

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

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



MEETING NOTICE BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)

Matt Davis, MO Co-Chair and Leslie Herring, KS Co-Chair

Wednesday, March 13, 2024 - 1:30 PM
Lewis & Clark Room and Zoom

This meeting will be held in-person and via teleconference. Members of the public who wish to participate in this meeting virtually please email ptrouba@marc.org by Noon on Tuesday, March 12, 2024 for instructions to join the teleconference.

Agenda

- 1) Welcome
- 2) VOTE: approval of the January 10, 2024 meeting summary
- 3) Discussion and VOTE: Missouri Unfunded Needs – bicycle/pedestrian list prioritization
- 4) Presentation: Regional Trails & Bikeways Map 2024 print edition preview
- 5) Presentation: Connected KC 2050 update
- 6) Presentation: 2027-2028 suballocated funding call for projects
- 7) Roundtable updates

Next meeting: May 8, 2024

Getting to MARC: For information on transportation options to the MARC offices, including directions, parking, transit, carpooling, and bicycling, visit <http://marc.org/mapandparking.htm>. If driving, visitors and guests should enter the Rivergate Center parking lot from Broadway and park on the upper level of the garage. An entrance directly into the conference area is available from this level.

Special Accommodations: Please notify the Mid-America Regional Council 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). We will make every effort to meet reasonable requests.

MARC programs do not discriminate against anyone on the basis of race, color or national origin, according to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see http://www.marc.org/transportation/title_vi.htm, or call 816-474-4240.

Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting Summary

Wednesday, January 10, 2024 – 1:30 PM

Members/Alternates & Visitors in Attendance

Art Gough, Citizen	Joshua Gentzler, City of Lansing
A.J. Herrmann, City of KCMO	Kati Horner, Katigon Consulting
Brian Shields, City of Overland Park	Natalie Updyke, Children's Mercy - KC Healthy Lifestyles Collaborative
Chuck Soules, Smithville	Jenny Kramer, KS DOT
Eric Rogers, BikeWalkKC	Tresa Carter, BikeWalkKC
Krystal Jolly, MoDOT	Andrew Ngui, City of KCMO
Matt Davis, Jackson County Parks + Rec (co-chair)	Nick Ward-Bopp, Johnson County Parks + Rec
Michael Kelley, BikeWalkKC	Bobby Evans, City of KCMO
Noel Bennion, City of Riverside	Brett McCubbin, City of Shawnee
Tod Hueser, City of Olathe	Leslie Herring, BPAC Co-Chair and City Administrator of Westwood
Sherri McIntyre, City of Liberty	Christian Sinclair, Citizen
Joshua Martinez, City of Liberty	Ted Smith, Platte County
Jared Elbert, City of Grandview	

MARC staff in attendance

Martin Rivarola Patrick Trouba

- 1) Welcome and Introductions**
- 2) VOTE: Approval of the November 8 meeting summary**
 - 1) Brett McCubbin motions to approve.
 - 2) Eric Rogers seconds.
 - 3) Motion passes, summary approved.
- 3) Presentation: KC Physical Activity Plan (Tresa Carter, Natalie Updyke)**
 - 1) Children's Mercy is sourcing a research-based committee to program and promote healthier lifestyles in six counties in the metropolitan region (Cass, Clay, Jackson, Platte, Wyandotte and Johnson).
 - 2) Vision: To foster a culture of physically active lifestyles in the region.
 - 3) Goal: To create safe and equitable opportunities to live an active lifestyle in our region.
 - 4) Three overarching priorities: increase local funding, ongoing review of physical metrics, and regularly distribute a KC physical activity report card.
 - 5) Plan Organization: Ten sectors increase opportunities for physical activity in all aspects of an Individual's life (healthy schools, early childhood, infrastructure, parks, and recreation, faith-based, healthcare, sport, mass media, business and industry, and public health).
 - 6) Natalie Updyke is the ambassador from KC Healthy Lifestyles Collaborative programmed by Children's Mercy. She is heading the Infrastructure Sector Committee, with co-sponsors Tresa Carter (BikeWalkKC) and Bailey Waters (City of Kansas City).
 - 7) Active Transportation, being the focused sector of this presentation, scored an 'F' and the data quality grade was a 'C.' No details about the scope of the study or the reason for the results.
 - 8) The focus of the Infrastructure Sector: how does active transportation infrastructure influence health outcomes?

