



MID-AMERICA REGIONAL COUNCIL

HIGHWAY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, January 11, 2024

1:30 – 3:00 PM

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

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

ACTION	AGENDA ITEMS	PRESENTERS	TIME
	Welcome and Introductions	Co-chair	1:30
Approve	Highway Committee October 25 th and November 29 th meeting summaries	Co-chair	1:35
Presentation	Performance Measures Report	Selina Zapata Bur, MARC	1:40
Approve	MARC Policy Update: Complete Streets Policy	Patrick Trouba, MARC	2:00
Update	Spring 2024 Functional Classification System Updates	Selina Zapata Bur, MARC	2:30
Discussion	Highway Committee 2024 Workplan & Roster	Selina Zapata Bur, MARC	2:35
Discussion	Roundtable	Committee	2:50

VIRTUAL MEETING & CALL-IN INSTRUCTIONS

MARCZoom08

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

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

Meeting ID: 308-674-6761

Passcode: 976329

Audio:

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

NEXT HIGHWAY COMMITTEE MEETINGS:

Regular Meeting: March 27th, 1:30 – 3:00 PM

Special Accommodations: Please notify MARC at (816) 474-4240 at least 48 hours in advance if you require special accommodations to attend this meeting (i.e., qualified interpreter, large print, reader, hearing assistance). MARC programs are non-discriminatory as stated by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, call 816-474-4240 or visit our [webpage](#).

MARC HIGHWAY COMMITTEE

October 25, 2023

ATTENDANCE

Garrett Kauss, Garver
Jack Messer, Overland Park (KS Co-Chair)
Seth Horvatic, Wilson & Co.
Jeff Hardy, MoDOT
Rick Walker, City of De Soto
Carl Brooks, City of Harrisonville
Allison Smith, KDOT
Charles Soules, City of Smithville
Mike Spickelmier, City of Lansing
Tim McEldowney, City of Gardner
Brandon McElhiney, City of Lenexa
Chad Thompson, KCMO
Krystal Voth, City of Basehor
Dan Harper, City of Parkville
Randy Gorton, BHC Engineers

Joshua Scott, MoDOT
Art Gough
Lorraine Basalo, City of Overland Park
Ryan Sims, Johnson County
Haden Mattke, City of Belton

MARC Staff:

Selina Zapata Bur
Beth Dawson
Josh Woody
Patrick Trouba
Alicia Hunter

Agenda:

- Welcome and Introductions
- MARC Policy Update: Complete Streets Policy (Patrick Trouba, MARC)
- MARC Policy Update: Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox (Selina Zapata Bur, MARC)
- Roundtable
- Adjourn

MINUTES

Welcome and Introductions (Co-Chairs)

Welcome and introductions made by Kansas Co-Chair, Jack Messer. See attendance for those present.

MARC Policy Update: Complete Streets Policy (Patrick Trouba)

Patrick Trouba presented an update on MARC's Complete Streets Policy. Trouba presented the process to-date, including initial committee input, a volunteer workgroup, and a comment period from October 16 through November 3.

Feedback on the policy included expectations for safe streets for residents and clear expectations for sponsors. Trouba then presented changes in the policy section by section. New definitions are included in the current draft, and changes were made to the Policy Statement section, including the application sub-section and the requirements section. Section IV.2 of the Implementation section gives a more concrete idea of what compliance with the Policy means, while intending to allow for context and flexibility in design. Section IV.5 includes language regarding how the Complete Streets Network Assessment will help in implementation as well. The current draft of the policy adds several new exceptions in the Exceptions section. Performance measures focus on the Complete Streets Network Assessment.

MARC HIGHWAY COMMITTEE

October 25, 2023

Jeff Hardy, MoDOT noted that they have submitted several comments, and highlighted a few of them for discussion. There are some concerns in Section 3, Item 2 concerns around the term “safe” and potential legal implications. Chad Thompson, KCMO, noted that KCMO may run into a similar issue. There was a comment that “along or across” should be “along and/or across.” Allison Smith, KDOT agreed with MoDOT’s comments. Chad Thompson, KCMO, voiced concern regarding scoring and not having a definition of what that will be. Trouba clarified that the scoring he previously referred to was related to the Complete Streets Network Assessment, and not scoring of suballocated projects. Jack Messer reiterated that Overland Park also has concerns about how the policy changes will impact scoring for suballocated projects. Chad recommended that the policy could be revised to note that MARC would involve the committees if policy changes would require changes to scoring.

