



MID-AMERICA REGIONAL COUNCIL

HIGHWAY COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, July 26, 2023

1:30 – 3:00 PM

MARC, Lewis & Clark Room, 2nd floor
600 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri

NOTE: This upcoming Highway Committee meeting will be held **in-person and via webinar**. To join the meeting via webinar, please follow the virtual meeting and call-in instructions below.

ACTION	AGENDA ITEMS	PRESENTERS	TIME
	Welcome and Introductions	Co-chair	1:30
Approve	Highway Committee May 24 th meeting summary	Co-chair	1:35
Updates	K-10 Update	Steven Cross, KDOT	1:40
Presentation	2023 Fall Call for Changes to Functional Class System	Alicia Hunter, MARC	1:50
Discussion	MARC Policy Updates: Complete Streets Policy Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox	Patrick Trouba, MARC Selina Zapata Bur, MARC	2:05
Updates	Roundtable Updates	Committee	2:40
Adjourn			3:00

VIRTUAL MEETING & CALL-IN INSTRUCTIONS

MARCZoom08

Address: <https://marc-kc.zoom.us/j/3086746761?pwd=end1eUxnRjdLUURWUEJ4UzRCc3QwUT09>

- You may need to run the Zoom opener to join the meeting.
- This link also works with the Zoom smartphone app.

Meeting ID: 308-674-6761

Passcode: 976329

Audio:

- **We encourage the use of computer audio** especially if you are viewing a webcam or sharing your webcam.
- **Dial Toll-Free**
 - 877 853 5247 US Toll-free
 - 888 788 0099 US Toll-free
- **One tap mobile**
 - +18778535247,,3086746761#
 - +18887880099,,3086746761#

NEXT HIGHWAY COMMITTEE MEETING: September 27th, 1:30 – 3:00 PM

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](#).

Highway Committee

May 24, 2023

Attendance

Sherri McIntyre, City of Liberty
Allison Smith, KDOT
Michael Spickelmier, City of Lansing
Josh Hartman, Burns and McDonnell
Carl Brooks, City of Harrisonville
Chad Thompson, KCMO
Joe Blasi, HNTB
Joshua Scott, MoDOT
Melissa Schmitz, MoDOT
Krystal Jolly, MoDOT
Tim Vandall, City of Lansing
Steven Cross, KDOT
Brandon McElhiney, City of Lenexa
Therese Vink, Olathe
Shannon Stafford, TSI
Kip Strauss, HNTB
Krystal Both, City of Basehor
Ben Will, HNTB
Ben Asnicar, Burns and McDonnell

MARC Staff:

Martin Rivarola
Selina Zapata Bur
Patrick Trouba
Beth Dawson

Agenda:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Approval of March 22nd Meeting Summary
- Updates: I-35 & I-29 PEL Study
- Approve: Connected KC 2050 Amendment #7
- Presentation: 2022 Programming Activity Review
- Presentation: Performance Measure – VMT Per Capita and EV Adoption
- Roundtable

MINUTES

1. Welcome and Introductions (Selina Zapata Bur)

Introductions were made. See attendance for those present.

2. Approve March 22nd Meeting Summary (Selina Zapata Bur)

The March 22nd Meeting Summary was approved unanimously by committee members.

3. I-35 & I-29 PEL Study Update (Josh Scott, MoDOT; Joe Blasi, HNTB)

Josh Scott and Joe Blasi presented an overview of the Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study analyzing the I-29/I-35/U.S. 169 corridor for traffic, safety and performance, and assets, including short and long-term solutions, described by Josh Scott as a “pre-NEPA” study going into the NEPA process. A study area map and description were provided and explained, along with key findings from data collection finding congestion areas, areas of safety concerns, and vehicle crash hot spot analysis. Multimodal considerations, existing conditions of interchanges, and environmental factors along the corridor area were also analyzed, mapped, and discussed as part of the study. The factors that triggered the project to be needed, as well as the specific purposes of the project were detailed, including safety improvements, infrastructural fortification, increasing capacity requirements, and transit/multimodal alternative needs. Other goals and principles are listed, with input from public engagement.

