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, May 8, 2024

Time: 10:30 AM to 12:00

Location: In-person – Lewis & Clark Room, MARC Offices and online via Zoom.

#### Attendees:

Alex Lopez, City of Independence

Allison Smith, KDOT

Alyssa Marcy, Unified Government

Art Gough

Athena Huynh, City of Grandview

Bailey Waters, KCMO

Bradley Hocevar, City of Edwardsville

Brian Nowotny, Jackson County Brian Shields, City of Overland Park

Bryant DeLong, City of North KC

Cecelie Cochran, FHWA MO

DuRon Netsell, MO Community

Representative

Grant Purkey, City of Harrisonville

Jared Campbell, Downtown Council of

KC

Jason Withington, Clay County

John Davis, Clay County Parks

Juan Yin, MoDOT

Maddie Waldeck, City of Basehor

Mark Lee, Bonner Springs

Mayra Toothman, City of Smithville

Michele Silsbee, City of Osawatomie

Nicole Brown, JCDHE

Rodney Honeycutt, City of

Independence

Rodney Riffle, JCPRD

Shelie Daniel, City of Kearney

Soma San, Leavenworth County

Steve Casey, Lee's Summit

Travis Hoover, Riverside

Wes Minder, Platte County

Zach Baker, City of Olathe

#### MARC Staff:

Beth Dawson Marc Hansen Martin Rivarola Patrick Trouba Raymart Dinglas

#### Agenda:

- 1. Welcome and Introductions
- 2. VOTE: Approve the February 21, 2024 Meeting Summary
  - a. Summary approved.
- 3. VOTE: Missouri Unfunded Needs bicycle/pedestrian list review recommendation from BPAC and approval of ATPC list (Patrick Trouba)

a. Patrick Trouba: MoDOT district offices work with planning organizations to identify and prioritize transportation projects for which no funding has yet been identified. If state transportation funds increase, projects from the unfunded needs list may be considered for funding. Earlier this year, from surveys, sponsors identified bicycle/pedestrian projects that they would like on the list. In late February, members of ATPC and BPAC took a rank ordered survey listing preferences for priority of these projects. Staff presented a recommended list to BPAC and it was approved. This is the recommended list that is presented to the ATPC that will be discussed, changed if needed, and sent to TTPC. There is a little over 10 projects, with the total estimated cost at \$68.5 million. The number of times in the top 10 refers to the amount of times in the prioritization survey respondents ranked the project in the top 10.

#### b. Discussion:

- i. Jared Campbell: As a representative of the Downtown Council, I would like to note for the record that we would love to see the Greenline be considered for a future list of this kind. I know this may need to come through the City of KC. For those of you that aren't familiar it's a proposed 10 mile urban loop that would be a biking/pedestrian trail from the MO river on the North, KS river on the West, the Paseo on the East, by Union Station and through the Crossroads on the South.
- ii. Brian Nowotny: Is it to be assumed that this exercise will be an annual exercise that the committee should anticipate?
  - 1. Martin Rivarola: Yes, that is correct. This is an exercise we have done on an annual basis for 4-5 years and I assume we will continue.
  - 2. Juan Yin: Yes, that is correct. We renew this list every year.
- iii. Wes Minder: We have been talking about the Rock Island and KD forever. I don't recall the scoring but my comment is that the Greenwood Connector would finish the KD connection and all of the investments the region has put in. Getting from the stadium to Pleasant Hill, etc. If money were to fall out of the sky it seems like that would be a huge regional priority that we could finish and move on to the next big project.
- iv. DuRon Netsell: I would like to state the impact and importance of the Swope Park/Central Valley connector. There's a beautiful trail to the North of Swope Park and some excellent trails to the South. If we can begin to connect those two, particularly through the park, I think that would be an exceptional project for the region and for KCMO.