Lorraine Basalo, Overland Park, noted a number of references, such as the AASHTO Greenbook, Roadside Design Guide, and the MUTCD that should be balanced with the requirements in this policy. Jack Messer noted that a project could be designed upholding specifications in one of these references but still be considered to not meet the Complete Streets Policy. Lorraine Basalo noted that some standards are noted in the Policy. Jack Messer inquired about which committees have been involved in the process of revising the Policy and confirmation that the Policy was intended to be brought to TTPC without recommended approval from any sub-committees. Jack Messer also inquired if the changes would impact scope and budget of projects currently in the TIP. Trouba responded that it would not. Messer requested more clarity in some of the definitions as well and that Overland Park would submit final comments by November 3, 2023.

MARC Policy Update: Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox (Selina Zapata Bur, MARC)

Selina Zapata Bur presented an overview of the proposed key changes to the MARC’s Complete Streets Policy. Some re-organization has been made to the document to better set the stage for the main sections of the policy. Some changes to the introduction included tying the Congestion Management Process to regional goals, and stating who the audience of the policy is. A section for key definitions was added to include definitions for congestion, bottlenecks, single-occupancy vehicle capacity project, and auxiliary lane. Jack Messer inquired about the last time the policy was updated, which was roughly five years ago.

Section 3, the 8-step Congestion Management process section, which is the meat of the Policy, was reconfigured to present information in graphic and table format for readability, as well as to include involved agencies at different steps of the process. Most text was unchanged, with some small exceptions to add new references, where appropriate. One question was received to receive clarification regarding the counties within the TMA. Jack Messer inquired about the Congestion Management Report, which the Highway Committee will see in the next few months. A reference will be added to Section 3 to note the Congestion Management Report, if not already stated.

Section 4 focuses on the Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) Capacity projects. Revisions included framing text, outlining the steps of the policy more clearly, and incorporation of language to consider future growth. A revised SOV capacity worksheet was added as Appendix A, and subsection 4.1 includes new exemptions from the SOV capacity analysis related to safety and bottlenecks. Allison Smith, KDOT asked about previously voiced concerns regarding timing of the SOV capacity analysis. Zapata Bur and Allison Smith discussed the challenge further in the context of the SOV worksheet. Michael Park asked about whether ½ mile in the definitions section refers to a continuous distance or an aggregate distance. The intent is that it would refer to a continuous distance and the definition will be modified to reflect.

MARC HIGHWAY COMMITTEE

October 25, 2023

Another question was asked about whether safety projects should not be considered SOV capacity projects in lieu of considered exemptions to the process.

Sections 5, 6, Appendix A and the revised toolbox matrices were also presented. Jack Messer asked about the process for approval, and committee members discussed the desire to see the policy again and approve the policy before it goes to TTPC for approval.

Roundtable Updates

No roundtable items were discussed.

Meeting Adjourned

The meeting adjourned at 2:32pm.

NEXT MEETING: November 29, 1:30 – 3:00 PM

MARC HIGHWAY COMMITTEE

November 29, 2023

ATTENDANCE

Carl Brooks, City of Harrisonville
Sherri McIntyre, Liberty
Jack Messer, Overland Park (KS Co-Chair)
Allison Smith, KDOT
Charles Soules, City of Smithville
Mike Spickelmier, City of Lansing
Tim McEldowney, City of Gardner
Stephen Lachky, Parkville
Ryan Sims, Johnson County

Haden Mattke, City of Belton
Carl Brooks, City of Harrisonville
Greg Rokos, City of Belton

MARC Staff:

Selina Zapata Bur
Patrick Trouba
Alicia Hunter
Beth Dawson

Agenda:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Approve September 27th Meeting Summary
- Overland Park Comprehensive Plan Update (Jack Messer, Overland Park)
- Approve MARC Policy Update: Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox (Selina Zapata Bur, MARC)
- Approve Fall 2023 Functional Classification System Updates (Alicia Hunter, MARC)
- Congestion Management Network Update Approach (Selina Zapata Bur, MARC)
- Draft Highway Committee 2024 Workplan (Selina Zapata Bur, MARC)
- Roundtable
- Adjourn

MINUTES

Welcome and Introductions (Co-Chairs)

Welcome and introductions made by Kansas Co-Chair, Jack Messer. See attendance for those present.

