

MARC

MID-AMERICA REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETING NOTICE

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The next BPAC meeting will be held at 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, January 13, 2010, in the Broadway Room on the 1st Floor of the Mid-America Regional Council, 600 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri.

REVISED AGENDA

- 1) Welcome/Introductions (1:30 p.m. 2 ½ min)
- 2) Transportation Outlook 2040 *attachment* (Bartlett, 1:40 p.m. 40 min)
 - a) Strategy Development – (20 min)
 - b) Discussion on Regional Bikeway Criteria – (20 min)
- 3) Role of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee – *attached* (MARC, 2:20 p.m. 10 min)
- 4) MARC Update on Discussions with MoDOT regarding B/P Accommodations on River Bridges – (MARC 2:30 p.m. 10 min)
- 5) Open Forum (2:40 p.m. 10 min)

Next Meeting –To be determined

* Action Item

Parking

Free parking is available when visiting MARC. Visitors and guests should park on the upper level of the garage. To enter this level from Broadway, turn west into the Rivergate Center parking lot. Please use any of the available spaces on the upper level at the top of the ramp. Bicycle parking is available at the northwest corner of building entrance.

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.

If you need directions to MARC please visit <http://www.marc.org/mapandparking.htm> .

Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
January 13, 2010

Members / Guests Present

Brent Hugh, Mo Bike & Ped Federation
Art Gough, KCBC
Noel Challis, Platte County Parks
Lynn Jameson, Citizen
Dale Crawford, KanBikeWalk
Becky Pepper, KDOT
Jeff Froman, WyCo/KCKPublic Health
Neil Davidson, Platte County
Mark McHenry, KCMO Parks & Rec
Eric Rogers, Missouri Bike Federation
Laurie Chipman, KCBC/Lets Go KC

Laura Turnbull, City of Lenexa
Neil Holman, Shawnee Parks & Rec
Kenneth Walker, Urban KC Community of
Cycling
Jeff Perry, Greater KC Bike Federation
Greg Ruether, City of Overland Park
Steve Petrehn, SRTS Consultant
Beau Baker, BTG Clean Commute
Mike Shirk, TREKK Design Group

MARC Staff Present

Aaron Bartlett, Bicycle Pedestrian Planner
Marlene Nagel, Community Development Director
Heidi Schallberg, Transportation Planner
Lisa Pool, Transportation Planner
Tom Gerend, Asst. Director, Transportation
Ron Achelpohl, Asst. Director, Transportation
Eliza Waterman, Community Development

1. Welcome/Introductions

Mark McHenry welcomed the meeting attendees and invited all to introduce themselves and their affiliations. Brent Hugh announced that he is now also the State Coordinator for Safe Routes to School National Partnership. Steve Petrehn noted that he is no longer with Bridging the Gap, but now an independent SRTS consultant and trainer.

2. Transportation Outlook 2040

Aaron Bartlett noted that he received some comments since the last meeting about this document and has incorporated some changes into the latest draft. He asked to use this time to focus on the strategy development. Mr. Bartlett continued with a brief overview of this section and stressed that these issues can only be done through a concerted partnership. The document provides research and related back to policy. Under Section III of the document, there are headings about strategy and policy that are intended to address goals through the policy framework. The final format will change for consistency throughout the document. In addition MARC is striving to create a document that is easy to read, concise and not redundant. Mr. Bartlett asked if there were any questions about Section III; if anything was missing or unclear. Mr. Petrehn commented on the importance of curriculum and training with schools to create a culture of bicycling and walking. Eric Rogers asked where the target for criteria would be placed within the document? Mr. Bartlett replied that the Performance Measurement would be in the appendix portion of the document but noted that if anyone had any specific measurements to please let him know. He also noted that staff is continuing to work with jurisdictions on collection better data.

Steve Petrehn said that the new EPA air standards might highlight bike and ped efforts as one solution to the problem of non-attainment. Aaron said he would work with staff to determine if this is the right place for it or where it should be inserted.

