

600 Broadway, Suite 200
Kansas City, Missouri 64105-1659

816-474-4240
816-421-7758 FAX
marcinfo@marc.org
www.marc.org



Active Transportation Programming Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024

Time: 10:30 AM to 12:00

Location: In-person – Westview Room, MARC Offices and online via Zoom.

Attendees:

AJ Farris, KCATA
Allison Smith, KDOT
Athena Huynh, City of Grandview
Bailey Waters, City of Kansas City, MO
Public Works
Bradley Hocevar, City of Edwardsville
Brian Nowotny, Jackson County Parks +
Recreation
Brian Shields, City of Overland Park
Chuck Soules, City of Smithville
Dave McCumber, City of Blue Springs
Doug Wesselschmidt, City of Grandview
DuRon Netsell, MO Community
Representative
Grant Purkey, City of Harrisonville
James Wong, Kansas City Parks &
Recreation
Jenny Kramer, KDOT
John Davis, Clay County Parks &
Recreation
Jason Waldron, City of Kansas City, MO
John Jacobson, Leavenworth County
John Neuberger, Sierra Club

Juan Yin, MODOT
Lisa Donnelly, Jackson County Parks +
Recreation
Marisela Ward, MoDOT
Mark Lee, City of Bonner Springs
Matt Davis, Jackson County Parks +
Recreation
Mario Vasquez, City of Kansas City, MO
Mayra Toothman, City of Smithville
Nicholás Bosonetto, City of Kansas City,
MO Public Works
Nicole Brown, JCDHE
Rodney Honeycutt, City of
Independence
Rodney Riffle, Johnson County PRD
Shelie Daniel, City of Kearney
Soma San, Leavenworth County
Steve Casey, City of Lee's Summit
Tim Nebergall, City of Gladstone
Travis Hoover, City of Riverside
Wendy Shay, City of Independence
Wes Minder, Platte County

MARC Staff:

Marc Hansen
Martin Rivarola

Patrick Trouba
Ron Achelpohl

Agenda:

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. VOTE: Approve the December 6, 2023 Meeting Summary

- a. Summary approved

3. TAP Balances

a. Kansas program balances (Patrick Trouba)

- i. Balance at start of FY 2024: \$5.28 million
- ii. Obligations so far: \$875,000
- iii. **Balance after obligations: \$4.4 million**
- iv. Programmed for FY 2024: approximately \$3.5 million
- v. **Balance if FY projects obligate: \$923,840**
- vi. Allison Smith: I have very different numbers from the February balance report we sent you. If everything obligates as planned, including a couple of non-programmed projects, I have your balance at a little more than \$1.5 million for 2024. We really need to get that balance down this year if possible.
- vii. Patrick Trouba: I don't think we were intending to discuss any more allocations on the Kansas side, it seemed like we had done all we could do for now, but I have the spreadsheet and can pull it up if needed.
- viii. Ron Achelpohl: Patrick, are we concerned about any of the program projects needing to commit to a later year? Patrick Trouba: I haven't heard anything from project sponsors about that at this time.

b. Missouri program balances (Patrick Trouba)

- i. Balance at start of FY 2024: \$17.1 million
- ii. Obligations so far: \$1.47 million
- iii. **Balance after obligations: \$15.63 million**
- iv. Programmed for FY 2024: \$9.2 million
- v. **Balance if FY projects obligate: \$6.3 million**
 1. Needs some qualification
- vi. MODOT 120% goal to obligate: \$6.6 million
- vii. Expected obligations:
 1. MARC staff expectation to obligate this year: \$5.8 million – \$7.3 million
 - a. Going to need project updates to clarify which projects we can count on going this year.
 2. \$1.6 million – optional funding target for reallocating funds to this fiscal year.
 3. Patrick Trouba: The extra \$1.6 million would bring us up to a total obligation amount of about \$9 million. Doing this would help the TAP program itself. But since MODOT is also setting obligations to all of the different federal funding programs that we manage here, this would also benefit the other programs.
 4. AJ Farris: Does that mean we need, essentially, already approved projects to obligate \$5.8 million more, or new projects to meet that MODOT goal? Patrick Trouba: The \$5.8 million number is essentially what is already programmed. That's not all of what is programmed but, looking at the field of projects that what we expect will obligate this year. \$7.3 million is the high end of the

obligation expectations. Obligating more provides a cushion for the \$6.6 million goal that MODOT has set, we are proposing it to the committee as an option to reallocate about \$1.6 million more.