Approve September 27th Meeting Summary (Co-Chair)

Charles Soules motioned to approve the September 27th Meeting Summary. Allison Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Overland Park Comprehensive Plan Update (Jack Messer, Overland Park)

Jack Messer provided an update on the Overland Park Comprehensive Plan which has been ongoing for about a year. The update is called FrameworkOP. Overland Park is about 60 years old with comprehensive planning in its history. Much of its infrastructure is nearing the end of its useful life. Demographics and growth patterns have changed, and it is a major employment center in the region. Much public engagement has been undertaken as part of the comprehensive planning process. There is a shift in the nomenclature from zoning and land use towards character types which considers design and form of places in addition to use, and Overland Park modeled and analyzed land use alternatives sites. A draft comprehensive plan is anticipated mid-January, which would enter the adoption process thereafter.

MARC HIGHWAY COMMITTEE

November 29, 2023

Approve MARC Policy Update: Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox (Selina Zapata Bur, MARC)

Selina Zapata Bur presented the process of developing the Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox as well as the desire for the Highway Committee to see revisions to the policy since it was presented last to them in October 2023. Zapata Bur presented an overview of the recent changes to address comments received from the Highway Committee. Allison Smith, KDOT moved to approve the Congestion Management Policy & Toolbox, as presented. Michael Spickelmier seconded the motion and was approved unanimously.

Approve Fall 2023 Functional Classification System Updates (Alicia Hunter, MARC)

Alicia Hunter provided an overview of functional classification, what it is, and how it is used. Hunter provided the process of the Fall 2023 call for changes as well as where it is at in the process. Since the call closed, MARC staff has coordinated with the state DOTs and requesting jurisdictions and recommendations are now being brought forth to the Highway Committee for approval. There was a final cost of 249 request changes, 225 in Kansas and 24 in Missouri. This was an unusually high number of requests. These requests are broken down into recommendation categories (withdraw, deny, approve w/modification, and approve). Hunter presented the number and percentage of requests under each category, the justification for including the requests in these categories, and examples of why certain requests were included in those categories. Overall, 77% of the requests are recommended for approval. The full list of recommendations is included in the packet.

Jack Messer inquired about why certain requests were recommended to be withdrawn as well as clarification regarding the criteria that should be met for a request to be recommended for approval. Jack Messer and Alicia Hunter discussed the process undertaken to go through each request submitted by the Unified Government. Sherri McIntyre voiced appreciation for the coordination made over the last few months. Sherri McIntyre made a motion to approve and Allison Smith, KDOT seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Congestion Management Network Update Approach (Selina Zapata Bur, MARC)

Selina Zapata Bur provided background on what the Congestion Management Network (CMN) is and that it should be updated every 5 years. The last update was made 2 years ago. MARC staff is currently reviewing traffic volume data and estimates from State DOTs from 2021-2022. Currently there are no additional roadways that have traffic volumes of 25,000 or more in length that need to be added to the CMN. Please contact Selina Zapata Bur if there are additional roadways in your communities that should be considered for inclusion on the CMN. MARC staff is also reviewing current transit route data and coordinating with transit agencies to include all routes with high levels of transit service. Next steps will be to coordinate with the Regional Transit Coordination Council Tech Team to review the list of routes on the network. The intent is to update the network prior to the next published Congestion Management Report. Jack Messer asked about how these criteria factor into the world post-Covid. Zapata Bur responded that changes in travel patterns could impact these two criteria and that may be why certain roadways no longer meet the traffic volume criteria whereas they may have a few years ago.

