pedestrian, rail, roads, water and others.)

The plan identifies needs and sets out a budget for federal transportation.

**RTP 2050 Project Summaries For Public Review and Comment**

Social media:  [Facebook](https://facebook.com) | [Twitter](https://twitter.com)

**RTP 2050 Story**

- Overview
- Needs Assessment
- A Model Future

**Plan documents**

- The Kansas City Region’s Transportation Vision & Road Map
- Preliminary survey results
- Regional vision and needs assessment
- Policy framework development process

**Steering committee documents**

- May presentation
- July presentation
- October presentation
- Scenario analysis and project selection presentation
- Evaluation Criteria Workshop presentation
- January presentation

[marc.org/2050](http://marc.org/2050)
APPENDIX H: PROGRAMMING POLICY STATEMENT

Background

As the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for Greater Kansas City, MARC is responsible for facilitating the development of long-range transportation plans to guide the investment of federal funds for surface transportation projects and programs. Transportation Outlook 2040, adopted in June of 2010, is the region’s current Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

In 2012, Congress passed Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century or MAP-21, a new surface transportation authorization for fiscal years 2013 and 2014. Among the significant policy themes in MAP-21 was emphasis on streamlining the federal transportation fund program structure and project delivery process and emphasis on new performance-based planning processes. In 2013, MARC conducted a comprehensive review of its transportation programming processes and structures in response to MAP-21. This review resulted in a number of changes to MARC’s transportation programming processes and committee structure, including the following recommendation:

The Total Transportation Policy Committee (TTPC), with input from the MARC Board of Directors, Air Quality Forum and other MARC policy-level committees, should provide a statement of programming policy direction to the planning and programming committees with each update to the region’s long-range transportation plan. For programming activities in 2014-2015, TTPC should provide this guidance based on the policy framework of Transportation Outlook 2040 and its performance measures and targets. With the update to Transportation Outlook 2040 and its successors, this statement should be embedded in the long-range transportation plan.

This document has been developed to provide policy direction for MARC’s transportation programming activities.

Policy Considerations

a. The Transportation Outlook Policy Framework: It is the policy of the Mid-America Regional Council to award sub-allocated federal transportation funding to eligible local priorities that advance regional goals and objectives, strategies and actions as articulated in the plan.
TO2040 Programming Policy Statement

• Section 1 – Policy Considerations
• Section 2 – Committee Roles
• Section 3 – Specific Program Guidance
RTP2050 programming policy statement discussion
TO2040 Programming Policy Statement

#1 Goal discussion:

- What should be the overriding goal of MARC’s transportation programming activities?
- What should be our objectives, what should we accomplish with sub-allocated funds?
- What should the result be?
- Should this statement apply to projects programmed through MARC (sub-allocated funds) and/or also to projects in the TIP?
TO2040 Programming Policy Statement

For programming activities, TTPC should provide guidance based on the policy framework of Transportation Outlook 2040 and its performance measures and targets.

#2 Objectives Discussion:

• Advance regional goals and objectives, strategies and actions.
• Improve performance towards set targets/performance measures.
• Make investments to improve performance in all goal areas.
#3 Strategies Discussion:

- Give priority to funding to projects that advance goals and strategies of the region’s Clean Air Action Plan.
- Give priority to funding of projects developed through the CSP or PSP programs.
- Prioritize investments that strengthen centers and corridors.
- Projects spanning KS/MO rivers – must comply with regional policy on bike/ped accommodations.
- Continue Planning Sustainable Places Program.
- Complete Streets Policy.
#4 ISSUE: Committee considerations for development of recommendations:

- The full mix of eligible project types under their purview.
- Regional policy goals and objectives as described above.
- Project scores.
- Planning committee priorities.
- Project sponsor priorities.
- Other concerns.
TO2040 Programming Policy Statement

Issues

• Small City/Large City distribution strategies
• Federal Share Uncertainty
• Skipping High-Scoring Projects
• CMAQ “buckets”
Public Engagement and Outreach
Next Steps
Next steps

- Present scenario analysis and transportation network land use growth scenarios to various groups and seek comments and feedback (through late summer 2019).
- Project prioritization (through late 2019).
- Concurrent: Continue RTP strategy development and plan/website development

- **Tuesday, Aug. 13 at 3:00 p.m.**
  - Project and scenario review & engagement oversight
- **Monday, Oct. 7 at 1:30 p.m.**
  - Project prioritization & selection & strategy development
- December/January 2020
- March/April 2020