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5.1 Introduction

Transportation is about making connections. For people, it means connecting them to — or providing access to — opportunities. Those opportunities include goods and services (groceries and haircuts), jobs, volunteer opportunities, education (preschool to post graduate), health care, recreation, social interaction, and cultural and spiritual enrichment. The norm is that people take care of their own transportation needs, and in the Kansas City region this has typically involved owning, or otherwise having access to, a motor vehicle. Public transit and its more diverse cousin, human-services transportation, provide an alternative to motor vehicles.

Public transit and human-services transportation serve many purposes for many constituencies – the child who needs to ride a school bus to school, the teen who needs to get to that first job, the young adult who needs (and increasingly, chooses) to pinch pennies and get by without owning a car, the special needs adult who because of limited income or physical and/or mental limitations cannot drive a car, the socially/environmentally conscious person who wants to conserve resources and “do the right thing,” the senior who may be beyond safe driving years but still needs to get places. Family and friends and neighbors provide for some of the transportation needs of many of these people, but public transit and human-services transportation services meet other needs, as well.

5.2 Relationship Between Public Transit and Human Services Transportation and the Policy Framework of Transportation Outlook 2040

Responding to challenges that Greater Kansas City will face over the next several decades requires a clear vision that can guide collective decisions toward our desired future. That future — including focused regional growth, an increased quality of life for all residents, and a healthy environment and economy — will require improved mobility and access to opportunities throughout the region. Providing mobility options through a robust public transit and human-services transportation network is essential. And while these services are intrinsically important as an affordable, equitable means of transportation, their role in helping to achieve the policy goals of this plan makes increased investment in public transit and human-services transportation a top priority in our region.

Public transit and human-services transportation support the plan’s policy goals:

- **Accessibility** – Expanding public transit and human-services transportation will increase accessibility by providing an affordable means of travel to important regional and local destinations. When public transit and human transportation services are planned in concert with local land-use policies and development, people are able to access goods and services as easily as they could by using a personal vehicle.

- **Climate Change and Energy Use** – Public transportation can support reduction in fossil fuels by attracting new transit riders and reducing the number of single-occupant vehicles on the region’s roadways. Enhancements in bus-vehicle technology can also support the reduction in the consumption of fossil fuels. The typical public transit rider consumes on average one half of the oil consumed by an automobile rider (American Public Transit Association).

- **Economic Vitality** – Expanding public transportation and human-services transportation provides more accessibility to those who may be most affected by downturns in the economy.
By providing low-cost transportation alternatives, persons with low or fixed incomes can continue to be a part of a healthy workforce and contribute to social capital. Public transportation also promotes economic activity: every $1 invested in public transportation projects generates $4 to $9 in local economic activity (American Public Transit Association).

- **Environment** – High-capacity public transportation can reduce the need for building new roadways and lessen the disruption of sensitive natural areas, wildlife habitats, and prime farmland. By providing access and mobility to commuters, public transportation can reduce congestion and help improve our region’s air quality.

- **Place making** – Public transportation supports the principles outlined in Creating Quality Places and the goals of Transportation Outlook 2040’s adaptive growth and development scenario. Strategic coordination of land use and public transportation and the connection to other mobility options will help create lasting, community-oriented, walkable environments.

- **Public Health** – Public transportation can greatly support public health, especially when well-integrated with active modes of transportation, like bicycling and walking. Public transit that includes low- or no-emissions bus-vehicle technology can also help reduce harmful air quality that threatens public health.

- **Safety and Security** – The quality and function of the region’s transportation system relies on the overall safety of the system and its parts. Security also plays an important role in transportation. Maintaining and managing transportation facilities keeps the region’s residents secure. In major evacuations of urban areas during large-scale emergencies, public transportation can move many people quickly, and support first responders by delivering emergency equipment.

- **System Performance** – As a component of the regional transportation system, a well-planned and maintained public transit system can support transportation system performance as an additional mobility option that can decrease the number of cars on the region’s roadways. Considered by itself, the transit system must perform efficiently to provide a convenient, low-cost and reliable service to residents of the region who use transit.

## 5.3 Regional Needs and Challenges

**Transportation-Disadvantaged Populations**
The Kansas City region has a population of nearly 2 million residents. Transit needs are widespread, but can be assessed first by looking at certain populations that are considered “transportation disadvantaged” and may at some point be dependent on public transit and human-services transportation. The U.S. Census defines transportation-disadvantaged populations as adults age 65 and older, low-income persons, persons with disabilities, and those who do not own a car and, therefore, would be vulnerable in an emergency.

**Persons age 65 and Older**
Of the total 9-county population, approximately 11 percent of the total population are persons 65 and older. Figure 5.1 shows estimates of the 65 and older population in the nine-county region. The largest number of adults age 65 and older live in Jackson County (comprising 31 percent of the nine-county area...
65-and-older population); the smallest number live in Ray County (1 percent of the nine-county 65-and-older population).

**Figure 5.1: Population Estimates for Persons 65 and Older in the Nine-County Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Johnson</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Miami</th>
<th>Wyandotte</th>
<th>Cass</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
<th>Platte</th>
<th>Ray</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population Estimate</td>
<td>524,723</td>
<td>73,438</td>
<td>30,710</td>
<td>153,698</td>
<td>96,629</td>
<td>211,275</td>
<td>666,007</td>
<td>84,574</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>1,864,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 65 years and over</td>
<td>54,013</td>
<td>7,409</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>16,132</td>
<td>11,243</td>
<td>22,796</td>
<td>81,466</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>207,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 years and over</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimate

Figure 5.2 shows the relative density of older adults and their distribution throughout the region. The older adult population is fairly well dispersed throughout the region, with no outstanding concentrations, except where there are residential communities designed for older-adult living.

**Figure 5.2: Regional Distribution of Persons 65 and Older**

**Persons with Disabilities**

Persons with disabilities are a segment of the transportation-disadvantaged population that have the most varied needs. Disabilities may be physical, mental/emotional, or developmental impairments, or may be a combination of any of these. Figure 5.3 shows that Wyandotte and Leavenworth counties have the highest percentage of disabled persons per county, 15 percent and 14 percent, respectively.
However, Johnson and Jackson counties have the highest count of disabled persons in the seven-county region, with 23 percent and 41 percent of the total disabled populations within the region.