Draft Highway Committee 2024 Workplan (Selina Zapata Bur, MARC)

Selina Zapata Bur presented a draft 2024 workplan to the Highway Committee. The current draft is similar to the 2023 workplan which is consistent with the cyclical nature of many of the Highway Committee's responsibilities. A request for additional external presentations was made. Jack Messer noted that the Complete Streets Policy should be noted in January and Selina Zapata Bur agreed. Jack

MARC HIGHWAY COMMITTEE

November 29, 2023

Messer inquired about when the Highway Committee would review the suballocated candidate project alignment with the MTP as well as the MTP update, and these are currently noted on the workplan.

Roundtable Updates

A discussion around the date of the next Highway Committee meeting. Members present agreed that only one meeting should be scheduled in January to cover the Complete Streets Policy Update and other January items in the workplan. Selina Zapata But will send a notice with meeting invitation out to the Highway Committee members.

Meeting Adjourned

The meeting adjourned at 2:25pm.

NEXT MEETING: January 11, 1:30 – 3:00 PM

HIGHWAY COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT

January 2024
Item No. 4

ISSUE:

VOTE: MARC Complete Streets Policy

BACKGROUND:

The Complete Streets Policy applies to MARC’s planning processes, including, but not limited to, the programming of suballocated federal transportation funds. It seeks the implementation of Complete Streets, which are “streets, highways, bridges and facilities that are planned, designed, operated and maintained for the needs and safety of all users along and across the entire public right of way. This includes people of all ages and abilities who are walking; using powered, street-legal vehicles such as cars, trucks, motorcycles or buses; bicycling; using transit or mobility aids; and freight carriers. Complete Streets integrate contextually-appropriate green infrastructure techniques.” The Complete Streets Policy calls for an update of itself before each new or updated metropolitan transportation plan. The last update to the Complete Streets Policy was adopted by the MARC Board of Directors in December 2015.

MARC staff have engaged committees and stakeholders in various ways since July 2023. Engagement has included presentations to committees, three meetings of a special volunteer workgroup, a three-week open comment period, and a special feedback-focused meeting of the Highway Committee. Notable changes in the draft policy update include:

- A reorganization of the policy text for easier navigation.
- An expanded Definitions section.
- A clause in the Policy Statement section requiring green infrastructure to the extent possible.
- An expanded Implementation section articulating needs of different transportation modes (and green infrastructure) as a context-sensitive guide for compliance with the policy.
- An expanded Exceptions section.
- The introduction of the Complete Streets Network Assessment, particularly as a performance measure.
- An Encouragement section addressing several matters relevant to Complete Streets that are outside the effective scope of the policy.
- An Appendix of design guides that public agencies can consult to better implement Complete Streets, and an Appendix suggesting certain forms of bicycle facilities relative to motor vehicle speeds.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

This is a proposed update to the MARC Complete Streets Policy.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:

None.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

Staff is requesting a vote of approval from both the Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee and the Highway Committee.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval.

STAFF CONTACT:

Patrick Trouba

MARC Complete Streets Policy

January draft

I. Preamble

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) serves as the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine counties and 119 cities in the Kansas City region. As the region's MPO, MARC is responsible for transportation planning, and the Total Transportation Policy Committee coordinates the allocation of millions of dollars in federal transportation funds each year. Complete Streets are advanced in this policy so that transportation investments may result in a rising quality of mobility for everyone. An exemption review process exists for unique projects which may require special consideration, however, this policy intends to enable Complete Street treatments to the maximum extent possible.

II. Definitions

Bridges are public structures designed to carry traffic across natural and constructed barriers with spans that are greater than twenty feet.

Complete Streets are streets, highways, bridges and facilities that are planned, designed, operated and maintained for the needs and safety of all users along and across the entire public right of way. This includes people of all ages and abilities who are walking; using powered, street-legal vehicles such as cars, trucks, motorcycles or buses; bicycling; using transit or mobility aids; and freight carriers. Complete Streets integrate contextually appropriate green infrastructure techniques.

Curbside management is the practice of analyzing and adjusting the uses and regulations of space around the structure of the curb so that it can more efficiently and safely serve different kinds of users.