5. Juan Yin: Is this balance only for the TAP or is there other funds?
Patrick Trouba: This is only for TAP. If the TAP program allocates more than the target, this would help other programs correct? Like STP and CMAQ in our region?
Ron Achelpohl: That's our understanding. MODOT's target for us of 120% of our portion that applies to all of the programs, it's not program specific. MODOT has also indicated that if we are able to obligate more than 120% they are open to it.
Juan Yin: Yes, that is the guideline we received.

viii. List of Projects, MO specific:

1. Patrick Trouba: Because it is a possibility that we can allocate additional funds to projects in MO that can take additional funds, we thought we would show you some of these projects and go through some updates to see where projects are at and if they are set to be obligated this fiscal year or very shortly.

c. Review of projects programmed for 2024, updates:

- i. Blue Ridge Blvd (Doug Wesselschmidt): We would like to be able to obligate that project and let it within the next 4 months. We have a funding gap that we are working with FRA on as well as the CPKC railroad. The TAP portion of the project is to add bike multiuse trail on one side of the road and a sidewalk on the other to tie into current conditions on the west and future conditions on the east.
- ii. Independence, Truman Connect (Patrick Trouba): We think they're still planning on obligating this year, however it could be at the tail end of the fiscal year.
- iii. Little Blue Trace/Rock Island (Matt Davis): We have agreements in place with all the property owners and we are in the process of completing the acquisition of those parcels. We are on track to obligate this year. This is a joint project between KC and Jackson County, KC is acquiring the parcels.
 1. Brian Nowotny: Significant funding gap from what was allocated previously through TAP and others. A project in need of additional funding. There is an updated budget for that project as well, so you all can look at the most current numbers.
- iv. Martha Truman Connect (James Wong): We received PS&E approval from MODOT, so we intend to have the project obligated in the next 4-5 months. We would like to get additional TAP funding if available to fund the project 80%. Bailey Waters: We were going to propose that a different project on the list move its funds to this one.
- v. KCI Corridor Trail Segment 3 (Bailey Waters): This one is on track to obligate.

- vi. US 69 bike/ped overpass (Bailey Waters): This one could use additional funds, quite a significant amount. If we were able to get those it should be able to happen in 2024.
 - vii. Route 9/NW Prairieview (Bailey Waters): We want to keep on schedule for 2024.
 - viii. Complete Streets improvements, 3rd St. (Steve Casey): All but 2 parties have reached agreement on condemnation. Project is on schedule and could accept additional TAP funds. About 28% of the total cost of the project qualifies for TAP funding (\$1.7 million). Getting close to obligation.
 - ix. Vivion Rd. trail segment 1 (Travis Hoover): There's one property to acquire on the KC side and we are ready to obligate this year. We are looking for additional funding as well.
 - x. Commercial pedestrian project (Chuck Soules): The project should be ready to go in June 2024, also need additional funding.
 - xi. Smithville Streetscape Phase III (Chuck Soules): The project is going as planned, should be in the next month or so.
 - xii. Patrick Trouba: there are several projects that we anticipate will not obligate in 2024 even though they are programmed for that year. Greenwood Connector, 23rd Street Complete Streets, Lexington Gladstone Bikeways and Missouri River Trail segment 1.
 - 1. Greenwood Connector: Jefferson to Hamblen Rd.
 - 2. 23rd Street (M-78 Highway) Complete Streets
 - 3. Lexington Gladstone Bikeways
 - 4. Missouri River Trail Segment 1
 - 5. Bailey Waters: For the Lexington Gladstone and MO River Trail we want to propose releasing those and giving those funds to other projects that will obligate on our list. For these two projects we can implement with local funds.
 - 6. Nicolás Bosonetto: What is the maximum amount of TA funding that a project can receive? Patrick Trouba: It depends on what the committee wants to do. In programming when we first took in applications the maximum was \$750,000. We're also thinking about discussing whether that should be raised today, to say \$1.5 million or possibly higher. Nicolás Bosonetto: and it has to be 80/20? (24:23)? Patrick Trouba: Yes.
 - 7. Wes Minder: Has the MODOT OPA right of way review process gotten better? It is February and it may still take 6-9 months to get the consultant. Chuck Soules: on our streetscape plan I worked very closely with the consultant, and it only took about 30 days. But I worked very closely, phone calls everyday.
 - xiii. Linden Connector (Tim Nebergall): Making progress, getting tied up in environmental issues. MODOT has committed to helping us get through the environmental. We are still working to be obligated this fiscal year.
- d. Potential funding reallocation amounts