- 9) The main goal of this presentation is to reach out for help or get involved. This committee is still in its developmental stage. Seeking members to become a part of the committee. The committee has a \$15,000 budget and would like to find out how to support active transportation in the KC region. Committee members would lead the research and help find data gaps and/or needed data analysis. With meetings planned to meet quarterly.
- 10) Leslie: In terms of committee membership, if we suggest membership to someone is there any parameters to becoming a committee member? Tresa Carter: No, only seeking enthusiastic members.
- 11) Chrisitan Clare: Since kids using active transportation to school is one of the measures used for scoring, should membership be more inclined to those that are a part of the school districts? Leslie: I would extend that idea to PTA members, other types of school supported members or neighborhood groups.
- 12) Art: Presentation photos emphasize bicycle as the mode of transportation, will walking still be a part of active transportation? Tresa: That was an oversight of the pictures used in the presentation. Walking, scooters, jogging, even using public transportation are a part of active transportation.

4) Presentation: Westwood 47 St. Streetscape (deferred)

5) Discussion: BPAC Workplan – Patrick Trouba

- 1) Tasks for January: The Complete Street Policy – approval vote. Missouri Unfunded Needs - bike/pedestrian projects.
- 2) Tasks for March: Regional Trails and Bikeways print map and review of map in progress. Missouri Unfunded Needs – bike/pedestrian projects.
- 3) Tasks for May: Missouri Unfunded Needs - bike/pedestrian projects. Suballocated funding projects – committee feedback.
- 4) Other tasks with no timeline determined: Regional Bikeway Plan update. Vulnerable Road User Assessment (late Spring/Summer). Crosswalk Compliance in KCMO (proposed by Eric Bunch, Councilman of the City of KCMO).
- 5) External presentation ideas listed on slide deck: Operation Green Light – the pedestrian aspect of OGL, literature review of non-motorized fatalities/serious injuries, KDOT and MoDOT Local Technical Assistance Programs, Slow Streets/20 is Plenty, integrating stormwater best management practices into Transportation Projects.
- 6) Michael Kelley: Topic for future meetings: revisiting the River Crossings Policy. Especially given the recent activity with the HOA bridge. Looking at how to better accommodate bikes, pedestrians, and other multi-modal users to cross the bridge especially when it is undergoing construction. Another presentation idea would be to have KDOT share how they plan to implement their active transportation plan.
- 7) Martin Rivarola: Funded projects from either Long-Range Transportation Plan, or Transportation Improvement Program that have issues with bicycle or pedestrian facilities will become committee agenda items for review as they come up. Regarding the Long-Range Transportation Plan, we will be collaborating with this committee to prioritize and support bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- 8) Nick Ward-Bopp: Presentation Idea: The East/West Transit study by KCATA.
- 9) Leslie Herring: Interested in Vulnerable Road User Assessment and the literature review of non-motorized fatalities/serious injuries.

6) Discussion: MoDOT Unfunded Needs List (Patrick Trouba)

- 1) MODOT requested a more precise look of items on the Missouri Unfunded Needs list. MARC plans to survey Missouri jurisdictions to collect projects and help prioritize them for

this list. The surveys will be out in the next week to hopefully get results by the next BPAC meeting.