#### c. Voting:

- i. Duron Netsell: Motion to approve the list as presented.
- ii. Bryant Delong: Second
- iii. Motion passed, presented list approved.
- 4. VOTE: Scope change: Unified Government BikeShare Expansion in Wyandotte County (Alyssa Marcy)

a. Alyssa Marcy: We are requesting a scope change for the \$100,000 CMAQ grant that we received for bikeshare expansion. Our needs have shifted since we received the money. What we are seeing is that in our Rosedale neighborhood we have the most use of e-bikes to the point where we do not have the supply to meet the demand. That is also a part of our city where we have the most expansive bike network. The second reason for the change of scope is that we are trying to prepare our transportation network for the 2026 World Cup, when we will have events in the Legends area/Village West. We did receive some additional funding from the state to expand a trail out there that is part of the Margaritaville development and that is in need of additional transportation options. We have a fairly limited scope in Wyandotte County. Our proposal is to focus specifically on the Rosedale neighborhood and on the Village West area in preparation for the World Cup. We also believe this to align better with our current projects. We are expecting some trail/sidewalk projects to be completed in 2026/2027 and at that point it might be a better time to introduce BikeShare into some of our other neighborhoods

#### b. Discussion:

- i. Bailey Waters: I am wondering what the initial scope was if you could clarify?
- ii. Alyssa Marcy: The initial scope was to expand BikeShare in some of our neighborhoods that don't yet have them. That includes Argentine, parts of downtown, and our Northeast area. We don't quite have the bike infrastructure needed in these areas for folks to ride safely and we're also seeing our priorities shift a bit.
- iii. Patrick Trouba: You are shifting some of the bikes to other areas, correct?
- iv. Alyssa Marcy: Yes, Rosedale will have more BikeShare, which is our highest used area. We will shift others to the Legends in preparation for the World Cup. We currently do not have anything in that part.

#### c. Votina:

- i. Nicole Brown: Motion to approve scope change.
- ii. Maddie Waldeck: Second
- iii. Motion passes, new scope approved.

## 5. VOTE: Scope change: Johnson County – Comprehensive Safe Routes to School Program in Johnson County (Nicole Brown)

a. Nicole Brown: There was a letter in the packet that gives a broad overview if you wish to read that. Our health department was fortunate to be provided this funding for 4 years in a row altogether, but unfortunately the first year of funding was 2020 when schools weren't open. We got started with the programming 15-18 months later than expected with a slow start. There still was limited access to schools and it was difficult to get things going. We've done well catching up, but we're coming up to our 4 year cycle and finding that we are likely not going to need to last bit of funding. The group that we contract with for the funding is also the recipient of the funding for the cycle coming up after this. We did not feel that we would be the best stewards of

these funds to be competing with the same agency that is also going to have these funds. We feel that it is the most fastidious use of the funds to return back the last bit that was not used.

#### b. Discussion:

- i. Allison Smith: Are you going to all of the funds, the \$150,000?1. Nicole Brown: No, just \$74,000.
- ii. Bailey Waters: To clarify, the scope change is just to reduce the scope, it's not actually changing?
  - 1. Nicole Brown: No, we are finding that it would be difficult for us to use the last of the funds and didn't want to wait until extremely last minute to finalize our arrangements. It's more a reduction in spending versus a change in the activities or programming that we are providing.

#### c. Voting:

- Mark Lee: Motion to approve scope change as outlined by Johnson County
- ii. John Davis: Second
- iii. Motion passes, scope change approved.

# 6. VOTE: Scope change: Kansas City, MO – Greenline Multimodal Corridor South Leg (Bailey Waters)

a. Bailey Waters: We are presenting a scope and schedule change for the Greenline Multimodal Corridor South Leg. This project was awarded \$750,000 of CMAQ money for design of the Greenline southern leg. The city doesn't want to move forward with that, because the railroad will not give the city a long-term lease agreement to build a trail on that southern leg. We would like to change the scope to a project that has previously received funding, but could use more funding. That is Cliff Dr. to River Market Connector Trail. It's in the Columbus Park neighborhood and that project has received \$750,000 of TAP money, but CMAQ money would be used to supplement that project. This CMAQ money given to Greenline was scheduled for fiscal year 2025, we propose to change it to 2026, aligning with the TAP project. I will note that the money was initially scoped just for design fees, and with the change we would use some of it for design and some for construction.