New since last July, a “Universe” of over 70 wide ranging alternatives was developed, grouped into 7 families including Intelligent Transportation Systems, Congestion Management, Freight, Highway Build, Multimodal, Non-Recurring Congestion Management, and No Action. The methodology for screening these alternatives was discussed, with 4 phases including methodology development, baseline conditions, alternatives development and analysis, and concluding with Organizing the PEL success, where the study is now as it develops a transition to NEPA. Each of these 4 phases was detailed as it relates to the development of each alternative, including the sorting into Primary and Complementary categories, organizing 7 resulting potential scenarios with maps and descriptions, and screening each of these scenarios quantitatively regarding traffic, safety, environmental, and cost.

The preliminary PEL recommendation is for scenarios 5, 6, and 7, while specific corridor recommendations will be identified in the NEPA phase. Next steps include concluding the PEL to NEPA transition and completing the PEL report. Sherri McIntyre asked about how the recent I-70 widening legislation may relate, and EA or EIS determination, and this was answered as being part of the PEL to NEPA transition process.

4. Approve Connected KC 2050 Amendment #7 (Martin Rivarola)

Amendment #7 for Connected KC 2050 including project cost amendment to project #1389, adjusting project limits of Project 1591 (I-35 in Kansas), removed already constructed project 1535, and consolidating several other projects on 135th and 133rd St. into one new Olathe Project in partnership with KDOT, *"I-35 and Santa Fe Corridor Improvement Project."* MARC staff recommends approval and release for public review and comment. Kystall Jolly from MoDOT notes that environmental work is being worked on for this job and they intend to stay on schedule for this project to begin construction in early 2026, due to end of life recommendation from engineering as well as funding available. Allison Smith from KDOT summarized Kansas implementation and funding details for projects. Therese Vink from the City of Olathe describes city project which combines these improvements and notes they are in the NEPA process and will be applying for grant funding later this year. Sherri McIntyre motioned to approve; Chad Thompson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Presentation of 2022 Programming Policy Review (Martin Rivarola)

Presentation by Martin Rivarola. Review of result of every other year process update. Pre-application 2-step process has been in place since 2018 with guidance from Connected KC 2050. Goals were to elevate projects that are in line with CKC 2050 goals, policies, and objectives, improving quality of applications, and allowing for reflective improvement between programming rounds. Table and bar graphs presented describing program application numbers between Kansas and Missouri with funding requests vs programmed funds. Projects were categorized into levels of alignment with CKC2050 goals and objectives and charted. This round had more aligned projects than previous rounds, with only 1 project non-aligned, showing effectiveness of rating system. Scoring system presented visually for Kansas and Missouri with funded projects aligning with higher scores and not funded projects generally scoring lower. The funded scores since 2018 were charted showing higher scores being funded over time compared to previous trends, and average scores of all scores has been rising over time, which is a positive result from the change in 2018. Additionally, the gap between Kansas and Missouri project has lowered over time. Type distribution was presented as a pie chart, with consistent makeup from previous years. A table with recommended projects over \$4,000,000 is shown, with the majority described as going to operations and safety improvements.

Takeaways from the process are listed with project emphasis on rehabilitation, safety, modernization and multi-modal access, complete street elements added, and a distributed spread of projects between small and larger cities and towns. Some Streetview images of future recommended project locations were then shown in many different areas, followed by a map with distribution of major projects between 2018-2022. Process is positively contributing to quality of submitted and funded projects over time. Focus and spread of projects has also improved with programming process.

6. Discussing of Performance Measures: VMT per Capita and EV Adoption (Selina Zapata Bur)

Selina Zapata Bur presented a description of performance-based planning and specific performance measures to inform future planning. Allows measurement of progress for regional goals to reduce VMT per capita as described in ConnectedKC 2050 and the 2021 Climate Action Plan. Context given with other cities VMT per Capita goals. Methodology for VMT per Capita outlined using VMT growth rate and MARC 2050 population forecast to calculate “do-nothing” 2050 scenario, assuming a 15%-20% reduction with Transportation Demand Management Strategies and calculating 2050 VMT per capita using discounted VMT number with population projection. Line charts presented with difference between “do-nothing” and 15% and 20% VMT discounts on VMT per capita illustrated, as well as total VMT changes over time. Next electric vehicle registration numbers were charted, and questions were raised for consideration.

“How important is it to adopt a VMT per capita target and/or an EV target?”

“Would you support a VMT per capita target that assumes a 15% reduction of 2050 VMT, or 20% reduction of 2050 VMT, and why?”

