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1) Welcome/Introduction (3 min, )
   
   Brian Shields, served as a substitute Co-Chair. Brian called the meeting to order and requested introductions from those present.

2) Draft: January BPAC Summary* (2 min, Bartlett)
   
   Approval of the summary notes passed unanimously.

3) Discussion: Regional Pedestrian Policy Plan (25 min, Bartlett)
   
   Aaron handed out a one-page project summary. His presentation covered three key questions
   
   • What is a Regional Pedestrian Policy Plan?
   • Why is a Regional Pedestrian Policy Plan needed?
   • How will the Regional Pedestrian Police Plan be developed?

   This Plan will provide a summary of regional pedestrian initiatives while providing some comparison to peer MPOs. It will also formulate areas for further development of regional efforts directed at MPO plans, policies and programs. In a similar way, the Plan will look at pedestrian efforts and issues at the local level through information gathered from local governments. Best practices for local governments will be addressed at a high level providing guidance for communities.

   Development of the RPPP will be a multi-phase processes completed over more a period of years.
Phase 1 included the development and conducting of the Local Pedestrian Government Inventory. This phase ended with the closing of the survey in January.

Phase 2 Conduct review of MARC’s Plans, Policies, and Programs using a pedestrian lens. Aaron shared a list of MPO’s that are being examined.

Research best practices for local governments will be added to the information collected in Phase 1.

Phase 3. The project will produce the final draft document for adoption. This document will include:

- Reviews MARC’s existing plans, policies and programs from pedestrian and walk friendly perspective accompanied with Regional Policy Recommendations
- Findings of the Local Government Pedestrian Inventory accompanied with Local Government Best Practices

Discussion: Has there been any programs that have focused on Safe Route to Parks or Safe Routes to Transit by peer MPOs? Aaron indicated that the work related to SmartMoves3.0 includes mobility hubs and pedestrian access. While not using the term “Safe Routes to Transit” safety and access to transit are integral to this planning effort. Additional efforts are also underway to study transit access. I am not aware of any Safe Routes to Parks work in our region. What are some of the other approaches that MPO’s are using to address pedestrian issues on a regional scale? MPOs are providing technical support to local governments through GIS modeling. MPOs develop programming projects selection criteria that address pedestrian connectivity, and access. MPOs are not replacing the work of Local Governments. Instead, MPOs are working with Local Governments develop tools that aid in local planning efforts. They are also in a few cases encouraging programs like Walk Friendly Communities because these programs provide best practices at the local level. The Atlanta Regional Planning Commission is one example that is using this approach. MARC has already begun this approach through the last MTP update and the work that followed with the regional workshop.

4) Discussion: MetroGreen® Bikeway and Trail Wayfinding Plan (10 min, Bartlett)

Aaron’s presentation addressed three questions:

A. What is bikeway and trail wayfinding plan?

The final document will provide design guidelines and specifications, which builds the architecture of a regional wayfinding network. This work will address destination, distance, direction, and protocol for sign placement. This work promote consistency and compatibility between regional and local systems.
B. Why is a plan needed?

The 2002 MetroGreen® Action Plan provided in Appendix D: Design Guidelines for MetroGreen®. Appendix D includes “Trail Signage” on pages D-34 through D-41. This wayfinding tail signage was developed 15 years ago. The Greater Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan (RBP) primarily focused roadway corridors. The RBP supplements MetroGreen® in three ways.

The plan recommends adding 128 miles of stream and river corridors in Miami County, Kansas to the MetroGreen® System.

The plan expands the concept of MetroGreen® Type 5: Bike & Pedestrian Facilities in Right-of-Way to a complete-streets approach using modern design guides (such as the National Association of City Transportation Officials – NACTO).

Once fully implemented, the plan will substantially expand the MetroGreen® system, adding hundreds of miles of roadway corridors (from 344 to over 2,000 miles).

The RBP recommends that MARC coordinate development of new and updated guidelines and specification to meet the needs of regional bikeway and trail wayfinding system. This work will:

Guide the architecture of a regional wayfinding network for bikeways and trails.

Promote consistency and compatibility between regional and local bikeways to make it easier for navigate across boundaries to neighboring community destinations

C. How will the plan be developed?

MARC coordinate development standards for a regional bikeway and trail wayfinding system.

