



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 3, 2026

9:30 AM

MARC Board Room

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. **Vote:** Approval of May 6, 2026 meeting minutes
3. **Vote:** Approval of Suballocated Phase 1 Project Assessments
4. **Vote:** Approval of Critical Urban Freight Corridors Plan
5. **Vote:** Approval of Public Transit Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Targets
6. Smart Moves Plan Update
7. System Performance Report Target Setting Methodology: Transit Accessibility
8. Activity Based Model Development Update
9. Other Business
10. Adjournment

SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS

Please notify MARC at 816-474-4240 at least 48 hours in advance if you require special accommodation to attend this meeting (for example, qualified interpreter, large print materials, 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 [Title VI information page](#).

TAC AGENDA REPORT

June 2026

Item No 3

ISSUE: VOTE: 2026 Suballocated Call for Projects - Project Assessments

BACKGROUND:

One of MARC's fundamental roles as Metropolitan Planning Organization is to facilitate processes for cooperative decision-making about the use of federal transportation dollars for projects and programs in the Kansas City area. A call for projects for the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP), Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) program, Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) and Surface Transportation Block Grant Program - Set Aside Program (TAP) programs [was recently launched](#) and closed on March 20, 2026.

MARC conducts the 2026 call for projects in two phases. The first phase (ongoing) assesses project applications for consistency with regional plans and policies. The second phase will evaluate project applications using the scoring methodologies established by the various programming committees as in previous funding rounds.

MARC staff has conducted an evaluation/assessment of all projects submitted in response to this call for projects (1st phase). This evaluation/assessment was then released to members of the TAC for review/concurrence/additional feedback. Concurrence with staff evaluation and feedback was collected from members of the TAC through Wednesday 27th, 2026. **A summary report of this feedback is included following this staff report.**

During the TAC meeting of June 2026, staff will provide a summary of completed evaluations from TAC membership. Staff will seek a recommendation be forwarded to TTPC for their review and approval at their June committee meeting.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

It is the policy of the Mid-America Regional Council to award suballocated federal transportation funding to eligible projects that advance regional goals, objectives, strategies and actions as articulated in [Connected KC 2050](#), the metropolitan transportation plan for the Kansas City region.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:

Preliminary funding amounts for the two-year period of FFY 2029-2030 are noted in the following table. These amounts remain subject to change during the call for projects timeframe.

FFY 2029-2030 Preliminary Funding Amounts		
Program	Kansas	Missouri
CRP	\$ 4,800,000	\$ 7,100,000
CMAQ	\$ 6,100,000	\$ 5,700,000
STBG	\$ 37,500,000	\$ 40,000,000
TAP	\$ 5,800,000	\$ 12,600,000
Total	\$ 54,200,000	\$ 65,400,000

FFY 2029-2030 Advance CMAQ Allocations		
Program	Kansas	Missouri
Active Transportation Program	\$ 76,000	\$ 76,000
Air Quality Public Education	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000
Way to GO	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000
Total	\$ 1,206,000	\$1,206,000

FFY 2029-2030 Advance STBG Allocations		
Program	Kansas	Missouri
Operation Greenlight	\$ 1,062,414	\$ 2,367,734
Planning Sustainable Places	\$ 800,000	\$ 900,000
Total	\$ 1,862,414	\$ 3,267,734

RELATED JURISDICTIONS:

This item impacts all counties in the MARC region.

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend approval of project alignment assessments as discussed at the June 3, 2026 TAC meeting.

STAFF CONTACT:

Martin Rivarola
Bobby Evans

2026 Call for Projects - MARC Suballocated Programs

Technical Advisory Committee's

Assessment of Staff Evaluation/Comments

The table below summarizes TAC members' commentary and concurrence with MARC staff assessments. Each TAC member was allotted one comment box per project reviewed.