#### b. Discussion:

- i. Juan Yin: In the letter, the TAP # is 3001001. Can you double-check that number? The number I have is 3001011.
  - 1. Bailey Waters: I will confirm that with you. KC's network is currently down, when I can reach the information I will confirm with you.
- ii. Jared Campbell: As the Downtown Council, we are the primary non-profit organization helping work with the city and other partners on the Greenline. I just speak in favor of the scope change. We do have more of a long-term plan with the southern leg, given the news received from the railroad. Being able to still use this money for the Greenline Loop overall is a positive in our opinion. With some great momentum

- happening along the Northern routes, with PortKC and work they are doing along the MO river this is an important connection point for the Northeast corner.
- iii. Patrick Trouba: For Marc Hansen, we confirmed that this had been evaluated for CMAQ funds, so it could be eligible to receive those funds, correct?
  - 1. Marc Hansen: That is correct.
- iv. Patrick Trouba: So this is a defederalizing of the Greenline Multimodal Corridor South Leg in favor of shifting those funds?
  - 1. Bailey Waters: Yes, these funds.
- c. Voting:
  - i. John Davis: Motion to approve scope and schedule change.
  - ii. Rodney Riffle: Second
  - iii. Motion passes, scope and schedule change approved.

## 7. Program balances and project updates (Patrick Trouba)

- a. Kansas TAP Balance:
  - i. Patrick Trouba: KS balance is so far a little over \$1 million. The projects that obligated were from Basehor and Overland Park, Parallel Rd. and Downtown OP Wayfinding projects. There are a numbers of projects pending, that all amounts to about \$2.87 million in pending obligations. KS doesn't count pending obligations as remaining balance, thus the remaining balance is \$1.345 million.
- b. Missouri TAP Balance:
  - i. Patrick Trouba (Review): At the Feb. meeting we worked quite a bit with the MO balance. Several projects were defederalized and their funds moved to other projects. That included 11/12<sup>th</sup> St. Bikeways Phase 2, Lexington Gladstone Bikeways, MO River Trail Segment 1. That funding was moved to the U.S. 169 Bike/Ped Overpass and the Martha Truman Connector Trail. We also reallocated \$2.5 million in the existing MO TAP balance to projects that could obligate this fiscal year. included the Linden Connector, Blue Ridge Blvd, Little Blue Trace/Rock Island Connector, Martha Truman Connector, U.S. 169 Bike/Ped Overpass, Route 9/NW Prairie View Rd., Complete Streets improvements in Lee's Summit, Vivion Rd. Trail Segment 1, and Smithville's Commercial Pedestrian Project.
  - ii. Patrick Trouba (Current Balance): We have obligated thus far \$1.47 million, that includes all 3 of the KCI Corridor Trail Segments and a partial obligation for Bike Walk KC Local Spokes SRTS. There is \$960,000 in pending obligations from Smithville's Commercial Pedestrian Project that is not an official designation my MoDOT. With that, the unmet MoDOT target we are still looking to meet this fiscal year is about \$4.2 million. But, taken altogether with the pending obligations, the target, and the rest, we still have \$15.6 million in the whole MO TAP balance.
- c. Project Updates:

- i. Mark Lee (Bonner Springs): Project was in KDOT's hands when last checked, waiting for Atmos to relocate some gas lines. Other than that project is ready.
- ii. Maddie Waldeck (Basehor): Project is on schedule. Meeting to be held soon with KDOT/design engineers for review of plans. All is going well.
- iii. Alyssa Marcy (UG): Still looking for additional funding, we have some additional grants we are applying to in the next 30 days to find the other funds required. Also considering adding some of the Rock Island Bridge Connection to that scope as well. Not sure if project will obligate in 2024, but hopeful.
- iv. Athena Huynh (Grandview): We are attempting to apply for additional funding for the project. Also looking at redesigning areas to reduce cost. The schedule may slide backward a bit, possibly toward August.
- v. Alex Lopez (Independence): Project is progressing, date may slide a bit to toward the end of 2024. ROW plans are approved, so we are currently beginning the acquisition process. Project is intended to obligate in 2024.
- vi. Brian Shields (Overland Park): This is a collaborative project between the city and the county. The city has been responsible for design of the project and ROW acquisition via the public works department. We've been updated in the last week that 1 of 2 properties needed for ROW acquisition has been secured, the other is close to being secured.
- vii. Bailey Waters (KCMO): Working through some final design and some conflicts, but no further updates.
- viii. Steve Casey (Lee's Summit): All ROW has been acquired; audits have been completed. Our engineering consultant is finalizing plans and should be making submittal to MoDOT toward the end of June. Project is on schedule.
- ix. Travis Hoover (Riverside): We have acquisition complete and working with MoDOT on ROW clearance. Project should be moving ahead quickly.
- x. Mayra Toothman (Smithville): All ROW is acquired and project is currently with MoDOT to review the final plans. We are hoping to have both projects begin sometime this summer.

## 8. CRP + CMAQ committee options update (Martin Rivarola)

a. Martin Rivarola: We would like to get the committee up to speed with the work we have been doing regarding looking at responsibilities for oversight of the Carbon Reduction Program funds. It is a new federal program that doesn't have a committee home for programming of these funds. We have been doing work with a group and they have recommendations that will be advancing before the TTPC. This work group is made up mostly of co-chairs of the various programming committees at MARC and also a few members of the TTPC. They have been assigned the task to look at committee changes to address oversight/programing structure for CRP, that has a similar project eligibility to CMAQ. The 9 MARC counties are eligible for CRP while CMAQ is only 5 counties in the KC region. We are also looking

- at CMAQ and the way we have gone about and developed recommendations for CMAQ funding has been split between committees and we are wondering about a more efficient way of doing that. Within the CMAQ overall funds that are programmed we have historically determined different "buckets" for certain percentages of the funds.
- b. Issues: There is no committee for CRP oversight, like what is put in place for TA funds. Additionally, CMAQ funding and structure is decentralized among multiple committees. That works well, but can be problem when projects within one or multiple of these buckets are more in demand than others and there is a need to move money from one bucket to another. Not having this under one committee umbrella creates a problem for the programming of CMAQ funds. Often leads to "left over" amounts in certain "buckets". The air quality forum provides overall oversight to the program but does not function as a programming committee.
- c. Programming is underway, we have conducted a call for projects that is currently going through staff review. We do anticipate by Sept. 2024 we will have a slate of projects and scores that will be turned over to programming committees for funding recommendation discussions. We shard with the work group that met twice the three options to consider. One option is to formalize a CRP committee to have specific tasks regarding the CRP. Another option was to create a new committee and assign that committee to oversight of CMAQ and CRP. The third and most interesting to this group is reorganizing the scope of work and membership of ATPC and assign responsibilities of CMAQ and CRP to this committee. Group found option C (restructuring ATPC) to be the least duplicative of options. There may have to be consideration of expanding membership of committee to include expertise in areas this committee does not have as much of. There may be a need for increased frequency of meetings and adjustment of CMAQ buckets. Work group chose option B (creation of new committee) as the preferred option to be presented to TTPC on May 21. There is still work that needs to be done regarding committee structure and membership. As a result, while ATPC typically works to develop recommendations for CMAQ, that would likely be taken away and given to the new committee.
- d. Brian Shields: As I sat in with this work group, I can echo Martin's endorsement from that committee of option B. They did thoroughly look at each option, including a possible amendment of the work of this committee. When we got to the possibility of more meetings and members on the committee, the overwhelming majority of committee members felt that the decision should be a new committee with fewer meetings was best.

### 9. Conflict of interest and whistleblower policies (Patrick Trouba)

a. Patrick Trouba: We just like to remind committee members that we have COI and whistleblower policies. You can find them on our website, the do not live on a particular page on the website but if you type either into the search bar you will find them easily.

### 10. Adjournment