Mr. Bartlett moved on the next part of the chapter, Section IV of the draft Active Transportation Evaluation Project List – this portion is still under draft but should be completed by February’s meeting will reflect a more concise listing of projects by decade and how this falls within the financial evaluation. He said it is not the intent to include Regional Bikeway designations in the plan because additional work is needed. The chapter will include the list of projects submitted for the LRTP by decades to demonstrate where communities are trying to build their systems over time. Maps will highlight the gaps identified by the committee. Steve Petrehn commented on the big “doughnut hole” around the Unified Govt. on the map displayed at last month’s meeting. Mr. Bartlett explained that those maps did not represent all local planned facilities, only those that communities could commit to funding through 2040.

3. MARC Update on Discussion with MoDOT regarding B/P Accommodation on River Bridges and 4. Role of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Marlene Nagel picked up on last month’s discussion regarding the Heart of America Bridge and the committee’s strong response to MoDOT about the process and design that went into the bike-ped facility. At the end of the discussion, there was a motion to send communication to TTPC about this issue. Following the meeting, MARC staff and others from BPAC met with MoDOT and a draft memo to BPAC was distributed to the committee that outlines the extent of the process and the input from BPAC. At this point, it seemed important to clarify the role of BPAC as a modal committee for MARC as a technical advisory committee to TTPC. BPAC serves to advise MARC as an MPO in developing policy, guidelines and standards and making recommendations that might lead to the programming of resources and in helping look both at long and short range investments. BPAC’s role is not to recommend specific designs for projects.

Ms. Nagel noted that a good example of BPAC work was the River Crossing policy, that policies which helped guide the work of the TTPC as river crossings are proposed for funding. Another good example is work with APWA on guidelines / standards and encouraging project sponsors to use these guidelines. The committee is not charged with making engineering recommendations for specific unless MARC is the project sponsor. MARC is willing to host public meetings / forums and encourages MoDOT to provide more feedback as they’re making decisions to the public and interested stakeholders so everyone is aware of those decisions as they are being made. Lynn Jameson asked if this document is a clarification or a change of BPAC’s role. Ms. Nagel said it is a clarification and gave an example that project sponsors have asked for the committee’s feedback but the intent was not for the committee to make a formal recommendation but for the project sponsors to draw on the technical expertise of this group as they consider best design practices.

Steve Petrehn commented that perhaps this was a missed opportunity by MARC/BPAC to come up with policies that would advance or help guide the design of future projects. Deb Ridgway added much like the River Crossing Policy that was developed a few years ago. Mr. Petrehn replied that the River Crossing Policy failed to address the design issues that have caused all of the friction surrounding the HoA Bridge. Ms. Ridgway disagreed and felt that it was more a failure of communication; those issues were addressed by the MoDOT’s core team but it would appear that it was not communicated back to this group in a timely way. Aaron Bartlett said that he is not sure that all of the information that was shared was accurate and wants to make sure in moving forward that there are mechanisms in place for better communication.

Dale Crawford asked in regards to the MO TE committee, what is its role in the review of the design of projects. Ms. Nagel replied that it applies criteria for evaluating projects and through applications of that criteria, projects can be judged both where it goes and how it will be designed to accommodate users. Mr. Crawford said in regards to the HoA Bridge they were looking at design. He continued that there is a lot of history between the HoA and the Committee, which is why he thinks it has struck such a deep chord and like Steve Petrehn, he too feels that this was a missed opportunity. Part of the frustration then is that there is “fatigue” in missing opportunities and seeing other cities doing class projects and the potential that is out there.

Brent Hugh said we need to capture accountability on the back end of projects and can't just set policy guidelines and hope for the best. A stronger review process is necessary. He said that other MPO's have such mechanisms in place. Mr. Bartlett reiterated that BPAC is a modal and not a programming committee like TE/CMAQ. Ms. Nagel added, as we look at policy in the LRTP, we should consider what MARC as an MPO should be doing to make sure project sponsors are doing things in a way that has the best outcome; how can BPAC help shape decisions at the state and local level that work in everyone's best interest.