Category	Count
Total of projects submitted for consideration:	101
Total projects reviewed by TAC members:	98 *
Committee members who participated in review process:	17
Total of TAC committee reviews and comments:	648
Average of reviews/comments per evaluated project	6.6
Total # of committee concurrence with staff assessments	617 "Yes" (95% of total)
Total # of committee dissent with staff assessments	31 "no's" (5% of total)
Total # of reviewed projects with full TAC concurrence w/staff	73 projects – all "yes"
# of reviewed projects with at least 1 review w/ dissenting comment	25
Reviewed projects w/ 1 "dissenting" comment	21**
Reviewed projects w/ 2 "dissenting" comments	2
Reviewed projects w/ 3 "dissenting" comments	2

**Reviewed projects w/ 1 “dissenting” comment	
179th Street - Switzer Road to Antioch Road	83rd and Kill Creek Intersection Improvements
Blue Ridge Boulevard Historic Trail Retracement	
Entrance Sign Marker	Grandview Community Walking Loop
Gregory Blvd Transportation Accessibility Improvements	Holmes Road from Blue Ridge Boulevard to 135th Street
I-435 and Johnson Drive Intersection Improvements	KCATA Bus Stop Improvements
Langsford Rd - 291 Hwy to East City Limits & 5th Terre	Mission Road (143rd to 151st)
N. 72nd Street Complete Street Improvements - Parallel Pkwy. to Leavenworth Rd.	Commercial Ave Pavement Improvement - M-291 to Independence Street
Platte City Downtown PSP Phase 2	Rt 9 Corridor (Downtown Triangle)
Scherer Parkway - Sampson Rd to Ward Rd	Second Creek Trail
Winner Rd Bridge over CPKC	NW 56th Street
3rd Street at US50 Interchange Improvements***	Independence Phase 1 - Chipman to 2nd***

* 3 projects not previously reviewed due to technical issues.

** Reviewed projects with ONE “dissenting” comment (21): Comments ranged from suggestions that categorization should be higher (majority) – to suggestions to improve on scope of project. Of these 21 projects, categorization was as follows: 1 Highly Aligned/15 Aligned/5 Not Aligned.

*** Projects currently categorized as “Aligned” (2). Sponsor and TAC committee member request that due to high number of advanced strategies and project being a supporting program, that it be listed as “Highly Aligned”. MARC staff comment: This was an oversight error in the tabulation tables and project should have been categorized as “highly aligned”. Of note, 10 other projects were found to be in similar status.

MARC staff recommendations (for projects with one ‘dissenting comment’):

- **For 19 projects:** Given majority of received comments on these projects were in concurrence with MARC staff evaluation, **note and pass on comments to project sponsors. Retain categorization of projects as noted by Staff.**
- **Further, recategorize two projects (3rd Street and Independence Phase 1) to highly aligned, along with 10 other projects in similar status.**

Four (4) projects with at least 2 or 3 “dissenting” comments

- A) 175th St & Pflumm Roundabout (2 dissenting comments)
- B) Lone Elm Rd, 159th St to 167th St Improvements (2)
- C) 4H & DeSoto Roundabout & Trail Project (3)
- D) NE Shoal Creek Parkway from Maplewoods Parkway to Staley Roadway (3)

A) 175th St & Pflumm Roundabout Categorization: Not Aligned

Staff Comments: Project does not align with MARC's policies on green infrastructure. Project might align and improve their project application if green infrastructure elements are incorporated, or if the project application clearly explains why elements are not incorporated. This could include additional detail and study on the necessity of green infrastructure in this project scope. These details will be scored in Phase II of the Call for Projects.

Agree with Staff categorization (Yes/No) & Committee comments:

- Yes: na; Yes: N/A Yes: Minimal discussion on green infrastructure
- Yes: No additional suggestions Yes: Nothing to add.
- **No: A corridor should have green infrastructure. For one-off intersection improvements, I think there should be a different level for assessing what is the potential for green infrastructure. A project should not be considered 'not aligned' just because green infrastructure is not a core tenant of a single intersection project.**
- **No: None.**

Note: None of the ‘dissenting’ comments originate from the project sponsor. Of note, project sponsor will have opportunity to adjust scope/provide further detail about project through Phase 2 application. Questions about green infrastructure should be able to be addressed at that point.

MARC staff recommendation: Retain categorization of project as “**Not Aligned**” due to green infrastructure policy.

B) Lone Elm Rd, 159th St to 167th St Improvements Categorization: Not Aligned

Staff Comments: Advanced CKC2050 Strategies (6). Project is not considered aligned with Connected KC 2050 policies. The proposed project adds volume and ROW to a road with minimal traffic. No study was provided to warrant increased capacity, and the project does not address a bottleneck identified in MARC's congestion management report.