Cyclists refer to users of the street who are using small mobility devices intended to travel faster than common pedestrian speed, but slower than common automobile speed. These devices include, but are not limited to, bicycles, Class I and Class II e-bikes, other types of "cycles" (tricycles, handcycles) and e-scooters. The term "cyclists" shall not refer to any user with a mobility device that can obtain speeds above 20 miles per hour by throttle function alone.

Freight carriers refer to users of the street who operate a variety of vehicles to transport goods. Vehicles used may fall into one or more of the above categories.

Green infrastructure refers to stormwater control facilities that use nature-based solutions to expand the urban tree canopy and/or use native vegetation designed to sustain plants and mimic natural hydrology by storing, filtering, infiltrating, evaporating, or reusing stormwater. Green infrastructure will increase the resiliency of urban stormwater infrastructure by reducing the amount of wet-weather drainage and collection systems and prioritizing safety, comfort and well-being for pedestrian and transit users through reduction of extreme temperature variation and airborne pollutants.

Maintenance refers to activities including mowing, cleaning, sweeping, pothole repair, chip-seal and slurry-seal operations, pavement mill and overlay operations, and other regular upkeep activities.

Major river bridges are public structures designed to carry traffic across the Kansas or Missouri rivers.

Motorists refer to users of the street who operate motorized vehicles capable of high speeds. These include automobiles, buses, trucks, motorcycles, mopeds, Class III e-bikes and any other mobility device that can obtain speeds above 20 mph by throttle function alone.

Pedestrians refer to users of the street who are walking and/or using assisted mobility devices at commonly accepted walking speed, such as, but not limited to, wheelchairs, motorized wheelchairs, strollers, walkers and canes.

Transit users refer to people who use the public right-of-way to access public transportation vehicles.

III. Background and Regional Vision

In 2010, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) issued an updated Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation that calls for all transportation agencies “to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems.” The USDOT encourages transportation agencies “to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes.” The Policy Statement considers walking and bicycling equal to other transportation modes.

In June 2020, the MARC Board of Directors adopted *Connected KC 2050* as the Kansas City region’s metropolitan transportation plan. The vision of this plan is as follows:

Greater Kansas City is a region of opportunity. Its robust economy, healthy environment and social capacity support the creativity, diversity and resilience of its people, places and communities.

Formed at the confluence of rivers, trails and trains on the border of two states, Greater Kansas City is a place of interconnection, where people of all backgrounds are welcome and where commerce and ideas flow as freely as the rivers and streams that run through and define it. Our people thrive here, in safe, walkable and well-maintained neighborhoods.

We have abundant opportunities for education, and work in fulfilling jobs at businesses that can compete with any in the world. We enjoy, protect and preserve our region’s natural beauty. We care for our neighbors and our communities. We lead by example. Our region has the strength to not only bounce back from adversity, but bounce forward, confidently, into the future.

Complete Streets benefit communities and help the Kansas City region achieve progress toward *Connected KC 2050*’s five transportation system goals in the following ways:

- **Public Health and Safety** – Complete Streets are designed for the safety of all users of the street, aiming for zero transportation-related injuries and deaths. Complete streets consider conflicts between modes of transportation, exposure to environmental pollutants, and access to physically active transportation modes.
- **Access to Opportunity** – Complete Streets ensure that destinations are accessible by multiple modes of transportation, providing residents with ways to access employment and education even if automobile ownership is out of reach.
- **Economic Vitality** – People seeking goods and services can access businesses through multiple modes of transportation and may have more money to spend through decreased vehicle and fuel costs. Since non-automobile modes require less parking space, making those modes more viable enables more people to patronize a business at the same time.

- **Healthy Environment** – By making more modes of transportation viable, Complete Streets reduce pollutant load from motor vehicle traffic. Green infrastructure treatments on Complete Streets create community amenities while protecting people from the effects of urban heat, flooding, and air and water pollution.
- **Transportation Choices** – Complete Streets consider more than what modes are simply legal on a roadway and make mode choices such as walking and bicycling appealing through facilities that both feel safe to users and result in fewer injuries and deaths.