Of the 11 percent of persons who are 65 and older, approximately 27 percent have a disability of some kind. Figure 5.3 breaks down this group further into persons 65 to 74 years of age and 75 and older. Persons in the latter age cohort are twice as likely to have a disability as the 65 to 74 age cohort.

Figure 5.3: Population Estimates for all Disabled Persons and Persons within 65 and Older for Seven-County Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Johnson</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Miami</th>
<th>Wyandotte</th>
<th>Cass</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
<th>Platte</th>
<th>Ray</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian Non-</td>
<td>529,926</td>
<td>67,131</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>152,722</td>
<td>97,303</td>
<td>214,487</td>
<td>664,093</td>
<td>84,982</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,810,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutionalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a Disability</td>
<td>44,270</td>
<td>9,417</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22,532</td>
<td>9,914</td>
<td>21,830</td>
<td>80,208</td>
<td>8,562</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>196,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Civilian Non-</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutionalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 65 to 74 years</td>
<td>28,834</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8,310</td>
<td>6,018</td>
<td>12,758</td>
<td>42,083</td>
<td>4,925</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>107,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a disability</td>
<td>5,703</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>10,628</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 to 74 years with</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years and over</td>
<td>24,555</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,375</td>
<td>4,517</td>
<td>9,939</td>
<td>38,082</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>90,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a disability</td>
<td>11,826</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>19,026</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>45,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 75 and older with a</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimate

Figure 5.4 illustrates the distribution of persons with disabilities in our region. It is clear that the disabled populations are fairly well dispersed throughout.
Low-income
The low-income population is defined using the poverty status level updated each year by the Census Bureau. Figure 5.5 shows the low-income population estimates by county. Low-income populations typically reside closer to the urban core of the region; thus, Jackson and Wyandotte counties have the largest low-income populations in the region. There are, however, high concentrations of low-income populations in eastern Jackson, Leavenworth and Cass counties.

Figure 5.5 Estimated Low Income Population for the Nine-County Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Johnson</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Miami</th>
<th>Wyandotte</th>
<th>Cass</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
<th>Platte</th>
<th>Ray</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated</td>
<td>518,143</td>
<td>67,658</td>
<td>30,192</td>
<td>151,278</td>
<td>95,574</td>
<td>207,878</td>
<td>656,336</td>
<td>83,286</td>
<td>23,238</td>
<td>1,833,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Status is Determined population with income in the past 12 months below poverty level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total estimated population with income in the past 12 months below poverty level:</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 65 years and older</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>14,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 years and older</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimate
Vehicle Ownership – Zero-Car households
Zero-car household data capture persons who cannot afford to own a car and those who choose to not own a car. Transportation-disadvantaged persons include the former; however, those who choose not to own a car can be just as vulnerable in emergency situations. In the nine-county region, Jackson and Wyandotte counties have the highest percentages of persons who do not own a car. Persons who have low incomes are less likely to own cars than persons with higher incomes.

Figure 5.7: Estimated Population of Workers in Zero-Car Households for the Nine-County Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Johnson</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Miami</th>
<th>Wyandotte</th>
<th>Cass</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
<th>Platte</th>
<th>Ray</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers 16 Years and Over in Households</td>
<td>284,502</td>
<td>33,575</td>
<td>15,965</td>
<td>65,852</td>
<td>49,296</td>
<td>109,508</td>
<td>318,352</td>
<td>45,110</td>
<td>11,366</td>
<td>933,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers 16 Years and Over, in Households, With 0 Vehicles</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>18,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Workers 16 Years and Over, in Households, With 0 Vehicles</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimate
Figure 5.8 shows that persons without a car are concentrated near the urban core of the region.

**Figure 5.8: Distribution of Zero-Car Households in the Nine-County Region**

Public Transit Need

A robust transit system that serves the urban core is critical to meeting the needs of transportation-disadvantaged populations. However, the data presented do not communicate the need for transportation beyond these residents’ home areas. We know that trips in the region cross city and county boundaries. And, while these trips are easy for those who may own cars and have no mobility issues that prevent them from using cars, transportation-disadvantaged persons may not be able to make longer trips to destinations throughout the region. Understanding where major employment and activity centers are within the region is as important as understanding where concentrations of persons with the greatest transportation needs live.

All residents of the region must be able to access employment centers that are spread throughout the region. Greater Kansas City has grown in a way that often geographically separates people’s homes from their places of work. This is particularly true for low-paying service jobs located in suburban areas of the region, as those who are most likely to work those jobs live closer to the center of the region where housing is more affordable.
Human-Service Transportation/Paratransit Need

There will always be a specialized transit need that cannot be met by traditional, fixed-route bus services. Paratransit services use small buses, vans or automobiles to provide subscription or on-demand, door-to-door or curb-to-curb service.

Using previous estimates from Transportation Outlook 2030, it was identified that an estimated 4,000 weekly paratransit trips were needed to reach what was considered a standard level of service in comparison to peer communities.

In the Kansas City region today, approximately 3,100 daily subsidized paratransit trips are funded, administered and provided by many different public and private agencies. As an estimate, 781,200 trips a year (3,100 daily trips x 252 work days a year) are currently provided to human-services populations throughout the metro.

Estimating and understanding the full breadth of the need for human-service transportation is difficult. Assessing the need for public transit and human-services transportation in the Kansas City region is a collaborative effort undertaken through a peer exchange of many human-service transportation providers that serve the region. In fact, stakeholder input from users and providers suggests that the unmet need is great, and the gap between need and available capacity will continue to climb as the region’s population ages, as life expectancies increase, as the population of the infirm and/or the disabled increases, and as the gap between all income groups in the U.S. grows.

Unmet need can generally be attributed to one of the following categories:

1. Lack of funding – Services operating in environments of limited or constrained resources where expanding services is very difficult.
2. Hours of service – Services that have limited on-clock availability. These services may be affected by limited resources or the agency operating these services may operate limited hours by choice.
3. Geographic extent of service – Services that are operated within a set geographic boundary. These services may be affected by limited resources or boundaries that are set by the source of the funding.

Based on the preceding annual estimates of 781,200 met and 208,000 unmet trips (52 weeks x 4,000 unmet trips per week) in the Kansas City region, there is an estimated need for a minimum of 989,000 annual paratransit trips for special populations.