Agree with Staff categorization (Yes/No) & Committee comments:

- Yes: Nothing to add Yes: None Yes: na Yes: Agree with staff recommendations
- **No:** The comment 'No study was provided to warrant increased capacity' is not altogether fair. A study may be helpful but MARC does not officially require a road capacity study to justify scoring or alignment. If a study is going to be necessary for MARC staff to review, that should be communicated through a separate conversation rather than through this Policy Alignment comment section. Also, the statement 'The proposed project adds volume' is a bit too simplified of a statement. As an alternative, says that 'The increase in roadway capacity will account for rising traffic volumes and would likely induce additional demand' would be a bit more accurate.
- **No:** Address the bottleneck issue.

Staff note: Both 'dissenting' comments are TAC committee members who also represent project sponsor. Project is not in conformance with CM policy.

MARC staff recommendation: Retain categorization of project as “**Not Aligned**” due to CM policy.

C) 4H & DeSoto Roundabout & Trail Project Categorization: Not Aligned

Staff Comments: Project does not align with MARC's policies on green infrastructure. Project might align and improve their project application if green infrastructure elements are incorporated, or if the project application clearly explains why elements are not incorporated. This could include additional detail and study on the necessity of green infrastructure in this project scope. These details will be scored in Phase II of the Call for Projects.

Agree with Staff categorization (Yes/No) & Committee comments:

- Yes: na Yes: Please take a close look at MARC staff comments. This is a worthy project with better definition. Yes: nothing to add Yes: Project is highly aligned if green infrastructure features are incorporated.
- **No:** Maybe a commitment to a number of trees placed could replace green infrastructure for one-off intersection projects.
- **No:** Roundabouts are great for GHG and traffic calming for non motorized users
- **We request that the project alignment be reconsidered.**

Note: One of the 'dissenting' comments originates from the project sponsor (City of Lansing). Two of these comments originate from other committee members. Of note, project sponsor will have opportunity to adjust scope/provide further detail about project through Phase 2 application. Questions about green infrastructure should be able to be addressed at that point.

MARC staff recommendation: Retain categorization of project as “**Not Aligned**” due to green infrastructure policy.

D) NE Shoal Creek Parkway from Maplewoods Parkway to Staley Roadway Categorization: Aligned
Staff Comments: Advanced CKC2050 Strategies (4). Project is not considered aligned with Connected KC 2050 policies. The proposed project adds volume and ROW to a road with minimal traffic. No study was provided to warrant increased capacity, and the project does not address a bottleneck identified in MARC's congestion management report.

Agree with Staff categorization (Yes/No) & Committee comments:

- Yes: na; Yes: nothing to add; Yes: N/A; Yes: None
- **No**: It is nice to see that the project is looking into the existing trail networks and what connections can be made. Can't tell from provided information if additional lanes are required. (James Dunn, Northland Transportation Committee)
- **No**: perform preliminary engineering study to understand needs better.
- **No**: Looks like an error in assigning the Aligned rating.

Staff note: None of the 'dissenting' comments originate from the project sponsor (City of KCMO). However, this project is not in conformance with CM policy. This error in tabulation was elevated by committee review. Project should have been labeled as "**Not Aligned**".

MARC staff recommendation: Recategorize project as "**Not Aligned**" due to CM policy.

Recommendations for adjustments to other projects

Projects to be elevated from "Aligned" to "Highly Aligned" to account for prior mis-tabulation of projects:

- Byars Road from Highgrove Road to MO 150 Highway
- 167th Street Improvements, Kill Creek to Waverly
- Blue Ridge Boulevard from Grandview Rd to West Frontage Rd
- 15th Street Intersections Improvements (Main St to Goode Ave)
- 135th Street Multipurpose Trail
- 4th Street Arborway and Safety Improvement Project
- Norby Road Multi-Purpose Path
- Platte City Downtown PSP Phase 1
- Platte City Downtown PSP Phase 2 (1 dissenting comment in favor of elevate categorization)
- NW 56th Street (1 dissenting comment in favor of elevate categorization)

Summary Recommendations:

- Reclassify 12 projects from "Aligned" to "Highly Aligned".
- Reclassify 1 from "Aligned" to "Not Aligned" (**NE Shoal Creek Parkway from Maplewoods Parkway to Staley Roadway**)

TAC AGENDA REPORT

June 2026
Item No. 4

VOTE: CRITICAL URBAN FREIGHT CORRIDORS

BACKGROUND

Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs) are important freight corridors that provide critical connectivity to the Nation Highway Freight Network (NHFN). By designating these important corridors, States and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) can strategically direct resources towards improved performance and efficiency of goods movement.