Connected KC 2050 further indicates that “transportation investments should protect air and water quality, reduce urban heat islands and energy consumption, promote climate resilience and preserve cultural and historic resources.” Plans adopted by the MARC Board that support the implementation of integrated Complete Streets and “green street” concepts include the MetroGreen Plan (2001), the Best Management Practices Manual to Protect Water Quality (2003), the Clean Air Action Plan (2004 and 2011), the Eco-Logical Action Plan (2008), and the Greater Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan (2015), the Regional Green Infrastructure Framework (2017) and the Regional Climate Action Plan (2021). Additionally, MARC’s Regional Forestry Framework (2011) calls for increased canopy coverage through streetscaping, forest protection and other mechanisms.

Ultimately, this policy seeks to effect a safe multimodal transportation network throughout the Kansas City region through MARC’s transportation planning processes.

IV. Policy Statement

MARC seeks to achieve the Kansas City region’s vision of a safe, balanced, resilient regional multimodal transportation system that is coordinated with land use planning, supports equitable access to opportunities and protects the environment. This vision can be furthered by implementing Complete Streets and context-sensitive solutions.

1. *Application* – This Complete Streets Policy applies to the following:
 - a. All MARC planning activities that involve public rights-of-way, including the metropolitan transportation plan.
 - b. Any non-exempt projects included in the Transportation Improvement Program that use federal funds.
 - c. This policy does not supersede any federal, state or local law or regulation.

2. *Requirements*
 - a. Planned and programmed projects shall provide safe accommodations along and across the public right-of-way for all users who have legal access to use the facilities.
 - b. Planned and programmed projects shall utilize green infrastructure techniques to the extent possible.
 - c. Safe accommodations for cyclists and pedestrians must be provided for major river bridges, except where provision of such facilities would exceed 15% of total project costs, and when it is deemed that sufficient existing or planned future bicycle or pedestrian trip generators are not located within one mile of the project. (Please see MARC Major River Crossing Policy for more information).

V. Implementation

To implement this Complete Streets Policy into planning and programming processes at the metropolitan level, MARC will take the following steps:

1. Ensure this policy is reflected in ongoing planning and programming work and current policies. MARC's transportation modal committees will advise MARC staff on conformity to the policy by planned and programmed projects seeking federal funding.
2. Review all project applications seeking federal transportation funding for compliance with the policy statement. **MARC may assess compliance using any of the below principles, subject to the exceptions in Section VI. and considering the context of the project and stage of design:**

i. Pedestrians

- That pedestrians are accommodated *along* the right-of-way by paved, unobstructed facilities separated from motor vehicle traffic traveling above 15 miles per hour.
- That pedestrians are accommodated *across* the right-of-way using dedicated crossings that are highly visible to motorists, which encourage motorists to yield to pedestrians, which are as narrow as practical to reduce crossing distances (or supported with crossing islands), and which are implemented between intersections as necessary to connect to goods, services and other destinations.

ii. Cyclists

- That cyclists are accommodated *along* the right-of-way using either low motor vehicle speeds or facilities that provide separation from motor vehicles. See Appendix B for a table of suggested cycling facility treatments relative to motor vehicle speeds.
- That cyclists are accommodated *across* the right-of-way using intersection treatments, approaches, and extensions which enable through and/or turning movements where dedicated bikeway facilities (including striped bike/mobility lanes, separated bike/mobility lanes, and shared use paths) are present, and which increase cyclist visibility to motorists.

iii. Transit users

- That transit users are accommodated *along* the right-of-way using facilities at bus or rail stops that provide some shelter, seating, or both. Regarding travel to stops, see pedestrian principles in section IV.2.i.
- That transit users are accommodated *across* the right-of-way with intersection crossings using the pedestrian principles in section IV.2.i.

iv. Motorists

- That motorists are provided street configurations which reduce conflicts with other users, encourage predictable movement, and are designed with target speeds to match the surrounding land use.

v. Freight

- That freight carriers are allowed loading/unloading space that minimally exposes workers to vehicle traffic. Solutions for this mode may occur outside of the public right-of-way, or through a curbside management effort. See Exceptions item 4 and Encouragement item

d.