Transit and Human-Service Transportation Challenges

Many factors —financial and geographical — present challenges to providing a robust, well-functioning public transportation system. The Kansas City region is geographically larger than average for a population its size, which makes providing adequate capacity difficult. And, as the region continues to grow in land area and population, the need for public transportation grows as well.

The challenge for both transit and paratransit (a more flexible, non-fixed route version of transit) is to find and fund the best compatible mix of available, adequate and appropriate mobility service that communities will support.
The way the region has developed also presents challenges for providing efficient, sustainable service. Only a few areas in the region can sustain frequent, reliable service. These areas largely include the more densely populated areas of the region that include a mix of land uses, like the urban core. However, transit needs extend beyond these areas.

Compounding the challenge of the region’s physical growth are the financial challenges. The construction of road and highway infrastructure in our region has been made possible largely by state and federal funding, with less significance placed on long-term operations and maintenance costs. However, public transit and human-service transportation expansion has not enjoyed the same reliable and constant funding, particularly for operations and maintenance of service, which would likely require a dedicated local funding source.

5.4 Current Service

5.4.1 Transit Service

Today, three independent transit agencies work together to provide public transportation services in the metropolitan region. The Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA) is the largest of the three service providers, with Unified Government Transit operating in Wyandotte County, Kan., and Johnson County Transit operating in Johnson County, Kan.

**Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA)**

KCATA was created by bistate compact in 1965, and today provides over 90 percent of the fixed-route transit service in the region, funded in large part through a ½-cent and a 3/8-cent sales tax in Kansas City, Mo. KCATA operates service under contract with participating local governments. Although service is provided to participating communities in Clay, Jackson, Platte and Wyandotte counties, over 90 percent of KCATA service is operated in the portion of Kansas City, Mo., within Jackson County. Various other jurisdictions contract with KCATA for service, including the cities of Blue Springs Gladstone, Independence, North Kansas City, Liberty, Raytown, Lee’s Summit and Riverside in Missouri, and the Unified Government of Kansas City, Kan., and Wyandotte County in Kansas.

Transit centers, generally located at route-connection points, are found at 10th and Main in downtown Kansas City, Mo.; Independence Square; Bannister Mall; Antioch Center; Crown Center; I-29/Barry Road and 39th/Troost, and U.S. 71/Red Bridge.

**Unified Government Transit**

Unified Government Transit was created in 1978 to serve Wyandotte County. Many of Wyandotte
County’s fixed routes originate from the Indian Springs Transit Center and connect with KCATA routes that serve Kansas City, MO. Half of the Unified Government’s (Wyandotte County and Kansas City, KS) routes are operated under contract with the KCATA. Fares, schedules and service are coordinated so riders can transfer between Unified Government Transit and KCATA. In addition to fixed-route service, Unified Government Transit also operates the Dial-a-Ride paratransit system, Senior Group Transportation and Aging transit services including Meals on Wheels, demand-response medical and grocery shopping, and nutrition sites.

**Johnson County Transit**

Johnson County operates mostly fixed-route commuter service (The JO) into Kansas City, Mo with much of that service connecting at the 6000 Lamar Transit Center. In addition, Johnson County Transit operated the Special Edition, a demand response service for people over 60 and those with disabilities.

**Transit Coverage**

Transit coverage, measured by how many people live within ½ mile of a transit route or stop in the region, is used as a measure of progress toward expanding the transit system in Greater Kansas City. Using Census 2000 data and MARC’s geographic information system (GIS) it is estimated that 43 percent of region’s residents have access to transit within 1/2 mile. This number captures the extent of the overall coverage, but does not reflect the more limited extent of the service coverage varies during evening, non-peak hours, and on weekends.

The best coverage exists in Kansas City, Mo., south of the Missouri River, though some peak-hour service is available in many areas of the region. Off-peak and weekend service is particularly limited outside of Kansas City, Mo. Figure 5.9 shows the geographic extent of the regional transit system.
Figure 5.9: Current Transit Routes Available in the Kansas City Region

Ridership
In 2007, the three transit operators carried an average daily ridership of over 56,000 passenger boardings. Ridership increased between 2004 and 2008 and continues to increase. This can be explained in large part by the increased capacity of the system and increased fuel prices.
Figure 5.10: Average Daily Transit Ridership, (1972–2007 National Transit Database)
Figure 5.11: Ranking of Top Bus Routes by 2009 Ridership in the Kansas City Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro rank</th>
<th>Route name</th>
<th>2009 average weekly ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metro No. 25 Troost</td>
<td>7,835.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metro No. 71 Prospect</td>
<td>5,235.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metro No. 58 MAX</td>
<td>3,999.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metro No. 24 Independence</td>
<td>3,411.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metro No. 39 Thirty-ninth Street</td>
<td>3,175.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metro No. 28 Blue Ridge</td>
<td>2,099.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Metro No. 31 Thirty-first Street</td>
<td>1,914.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metro No. 12 Twelfth Street</td>
<td>1,710.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Metro No. 101 Minnesota</td>
<td>1,366.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Metro No. 47 Roanoke</td>
<td>1,325.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Metro No. 51 Ward Parkway</td>
<td>1,284.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Metro No. 106 Quindaro</td>
<td>1,272.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Metro No. 57 South Oak</td>
<td>1,149.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Metro No. 108 Indiana</td>
<td>1,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Metro No. 54 Armour/Paseo</td>
<td>1,096.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Metro No. 53 Armour/Swope Park</td>
<td>972.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metro No. 142 North Oak</td>
<td>823.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Metro No. 27 Twenty-seventh Street</td>
<td>812.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Metro No. 30 Northeast</td>
<td>802.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Metro No. 175 Seventy-fifth Street</td>
<td>684.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Metro No. 163 Sixty-third Street</td>
<td>683.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Metro No. 173 Casino Cruiser</td>
<td>672.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Metro No. 35 35th Street</td>
<td>654.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Metro No. 107 Seventh St/Parallel</td>
<td>559.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Metro No. 129 I-29 Express</td>
<td>559.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The Jo Systemwide ridership</td>
<td>1,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The Jo K-10 Connector to Lawrence</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The Jo A-Antioch</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Kansas City Area Transportation Authority and Johnson County Transit
5.4.2 Human-Services Transportation (Paratransit Service)

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service

Each transit provider operating fixed-route service is federally required to provide ADA-complementary paratransit service with origins and destinations within 3/4 mile of either side of any bus route, excluding commuter service, for any person with a disability. The ADA regulations specifically define a population that is entitled to this service as a civil right. The regulations also define minimum service characteristics that must be met for this service to be considered equivalent to the fixed-route service it is intended to complement. ADA-complementary paratransit services are considered demand-response services, where passengers generally schedule door-to-door trips through a call/dispatch center.

