ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
February 8, 2017  
Meeting Summary

Members Present:  
Brian Nowotny, Jackson County, Mo.  
Cliff Middleton, Johnson County, Kan.  
Lideana Laboy, UG Wyandotte County & KC, Kan. (A)  
Wendy Shay, City of Independence, Mo.  
Greg Ruether, City of Overland Park, Kan.  
Nathan Musteen, Cass County, Mo. Municipalities  
Allison Smith, KDOT (A)  
Mike Landvik, MoDOT  
Travis Hoover, Platte County, Mo. Municipalities  
John Neuberger, Sierra Club

Alternates Present:  
Brian Shields, City of Overland Park, Kan.

Other Attendees:  
Eva Steinman, MoDOT  
Colin Victory, MoDOT  
Sean Partain, MoDOT  
Matt Messina, KDOT  
Kati Horner Gonzalez, City of Raytown, Mo.  
Ben Hyde, City of Lawson, Mo.  
Krystal Davis, Leavenworth County, Kan.  
Tammy Snyder, City of Edwardsville, Kan.  
Vernon Fields, City of Basehor, Kan.  
Jon Gallion, City of Basehor, Kan.  
Rob Richardson, UG Wyandotte County & KC, Kan.

MARC Staff:  
Marc Hansen  
Kaitlyn Service  
Aaron Bartlett

1. Welcome and Introductions  
Kansas Co-Chair Cliff Middleton welcomed the attendees and introductions were made.

2. Approval of November 9, 2016 Meeting Summary  
Motion: Allison Smith moved and Brian Shields seconded to approve the November 9, 2016 meeting as written. The motion carried.

3. Status of the Current Program  
Program Balances  
KDOT report from Allison Smith: Four of the five 2017 Kansas projects are programmed with KDOT. Johnson County Bike Share has not been programmed. If all five projects are obligated, we will be overprogrammed by about $126,000.

MoDOT report from Mike Landvik: Kansas City’s Brush Creek Trail- Blue River Confluence project was obligated this week. About $5 million of TAP funds still need to be obligated.

Marc Hansen shared a list of Missouri TAP projects that are in the TIP for 2017-2020. Numerous projects that were programmed for previous years have been pushed into 2017. Projects that are several years old and/or have already used their “one-time extension” are especially encouraged to progress this year. About $9 million of projects are in the TIP for 2017. Given the current TAP balance, projects may have to wait if Missouri reaches the end of its TAP balance for 2017.

Project Updates  
Kansas City, MO’s Blue River Trail—Brush Creek to Stadium Drive requested an extension in 2014 to move to 2015. This project is close to obligation. The plans are complete.
KCMO is combining some of the MO-152 Trail projects. They are close on a couple of the segments.

KCMO is doing work on Platte Woods's Route 9 & NW Prairie View Road Sidewalk/ Bike Lane project. Additional intersection design is needed.

Belton’s Bel-Ray Connector Trail has not been obligated, but was not included on the list. They recently requested an extension.

4. Review of Pedestrian & Safe Routes to School Project Scoring

During the most recent programming round and during November’s debriefing discussion, concerns were raised that pedestrian and safe routes to school projects were not scoring competitively. In response, the scoring criteria for Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects (Category 1) was reviewed and potential changes were brought to the committee for discussion.

The committee discussed Section A of the scoring criteria, which currently includes this scoring criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creates link in identified gap or provides new access in walking or bicycling network</th>
<th>10 possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General improvements (no plans referenced)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to local corridor (references local plans)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to regional corridor (references regional or national plans)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaitlyn Service pointed out that regional bicycle and trail plans exist, but MARC does not have a regional pedestrian plan. Pedestrian projects do not have the ability to earn the full 10 points. She suggested scoring the bicycle/trail projects with the existing criteria, but creating new separate criteria for pedestrian projects and asked for input from the committee.