- 2) Survey Questions: Scope of the project and location, the estimated cost, whether project is in Connected KC 2050, whether project is on identified high-injury corridor or if data show the equivalent, what modes does the project serve (bike, pedestrian, or both). There will be specific questions about bikes, pedestrians or both modes of transportation. Bicycle question: would this project provide separation from motor vehicle traffic? Pedestrian question: Would this project provide accessibility or universal design benefits beyond ADA requirements? Both modes questions: Does this project implement recommendations from a local or regional planning document? Which ones and how? Will this project extend or connect to existing facilities?
 - 3) Patrick Trouba: One question to add is if the project will cross natural or built barriers, for example rivers or highways.
 - 4) Martin Rivarola: We collaborate with this committee (BPAC) and the Active Transportation Committee to help prioritize the projects from the survey. MoDOT has set a deadline for this Unfunded Needs list in May.
 - 5) Eric Rogers: Will MoDOT be compiling their own projects for this list or is it up to the local authorities with MoDOT routes in them to send them to the list? Martin: We must collaborate with all committees to create one list for the Kansas City region. That includes facilities on and off the MoDOT system. Working with MoDOT district staff to help generate the list and then the list is vetted by our committees. Then it goes to the Total Transportation Committee for their adoption. Finally, once we send this list off to MoDOT, MoDOT will vet the list to the public, this is a statewide list. Our contribution to the MoDOT list will focus on the Kansas City Metro region.
 - 6) Michael Kelley: One question to potentially consider for the survey; include support of public engagement for a project. For example, has there been a public meeting about a proposed project; traffic calming study, walk audits. Not just a city priority but active support from people who live off these corridors for funding a project.
 - 7) Bobby Evans: Our city/agency has a list of projects we would like to see done. If we put a project on this list, would it be confusing for our city if MoDOT selected our project? A selected project could lose city priority because it is selected for the Unfunded list. Martin Rivarola: Put on this list high priority projects for your agency or city. Those that are not in the CIP for the city yet, or don't have complete funding. Also look for projects that are somewhat regional in nature; regional bikeway or pedestrian plan, fills gaps in between two facilities or connects activity centers. We are going to collect this information and create a table with all the projects information. Then ask the committees to help assess this table. Projects that are regional in nature will intuitively move to the top of that list. This is not a promise of funding. We have seen projects that concern the road and bridge category get included in the STIP. We have not seen this in the bike/pedestrian project category. We hope that having specific projects will help raise the awareness of these projects that we want to see advanced.
 - 8) Bobby: Would it be in our best interest to partner with neighboring cities/communities. Martin: I think that is a good idea, maybe this is a question we could put on the survey.
 - 9) Art: The survey is to be handed out to local jurisdictions, not citizens. Patrick: Correct.
- 7) Vote: Complete Streets Policy Update (Patrick Trouba)**
- 1) Overview of the process: Engagement with MARC committees from July 2023; with presentations to most MARC committees to update the policy and get feedback on the policy, and to see how well the policy was serving the different modes. There were three meetings with the special volunteer workgroup. Then we had a three-week open comment

period. Special feedback-focused meeting of the Highway Committee. The Highway Committee wanted to vote on the approval of the new policy as a committee. It made sense for BPAC to vote on the policy as well, that is why we are bringing this item today. As a reminder, we do have a Complete Streets policy already in place. For any reason this draft is not adopted today, MARC staff will refer to the current policy. If any textual changes come out of this committee or the Highway Committee, we won't have time to bring it back to either committee for review. We are seeking a motion to approve this policy today.

- 2) Martin Rivarola: If we do not get approval for this updated policy by the end of this month, we will not have time to make changes before we launch our sub-allocated funding programming process. These are funds that are set aside for the rest of the year. We use the Complete Streets policy to influence and inform the slate of projects that receive funding every year.
- 3) Overview of Policy: One of the features of the new policy is the reorganization of the format. The Preamble section introduces MARC's role and the intent of the Complete Streets policy. The Definitions section is expanded compared to the current policy. This draft offers more definitions than the current policy. The Background and Regional Vision section sets up values behind and benefits of Complete Streets. The Policy Statement section is the most effective section of the policy. It is divided into two subsections Application and Requirements. The Application subsection lays out what projects this policy applies to. It applies to all MARC planning activities in ROW and all projects in TIP receiving federal funding. The Requirements subsections lays out that it requires safe accommodation for all modes, green infrastructure where possible, major river crossing policy, and does not supersede laws or regulations. The Implementation section says that MARC staff follow the policy, and that the committee advises on the staff assessment. A new feature in this section is an outline of principles for compliance by mode in a complete street. This is so we don't dictate design to any city or county, but we still have some basis for complying with the policy. The Exemptions section is expanded from the current policy. The Performance Measures section highlights Complete Streets Network Assessment. The Encouragement section addresses matters outside of the scope of the policy. The Appendix A: Design Guides section lists design guides to help enable Complete Streets treatments. The Appendix D: Suggested Cycling Facility Treatments Relative to Motor Vehicle Speed section is a table that has cycling facilities compared to vehicle speed.
- 4) Overview of Recent Feedback. Concern One: Maintenance is not accounted for in the policy. Changes for Concern One: Maintenance is included in both the Exceptions and Definitions sections. Concern Two: Policy language will conflict with current policies/practices/standards. Changes for Concern Two: Additional design guides in Appendix A, and the existing clause: this policy does not supersede any federal, state, or local law or regulation. Concern Three: Usage of the word 'safe' presents a litigation risk for state DOTs. Change for Concern Three: No change made because safety is a main goal in Complete Streets and similar language is used in state DOT documents.
- 5) Process of applying - Complete Streets Policy: For the Metropolitan Transportation Plan - sponsors are asked whether the project requires an exemption to the Complete Streets Policy. For Suballocated Funding: Phase 1 – Preapplication: MARC staff assesses compliance with the Complete Streets Policy as a part of assessing alignment with the Connected KC 2050. Then members of the planning, modal and policy committees are invited to review projects. Committees can evaluate staff assessment and provide comments. The invited committees to review are Highway, BPAC, Goods Movement, RTCC

Tech Team, Air Quality Forum, SPPC and Destination Safe. Comments are provided to sponsors to edit applications for Phase 2 applications.