KCATA provides comprehensive paratransit services through Share-A-Fare, a service contracted with private providers for elderly and disabled persons in portions of Clay, Platte and Jackson counties. Unified Government Transit operates intracity service called Dial-a-Ride and contracts with KCATA’s Share-A-Fare for intercity ADA service. The JO only operates commuter service and, therefore, is not required to operate ADA-complementary paratransit service. It is likely that the commuter status of several of the JO’s services will change in the future, thus requiring ADA-complementary paratransit service. However, The JO currently operates the Special Edition, which serves a similar population.

In addition to ADA-complementary paratransit services, many other demand-response-type services usually having a health and human service, state-enabling appropriations or statute, or a municipal general revenue funding base are provided by public, private and nonprofit organizations throughout the region. Following is a list of significant paratransit/special needs/human-service transportation systems currently serving this market:

- Share-A-Fare, a service administered by the KCATA which primarily provides service (by contract with private providers) for elderly and disabled persons in Clay, Platte and Jackson counties in Missouri
- MARC’s Aging Department, which contracts with several providers for transportation service for elderly and disabled persons, as well as meal delivery, in Cass, Clay, Jackson, Platte and Ray counties
- Other Area Agencies on Aging
- Medicaid Brokerage KS and MO
- HB351 Boards MO – (county-based senior service funding legislation)
- SB40/240 boards MO – Missouri county-based service fund for developmentally disabled

As a recipient of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 and as an adjunct requirement to Title II of the Public Accommodations Section of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the operators of general fixed-route, line-haul bus service must provide complementary paratransit services at comparable levels for disabled riders unable to access fixed routes.

What are Section 5307 funds? Section 5307 is a formula grant program for urbanized areas providing capital, operating, and planning assistance for public transportation. This program was initiated by the Surface Transportation Act of 1982 and became FTA’s primary transit assistance program in FY 1984. Funds are apportioned to urbanized areas utilizing a formula based on population, population density, and other factors associated with transit service and ridership. Section 5307 is funded from both General Revenues and Trust Funds. Source: www.fta.dot.gov
• Coordinated Transit District #1 – Kansas legislative entity KSA 75-5051 through 5058
• Tiblow Transit – Kansas municipal Section 5311 based operation
• Olathe Taxi Coupon program – Kansas county- and contract-based senior and disabled low income
• Leavenworth Council on Aging – Kansas
• Riverside Resources Inc. – Kansas
• Liberty Missouri Omni – municipal operation
• Independence Missouri Dial-a-ride – Missouri municipal operation
• Unified Government Transit Dial-a-Ride service for persons with disabilities in Wyandotte County, Kan
• Jackson County Board of Services, which provides transportation to disabled persons in Jackson County
• The JO – Special Edition, which provides service to elderly and disabled persons in Johnson County
• Mr. Goodcents Foundation community transportation
• OATS, Inc., a private, nonprofit corporation offering door-to-door transportation to the general public with an emphasis on senior citizens and the disabled in Cass, Clay, Jackson and Platte counties
• Ray County Transit – a rural Missouri section 5311 based general public operator

Accessible buses — lifts and low floors —and flexible routing have improved the ability of the transit operators to serve senior citizens and persons with disabilities or low income. However, transportation providers report that the demand for paratransit trips continues to exceed the capacity of existing resources.

5.5 Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision

As the region addresses the varied transportation needs of its residents, a common vision for public transit and human-services transportation and how these services interact is essential.

The Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision, developed in 2005 and updated in 2008, was created to guide and focus the transit investments within the region. This vision was developed in partnership with the region’s three primary transit agencies, the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority, Unified Government Transit and Johnson County Transit. Its creation was guided by an extensive public engagement process, research, and various transit initiatives in place to support transit operations. The vision consists of a series of goals and action steps that support the Smart Moves vision statement and a service concept which includes both regional and community-based service networks.

Regional Service Network

The Smart Moves service concept consists of a regional network of significant transit corridors. These include urban corridors, commuter corridors, and major fixed-route corridors. Together they connect
important activity centers, such as major employment centers, cultural destinations, and areas with high concentrations of transit-dependent populations. All of the corridors in the regional network are currently served by bus. Smart Moves envisions that many of the higher-demand corridors could be served by bus rapid transit and that some would eventually become rail (light rail or modern streetcar) corridors. These interconnected regional services provide the structure for local community-based services. Figure 5.11 is a conceptual map of the Kansas City region that shows the relationship between the different types of corridors in the Smart Moves concept and the underlying network of local service.

Figure 5.11: Smart Moves Region Transit Concept
**Community-Based Service**
The concept of community-based transit service is central to the Smart Moves vision. Community-based services are designed to serve specific local needs, and support access to local goods, services and employment locations — places that regional service alone might not reach. These services are designed by, or created in partnership with, local communities, transit agencies, and private or non-profit transportation service providers.

Community-based service is where coordination between public transit and human-services transportation happens. In this concept, "activity centers" serve as connection points where people find their destinations, link to their destinations by public transit, demand-response service, taxi, etc. Such centers are the place where a variety of transportation services interact with and supplement each other. An activity center could be a large employment center or retail area, or one of the traditional "town centers," connected with other activity centers by multiple modes of travel (walking, biking, public transit, highways, etc.). Ideally, it would include a variety of land uses that provide employment, access to healthy food, medical care and other services, and other destinations, in addition to housing.