In urbanized areas with a population of 500,000 or more individuals, the MPO may designate CUFCs in consultation with the State. MARC designates the CUFCs in the Kansas City urbanized area in coordination with the Kansas and Missouri Departments of Transportation. A public road designated as a CUFC must meet one of more of the following elements:

- a) connects an intermodal facility to:
 - a. the PHFS;
 - 2. the Interstate System; or
 - 3. an intermodal freight facility;
- b) is located within a corridor of a route on the PHFS and provides an alternative highway option important to goods movement;
- c) serves a major freight generator, logistic center, or manufacturing and warehouse industrial land; or
- d) is important to the movement of freight within the region, as determined by the MPO or the State.

Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) has asked MARC to review the CUFCs in the Kansas City urban area to incorporate into an update of the Kansas State Freight and Rail Plan. Staff presented an overview of this information in May.

MARC staff developed a list of prioritized corridors based on projects identified in existing plans and programs, including MARC's long-range transportation plan Connected KC 2050, suballocated call for projects for Surface Transportation Block Grants (STBG), and MARC's regional freight plan Connected Freight KC 2050.

Staff are recommending the following corridors be recommended for approval by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to update the CUFCs in the Kansas counties of the Kansas City urbanized area. This list was reviewed by city staff from identified jurisdictions, and prioritized into three tiers based on scoring and alignment with MTP and local priorities:

Jurisdiction	Route	Start Point	End Point	Miles
Tier 1				
Olathe, Johnson County	Lone Elm	175th	159th	4
Olathe/Gardner, Johnson County	175th Street	I-35	US 169	3.25

Gardner, Johnson County	US-56 (New Century & I-35 Interchanges)	Moonlight Rd	I-35	1.5
Unified Government, Wyandotte County	Bridge Replacement Kansas Ave. Bridge	Berger Ave	MO State Line	0.5
De Soto, Johnson County	83rd St. Bridge over BNSF & US Army RR			0.25
Merriam, Johnson County	Shawnee Mission Parkway/I-35 Interchange and Corridor	Mastin St.	Craig St.	1.5
Tier 2				
Shawnee, Johnson County	Shawnee Mission Pkwy	Pflumm Rd	I-435	2.5
Shawnee, Johnson County	Shawnee Mission Pkwy	I-435	K-7	3.75
Unified Government, Wyandotte County	Turner Diagonal	K-32	Leavenworth Rd	4
Olathe, Johnson County	167th	Hedge	US 169	2
Olathe, Johnson County	159th Street	North Loop (NCA)	Ridgview	4.8
Johnson County	K-10	I-435	Cedar Creek Rd (UZA Boundary)	7.4
Tier 3				
Unified Government, Wyandotte County	I-435/State Ave Interchange			1
Lenexa, Johnson County	95t St	Renner	Loiret	1
Lenexa, Johnson County	Lackman	101st	105th	0.35
Olathe, Johnson County	K-7 (Old 56 and Harrison)	K-10	175th	10.2

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

MPOs are responsible for designating public roads for the CUFCs in accordance with section 1116 of the FAST Act and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act section 11114 (23 U.S.C. 167(f)). State and MPO designation of the CUFC is limited to a maximum of 150 miles of highway or 10 percent of the PHFS mileage in the State, whichever is greater.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

None

COMMITTEE ACTION

Recommend approval of the Kansas Critical Urban Freight Corridor (CUFC) priority list to the Total Transportation Policy Committee (TTPC).

RELATED JURISDICTIONS

This project impacts the 9-county MARC region.

STAFF CONTACT

Cy Splichal, Transportation Planner

TAC AGENDA REPORT

June, 2026
Item No. 5

VOTE: REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SAFETY PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURE TARGET (PTASP)

BACKGROUND

The Federal Transit Administration requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations to adopt regional targets for the performance measures included in Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans (PTASP). These measures cover a wide range of safety-related metrics. The “rates” noted are calculated per 100,000 Vehicle Revenue Mile (VRM):

- Major Events
- Major Events Rate
- Collision Rate
- Pedestrian Collision Rate
- Vehicular Collision Rate
- Fatalities
- Fatality Rate
- Transit Worker Fatality Rate
- Injuries
- Injury Rate
- Transit Worker Injury Rate
- Assaults on Transit Workers
- Rate of Assaults on Transit Workers
- System Reliability

These measures apply separately to each mode. The modes in the MARC region include Fixed Route Bus, MicroTransit, and Streetcar.