- 6) Scope changes to programmed projects: If a project needs a scope change that affects the types of facilities that the project will deliver, this may prompt a review by staff of whether the project still follows the Complete Streets Policy. If needed, staff will give recommendations to the overseeing committee.
- 7) Evaluation of Preapplications: The first phase of the process: applications are screened against our different policies. If the project application fails the screening, it falls into the Not Aligned category. If it passes the first screening the application moves into other considerations. For example, does it follow the Connected KC 2050 strategy, or if it is financially constrained. Once it passes the first phase of evaluation it will go into either the Aligned or Highly Aligned categories. There are a couple more categories of projects besides the suballocated projects that the Complete Streets Policy applies to. This process is not formalized like the suballocated project process. MARC tracks the projects and ensures conformance with the Complete Streets Policy. Projects which require other consideration may be brought to planning/modal committees for review.
- 8) Leslie Herring: What impact will these changes have on what gets funded and what doesn't? Will it make it more difficult or more competitive to receive funding? Patrick: When we were redrafting, it was important to have a basis to evaluate projects. Complete streets are context sensitive this gives us something to refer to in the policy. Martin Rivarola: These policy changes align with our current practices at MARC. The changes provide clarity about the intent of the policy for our members. We are looking forward to making the streets more complete, safer for all users of all modes. We are not looking to make any project implement all these facilities, or all at do all these things at once.
- 9) Brain Shields: There is a concern about green infrastructure; the role that it plays in thinking about trees, grass, and flowers as infrastructure. Old infrastructure gets replaced and thinking about in a green infrastructure context; we don't want to take out our trees like we do our roads and bridges. There is a concern about aiming for zero transportation injuries and deaths. Realistically that isn't going to happen. Unless we take the human element out of driving. Some language concerns; is there a difference between ordinance, policy or regulation? There is concern over the Nation Complete Streets Coalition and their scoring and if it valid to assess program funding. Bobby Evans: National Complete Streets Coalition is a reputable source. Patrick Trouba: To further respond to Leslie's question, the Implementation section has a difference between along and across the ROW. The requirements used in the policy may be more than local authorities are used to doing. We do have to take projects into consideration along with the unknown details in the stage of design. Martin Rivarola: Addressing the green infrastructure language, the policy uses softer language like 'to the extent possible.' To address the other concern about scoring, we will use this policy to evaluate these projects. In an equivalent way to what MARC already does. We do not score projects but filter them into if the projects are aligned or not aligned with the policy.
- 10) Vote: Eric Rogers motions to approve
Brett McCubbin seconds the approval
Matt Davis votes to approve
Leslie Herring votes to approve
A.J. Herrmann votes to approve
Brain Shields votes not in approval
Jenny Kramer votes to approve
Noel Bennion votes to approve

Krystal Jolly votes to approve
Bobby Evans votes to approve

Motion passes Nine to One

8) **Discussion: Roundtable**

- 1) Brett McCubbin: We have applied for reaccreditation of our bronze level ecofriendly community. Hoped to announce the accreditation this meeting. But there has been a delay with the application.
- 2) Leslie Herring: In Westwood we are collaborating with our neighbors on our Planning Sustainable Places program application. It is a study on Rainbow Boulevard and should be finished in the next month. There is a public open house meeting on January 27 from 2PM to 4PM.
- 3) Eric Rogers: We are starting a project that focuses on social service agencies. It will try and help clients of these agencies who experience transit barriers. We are trying to get these agencies involved in transit policy. Looking at the transportation policies on the horizon, such as zero-fare. If there is a nonprofit or social service agency in your community that helps people that experience transportation barriers. We also have Veronica Davis; she is an engineer and public works director from Houston who is coming to town to speak on April 23 and 24.
- 4) Noel Bennion: We are kicking off Planning Sustainable Places Missouri River North trail. That includes cities, Riverside, North Kansas City and Kansas City. Connecting these cities along the river. The open house is January 17 at Kansas City North Community Center from 5PM to 7PM.
- 5) Patrick Trouba: MARC is working on regional bike and trails map. Check out the current map and see if there is something missing or if a line is on the map that does not exist.