vi. Green infrastructure

- That, to the extent possible, canopy coverage is maximized along a project corridor by installing native and/or drought tolerant vegetation and tree landscape treatments in existing right-of-way or as made available through reductions in setback, parking requirement, and street width.
 - That to the extent possible, stormwater runoff of the most frequent storms (less than 1.37 inches of precipitation within 24 hours) should be captured and controlled using green infrastructure. Refer to current APWA 5600 Storm Drainage Systems & Facilities, Manual of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality and other resources in Appendix A.
3. Monitor all projects receiving federal transportation funding for compliance with this policy.
 4. Engage project sponsors in evaluating projects for the Transportation Improvement Program that receive federal funding outside of MARC's programming processes.
 5. Using the Complete Streets Network Assessment, MARC staff shall consider ways to elevate in planning and programming priority corridors that score poorly relative to corridors in similar contexts, or segments of corridors that the Complete Streets Network Assessment rates poorly compared to adjacent segments.
 6. Re-evaluate this policy regularly — at least before adopting each new or updated metropolitan transportation plan.

VI. Exceptions

Maintenance, projects that are not “streets”, such as transit capital equipment, bike share capital equipment, diesel engine retrofits, clean vehicle conversions, alternative fuel vehicle purchases/fleet replacements, compressed natural gas fueling stations, other Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program eligible projects, off-street bicycle/pedestrian trails, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) programs and initiatives and others, are exempt from the Complete Streets Policy.

The Total Transportation Policy Committee may grant exceptions to this policy. Staff and the modal and programming committees will review requests for exceptions and make recommendations to the Total Transportation Policy Committee. Exceptions may be granted in the following cases:

1. Where using specific modes of travel is prohibited by law, such as bicyclists and pedestrians on some sections of Interstate highways or trucks on boulevards.
2. Where accommodations for non-motorized travel conflict with the purpose of high-speed motor vehicle facilities, particularly limited-access highways. In these cases, MARC staff may inquire about the provision of separate facilities, especially if the corridor's general alignment appears on a local or regional planning product.
3. In cases where the provision of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists of higher comfort and/or greater separation from motorized traffic would be inappropriate due to factors such as rural character or high cost (exceeding 20% of total project costs per federal guidance), sponsors of planned and programmed projects may provide facilities of lower comfort and/or lesser separation from motorists and freight shippers.
4. Where accommodations for a mode are best provided using solutions outside of the project right-of-way. Such instances shall be clearly explained.
5. Where emergency service providers have indicated that providing for all modes will conflict with

operations. Such instances shall be clearly explained.

6. Where a transit route does not exist or is not planned, a project does not need to accommodate transit users with corresponding facilities (boarding pads, shelters, etc.).

VII. Performance Measures

MARC has developed the [Complete Streets Network Assessment](#), which scores roadway segments according to infrastructure-based criteria. The Complete Streets Network Assessment may be used in the following ways:

- To identify multimodal infrastructure gaps in corridors, or lengths of corridors that lack safe and comfortable multimodal facilities.
- To show the improvement in multimodal facilities as streets are rebuilt or resurfaced.

MARC staff will work to improve the Complete Streets Network Assessment in coverage, data quality, and fidelity to the Complete Streets paradigm.

Stakeholders may also look to MARC's performance measures reports to view the Kansas City region's progress in roadway safety, use of alternative modes, and other important categories.

VIII. Encouragement

Many matters related to the successful implementation of Complete Streets are outside of the effective scope of this policy. MARC encourages local communities to adopt the Complete Streets paradigm in all aspects of their transportation and land use planning work.