These important local and regional centers are envisioned as being connected by the regional public transit network so users could move from center to center with ease. Activity centers can be pivotal for the mobility of persons who, for one reason or another, may not be able to reach public transit in their community but are eligible for human-services transportation. Persons using demand response services, for example, could be transported to an activity center where they could access a variety of goods and services, or connect to other regional destinations by using fixed-route transit service. This coordination between services is beneficial not only for human-services transportation programs that may be geographically-limited, but also for the user who can maintain a greater sense of independence through full access to the region’s offerings.

### 5.6 Implementation

#### 5.6.1 Current Implementation Activities to Build On
Although financial challenges may slow expansion of the region’s transit system, there have been several expansion projects and studies over the last few years that have created momentum for the implementation of the Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision.

**Regional Urban Corridors**
Two of the Smart Moves urban corridors are fully funded for bus rapid transit service: MAX on Main Street and Troost Avenue MAX. The Main Street MAX route began service in 2005 and quickly exceeded ridership forecasts. Its cost-efficiency and public acceptance have earned it “best practices” recognition at the national level and increased interest in bus rapid transit expansion in the region and in other cities. The Troost MAX is a logical next step for bus rapid transit expansion as it connects to the Main Street MAX and Route 25. The current service along Troost Avenue has the highest ridership of all routes in the region. Construction is underway for Troost MAX and operation is expected to begin in late 2010.

MARC and the transit agencies are partnering with local jurisdictions to implement additional BRT routes. The following are urban corridor studies that are in progress:

- Metcalf Avenue/ Shawnee Mission Parkway Transit-Planning Study (Johnson County) – the corridor has been studied, and construction of supportive infrastructure is funded through the ARRA/TIGER grant announced in February, 2010.
• State Avenue Corridor Alternatives Analysis (Wyandotte County) – an alternative analysis has been completed and construction of supportive infrastructure is funded through the ARRA/TIGER grant announced in February, 2010.

• Smart Moves Implementation Plan - Phase 1: Urban Corridors (regional) – MARC has undertaken this study to lay out a strategy for developing four additional bus rapid transit corridors, and for integrating them into unified regional MAX bus rapid transit system.

Regional Commuter Corridors
Many Smart Moves commuter corridors are served by transit today, and ridership increases over the past three years due to rising gas prices has stimulated interest among local elected officials and transit agencies to study various corridors for improving the level of service and amenities.

• K-10 Connector (Johnson County) – This service, implemented in 2007, provides commuter service from Johnson County to Lawrence, in Douglas County, connecting both KU campuses and Johnson County Community College.

• Smart Moves Implementation Plan - Phase 2: Commuter Corridors (regional) - MARC has undertaken this study to determine the feasibility and viability of high capacity commuter service in six corridors throughout most of the region. This study includes high level analysis of rail and bus alternatives for each corridor.

• Rock Island Commuter Corridor Partnership (Jackson County) – This partnership of multiple local jurisdictions is exploring possibilities for the ultimate purchase of the Rock island Rail Corridor currently owned by Kansas city Southern. Potential uses of this corridor could include bike paths that connect to the Katy Trail and commuter service.

• I-35 Bus-on-Shoulder (Johnson County) – In 2008, Johnson County Transit completed an Alternatives Analysis to pursue federal funding for on-shoulder BRT commuter service.

• I-70 First tier Environmental Impact Statement (MoDOT) – MoDOT’s First-Tier Environmental Impact Statement study follows the completed I-70 Major Investment Study (MIS). Investment recommendation from the MIS are undergoing more detailed environmental analysis in this new phase which is includes investments that may support expanded commuter service in the I-70 corridor.

Local Community-Based Mobility
Activities related to community-based mobility service include the following:

• Regional competitive-selection programming process that allows for a more comprehensive look at services, needs and gaps.

• Senior Mobility Framework - An effort by the Mr. Goodcents Foundation, the Jewish Heritage Foundation and the Midwest Center for Non-profit Research to understand and address mobility needs of the aging population. The framework provides policies and short- and long-term strategies.

• Volunteer Services - These services offer personalized, one-on-one transportation solutions that are affordable. Volunteer services are currently available in the Kansas City region and efforts are underway to explore the expansion of these services.
5.6.2 Regional Public Transit and Human-Services Transportation Priorities

Continuing the momentum of studies and plans currently underway that contribute to the implementation of the Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision is vital. However, further expansion of the system should not come at the expense of any existing services. The implementation path that will support the alignment and sustainability of both services planned for and provided by transit operators in the Kansas City region, and by the funding and operating systems addressing the mobility needs of human-services transportation programs is outlined in the following priorities that are fundamental to this element of Transportation Outlook 2040:

1. **Open, transparent and inclusive processes** - Addressing the transportation needs of the region’s residents requires a process that is open to the public and to agencies that not only help identify needs and gaps, but provide for the needs of the region.

2. **Maintaining existing service** - Sustaining the services that are already in place (and continue to successfully fulfill needs) is prioritized over investing in expanded service.

3. **Enhancing the usability of existing operations** – Improving how well people access and understand existing services and improving the interconnections between different types of services will help sustain and strengthen the investments already in place.

5.6.3 Implementation of Human-Services Transportation

The Kansas City region is served by many independent human-services transportation systems that are funded or operated under different service models. These transportation systems acquire funding through both public and private sources. At the federal level, several administrations have funding programs that support these types of services. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has three programs, each serving a different mobility purpose. Implementation of human-services transportation can occur in various ways.

MARC, the Kansas and Missouri state DOTs, and the governors’ Designated Recipient receive portions of these funds to be distributed throughout the MARC region. MARC and its stakeholders, through an open, transparent and inclusive process, help to fund the FTA Section 5316 (Job-Access and Reverse Commute), Section 5317 (New Freedom), and Section 5310 (Elderly and Disabled Persons) funds and does so based on priorities and strategies in the FTA-required Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation

### Federal Transit Administration Programs

**Section 5310 – Transportation for Elderly Person and Persons with Disabilities**

This program provides formula funding to states to help private nonprofit groups meet the transportation needs of the elderly and persons with disabilities when the transportation service provided is unavailable, insufficient or inappropriate to meeting these needs. Funds are apportioned based on each state’s share of population for these groups of people.

**Section 5316 – Job Access and Reverse Commute**

This program provides funding for capital planning and operating expenses for projects that transport low-income individuals to and from jobs, and activities related to employment, and for reverse commute projects.