Kenneth Walker commented that his impression is that MoDOT thinks that we should be happy with what we got out of the HoA Bridge. Dale Crawford asked if there is a way to change the structure of BPAC. Ms. Nagel replied that BPAC will remain as a forum for these concerns in the community and to give input to project sponsors but that committee's role is not to offer formal recommendations on project design. Ron Achelpohl followed up that MARC selects and makes funding recommendations which is typical of an MPO but the project design is really between the project sponsor and the state DOT's / FHA; MARC does not have a formal role over this relationship.

Laura Turnbull seconded Dale Crawford's comment on frustration with getting money for a project that may or may not take into account the committee's feedback and that there is no mechanism that says they need to be responsive to the comments and recommendations of the committee. Ms. Nagel responded that there is a component of public involvement and meetings but in this instance it seems neither MARC nor MoDOT circled back with the committee and stakeholders

Following this discussion, Mr. Bartlett asked if the committee would be willing to retract its motion to write a letter to TTPC expressing its concerns over the process and design of the HoA. Art Gough replied that indeed, there was a communication gap, and informed the committee that he apologized to Linda Clark regarding his interaction with her at the last BPAC meeting but still not sure if we should retract the motion to write the letter. He continued to say that we need to determine the standard this committee wants to set for this type of facility; do we settle with “good enough”? He conceded to ask the BPAC chair to consider retracting his motion to write the letter. Ms. Nagel said that if there is a communication to TTPC it should at least be pro-active for the next project and not just carry the sentiment that “we're unhappy.” Dale Crawford agreed with this approach.

Deb Ridgway commented that she wasn't sure if the committee members had reviewed the Active Transportation draft but said referencing this document as projects come forward will be a great value and noted specifically the section on encouraging quality facilities. Ms. Ridgway stated that this is a pro-active approach and with this update MARC staff has made a very good

effort to help guide these discussions. Lynn Jameson noted that if there was a best practices reference for the design of the HoA, it might have helped sort through the perspective of different user groups and if we could work towards that, we will be better off. Steve Petrehn asked if any of the 600 projects submitted involved bridge / river crossings to which the answer was yes. Aaron Bartlett asked if he could conclude this discussion with the comment that as we look at design guidelines in the future, it should begin with common principles, move to general policy and culminate with specific practices and that this should not be a cookie cutter approach but a means for making facilities the best that they can be.

Brent Hugh reiterated that given that MARC staff has already met with MoDOT and the point has been made, the letter to TTPC is not going to make a difference in regards to the design of the Bridge. Before moving forward, Ms. Jameson asked for clarification regarding the memo on BPAC's roles and responsibilities; the memo was just a "refresher" and nothing in the scope has changed nor did it require a vote. With this, Hugh he made a motion to withdraw the previous motion to write a letter to TTPC. The motion was seconded; the motion passed. For the record, Art Gough and Dale Crawford were opposed to the motion.

Mark McHenry noted that he received correspondence from Ron McLinden in light of the recent snow and efforts to clear the roads and sidewalks to emphasize what a big issue this really is for bike and pedestrian facilities. Steve Petrehn commented that perhaps this is a good policy issue for this committee to get involved with. He also noted that Lawrence is the only city to have eliminated school busing so children are reliant on cleared and safe sidewalks on which to walk to school. Ms. Ridgway said since this a municipal issue how could MARC and this committee do something when each municipality has their own laws. Several members said it would be to create a model ordinance. Aaron Bartlett said our role could be to educate on best practices.

5. Open Forum

Brent Hugh passed out information on bike events coming up and announced that a recent meeting with Kevin Keith of MoDOT resulted with the task of finding the fifty best bike-pedestrian projects in MO, packaging and taking them to MODOT and they will build those projects in the next five years. Mr. Hugh asked the committee for their help on identifying local projects.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.