Attendees discussed the following:

- Points could be given to sidewalks that connect destinations.
- Scoring could be higher for sidewalks that serve schools.
- Pedestrian projects should not be expected to reference larger plans. A project should get points if the local government identified it by as a need.
- All TAP applications are submitted by local governments who have identified a need. How will the scoring differentiate?
- More points should be given to projects that support a larger walkability plan or ADA transition plan. This should be captured in the scoring criteria somewhere, rather than replacing the current criteria with something brand new. The pedestrian scoring criteria should be reasonably comparable to the bicycle/trail scoring criteria.
- UG Wyandotte County/ KCK has a local plan. Basehor has a sidewalk plan, which is also referenced in the comprehensive plan. Independence does not have a city-wide sidewalk plan and does not anticipate ever having funding to create one.
• Some cities do not have a city-wide sidewalk-specific plan. Cities should not be disqualified from earning points if they do not have a local sidewalk plan. There is still a need for sidewalks in these communities.

• There may be parts of every city that will never have a sidewalk, but cities can have area plans for parts that really need sidewalks. Independence has smaller scale types of programs, such as sidewalks to schools.

• To qualify as a local pedestrian plan, a plan would not necessarily need to include city-wide segment-by-segment detail. For example, a local plan may say that sidewalks are needed within a half-mile radius of schools. Something this general could earn points for a safe routes to schools (SRTS) project.

• Five of the ten points can be based on plans and the other five points can be qualitative, such as connections to destinations.

• Section B of the scoring criteria has ten points dedicated to connections to activity centers. Duplication should be avoided.

• Does “plan referencing” need to be worth a full ten points? Maybe we don’t need this many points associated with this criteria.

• We should avoid having a different number of total points possible for bicycle vs. pedestrian projects.

• To ensure connectivity, it is really important for bicycle and trail projects to further regional plans. We do not want to lower the number of points associated with this criteria for the bicycle/trail projects. The region has done a good job of creating a connected trail network and we do not want to abandon that effort.

• It is more important for bikeway and trail projects to achieve regional connectivity because bicycles can travel long distances in a short period of time. The pedestrians are slower and typically travel less than a mile in one trip, making large-scale connectivity less crucial. This is likely the reason a regional plan does not exist for pedestrians.

• MARC is currently working on a regional pedestrian policy plan. It is focused on policy, not connectivity of physical pedestrian infrastructure. It will not designate any sidewalks as “regional sidewalks”.

• SRTS sidewalks can be scored based on whether they are part of a comprehensive plan, such as one that includes the “5 E’s” of SRTS: Education, Encouragement, Engineering, Enforcement, and Evaluation. This does not answer the question of how other sidewalk projects will be evaluated. There could be 3 categories: 1) Bike/ trails 2) Pedestrian 3) SRTS.

• SRTS non-infrastructure projects, such as Local Spokes SRTS Education, are scored under different criteria (Category 5). There is currently no bridge between SRTS infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects.

• Points could be given if a project is within a certain radius of a school.

• In some cities, a one mile radius around all schools in the city will include the majority of the city.

• 100% of SRTS projects will be in close proximity to a school. To differentiate, the scoring can be graduated: the closer to the school, the higher the points.

• Points could be awarded if a walking study was done to identify common routes to school.

• Scoring could be qualitative based on safety reports or incident reports.

• Points should be given to sidewalks along major transportation corridors, where there is an obvious safety need.
• Section F of the scoring criteria is dedicated to safety.

• Scoring could be higher for sidewalks on roads that have higher ADTs.

• Some streets with heavy vehicle traffic do not have the population or land use to support high pedestrian traffic. ADT may be an oversimplified measure. Areas where people are walking in the street should be given priority regardless of ADT.

• Cyclists and pedestrians prefer low-traffic streets and intentionally avoid high-traffic roads when possible.

• Evaluating by ADT will not allow small communities to compete unless the evaluation is based on a population to ADT ratio.

• Do many communities have ADA transition plans? ADA transition plans are required by federal law, but the requirement is rarely enforced unless there are legal challenges.

• MARC recently collected information from local governments via a pedestrian survey. It may provide insight on how many communities have local plans.

The committee discussed Section C of the scoring criteria, which currently includes this scoring criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Climate Change and Energy Use</th>
<th>5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project includes elements that use renewable energy sources, recycled materials, or other green technologies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring criteria for two other TAP categories currently awards points to projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by including this language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Climate Change and Energy Use</th>
<th>5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project includes elements that use renewable energy sources, recycled materials, or other green technologies</td>
<td>5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reduces VMT by increasing access to multimodal transportation options</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee agreed that this change would be appropriate for the Active Transportation Infrastructure category.

