

Active Transportation Programming Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: Wednesday, August 9th, 2023

Time: 10:30 AM to 12:00

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

Attendees

Alison Smith, KDOT
Andrew Roberston, GBA
Bailey Waters, KCMO Public Works
Bradley Hocevar, City of Edwardsville
Brian Nowotny, Jackson County (Co-Chair)
Brian Shields, City of Overland Park
Chuck Soules, City of Smithville
DuRon Netsell, MO Community Representative
Grant Purkey, City of Harrisonville
Jared Campbell, Downtown Council
Jennifer Lee, Mission Hills
Jenny Kramer, KDOT
John Davis, Clay County Parks and Recreation
Stacy Lowe, KCMO Public Works
Steve Casey, City of Lee's Summit

John Neuberger, Sierra Club (Co-Chair)
Joshua Gentzler, City of Lansing
Juan Yin, MoDOT
Kelly Wray, Cass County
Kristie Reitingner, Miami County
Lisa Treese, City of KCMO Parks and Recreation
Maddie Waldeck, City of Basehor
Mark Lee, City of Bonner Springs
Matt Davis, Jackson County
Nicole Brown, JCDHE
Rodney Honeycutt, City of Independence
Scott Fricker, Platte County
Zach Baker, City of Olathe

MARC Staff

Alicia Hunter
Beth Dawson
Martin Rivarola

Patrick Trouba
Raquel Ordoñez
Selina Zapata-Bur

Agenda

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **VOTE: Approve the May 10, 2023, meeting summary.**
 - a. Motion to approve by John Neuberger.
 - b. Seconded and approved.
3. **KDOT and MoDOT TAP balances.**
 - i. Alison Smith from KDOT explained that there is not much to update at this time. There were no projects on the TA schedule to be obligated and Johnson County returned the funds for their project. Unfortunately, this means they will leave a

balance of just over \$3 million. KDOT will cover and float those funds for next year.

- ii. No update from MoDOT. Patrick will reach out via email and let the committee know of any important updates.

4. VOTE: Scope change: KCMO Paseo Blvd. Bikeways

- a. Stacy Lowe, KCMO Public Works Department: Explained that they are requesting a reduction in the length of the project to Independence Avenue and 18th Street Corridor. (See letter in meeting packet) This goes along with another project the city is working on to install a trail in this area instead of bike lanes. There has been extensive public engagement along the entire Paseo corridor and through that they have learned that it would be more feasible and acceptable to the community to build a trail in this area rather than bike lanes. The City is still working on putting bike lanes in other areas of the Paseo and will consider using City funds to add to existing bike lanes on the Paseo in the future. Open to discussion and questions.
- b. Question: What were the extensive interactions with the community? Can you give us some more details?
 - i. Stacy: There was previous CMAC funding provided to this project which was used to hire a design consultant who did a study on behalf of the city. It included community engagement set up with several working committees to look at options with city staff and council members and provide their opinions. This took place over a year and a half which led to the City's decision to pursue the trail over the bike lanes for this portion of the corridor.
- c. Clarification – Original scope of the TIP was a bike lane on Paseo from Independence Ave to 83rd Street. Patrick clarified that the change from on street bike lane project to an off-street shared use trail was already amended in MARC's TIP and the focus of this change is shortening the length of the trail to Independence Ave. to 18th instead of 87th.
- d. Question – Will any additional right of way be needed to complete the shortened segment?
 - i. Stacy – No, at this time we are attempting to do the design without any right of way impacts. We are also trying to save as many existing trees on this corridor because of its historic nature as well.
- e. Question – Its sounds like you are not requesting any change in the amount of funding?
 - i. Stacy – That's correct. We are asking that the funding level remain the same.
- f. Public Comment – Jared Campbell, Downtown Council – Expressed support of this change. The Downtown Council is a project lead on a project called Greenline KC which is a proposed 10-mile urban trail throughout greater downtown. This project on Paseo represents the eastern lay of what will ultimately be the Greenline. We really like the idea of it being off street and being more of a trail. We see better usage for both pedestrians and cyclists.
- g. Question from Patrick Trouba - We have been hearing from other cities that the cost of construction has been affecting their projects. Was that part of the decision to shorten the Paseo project by as much as you did?
 - i. Stacy – At this point the cost of construction did not play into our decision. Our decision was guided by coordination with the Greenline project and the community acceptance of the shortened scope.
- h. Motion to approve from John Neuberger.