- i. Patrick Trouba: Column A of the spreadsheet was in your packet, this shows how much additional funds 2024 projects could add to their funding to be brought to 80%. The second column is hypothetical by MARC staff, to make that additional \$1.6 million reallocation that was split between all the projects we thought would obligate this fiscal year. For most projects that pans out to an additional \$177,000. Column N is a prorated scenario in which we looked at how much TA funding the project already has, and adjusted that by percentage (on a proportional basis).
- ii. Nicolás Bosonetto: How come KCI Corridor Trail Segment 3 isn't included? Patrick Trouba: It sounded like that project was already obligated by now or very soon.
- iii. Martin Rivarola: For interest of discussion, we put column L and M as a starting point. There is another version which is taking some of those 2024 KCMO projects that are no longer pursuing local funds reallocated some of those dollars to these KCMO projects.
- iv. Martin Rivarola: If a project is already obligated, we cannot release more funds.
- v. Wes Minder: If that project is already obligated and you take the 400 off, does that mean you have an extra 400 in your calculations?
- vi. Mario Vasquez: For the sake of simplicity and because the numbers are close, we want to propose that we move Lexington Gladstone's funding to the Martha Truman Connector Trail.
- vii. Patrick Trouba: Martha Truman Connector Trail can take up to \$312,000 in additional TA funds. James Wong: So we looked at the cost, we think we can take \$342,000 with that to get up to 80%.
- e. *Created a new column on TAP projects excel sheet
 - i. Martin Rivarola: Add Martha Truman's \$342,000 that is trying to be transferred. Let's go back and look at the other \$400,000
 - ii. Marc Hansen: Bailey said that MO River Trail \$500,000 was going to need to be reallocated somewhere else. Bailey Waters: So the MO River Trail \$500,000 we would like to add to the KCI corridor trail segment 1 because that is the segment that has not been obligated yet. Patrick Trouba: Segment 1 did obligate. Wes Minder: my last week there, all three segments obligated.
 - iii. Martin Rivarola: That leaves the US 169 Overpass and Route 9. Mario Vasquez: I think on that one we would definitely be willing to move that from MO River Trail to the overpass. Both of those projects are going to get obligated this year.
 - iv. Nicolás Bosonetto: Do we need to pass a vote to allow that project to have \$1 million dollars? Mario Vasquez: If we accept these transitions, then we must decide how we distribute the remaining \$1.6 million. We can vote on these now, zero out columns L and M and then get a better idea of how that gets reallocated. Wes Minder: Where did the \$1.6 million come from? On the initial spreadsheet I thought the number was a larger amount of money. Patrick Trouba: The \$1.6 million is a

provided cushion for the program so that it meets its funding obligations. If everything obligates we should get fairly close.

- v. Doug Wesselschmidt: So what we're doing right now is moving KCMO money from a KCMO project to another KCMO project? Patrick Trouba: Yes, they are proposing moving money from their projects that are not likely to obligate this year to ones that will.
- vi. Chuck Soules: Before we make a motion, should we see how the others pan out? AJ Farris: KCMO is allocating to KCMO to projects they are planning to obligate. It will allow us further down to have a better understanding of money that's leftover for us to allocate to other projects. Bailey Waters: The initial vote is on column N. Then the \$1.6 million would then be divided in a different vote and you would likely get more money.
- vii. Chuck Soules: If Smithville's project wasn't going to go, we should drop it from the conversation. If KCMO has two projects that aren't going to go, should they just be dropped out of the conversation rather than reallocating? Mario Vasquez: What we're doing is enabling projects that are moving forward to do so, which is in the interest of the region. They are defederalizing, they are not going to ask for federal funding on some projects, only local funds.
- f. **Motion for a vote on column N, reallocation of KCMO funding from projects that will not obligate to KCMO Martha Truman Connector Trail and US 169 Bike/Ped Overpass (Route 152 Segment 10)¹**
 - i. **Vote passes with none opposed.**
- g. Marc Hansen: These targets from MoDOT are shifting, so providing yourself with a cushion, whatever that is, this committee has a balance of funds approaching \$12 million dollars. MoDOT is holding us responsible for all of that, so moving the \$842,000 doesn't burn you further down the line. My recommendation is continue down the path of at least \$1.6 million in obligation funding.
- h. Brian Nowotny: Let's look at the revised list for the \$1.6 minus the KC Martha Truman Project because it has now been taken care of. Martin Rivarola: To develop this new scenario, we have shown a few different ways of doing it. One was same amount down the board and the other was more proportional to the TA funds that have been previously programmed. What is the preference?
 - i. Wes Minder: Are there any of these projects that close some gaps of existing corridors? That would be a good preference to give more to those that complete links. Marc Hansen: I would caution, if you commit to accepting these additional dollars to obligate in federal FY2024 and you fail to do so, these dollars do not carry into the following fiscal year. You would revert back to the dollar amount that you had. So if you are uncertain about obligating in FY2024, carrying that into your thinking as well.