- MARC will lead an effort with the aid of a consultant develop regional wayfinding guidelines to promote consistency and compatibility between regional and local bikeways.
- The planning process will include a review of national bicycle wayfinding best practices and a summary of existing bikeway and trail wayfinding throughout the MARC region.
- The final document will provide design guidelines, which build the architecture of are regional wayfinding network, including a destination, distance/travel time and protocol for sign placement.

MARC will lead an effort with the aid of a consultant to coordinate development of regional wayfinding guidelines and standards for the MetroGreen® bikeways and trails. The Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee will serve as the project steering committee to guide the process. A Technical Working Committee will be formed of city and county stakeholders. We
anticipate open house stakeholder and public engagement meetings. MARC anticipates anticipated planning effort period to completion after the consultant has notice to proceed is 9 months.

Several objectives are being considered.

- The regional plan needs to be destination driven based on connections between communities to destination points.
- Inventory and assess current bikeway and trail wayfinding practices in the MPO area.
- Screen peer MPOs for examples of regional or multijurisdictional bikeway and trail wayfinding practices.
- Use national best practices in wayfinding for regional systems during the development process.
- Develop on-road regional signage options that are in full compliance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and using the flexibility allowed.
- Consider emerging wayfinding technologies and implementation strategies.
- Renderings to illustrate regional wayfinding concept.
- Develop options to integrate with existing systems.
- Develop a wayfinding system that can grow as the regional network grows.
- Develop with guidance and direction from stakeholder engagement.
- Build consensus of community stakeholders.
- Develop a Memorandum of Understanding to advance local government coordination.
- Develop an implementation plan that identifies immediate opportunities.
- Adoption of the deliverables.

Final Deliverable could include:

- Metrogreen® Bikeway and Trail Wayfinding Plan
  - Survey of Existing Conditions
  - Updated and Expanded Regional Wayfinding guidance and standards for both on road bikeways and off road share use paths.
  - Local Intergovernmental Memorandum of Understanding to ensure coordination and implementation.
  - Implementation strategy to advance priority corridors based on local government consensus.

**Discussion:** The group discussed the timeline to begin this work. The work will depend on funding availability. We are looking for support for a consultant. We will seek to collaborate with local governments to raise local match. It is hope to get this work under way later this year.
Is the MOU for the local funding? No, we are looking for a MOU at the end of this process to coordinate implementation across multiple jurisdictions. It would be helpful to local jurisdictions to have some guidance, especially if there is a system that is based on numbered routes or corridors across the region. We envision a brand that ties the region together that can be used in conjunction with local brands.

5) **Discussion**: Policy review of MARC programming process for sub-allocated transportation funds (15 min, Martin Rivarola)

Martin indicated that MARC is currently undergoing a policy review of the MARC programming process. We are looking at the link between the MTP, the review criteria, and the projects that were funded in the last round. This committee and others are being engaged in a conversation to see if we are meeting expectations. This presentation focuses on the STP program. This was 66 million for two year in two states. The Kansas and Missouri Priority Programming Committees go through a process to review projects. The decision making process should address crosscutting strategies including:

- Maintain existing systems and services
- Complete Streets
- Expand transit
- Serve centers and corridors
- Preserve environmental resources
- Performance-based planning

How do we measure our progress? The programming review assessed key questions. With this goal in mind, we set out to measure how the project selection decisions may have moved the needle in a number of ways. We again looked at our entire set of scoring criteria, distributed amongst these same policy goals, and compared the total percentage of points in each category for all of the submitted projects, vs. the total percentage of points in each category for the projects, which were funded. The programming scorecard that maps policy goals to project scoring criteria sets out to answer these questions: Did our processes select projects according to our policy goals? Did our processes select the best projects of those submitted?

We developed two score cards. To address these questions we developed a programming scorecard.

**Analysis:**

1. Compared average % of points for each scoring category (by policy goal) for all projects submitted vs. funded projects
2. Calculated average increase/decrease in % of points in category for funded projects vs. submitted projects

3. Developed 2 scorecards

We did this for all 10 objectives for Vibrant, Connected and Green and did so independently for Kansas and Missouri.

Martin looked at comparisons from this analysis. We are doing fairly well in matching programming with our MTP goals. This scorecard shows how the selected projects ended up “score wise” compared to total # of points. Did the projects selected reflect our policy goals?

- Thumps up is = or > 60% of points; (unless projects selected average lower scores than all projects submitted – then so/so)
- So/so – 40-60% of points; (unless very large jump in selected projects vs. all projects submitted – then thumbs up).
- Thumbs down is < 40% of points.