- a. Local communities are encouraged to adopt Complete Streets Policy ordinances. They are further encouraged to adhere to the National Complete Streets Coalition criteria such that their policies score highly (a score of 70 out of 100 or greater) using these criteria.
- b. Local communities are encouraged to consider development that features a greater variety of housing types and mixed uses so that development is more feasibly served by public transit, walking, and cycling.
- c. Local communities are encouraged to consider zoning and development codes that make goods, services, and civic uses more readily accessible to pedestrians from the public right-of-way.
- d. To reduce conflicts and make streets more complete for freight, off-street loading and curbside management solutions are encouraged.
- e. Complete Streets policies for cities may reference third-party design guides that provide best practices. Adoption of these design guides may make it easier to provide for the comfort and safety of all modes of transportation, and to comply with MARC's Complete Streets Policy. Design guides are listed in Appendix A.
- f. Due to the long service lives of bridges, project sponsors are encouraged to follow Complete Streets principles for all bridges, not just those crossing the Kansas or Missouri rivers.
- g. Emergency services are not listed as a modal user by the definition of Complete Streets, but input and cooperation from emergency services should always be sought during the planning of Complete Streets projects.
- h. Project sponsors are encouraged to assess nearby watershed management opportunities to manage transportation runoff offsite while creating additional community amenities. They are further encouraged to review green infrastructure plans with public works, planning and parks departments for feasibility and alignment with neighborhood, land use and watershed plans.
- i. Complete Streets and Complete Streets policies are encouraged as a means of congestion management. Improvement to the viability of other modes of transportation is encouraged in

Appendix A: Design Guides

Multi-modal

- A Guide for Achieving Flexibility in Highway Design (AASHTO)
- A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 7th Edition (Green Book) (AASHTO)
- Achieving Multimodal Networks: Applying Design Flexibility and Reducing Conflicts (FHWA)
- Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach: An ITE Recommended Practice (ITE)
- Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities (AASHTO)
- Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities (AASHTO)
- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (FHWA)
- Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) (United States Access Board)
- Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide (FHWA)
- Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks (FHWA)
- Transit Street Design Guide (NACTO)
- Urban Bikeway Design Guide (NACTO)
- Urban Street Design Guide (NACTO)
 - Designing for All Ages & Abilities: Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities
 - Don't Give Up at the Intersection: Designing All Ages and Abilities Bicycle Crossings

Green Infrastructure

- APWA Section 5600: Storm Drainage Systems and Facilities (Kansas City Metropolitan Chapter of the American Public Works Association) **(update anticipated May 2025)**
- Kansas City, Missouri Green Stormwater Infrastructure Manual (GSI Manual)
- Manual of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality
- Urban Street Stormwater Design Guide (NACTO)

Appendix B: Suggested Cycling Facility Treatments Relative To Motor Vehicle Speed

Motor vehicle posted speed limit	Facility type
≤25 miles per hour	Shared streets (urban/suburban settings)
≤30 miles per hour	Striped bike/mobility lanes (including buffered)
≥30 miles per hour	Separated bike/mobility lanes
Any	Shared use path

MARC Highway Committee – 2024 Work Plan

Last updated January 8, 2024

Key Tasks and Discussion Topics

- Support Connected KC 2050 MTP Update: Continue scenario analysis, continue project identification & analysis, confirm goals and strategies
- Review Complete Street Network Assessment & Complete Street Policy, as necessary
- Consider Functional Classification Changes bi-annually
- Consider ConnectedKC 2050 Plan amendments, as necessary
- Performance management/target setting: Update the required USDOT performance measures as necessary and support target-setting for voluntary measures (e.g., VMT per capita)
- Review updated fiscal constraint analysis reflecting new transportation funding (tentative)

Meetings

January 11th

- Complete Streets Policy Update
- 2023 Performance Measures Report
- Issue (semiannual) call for functional classification changes
- Review 2024 work plan, review membership list

March 27th

- Status of I-35 Santa Fe Corridor Improvement Project (Olathe and KDOT)
- Work Zone presentation by KC Scout
- 2023 Congestion Management Report
- Update on the Connected KC 2050 MTP Update

May 22nd

- External Presentation - TBD
- Review and approve Functional Class request changes
- Review suballocated candidate project alignment with MTP

July 24th

- External Presentation - TBD
- Consider select voluntary performance measures target setting processes
- Issue (semiannual) call for functional classification changes

September 25th

- External Presentation - TBD
- Update on the Connected KC 2050 MTP Update

November 20th (Moved due to Thanksgiving)

- External Presentation - TBD
- 2024 Performance Measures Report
- Review and approve Functional Class request changes
- 2025 Work Plan

Various External Presentations (scheduled throughout the year):

- Seeking suggestions from the committee