**Section 5317 – New Freedom Program**

This program provides funding for capital and operating expenses for new public transportation services and new public transportation alternatives beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), that are designed to assist individuals with disabilities.

*Source: [www.fta.dot.gov](http://www.fta.dot.gov)*
Plan. Chapter 5.0 of *Transportation Outlook 2040* serves as that plan.

### 5.6.2 Public Transit and Human-Services Transportation Strategies

The following strategies for public transit and human-services transportation support *Transportation Outlook 2040* policy goals:

1. Support and Sustain Existing Services – Focus investment to maintain existing services where there are continued needs before supporting expanded services.
   a) Advocate for more flexible federal funding
   b) Seek new local funding opportunities

2. Enhance the Usability of Existing Operations – Support the usability of existing services through new technologies, maintenance of transit supportive infrastructure (sidewalks, trails, bike racks, etc), and expanded and improved access to user information.
   a) Work with transit agencies to create a regional standard for accessibility of transit infrastructure so that all persons can use existing services with ease.
   b) Work in partnership with transit agencies to bridge information and technology gaps.

3. Expand Regional Transit Service – Plan, develop, and identify funding opportunities to support an expanded regional transit system as envisioned in the Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision.
   a) Leverage local plans, strategies, and initiatives to help identify short-term opportunities.
   b) Work in partnership with local governments and the region’s transit providers to increase and expand seamless operations.
   c) Develop and communicate clear local and regional options for financing and supporting expanded transit and human-service transportation /paratransit services.

4. Expand Special Human-Services Transportation – Work with local stakeholders to maintain the existing regional mobility planning and programming process addressing areas where fixed-route transportation services are unavailable, inappropriate, or insufficient.
   d) Build on this *Coordinated Public Transportation-Human Services Transportation Plan* and the *Framework for Senior Mobility* to clarify next steps.
   e) Coordinate with stakeholders and community partners to inform and support the process.

### 5.6.3 Action Plan

This action plan supports the broader strategies of this chapter.

1. Support the maintenance and operations of existing services for the elderly, individuals with disabilities and low income persons. These efforts may include but are not limited to the following actions:
   a) MARC will encourage the maintenance and sustainability of existing public transit and human-services transportation services.
b) MARC will encourage the procurement of equipment eligible under federal guidance to support the maintenance and operations of existing fleets.

2. Pursue enhanced usability of existing services:
   a) MARC will partner with local transit agencies to develop regional service standards, including transit user information that supports the image and use of the regional transit network as one seamless system.
   b) MARC will work with transit agencies and alternative transportation partners to identify opportunities for infrastructure enhancements that would improve the connections between public transportation services and pedestrian and bicycle activities.
   c) MARC will work with human-service transportation providers, public transit providers to identify opportunities to coordinate human-services transportation users and providers with existing mainstream fixed-route service.

3. Promote the expansion of services for the elderly, and individuals with disabilities or low income persons.
   a) MARC will encourage the procurement of equipment eligible under federal guidance to support expansion of existing fleets.
   b) MARC will encourage the expansion of existing public transit and human-services transportation services and implementation of new services compatible with existing state, regional or local plans.

4. Work toward implementing of the Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision
   a) MARC will encourage the use of existing funds and support the pursuit new funding.
   b) MARC will support local jurisdictions and agencies in continuing to build towards the regional transit vision using transit centers to connect community-based local and regional service. Levels of service will be expanded, as funding is attained, to meet community and regional needs with urban and commuter routes, paratransit services, vanpools and carpools.
   c) The region will work to maintain and improve linkages between local transit services and intercity passenger rail, intercity motor coach and commercial airline services.

5. Manage and coordinate resources effectively
   a) MARC and area transit operators will coordinate regional transit planning and project development. MARC will provide support through development of expanded transit-planning tools such as forecasting, and planning methodologies. Transit operators will continue to conduct short-term service planning and project planning.
   b) MARC will support coordination, corridor planning, efficiency improvements and quality control; contribute planning resources such as staff, ridership forecasts and GIS resources; work with transit providers to develop performance standards that ensure quality services; support enhanced route planning and evaluation; and, conduct public opinion surveys as needed.

6. Encourage public participation:
   a) MARC will involve citizen and customer groups in the development of public transportation plans and programs.
   b) MARC will encourage strong community support of transit funding, services and transit supportive development.
c) MARC will encourage and support participation by the regional transit advocacy groups, chambers of commerce and major employers in the development and implementation of public transportation plans and programs.

7. Focus planning and implementation efforts:
   a) MARC will increase availability of information on the Smart Moves planning process;
   b) MARC will support the expansion of new technologies and intelligent transportation systems for transit such as real time schedule information, signal priority for transit vehicles, and roadway operational improvement to make transit travel times more competitive.
   c) MARC will investigate short-range planning and management activities and projects for improving coordination among public transportation and other transportation service providers (mobility management).
   d) MARC will encourage the inclusion of transit considerations in major transportation planning efforts, such as major investment studies, and significant highway construction traffic management plans, as well as in local development and redevelopment plans for communities and corridors.

8. Promote transit-supportive development from the regional urban form level to the site plan level.
   a) MARC will work in partnership with public transit and human-service transportation providers and local planning agencies to bring major projects to the attention of service providers and ensure that local planning agencies consider transit in their review of local plans.

5.6.4 Financial Summary
Current financial resources are insufficient for providing public transit and human-services transportation that fully meet the needs of the region’s residents. In fact, projected revenues barely meet the level of service needed for the region’s adaptive land-use scenario. (See Appendix C. Land-Use Forecasting Process.)

As a regional priority, public transportation and human-services transportation must be sustained and supported for the long-term to meet the region’s transportation needs and create the lasting impact envisioned in the policy goals of Transportation Outlook 2040.

Human-services transportation currently rely on a variety of funding sources, including federal, state, local and private sources. While we have not attempted to estimate future revenue for human-services transportation, it would be beneficial to include these streams of funding in the regional planning and programming carried out by MARC’s Special Transportation–Job Access Partnership.

Public Transit Financial Capacity Analysis
It is important to understand how the region’s current public transportation investment priorities compare to the projected amount of funding our region will have as a first step in crafting a focused financial strategy.