MARC staff consulted local transit agencies’ PTASP reports. For modes where only one transit agency operates in the region (e.g. streetcar) staff recommend adopting the agency’s targets. For modes where more than one transit agency operates in the region, staff have developed regional targets that accommodate all agencies’ targets.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Federal regulations require MARC to adopt Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Performance Measure Targets

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

None.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Vote.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Performance Measure Targets as presented.

STAFF CONTACT
 Bobby Evans, AICP

Public Transit Agency Safety Plan Targets, 2026

	Safety Performance Measure	Fixed Route Bus Target	Non-Fixed Route Bus Target	Rail Target
Measure 1a	Major Events	9	0	20
Measure 1b	Major Event Rate	2.5	0.0	4.440
Measure 1.1	Collision Rate	2.0	2	3.55
Measure 1.1.1	Pedestrian Collision Rate	0.1	0	0.22
Measure 1.1.2	Vehicular Collision Rate	1.8	3.6	2.88
Measure 2a	Fatalities	2	0	0
Measure 2b	Fatality Rate	0.1	0	0
Measure 2.1	Transit Worker Fatality Rate	0	0	0
Measure 3a	Injuries	24	2	4
Measure 3b	Injury Rate	4.5	0.14	0.880
Measure 3.1	Transit Worker Injury Rate	4.5	0	33
Measure 4a	Assaults on Transit Workers	30	0	33
Measure 4b	Rate of Assaults on Transit Workers	2.7	0.0	7.330
Measure 5	System Reliability	230,000	4,084,085	12,500

TAC AGENDA REPORT

June 2026
Item No. 6

REPORT: SMART MOVES TRANSIT PLAN UPDATE

BACKGROUND

Enhanced transit services have long been desired in the Kansas City metropolitan area to meet multiple goals for quality development and access to opportunity for area residents and businesses. In 2017, MARC and partners updated the region's Smart Moves public transportation vision plan. This plan included an integrated set of strategies and project proposals to improve transit services throughout the region.

While this plan has provided a framework for most of the region's recent high profile transit investments, the pace of implementation has been slow due to a variety of factors, particularly the lack of locally supported implementation plans and funding. Now there is a sense of urgency about public transportation in the context of rising needs and declining services in many parts of the region.

MARC has advanced an update the Smart Moves plan with a particular focus on developing investible implementation strategies rooted in local priorities, served by a range of service types that are regionally connected. This update delivers major re-prioritized Smart Moves service recommendations, including anticipated capital and operational costs. Potential local funding mechanisms have also been identified. The work has also included a benefit cost analysis. MARC anticipates public outreach regarding the outcomes of this work in the late summer/early fall of 2026.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Briefly describe how the issue relates to policy goals of Connected KC 2050 or other MARC plans or policies.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

None.

COMMITTEE ACTION

TTPC has been engaged in this discussion.

RELATED JURISDICTIONS

This item impacts all counties in the MARC region covered by the Smart Moves plan.

RECOMMENDATION

None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACTS

- Lukas Yanni, Transportation Planner III
- Martin Rivarola, Transportation Planning Director

TAC AGENDA REPORT

June 2026
Item No. 7

REPORT: 2026 SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT - REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES/TARGET SETTING FOR TRANSIT ACCESSIBILITY

BACKGROUND

As part of a performance-based planning process, MARC and planning partners are required to establish targets for and monitor progress related to a set of national performance goals in the areas of safety, infrastructure condition, system reliability, among others. This is part of a coordinated effort across transportation planning to make data-driven and data-informed decisions when programming funds. As the MPO for the region, MARC is responsible for ensuring the responsible use of federal funds that enables progress on these measures.

In addition to federally required performance measures and targets, MARC's [transportation performance management program](#) has yet to establish targets for a certain set of voluntary performance measures as recommended by MARC's Connected KC 2050 plan.

In the June 2026 TAC meeting, staff will provide an overview of MARC's transportation performance management program, including major upcoming milestones and timeline. The target to be approved at a future TAC meeting will be based on the fast and frequent network approved as a part of the Smart Moves Plan expected later in 2026.