¹ See attachment of post-meeting summary for results of funding votes.

- ii. Brian Nowotny: With that in mind, let's verify that all of the projects on the list can definitively move forward this year. Ron Achelpohl: It is also likely that we do a similar exercise next year, so if you feel like your project is not going to obligate this year you may have another chance.
 - iii. AJ Farris: Step 1, identify the projects that are definitely going to move forward.
- i. Brian Nowotny: As Matt said with the Jackson County presentation, the Blue Trace/Rock Island Connector is a project that can move forward, we're confident. Mario Vasquez: How much money are you looking for Matt? Matt Davis: Honestly, we will take what we can get. We have a low amount of federal funding relative to the project total. We are going to be overmatched significantly anyway.
- j. Patrick Trouba: If we are thinking about the even split scenario, I took the remaining projects and divided the \$1.6 evenly. That came out to \$228,570 for all except two projects because they can take less due to 80%.
- k. Mario Vasquez: Even though we put \$500,000 into the US 169 overpass, that project could use additional funds as well. We are also overmatched, so if there is an ability to add that project back into consideration of the \$1.6, we would like to. Wes Minder: There is \$16-17 million in the next call for TAP projects, is \$1.6 the right amount? If there's a risk, do we want to go over? If we are at risk of losing money, should we just fund these projects that have been around forever and get them done?
- l. Chuck Soules: From my perspective, I appreciate any money we can get. Right now we are \$460,000 short of 80%, and with the current estimate and our current budget, we could get this done by the latest July. But without the extra funding we may not be able to do this project. We can do it from a planning perspective, but the financial perspective is in question. We may have to cut other projects to get it done.
- m. Doug Wesselschmidt: What are you thinking Wes? Turn the \$1.6 into \$2 or \$2.6 million? Can we see what it would look like if we evenly distribute \$2.5 million? Or can MODOT weigh in on that scenario?
- n. Marc Hansen: We may need to look at how much is obligated for 2025 and 2026. Patrick Trouba: 2025- almost \$10 million. 2026- \$8.73 million. Marc Hansen: When you look at the way MODOT is structuring this, the TA program has a total available amount at this moment is approaching \$17 million. You could theoretically spend all \$17 million this year if that's what you wanted to do. But that will impact your ability to keep projects on track in following years. This program gets anywhere from \$5.5 to \$6 million dollars over that period a year. If you expend your whole balance, that's all you have available to you and once enough projects have gotten in the door and used that money, the remainder will have to wait until the next fiscal year. You can spend more amounts, but it does impact you in future years.
- o. Brian Nowotny: The reality is that we have money waiting on projects. Mario Vasquez: What's the harm of thinking about taking the balance down by 33% in a three-year spend-down rather than MODOT's 20%?