“Would you support an EV Adoption target that aligns with federal targets, targets from specific peer cities? -Federal Target: 50 percent of all new vehicle sales be electric by 2030”

Martin Rivarola noted importance to safety, environmental considerations, and how it helps accomplish long term goals as described in CKC2050. Kip Strauss noted EV considerations impact on greenhouse gas emissions as opposed to purely focusing on VMT reduction. Allison Smith agreed on EV target importance and mentioned availability of chargers being a driving force for adoption. The importance of individually tailored targets for adoption rather than comparing to other locations due to lagging adoption. Smith also mentioned growing interest in EVs throughout Kansas while at KDOT, with even very small communities showing future interest in expanded EV targets.

7. Roundtable Updates (Committee)

Allison Smith from KDOT mentioned that KDOT will be doing local consults this fall and will share details as that comes closer. Selina Zapata Bur asked about communities submitting Safe Streets for All grants for coordination. Sherri McIntyre mentioned the City of Liberty pursuing a planning grant for safety analysis.

Martin Rivarola reviewed the timeline for the long-range transportation plan, culminating in June 2025 with a 25-year planning horizon, and other shorter term engagement timelines this fall.

8. Adjourn

The committee adjourned at 2:49 PM.

NEXT MEETING: July 26, 2023, 1:30-3:00 PM

HIGHWAY COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT

July 2023
Item No. 5

ISSUE:

DISCUSSION: Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox Update

BACKGROUND:

MARC's [Congestion Management Policy](#) describes MARC's Congestion Management Process, a systematic way of monitoring, measuring and diagnosing the causes of current and future congestion on a region's multi-modal transportation systems; evaluating and recommending alternative strategies to manage current and future regional congestion; and monitoring and evaluating the performance of strategies implemented to manage congestion. The CMP also responds to requirements set forth by federal transportation legislation (23 CFR 450.320).

A policy update is required in coordination with updates to the metropolitan transportation plan, and review and update of the [Congestion Management Toolbox](#) is recommended at least every four years. Staff have provided the following discussion questions to help committee members and stakeholders prepare comments on updating the policy and toolbox:

- Which elements currently in the Congestion Management Policy are working well, and why?
- Are there elements you would add or change in the Congestion Management Policy? Why?
- The Congestion Management Toolbox details a wide range of alternative strategies to manage congestion. Are there any strategies you would add to the toolbox, and if so, please describe.

A survey for committee members and stakeholders to give additional input can be found [here](#).

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

Staff are soliciting comments and ideas from MARC committees and stakeholders about ways to update the Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Information only.

STAFF CONTACT:

Selina Zapata Bur

HIGHWAY COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT

July 2023
Item No. 5

ISSUE:

DISCUSSION: Complete Streets Policy

BACKGROUND:

The [Complete Streets Policy](#) applies to MARC's planning processes, including the programming of suballocated federal transportation funds. It seeks the implementation of Complete Streets, which are "streets, highways, bridges and facilities that are planned, designed, operated and maintained for the needs and safety of all users along and across the entire public right of way. This includes people of all ages and abilities who are walking; using powered, street-legal vehicles such as cars, trucks, motorcycles or buses; bicycling; using transit or mobility aids; and freight shippers. Complete Streets integrate contextually-appropriate green infrastructure techniques."

A re-evaluation of the policy before each new or updated metropolitan transportation plan is stipulated by the Complete Streets Policy itself. There is also an opportunity to integrate the [Complete Streets Network Assessment](#) into the policy. Staff have provided the following discussion questions to help committee members and stakeholders prepare comments on updating the policy:

- How can this policy better effect a complete multimodal network in the Kansas City region?
- Which of the 10 elements of a complete streets policy is most important to you? Which ones should MARC focus on in an update?
- What would you add or remove to the Complete Streets Policy? Why?
- What role(s) could the Complete Streets Network Assessment play in the Complete Streets Policy? How should gaps be prioritized?
- How should we integrate green streets/green infrastructure treatments into the Complete Streets Policy?

Committee members and stakeholders may also review the National Complete Streets Coalition's [10 Elements of a Complete Streets Policy](#). A survey for committee members and stakeholders to give additional input can be found [here](#).

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

Staff are soliciting comments and ideas from MARC committees and stakeholders about ways to update the Complete Streets Policy.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Information only.

STAFF CONTACT:

Patrick Trouba