The methodology creates a quarter-mile buffer around each transit stop in the MARC Urbanized Area. Each stop is then designated as part of the "fast and frequent" transit network - 20 minute or less frequency - or "all transit" - routes with greater than 20-minute headways. Next, population and jobs within those walksheds are calculated. The summary table below compares the population and jobs served by all transit and fast and frequent transit compared to the Urbanized Area as a whole.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

MARC's Connected KC 2050 plan recommends a set of voluntary targets be developed and adopted by MARC in advance of the launch of the next update of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

None.

COMMITTEE ACTION

None. Information only.

RECOMMENDATION

None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT

Bobby Evans, AICP

Year	Groups with Access to Transit	Served by All Transit (#)	Served by All Transit (%)	Served by Fast & Frequent Transit (#)	Served by Fast & Frequent Transit (%)	% of All Service Identified as Fast and Frequent
2024	<i>Population</i>	406,560	20.9%	74,213.92	3.8%	18.3%
2024	<i>Jobs</i>	396,921	38.0%	114,756	11.0%	28.9%
2026	<i>Population</i>	363,075	18.4%	88,992	4.5%	24.5%
2026	<i>Jobs</i>	382,586	35.6%	120,276	11.2%	31.4%

TAC AGENDA REPORT

June 2026

Item No 8

ISSUE:

REPORT: MARC Regional Travel Model Program Update and Activity-Based Model (ABM) Development

BACKGROUND:

Over the past 30 years, MARC has developed and maintained a regional Travel Demand Forecast Model (TDFM) serving the bi-state planning area. This model analyzes travel patterns and plays a critical role in developing long-range transportation plans and supporting informed decision-making across the regional transportation system.

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the next MARC Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is due by 2030, with a planning horizon extending to 2060. In light of significant shifts in travel behavior observed in the post-pandemic era, MARC is preparing to transition to a next-generation Activity-Based Model (ABM). This advanced modeling approach will provide deeper insight into key issues such as traffic congestion, remote work trends, community impacts, and multimodal transportation planning.

At the upcoming ATC meeting, staff will present an update on the MARC modeling program, along with a project summary of the ongoing ABM development effort.

The report is organized into four sections:

1. Regional Travel Model Overview

Trip-based, four-step model is currently used to forecast travel demand, analyze system performance, and support planning decisions.

2. MARC Modeling Program

Ongoing model maintenance, data integration, and technical support for regional planning, LRTP/TIP development, and environmental analysis.

3. Data Support and Coordination

As part of MARC modeling program, we maintain a data request and support process to provide model outputs, data, and technical assistance to local jurisdictions and partner agencies.

4. Activity-Based Model Status and Schedule

Next-generation model, ABM, simulates individual travel behavior, improves multimodal analysis, and better reflects emerging trends like telework. Development of the ABM is currently underway, including model framework design, data preparation, and calibration using observed travel data. The effort is led by the Cambridge Systematics team, with project completion anticipated in December 2026.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

None.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:

Activity-Based Travel Demand Model development budgeted for \$1.1M in 2025-2026 UPWP.

RELATED JURISDICTIONS:

This item impacts all counties in the MARC region.

RECOMMENDATION:

None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT:

Martin Rivarola

Eileen Yang



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 6, 2026

9:30 AM

MARC Board Room

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. **Vote:** Approval of April 1, 2026 meeting minutes

Motion: Lisa Womack

Second: Ryan Sims

3. **Vote:** Authorize Functional Classification System – 2026 Call for Changes

Alicia Hunter, MARC Staff, began by providing an overview of the Federal Functional Class system including key concepts of access and mobility as well as Federal Highway Administration procedures for designating and changing roadway classification. She then explained the MARC process for accepting Functional Class provided a walk through of the online portal for change submissions. She then explained the most recent refinements to the process including a limit to the number of change requests (20) and an accommodation for larger requests. Alicia detailed the next steps in the upcoming call for changes including two virtual offices hours sessions (June 5 and 26) with final recommendations on October 10th followed by approval from TTPC and MARC Board.

Motion: Sherri McIntyre

Second: Mark Shirley

The approval passed unanimously.

4. **Vote:** CKC2050 MTP Amendment Request – Central Avenue

Bobby Evans, MARC Staff, explained the details of the Central Avenue Bridge closure and the need for the project – based on a KDOT analysis provided to MARC. KDOT Staff Allison Smith answered questions about funding levels and timing.

Motion: Nicolas Bosonetto

Second: AJ Farris

The approval passed unanimously.