- p. Jason Waldron: I want to add this for consideration as numbers are getting bigger. We just passed out of committee a local match for the Grand bike/ped bridge. The project is ready to go, we are in final stages and agreements are signed. That number is rounding up to \$9.8 million, not counting local match. It checks a lot of boxes, and would like to have it done for the World Cup and of course the KC Current stadium needs it.
- q. Marisela Ward: I just have a comment to add. With the TAP funding everyone has to remember that this is for sidewalks and trail items. Looking at larger projects like bridges we can do 30% over what a ped facility would cost, but we don't want to use this funding for anything that is not ped-related. Jason Waldron: If that was directed at what I mentioned, our project is exclusively a bike/ped bridge.
- r. Wes Minder: Can we tackle the smaller projects that only need a little bit of money? Or are we all okay with the \$2.5 million? Brian Nowotny: I didn't hear objections. Patrick Trouba: That comes out to \$357,000 per project unless they can't take that much. Mario Vaquez: We would want the overpass project considered too, so the number may be smaller.
- s. (unknown): We are talking about \$2.5, but knowing how much there is there also understanding that it might impact future years, is \$2.5 going to be enough for everyone or should we be looking at more? Adding another project, should there be conversation of pushing it a bit further? Martin Rivarola: The question is asking whether \$2.5 million is the right number or should the committee be considering something larger. I would recommend that the numbers for \$2.5 million up for visual and divide \$2.5 by the 8 projects if they can take as much.
- t. AJ Farris: in the interest of what Jason brought up, what is the process for getting a project that is not on this list, on this list? It sounds like it's rare, but it can be done. I'm interested in finding more ways to get funding for the Grand bike/ped bridge, is that something we vote on to be added to the list? Nicolás Bosonetto: I would point out that this bridge is necessary, there's no pedestrian connectivity. And now you have games there. This project was on the TIP, what happened is KCATA pulled their money out. This is not a completely new project, just to clarify. AJ Farris: Are we only looking at these projects or can we as a committee put that bike/ped bridge project on the list? Wes Minder: So, if that's the project's \$8-9 million, do you have the local match identified (Nicolás Bosonetto: Yes, just voted on it today), second question is where is the rest of the money coming from? Nicolás Bosonetto: The \$9.8 with a \$2 million dollar match would build a bridge. Wes Minder: It's fully funded now. Nicolás Bosonetto: No, we would need \$9.8. Wes Minder: Obviously there's not \$9.8 here. We don't want to fund a project that's not fully funded, because it would recreate a possible obligation issue. Jason Waldron: The total project value is \$12 million, so \$9.8 of that we are looking for federal regional grant funding, and then the local match commitment just passed out a TINO this morning. That local match is \$2.4 million. Nicolás Bosonetto: Is there additional funding coming in for that bridge? Mario Vasquez: There is, we're still working through it, I

can't definitively say as of now because it's part of the budget process and is going to get voted on March 31. The biggest question I have is whether there is not enough capacity to fund it at \$6 million, or is there a possibility that we can give that project \$7 million, and it's taken care of this year?

Brian Nowotny: I don't think we can. I think that needs more discussion. I think what we have is an opportunity and I've come up with \$2.5 million to be able to get close on most of these projects, to get them going and out this year.

i. **Wes Minder: Motion to approve the \$2,5 million allocation column.**

1. Patrick Trouba: This column isn't quite \$2.5 million, there were some projects that couldn't take that amount. Smithville is still a bit under, as well as some others. So, it's about \$2.2 million.

Chuck Soules: So, you have about \$300,000 to give to projects that need them.

Wes Minder: What if you split the 2 between the Little Blue and the Smithville job? That would get you almost to

you 80%. Maybe make them both \$460,000. Patrick Trouba: That adds up to \$2.486 million in total.

ii. **Chuck Soules: I make a motion to approve column M.**

1. **Brian Nowotny: Second**

a. Marc Hansen: If you add the \$2.5 million, then what is the total of what is expected to be obligated in 2024? Including the projects that took additional dollars from KCMO and reallocated. With the additional programming we are at around \$10.6 million. Balance in the program is around \$17 million.

iii. Mario Vasquez: I am going to put something on the table regarding 2025 money for 11th and 12th street. Frankly speaking, we have been in limbo with that project, partly because of what's going on with the Royals, etc. That's something that we're going to have to figure out and get this money back in 2025. To help us with our project on 169 bridge, we would like to shift that there and program that this year and help with balances on TAP program. We would be happy to defederalize that other project. Nicolás Bosonetto: What is the matching capacity on the 169 bridge? Patrick Trouba: \$1.9 million. Mario Vasquez: If the committee would accept that, we would defund in 2025 11th and 12th street, and add those funds in 2024 to the US 169 overpass, and the balance of funds remains as proposed to you.

1. \$750,000 added to column O for US 169 project.

iv. **Vote taken on Motion for approval of column M and reapproving column O with US 169 project included.**

1. **(unknown from recording) motions, Chuck Soules seconds.**

2. **Vote passes with none opposed.²**

4. MO Unfunded Needs

a. Martin Rivarola: We generated a list of projects that would think would belong in an updated unfunded needs list, now we need to prioritize that list.

² See attachment of post-meeting summary for results of funding votes.

There is 28 of them. We are going to a follow-up survey asking you to rank them. From there we will get an initial committee ranking that we will bring back to you at the May meeting. At that meeting we will have a conversation on what the recommendation should be. We will also engage the BPAC committee on that.