- i. Seconded by DuRon Netsell.
- j. Vote to approve scope change passes.

5. Scope Change: Mission Hills – Indian Lane – Brush Creek Trail

- a. Jennifer Lee, Mission Hills – One homeowner along the proposed trail route is refusing to grant additional right of way to the project. Home is located in the middle of the proposed route on Indian Lane. Will interrupt the trail.
 - i. It is important to the community to maintain connection to the Southwest where 66th meets Mission Rd because there is a sidewalk there that leads to two schools.
 - ii. Asking for guidance on how to proceed with the project. Should the trail start and stop at the edges of the property? What has the committee done in the past in situations like this? Is the project still able to be completed with an interrupted trail?
 - iii. If the length of the trail is reduced, then we will reduce the funding request accordingly.
- b. Also considering a scope change to a proposed loop around trail located south of 63rd St. because public reception has not been great. Considering altering the layout.
- c. **Question:** Is the current scope a 10-foot-wide shared use path?
 - i. It's an 8-foot-wide pedestrian path with a pervious surface. Could also be used by cyclists.
- d. **Question:** Did you look at modifying the scope to see if there was any additional road right of way that you could go parallel to?
 - i. Project engineer is currently exploring alternatives to asking the homeowner for right of way. Including seeing if there is enough road right of way for the trail to be on the roadway for that segment. More information to come.
- e. **Question:** Can you elaborate on the other alignment you would be considering that is not along Indian Lane?
 - i. There is a park South of 63rd St where the path loops around and crosses a small pedestrian bridge. That is the only part of the alignment we are considering altering. In the case of the homeowner, we would omit that segment of the trail if there is no other viable alternative found. The rest of the project will remain unchanged.
- f. **Question:** In the section where you are in dispute with the homeowner, is there an existing sidewalk?
 - i. No, there is just a green space between the back of curb and the creek bank. Since the creek wanders a little bit sometimes that space is sufficient for the trail and in others it is not, and additional right of way is needed.
- g. **Question:** Does the right of way go just to the curb, or does it extend past that?
 - i. It does go behind the curb a few feet but not far enough to accommodate the entire path. It wanders a little bit in that location because overtime the creek has changed positions.
- h. Seems like the city is still pursuing alternatives. Hold this item for the next meeting.

6. MARC policy discussion: Complete Streets Policy and Congestion Management Policy

Please review linked resources in the meeting packet to allow for more discussion time