5. **Vote:** Regional Bikeways and Trails Plan Update

Patrick Trouba, MARC Staff, explained that the Regional Bikeways and Trails Plan was coming back to the committee for a second approval due to some changes to the facility network which arose from the approval discussion during the April TAC meeting. During the intervening month, Patrick and the plan consultant worked with City of Overland Park Staff – as well as other jurisdictions requesting changes – to make alterations to the plan network. The plan presented to the committee reflected the changes resulting from that collaboration.

Leslie Carr, City of Overland Park, commended the work by Patrick, thanked the team, and noted that she would be voting in favor of the plan as presented.

Motion: Selina Zapata-Bur

Second: Eric Rogers

The approval passed unanimously.

6. **Vote:** Missouri Unfunded Needs Process Update

Martin Rivarola, MARC Director of Transportation Planning, began with a reminder of the several previous presentations on this topic and an overview of the procedure. He then noted one change to the list of projects from the previously approved list from 2025 – an update to the priority of a project proposed by Bike Walk KC to update the facilities on the Heart of America Bridge.

Motion: Doug Wesselschmidt

Second: Tom Degenhart

The approval passed unanimously.

7. Reconnecting Eastside Planning Study Update

Selina Zapata-Bur, City of Kansas City, Missouri, introduced the project to the committee. Triveece Penelton, project consultant from Vireo, then presented on the history of the corridor and the inception of the study as part of a RAISE grant from the US Department of Transportation. Triveece then detailed the engagement process and the various alternatives considered. She went into more detail on the Parkway Alternative, which was emerging as the best option going forward. Triveece showed a video from the project website that illustrated how the Parkway Alternative would function and displayed several renderings of the alternative.

Co-Chair Dean Vakas asked about the history of the highway, asked about the nature of the consent decree governing the existing infrastructure. He also asked about the funding available and how the implementation would be funded. Ron Achelopol, MARC Director of Transportation and Environment, inquired about MARC's role in the project going forward in light of the fact that MARC was a party to the original consent decree.

Triveece – and other project team staff – explained that dissolution of the consent decree would provide the most leeway for applying the study's preferred alternative. Dissolution would require affidavits and letters of support and that MARC would need to be involved in the NEPA process. Selina expressed that the process of securing the letters of support and

affidavits was about to begin. Ron shared that the TAC Committee would be involved in the project going forward as well.

Co-Chair Vakas asked about the timeline for implementation. Triveece expressed hope that the project would be funded and implemented within 10 years but that improvements to key intersections, such as Gregory Blvd, would hopefully begin sooner. Sherri McIntyre shared that she was part of the original design team for US-71 and that the Parkway Alternative would be a great improvement on existing conditions.

Taylor Cunningham, City of Mission, Kansas, asked about any records of stories shared by community members who lived in the area during the demolition of the community and construction of US-71. Selina shared that these videos had been produced and were being posted on the project website on a rolling basis.

8. Planning Sustainable Places Program Overview and Call for Projects Announcement

Beth Dawson, MARC Staff, shared the history of the Planning Sustainable Places program as well as the successful implementation of many of the projects. She also detailed the funding mechanism for the program. Beth then shared the dates and details of the upcoming call for PSP projects beginning on May 4th and ending on June 22nd.

9. Critical Urban Freight Corridors

Cy Splichal, MARC Staff, provided an overview of the Federal Urban Freight Corridors program. He noted that designation of a roadway as part of this network allows for a higher federal match rate on project funding. Cy listed the corridors in Kansas and noted that the Missouri portion of the MARC service area had no corridors designated. Cy detailed the next steps in the process including a review of the corridors for the upcoming KDOT State Freight and Rail Plan. MARC staff will complete a tiered list of recommended corridors for TAC approval in June of 2026.

Ryan Sims asked about the National Highway Freight Network map displayed in the slide. Cy noted that the map was available online and that MARC provides an online freight map as well.

10. 2026 Suballocated Programs Call for Projects

Martin Rivarola, MARC Director of Transportation, began this presentation with an overview of the programming process with a timeline and detailed account of funding available to applicants. He then covered the application and grant prescription status in both Kansas and Missouri along with applications by type. Last, Martin covered the next steps in the process for the TAC members.

11. Other Business

Martin Rivarola, MARC Transportation Director, introduced the committee to Daniel Vasquez. Daniel is a fellow through the Young Leaders of the Americas Initiative who is working at MARC until May 21, 2026.

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 am