Financial projections were developed that include both transit revenue (projected funding the region will receive for transit) and operation and maintenance expenses (expected cost to maintain public
transportation services already in place). Figure 5.12 shows that the region could anticipate approximately $4.3 billion in transit revenue over the next three decades.

Operations and maintenance costs are projected to be approximately $3.8 billion over three decades, leaving roughly $516 million for new transit project to expand the regional transit system, based on current funding levels.

Figure 5.12: Transit Revenue and Expense Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2040 Revenue and Expense Projection for Public Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 -2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FareBox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Transit Projects*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2040 transit projects do not include MARC-sponsored projects added to project list

Of the 600 projects submitted by local and state governments through the open call for projects to be listed in Transportation Outlook 2040, 29 projects were transit-only projects. An additional 20 projects included a transit component but were considered primarily roadway, activity center or bicycle/pedestrian projects. The 29 transit projects totaled approximately $4.3 billion which is more than eight times greater than the amount of revenue available for new transit projects.

Financially Constrained Transit Project List

Transportation Outlook 2040 must include a financially constrained list of projects. While not all transit projects will be included in this list, many may still be considered significant to the regional transit system. The revenue and expense projections above were used to determine this final list.

MARC transportation committees were responsible for evaluating the project submissions and creating a final financially-constrained list of projects. The Transit Committee evaluated 29 transit-only projects. Among these 29 projects, two projects were included from other categories, as they support transit in two major Smart Moves commuter corridors. These two projects were Johnson County Transit’s I-35 Bus-on-Shoulder project and the Rock Island Railroad Trail and Transit Line, submitted in segments by five jurisdictions.
Upon consideration of these 29 projects, the Transit Committee focused its evaluation on how each project supported the Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision, and then determined where there were gaps, or which Smart Moves corridors were not represented among the submitted projects. The projects were divided between four categories:

- Smart Moves Urban Corridors and Local Service,
- Smart Moves Commuter Corridors,
- Transit Centers/ Park and Ride lots/ Service Facilities, and
- Transit Other.

Upon evaluation, gaps were identified in the Smart Moves commuter corridor category and MARC-sponsored projects were proposed to fill the gaps.

Using the financial constraint of $516 million, the list was narrowed to projects that currently have a higher level of momentum to that of other projects — in other words, priority projects that are already being studied and are more likely to be implemented sooner than other projects. These projects make up the financially constrained project list as shown in Figure 5.13. Projects that were not financially constrained make up an illustrative list of projects. While not required for this plan, the illustrative list helps express the longer-term vision for transit expansion in our region. The illustrative list of projects may at some point become a part of the financially-constrained list; however, additional funding source would be required for those projects.

The table below lists the financially constrained projects. The “capital/construction costs” indicate the approximate costs of the project as assigned by the project sponsor. The “financial capacity costs” were developed through the process to financially constrain the projects and may be less than the project’s given costs but are deemed to be reasonable adjusted costs.
### Figure 5.13: Transit Project Lists

#### Financially Constrained Transit Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Construction Decade</th>
<th>Planning Stage</th>
<th>O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Construction/ Capital Cost</th>
<th>Financial Constraint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Final Plan</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2020 to 2029</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Oak Bus Rapid Transit Improvement</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2021 to 2029</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2030 to 2040</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf/Shawnee Mission Parkway</td>
<td>Johnson County Transit</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>$2,890,000</td>
<td>$238,000,000</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Streetcar</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2030 to 2040</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,400,000</td>
<td>$548,000,000</td>
<td>$410,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Illustrative List of Transit Projects (Not Constrained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Construction Decade</th>
<th>Planning Stage</th>
<th>O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Construction/ Capital Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Moves Urban Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Study for BRT Service 87th/95th Streets in Lenexa</td>
<td>Johnson County Transit</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>$3,675,000</td>
<td>$106,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Study for BRT Ext. West on Shawnee Mission Parkway</td>
<td>Johnson County Transit</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Fixed Guideway Transit Development (Phase 1)</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2020 to 2029</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Fixed Guideway Transit Development (Phase 2)</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2030 to 2040</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,400,000</td>
<td>$3,004,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Smart Moves Commuter Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Construction Decade</th>
<th>Planning Stage</th>
<th>O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Construction/ Capital Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Moves Urban Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC Gulfport/I-29</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 North</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-71</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 East (Includes Blue Springs Commuter Rail Project)</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 West</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$50,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Construction Decade</th>
<th>Planning Stage</th>
<th>O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Construction/ Capital Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center, Park and Ride lots, and Service Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Centers— including but not limited to Rosana Square, Metcalf South, Mission, Roe and Shawnee Mission Parkway</td>
<td>Johnson County Transit</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>$620,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Stop at 70th and N. Oak</td>
<td>City of Gladstone</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte County Park and Ride</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Park and Ride Lot Development</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Facility Improvements and Expansions of the Murray L. Noile Transit Center Centers</td>
<td>Johnson County Transit</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Facility and Transfer Station in Mission</td>
<td>Johnson County Transit</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center @ M-291 Highway &amp; U.S. 40 High</td>
<td>City of Independence</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transit Maintenance and Service Facility</td>
<td>KCATA</td>
<td>2020 to 2029</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center @ M-78 Highway &amp; Truman Road</td>
<td>City of Independence</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center @ Brookside and U.S. 24 Highway</td>
<td>City of Independence</td>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,675,000</td>
<td>$106,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.5 Financial Strategies

Public transit and human-services transportation will greatly support the region’s transportation policy goals and improve the quality of life for those who need these services to maintain independence and for those who choose to use these services. Providing these services throughout the region is a priority – a priority to the many residents who have participated in the creation of this plan, as well as local officials.

If public transit and human-services transportation are indeed a priority to the region, and given the current financial environment for transportation, in general, a concerted effort and commitment must be made to implementing local and/or regional financial strategies that will support current services and expansion of the regional network of transit and paratransit services.

1. **Fund Operations and Maintenance of Existing Services before Supporting Expanded Services**

   In light of the fragile nature of services that are dependent upon funding derived through sales tax, either as a dedicated tax or budgeted from a local general fund, it is imperative that any investment is first focused to maintain existing services where there are continued needs before supporting expanded services.