The committee discussed Section E of the scoring criteria, which currently includes this scoring criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Place Making</th>
<th>10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate design elements contributing to quality places (up to 10 pt. total)</td>
<td>10 possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle parking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash cans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming (e.g., bulb outs, narrowing travel lanes, raised crosswalks)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses new tested visibility technology or treatment beyond MUTCD requirements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (must describe)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaitlyn Service pointed out that complete streets are generally thought of as context-sensitive. However, this scoring criteria is rigid, awarding points only if the project includes the specific elements listed. MARC staff were unable to determine how this list was developed, but it does not appear to reference any widely recognized standard. STP scoring criteria and two TAP scoring categories use the Creating Sustainable Places (CSP) guiding principles to evaluate place making benefits. Under these scoring criteria, points are awarded if the project promotes reinvestment, transportation choices, housing choices, development in corridors and activity centers, design for healthier lifestyles, unique community
characteristics, or resource conservation and energy efficiency. These principles were developed by local governments, a consultant team, and MARC using a HUD grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles</th>
<th>10 possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Principle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Principles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Principles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Principles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Principles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ Principles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See pg. 15 for Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles

Attendees discussed the following:

- A more context-sensitive approach would be good.

- The suggested change would standardize the place making criteria for the various TAP categories, which is helpful when comparing projects.

- If the CSP principles are too vague, projects may get points for something that is barely applicable and score the same as a projects who are fully committed. For example, if one community posted an advertising sign promoting carpooling, will they score the same as a community who actually develops a program and builds commuter lots? Both scenarios encourage transportation choices and sustainability, but the efforts are very different and should be rewarded differently.

- Perhaps the scoring could be divided into “minimum”, “moderate”, and “maximum” implementation categories.

- The brief descriptions on the handout may seem broad, but the actual product goes into greater detail and would guide scoring. More detailed information can be sent to the committee. The MARC staff member who scores this portion may be able to attend the next meeting.

- Applicants often do not have completed design and preliminary engineering at the time of application. At that point, applicants are not 100% sure whether they will include trash cans or benches. Evaluating projects using CSP principles will be more relevant to the final outcome of the project.

- If the scoring is working well for STP and the other two TAP categories, it will likely work for the active transportation infrastructure category.

The committee discussed Section F of the scoring criteria, which currently includes this scoring criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Width</th>
<th>5 possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 ft. curb lane OR 10 ft. SUP OR 5 ft. min sidewalk on one side of street</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 ft. curb lane OR 12 ft. SUP OR 5 ft. min sidewalks both sides of street</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ft. bike lane or ride able shoulder OR &gt;12 ft. SUP OR &gt;5 ft. sidewalks both sides of street</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering these funds are specifically dedicated to active transportation infrastructure, it may not be appropriate to award points to facilities such as 13ft curb lanes that do not actually delineate space for cyclists.
Attendees discussed the following:

- The suggested change makes sense.
- Some thoroughfares in old parts of town are not wide enough to accommodate bike lanes and sharrows are necessary.
- Sometimes it’s not possible to strip bike lanes at intersections, but the majority of the project length includes a bike lane.
- Given some of the new data coming to light, sharrows may not be considered safe.
- Some data shows that paint alone is not very safe.
- The scaling of the buffered/protected bike lane vs. the regular bike lane vs. the lane/sharrow combination is good.

5. Missouri Co-Chair
Brian Nowotny has rejoined the committee as the Voting Member for Jackson County. Until the summer of 2016, he served as Missouri Co-Chair, representing Platte County. The role of Missouri Co-Chair was not filled during his absence. Brian expressed willingness to resume the role of Missouri Co-Chair if the committee would like him to do so.

Motion: Brian Shields moved and Allison Smith seconded a motion to appoint Brian Nowotny to resume the role of Missouri Co-Chair.

6. Other Business
The committee discussed the Greenwood, Mo. gap in the Katy Trail connection to KC and the possibility that this item would be brought to the committee in 2018 for possible funding. MoDOT was asked about the possibility of connecting a branch of the Katy Trail along Highway 150 to a proposed bike-hike trail in Johnson County. Attendees discussed the possibility of connecting to the Flint Hills Trail. MoDOT may be able to provide some feedback on feasibility at a future meeting.

7. Adjournment: With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.