- a. Patrick Trouba, MARC – This is the first of two policy discussions. The Complete Streets Policy and the Congestion Management Policy are both in the process of being updated. These are complex topics, so information materials were sent out ahead of time. I will focus on the Complete Streets Policy.
- b. Definition of Complete Streets – Complete Streets are designed for the needs and safety of all users along and across the public right of way.
- c. The policy itself recommends re-evaluation before adopting each new or updated regional transportation plan. We are currently updating our regional transportation plan which is ConnectedKC 2050. We also want to integrate the Complete Street Network Assessment Tool into the policy. There is also an opportunity to review and clarify the language used in the policy and enhance green streets infrastructure language.
- d. This policy applies to any activities conducted by MARC to program federal funds for projects in the Transportation Improvement Program and projects that involve public rights of way including the metropolitan transportation plan. Existing policy requirements that all planned and programmed projects shall provide safe accommodation for all users who have legal access to the facilities while being sensitive to both current and future community context. It is important to note that policy states that project sponsors retain design decision authority over their projects.
- e. Exceptions to the policy – Projects that are not streets. Where modes are prohibited by law such as limited access highways. Where costs of providing facilities would be “excessively disproportionate to need or likely use.” Where population scarcity or other factors indicate an absence of need.
- f. Pollev.com/marckc activity. Complete Streets Policy last updated in 2015. We have been gauging how other committees feel about the policy using this same survey.
- g. **Discussion Questions:** How can this policy better effect a complete multimodal network in the Kansas City region? Which of the 10 elements of a complete streets policy is most important to you? What would you add or remove from the policy? What roles could the Complete Streets Network Assessment play in the policy? How should we integrate green streets/green infrastructure treatments in the updated policy?
- h. Open floor to discussion.
- i. **Question:** Matt Davis – Are projects reviewed/audited after completion to see how well they adhered to complete streets policy?
 - i. Patrick – No. The closest thing we have to that would be the Complete Streets Network Assessment (CSNA), but that tool does not look at the before and after results of how well a project implemented multimodal facilities. The CSNA scores a street according to several multimodal criteria. There is a lot of potential for performance measures with the CSNA but there is no process comparing the before and after of a proposed project.
 - ii. Matt – I bring this up because I have seen a couple projects make scope changes to major roadway projects where complete streets elements get cut due to various complications. It can be easy to overpromise when it comes to some of these things and then not fulfill the initial scope/vision for the project. This is particularly important when using federal dollars to fund a project. Complete streets elements should be included in those projects.

- iii. Patrick – That is something I think about in the policy language. How can MARC staff assess compliance in an easier to understand way during the application process and during scope changes as well. The current policy does not have good language about how to do that.
- iv. Brian? – It would seem like committee meetings like this one would provide a good opportunity to comment on the applicability of complete street standards and whether or not the changes still align with the policy.
- v. Matt – Expanding on that, when we have major roadway projects those typically go to the STP Committee first. I know there is bike/ped representation on that committee but if complete streets elements are being removed during a scope change, is STP looking out for complete streets elements in these projects? This goes for other committees as well. Is there some sort of firewall preventing the removal of complete streets elements at every level of the process?
- j. Bailey Waters, KCMO Public Works – Patrick, to your question about green streets/infrastructure, I think it is a good idea to integrate these elements because it adds to the pedestrian experience to have street trees or greenery. It is a more dignified experience to be walking on a street or sidewalk that has shade and it also adds to the environment. As far as the how, we could quantify a required number of trees per block or number of plantings? Or are there other implementation tools that have been thought of? I think it is a good idea to explore how to implement these things.
- k. Brian – Patrick, is this something that there is still time for committee members to review and provide feedback?
 - i. Patrick – Yes, we will talk more about this after Selina’s presentation but feel free to email us. There was also a survey included in the meeting packet and there are a couple upcoming workgroup sessions on August 23rd and 30th. We definitely want anyone who is interested to participate in those sessions.
- l. Bailey – Does the current complete streets policy address land use?
 - i. Patrick – Not in an effective way.
 - ii. Martin – There is a line in there about the context sensitivity when it comes to this type of improvements. I think the policy indirectly touches on land use. Please share any additional thoughts on the matter with us.
- m. Selina Zapata Bur, MARC – MARC is also updating our Congestion Management Policy and Toolbox. Materials were distributed prior to the meeting. I will give a brief overview now. The Congestion Management Process is a part of the metropolitan planning process. It is a systematic way of monitoring, measuring, and diagnosing the current and future congestion on the region’s multimodal transportation system. This policy should also be updated along with the MTP which MARC is currently in the process of. In collaboration with the National Highway Committee the Toolbox should be updated every 4 years.
- n. The current Congestion Management Process follows an 8-step approach. It includes requirements for single occupant vehicle (SOV) capacity projects with certain exemptions. A project that adds significant SOV capacity is defined as adding one or more lanes, turn lanes, or auxiliary lanes for the distance of ½ mile or more on a facility classified as a minor collector or higher on the FHWA classification system. If a project is planning on adding SOV capacity the project sponsor should conduct and document a congestion mitigation analysis during the planning stage of project development to show that additional capacity is necessary to manage congestion. Project managers

can refer to MARC's Congestion Management report that is updated every 2 years to see where congestion is occurring. If a segment is not shown in the report to have congestion, then a project sponsor can develop a separate study that shows congestion is occurring or expected to occur.