2. **Maximize the Use of Existing Funding**

   The region must maximize its use of existing federal funds and pursue new federal funding through discretionary grant programs. The efficient use of existing funds enhances the region’s ability to successfully compete for federal discretionary grant programs for bus system enhancements as well as “new starts” funding for fixed guideway projects. The following recommendations should be followed:
   a. Maximize the efficient use of existing federal formula funds. Monitor the existing system to maximize efficiencies and improve relationships of regional services. In the next federal funding authorization, advocate for increased funding and greater flexibility in the use of formula funds for capital and operations.
   b. Continue use of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to support transit. Support use of funds to operate new services and support capital improvements such as bus replacements. Currently, approximately 34 percent of the region’s CMAQ funding is allocated to transit projects by policy.
   c. Continue discussions on increased use of Surface Transportation Program and National Highway System and other flexible funds for public transit.
   d. Continue the use of New Freedoms Initiative funding and Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC), to serve special transportation markets, and the use of the established open, transparent and inclusive competitive selection process.
   e. Continue to strengthen coordination of federal funds for public transit and human-services transportation across multiple federal agencies including Department of Transportation, Department of Health and Human Services and others.
   f. Pursue federal Bus and Bus Facility Grants for bus fleet modernization and expansion, transit center development, shelters and other eligible passenger amenities.
   g. Pursue New Starts funds for future rail and bus rapid transit in high demand transit corridors.
3. **Pursue New Funding to Support the Regional and Community-Based Transit and Human-Services Transportation Networks**  
The region will pursue new federal, state and local funds to support existing services and implement expanded services to meet public transit and human-services transportation demand.  

   A. Elected officials, transit agencies, and MARC should continue to work together to lead efforts to implement the Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision. This should include efforts to:  
      1. Identify opportunities to secure dedicated or general revenue funding for sustaining regional and local community-based services;  
      2. Support the implementation of the high capacity Smart Moves urban and commuter corridors;  
      3. Coordinate transit legislative transit priorities to representatives in Washington D.C., Topeka, and Jefferson City;  

   B. Ensure adequate multimodal transportation funding for transportation and a fair share of statewide transit resources in both Missouri and Kansas. Work actively to protect existing revenues and increase appropriations for public transit and human-services transportation. Support the work of public transit and human-services transportation advocates in both States. Consideration should be given to both operating and capital funding. Specific state issues include the following:  
      **Missouri**  
      - Obtain longer, possibly permanent, authorization for the current Kansas City, Mo., $0.1-cent transit sales tax.  
      - Seek opportunities to increase the current state appropriation for transit and paratransit.  
      - Revise authorizing legislation for transportation taxes and/or districts to provide more flexible and useable mechanisms to raise funds locally in support of public transit and human-services transportation improvements included in the Long-Range Transportation Plan.  
      - Work with counties, as necessary, to create CTA’s as a funding mechanism to support their public transit and human-service transportation plans and operations.  
      **Kansas**  
      - Actively support appropriations by the Kansas Legislature sufficient to support transit and human-service transportation funding levels committed to in the Kansas Comprehensive Transportation Program.  
      - Actively promote higher transit and human-service transportation funding levels in the next Comprehensive Program.  
      - Obtain legislative authority to allow local referenda for transit and human-service transportation funding and as needed to support bus or commuter rail service.  

   C. Pursue federal and other grants to fund projects that have been identified as necessary to support system service priorities or maintain the system as outlined in this plan.

4. **Pursue opportunities for partnerships and economic development to support transit and human-service transportation and supporting capital facilities.**  
Elected officials and policy officials should continue to work with communities, employers, other transit and paratransit agencies, federal and state governments and vendors to expand resources
through public private partnerships that could support the sustainability of public transportation and human-services transportation in the region.

5.6.6 Existing Tools and Strategy Implementation in the Region
In an effort to meet regional public transportation needs in the region, various tools for funding have been developed or implemented. The following lists some of those strategic efforts:

- Regional Investment Fund – In 2006 legislation was submitted to both the Kansas and Missouri legislatures that would give metropolitan counties the opportunity to fund expanded transportation services and improved connections. The Missouri Legislature authorized Jackson, Clay, Platte, and Cass to place a transit funding initiative on a ballot to begin implementing portions of the Smart Moves service plan. The Kansas Legislature has not yet taken a similar action for Johnson, Wyandotte, and Leavenworth counties.
- Comprehensive Programs by both Kansas and Missouri are under development
- Use of ARRA funds for Smart Moves Implementation Planning
- Local funds
- Other national programs
- County measures

5.6.7 Performance Measures
Tracking the region’s progress towards reaching the policy goals of *Transportation Outlook 2040* is a new element in MARC’s long-range planning efforts. MARC has established a series of basic performance measures to help track our region’s direction.

Level of transit service, which supports multiple policy goals, will be measured by the percentage of population living within half mile of transit routes and stops, transit ridership, and vehicle revenue hours (the cumulative number of hours over the course of a year that a transit system provides service on all routes). The desired trend for each of these measures is up. A 2007 baseline has been established for evaluating performance:

**2007 Baseline:**
- Percentage of population within 1/2 mile of transit stops: 42.56 percent;
- Ridership: 52,156 riders per day;
- Vehicle Revenue Hours: 791,583

More information can be found in the Performance Measures element of this plan.

Additional performance measures that can track progress in the area of human-services transportation may be needed. The following measures should be considered as data becomes more standardized and readily available:

- Actual or estimated number of jobs that can be accessed as a result of geographic or temporal coverage of JARC projects implemented in the current reporting year.
- Actual or estimated number of rides (as measured by one-way trips) provided as a result of the JARC projects implemented in the current reporting year.
• Increases or enhancements related to geographic coverage, service quality and/or service times that impact availability of transportation services for individuals with disabilities as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year.

• Additions or changes to environmental infrastructure (e.g., transportation facilities, sidewalks, etc.), technology, and vehicles that impact availability of transportation services as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year.

• Actual or estimated number of rides (as measured by one-way trips) provided for individuals with disabilities as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year.

• Gaps in service filled. Provision of transportation options that would not otherwise be available for older adults and individuals with disabilities measured in numbers of older adults and individuals with disabilities afforded mobility they would not have without program support.

• Ridership. Actual or estimated number of riders (as measured by one-way trips) provided annually for individuals with disabilities and older adults on Section 5310-supported vehicles and services.