5. 2024 Programming Update:

- a. Martin Rivarola: These are programming targets for the upcoming funding cycle. For the interest of the ATPC we are looking at \$4.5 million on the KS side and \$14.2 million on MO side for fiscal year '28-'28.
- b. Marc Hansen: That number is expected actual allocation + 20% to deal with MODOT's balance requirements. Everything is subject to change. These are outside the window of federal transportation legislation. Proceed with caution. Martin Rivarola: These numbers are larger than we have looked at this this committee before, keep that in mind. Bailey Waters: I want to clarify that these are for just this next round that would cover a 2-year cycle or just 1 year? Marc Hansen: That is the total available on a 2-year cycle.
- c. Martin Rivarola: The call opens next week, there will be a pre-application workshop on March 7, preapplication phase I closes on April 5. Staff will be conducting the assessment and engaging with our planning modal committees to review how well these projects align with the transportation plan. We are looking forward to doing a planning committee workshop June 6 and the outcomes of the first phase in June. That sets us out for the technical application opening on June 19. We will have another workshop June 16, and applications are July 26. August into September will be scoring, and then putting them back in from of programming committees Sept-Oct looking at having a TTPC release. We want to have the process wrapped up 11 months from now.
 - i. Wes Minder: Has there been any thought about requiring a governing body resolution committing to matching funds so that there's the commitment of the TTPC to fall back on? Marc Hansen: We don't require an ordinance; we do require you to certify that you will have the local match available. You are welcome and encouraged to submit an ordinance that you do have as supporting documentation for your application. It will probably carry some weight and would be helpful to have.
- d. Martin Rivarola: Carbon reduction and CMAQ will use the same application. For the discussions we've been having around TA funds, CMAQ does not have a good committee to have those programming discussions, and carbon reduction doesn't have those either. We are going to be setting up a work group, and developing a process so that these two programs can have a committee home. We are going to be looking at doing that over the next couple of months. We have a few different options for that. CMAQ has buckets of funding that must be used for different modes, some of them have been undersubscribed/oversubscribed in the past, so we will put that on the table.

- e. Martin Rivarola: We had discussed previously the subject pertaining to CAPS for funding for TA funds. We have historically had a cap of \$500,000/project on KS and MO sides. For the last cycle we adjusted the caps and elevated it to \$750,000 maximum/project. We would like to ask what the well of the cap is, if the committee would like to change that or keep it as is. As the starting point discussion, we think that doubling those caps makes sense, but I want to give the opinion of the committee.
 - i. Wes Minder: I like the caps because they provide for spreading of regional implementation and regional plans. However, the amount has to be at least \$1 million. Matt Davis: You can barely get a project in for \$750,000.
 - ii. Wes Davis: I think you need the cap, it's important to spread bike/ped across the region.
 - iii. Martin Rivarola: I am looking forward to programming for the next cycle and they are higher.
 - 1. Wes Minder: \$1.5 million would give you about 10 projects. Doug Wesselschmidt: If the committee wanted to fund more projects, then they would reduce that.
 - iv. **Wes Minder: Motion to increase the cap to \$1.5 million.**
 - 1. **(unknown from recording): Second**
 - 2. Mario Vasquez: The smaller communities that can't come up with matching funds might have a concern. On the flip side, projects aren't getting cheaper, and the resources are needed. If they can't find the help their project may have to wait until they can find the help. Matt Davis: And they can apply for lower figure.
 - v. **Vote taken on motion to increase cap to \$1.5 million.**
 - 1. **The vote passes with none opposed.**

6. Community Representative Seats

- a. Patrick Trouba: We have nominations for community representative seats. We have 5 candidates for these seats, 2 voting members with an alternative. Candidates:
 - i. Dr. John Neuberger – current Kansas co-chair
 - ii. Craig Lubow (alternate only)
 - iii. DuRon Netsell (current voting member)
 - iv. Bill Blessing
 - v. Ted Smith
- b. The process would look like the committee taking a non-binding ranked-choice poll to get a sense of preferences. We advise that they don't have to attend the meeting. Motions can then be made to confirm members and alternates. The two top ranked people would be suggested to be voting members.
- c. **AJ Farris: Motion to accept the first two ranked choices (Dr. Neuberger, DuRon Netsell) as voting committee members.**
 - i. **(unknown from recording): Second**
 - 1. **The vote passes with none opposed.**

- d. **AJ Farris: Motion to accept the second two ranked choices as alternate committee members (Bill Blessing as DuRon Netsell's alternate, Ted Smith as Dr. Neuberger's alternate).**

- i. **Wes Minder: Second**

7. Adjournment