- o. Polling exercise. Pollev.com.marckc
- p. Bailey Waters –Last week I was at a luncheon at MARC and they handed out some system performance reports for the ConnectedKC 2050 plan and it showed that the most of the congestion related measures like Truck Travel Time Reliability were all in the green. But other measures related to injuries or multimodal were on the lower side of the scale meaning that we are not meeting those. So, I am wondering for congestion mitigation policy is there is a way to focus on the measures we are not meeting?
 - i. Selina – That's a good question. We are working to tackle all those things. The system performance report looks at system reliability specifically on the National Highway System which is only a subset of the roads in the region. The congestion management policy applies to a larger network. We are working to meet performance measures when it comes to reliability, infrastructure requirements, and safety.
 - ii. Martin – I was also at the luncheon, and I would like to add that it is generally true that this is a low congestion region. We have high reliability in the majority of our system, and we do a pretty good job of tracking and meeting performance targets. However, there are still parts of the system that are congestion/unreliable, so it is an objective to invest in those areas to deal with those issues. So, one of the reasons we have this policy in place is to distribute the limited resources among the various needs and encourage alternative solutions to adding roadway capacity like bike/pedestrian, land use or transit strategies. We also noticed that the existing policy does not address economic development or safety very well so there is room for improvement in that area.
- q. Selina – Next Steps – Throughout the rest of August Patrick and I will continue to present to other committees and put together a work group. We expected to have draft policy updates ready to present to committee members in September through October. Followed by potential approval from TTPC by the end of the year.
- r. Workgroup – August 23rd and August 30th from 12-2 pm. The sessions will build on each other and you are invited to attend one or both. Email sbur@marc.org or ptrouba@marc.org by 5pm on August 15th to volunteer.

7. Project progress

a. Kansas

- i. Basehor – Maddie Waldeck – 158th Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements – Will be let this year. We just submitted final plans to KDOT.
 - 1. Civic Campus Trail – We have submitted our first round of plans and we appreciate all the help from MARC on these projects.
- ii. BikeWalkKC – N/A
- iii. Bonner Springs – Mark Lee – 138th Street Improvements – Everyy completed utility relocations. Looking good for December.
- iv. Edwardsville – Bradley Hocevar – Town Centre Connector – Resolution for professional services have been adopted. We have an agreement in place with BHC. Staff planning to meet with financial and engineering partners regarding

timeline of the project, mod processes and right of way acquisition. Targeted for late 2024.

- v. Johnson County – Nicole Brown – Safe Routes to School – Rolling along really well with our schools. Starting to pick up on programming and spending. Walk audits and arrival dismissal evaluations to come in the Fall and Spring. One of our schools just opened back up so we will be looking at the new arrival and dismissal patterns when it comes to safety for them. We will also be working with some of the schools on some walking field trips to nearby community resources. We are also hoping to include some older students in the process and maybe set up a sort of mentoring program.
- vi. Mission Hills – Addressed earlier in the meeting.
- vii. Olathe – Zach Baker – Cedar Creek Trail Phase III – Phase II is still in construction.
- viii. Overland Park – Brian Shields – Overland Park Wayfinding Signage – Slight delay as we worked through some things with KDOT but the project is back on track. Plans will be finished in the next few months and then we will get them out to bid so we can get them up next year.
 - 1. The other three projects are in our CIP and we are compiling the necessary forms for KDOT to get the city-state agreements on those.
- ix. Prairie Village – N/A
- x. Unified Government – N/A

b. Missouri

- i. Blue Springs – N/A
- ii. Gladstone – N/A
- iii. Grain Valley – N/A
- iv. Grandview - N/A
- v. Independence – Rodney Honeycutt – no updates
- vi. Jackson County – Matt Davis – Greenwood Connector – Dealing with right of way issues but we are confident we will be able to get that out this year.
 - 1. Little Blue Trace/Rock Island Connector – Also working through right of way issues. We partnered with KCMO and they are handling the right-of-way acquisition process.
 - 2. Greenwood Connector Phase II – We just learned of a pre-approved development in the area that will impact construction of this project, so we are hoping to discuss that with the developer soon. We are hoping to integrate the two projects.
- vii. Kansas City – Bailey Waters – Charlotte Holmes Bikeways – Closing out soon.
 - 1. Lexington Gladstone Bikeways – Working on finishing the design. The City Council approved Phase 2 of bikeway facilities last week.
 - 2. Lisa Treese – Trolley Connector Trail Segment 2 – Will advertise for bid in September.

3. Martha Truman Connector Trail – Received PS&E comments. Working on revisions. Close to being ready to advertise for bid. Maybe this winter or spring.
 4. Swope Park Trail/Blue River Trail – Just got funding awarded. Working on filling out initial paperwork.
 5. Swope Park Connector Trail – Not on the list. Construction is almost complete.
- viii. KCATA - N/A
 - ix. Kearney - N/A
 - x. Lee's Summit - N/A
 - xi. Liberty - N/A
 - xii. North Kansas City - N/A
 - xiii. Parkville – No movement. They don't have the local match.
 - xiv. Riverside - N/A
 - xv. Smithville – Chuck Soules – Smithville Streetscape Phase III – Waiting for authorization from MoDOT to advertise.
 1. Commercial Pedestrian Project – We have preliminary plans and are working with property owners for some temporary easements.
 2. Riverwalk Park and Second Creek Sidewalk – Engineering will start in October.
- c. Martin – Before we hit the next round of programming we should check in and get a good update from the projects that were not here today. We need to know what is going on with 23-24 projects so that way we can identify ways to lower TAP balances going forward. Maybe projects could be pushed to 2025. Please be thinking about that over the next couple of months and at the next meeting of this committee we could use a good amount of time to discuss.

8. Missouri Unfunded Needs – Project Prioritization

- a. Martin – On an annual basis we work with MoDOT to determine a list of unfunded needs in the region. We consider a variety of project types: multimodal, bridges, transit, aviation, freight, and bicycle/pedestrian. We just completed that work and it went through TTPC and the Board of Directors in June. Last night MoDOT had an open house here to share that work with the public. Now we are looking ahead to see what we will be doing in this area for next year. This process works to identify projects that partners have an interest in moving forward but do not have the means in order to do so. We have gotten feedback from MoDOT that it would help projects get funded if they are as specific as possible, especially when it comes to naming the project. This could be identifying start and stop points and the type of facilities involved. To prepare for next year we will be putting together a survey for all the communities on the Missouri side of the region asking them to identify specific bike/pedestrian projects that folks are looking/moving forward in the next 5 to 10 years and what the estimated project costs are. We want to generate a longer brainstorming list of projects that have interest in moving forward. Then we will work with this committee and others to rank and prioritize those. Over the next three months, we will put together and administer the survey and then work with this committee early next year. This work needs to be completed by May

2024. In the meantime, please be thinking about those projects that are not in your CIP's and not funded.

- b. Question** – Do you anticipate the monetary targets for bike/ped projects will stay the same for next year?
 - i. Juan Yin, MoDOT – The number will be close. There may be a slight adjustment, but it should be close.
 - ii. Martin – We did receive a request from Ray County to be added to the MPO boundary and that request will be reviewed by TTPC next week. There is a recommendation to approve so it is likely that our MPO work will extend to Ray County.

9. Call for Community Seats

- a. Martin – Bylaws state we have 2 seats on the committee for community members. Now is a good time put out a call for anyone new interested. We will be gathering the names of any existing committee members or new people who are interested in participating on this committee and presenting them to you in November. Just wanted to let you know the call will be out there and you will receive more information about it soon.

10. Adjournment

Next Scheduled Meeting: Wednesday, November 8, 2023, 10:30 a.m.