There are some areas that we need improvement. In general, Missouri funding was more consistent with policy goals than Kansas. Two areas in Kansas that could be improved were Economic Vitality and Equity.

We also looked at the median score of submitted projects. Missouri STP the median score was 79 (% of all points). The media score of project funded 90. There was a good match with project scores and funding recommendations. In some cases, lower cost projects, which did not score as well as other projects, were recommended for funding in place of higher scoring low cost projects. Geographic equity and historical distribution were considered.

Kansas projects tended to score lower overall. Kansas funding resulted in four projects that scored well and took a majority of the funding. There where projects that were lower cost that were not funded even though the scored higher than other lower cost lower scoring projects. Of the top five projects not selected for funding, three included "transit or transit accessibility projects" and two bike/ped path projects.

Martin showed a set of pie charts to compare the 17-18 round to the 19-20 round by State. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities got about 64% in the 17-18 round. It increased to 41% in Missouri. Transit investments increased from 17% to 24% in Missouri. Kansas bike/pedestrian investments went from 20% to 21% and transit decreased from 25% to 6%. Regionally bicycle/pedestrian went from 29% to 32% and transit decreased from 20% to 17%.

Martin concluded with some observations. Project selection considers more than scoring. There is a preference on bricks and mortar projects and equity of distribution was important. There
was a lower priority placed on transit for some sponsors. Due to competition for funding agencies were asked to prioritize projects to distribute funds to more agencies.

Moving forward MARC will:

1. Continue analysis to identify areas where we are doing well and those that need improvement.
2. Present findings to TTPC, policy, planning and programming committees.
3. Engage committees on discussion regarding the level of influence the policy direction of TO2040 carries on the project selection process.

Discussion: - Did MARC host any workshops or provide technical assistance before for applicants? Yes, we held a workshop in 2015 that addressed local projects related to the regional bikeway plan and the MetroGreen trails. However, we did not see a lot projects result from this effort. Our intent is to create open lines of communications between communities to leverage connections that will span more than one jurisdiction. Plans required communication to create and communication to implement. It is work noting that Federal funds tend to be larger projects. Local funding is more appropriate for lower cost projects.

On the pie chart, what is the “other”? Roadway capacity, operations, safety and number of other categories. We do track the percentage of bike and pedestrian projects that are part of the roadway projects that fall under the “other” category.

6) Discussion: Scenario Planning Process (10 min, Martin Rivarola)

Mr. Rivarola began to address the scenario planning process that MARC is conducting. This is about a process of raising awareness of future variables. It is broader than just transportation. It spans into land use, emergency services, environment and other.

We are wrapping up the analysis of alternative futures and setting the stage for the next step, setting policy direction. This part of a four step process that: anticipates the future, analyzes scenarios, sets policy direction and integrates these policies into regional plan updates. We are working to complete this work in the summer of this year.

This will help to direct the update of the MTP. We are looking at “Driving Forces“ and we are looking at possible future scenarios.

1. Rapidly emerging new technologies
2. Climate change — more weather extremes
3. Globalization of our regional economy
4. Shifting demographics
How can we adopt policies that will help us get to our goals? How do we address new technologies that affect the way we travel? How will climate change influence our lives? What changes will globalization of our economy? How will changing demographics affect our society and the demands for services? The purpose of these questions is to position our region to take advantage of opportunities and limit negative consequences from these drivers of change.

We have conducted two workshops (over 100 participants at each workshop) under the Scenario Planning I to discussed driving forces, potential impacts, vision for the future. This was followed by an FHWA-sponsored workshop with a panel of three peer regional councils. Currently we are sharing this information with the Technical Forecast Committee and others like BPAC.

Policy Direction - Given these new realities, how do we keep focused on the goals and aspirations embedded in our local and regional plans?

- Equity and inclusion
- Expanding choices
- Protecting health
- Preserving/maintaining what we have
- Fostering innovation and economic vitality
- Enhancing safety and security

Martin reviewed a several remaining questions and next steps.

- What are the most important challenges/opportunities?
  - What are we already doing to address them?
  - What more should we be doing?
- What policy priorities should be in place to achieve our common objectives in light of driving forces/potential impacts?
  - Staff and committees analyze, review, refine.
- Create a policy framework
  - Begin to incorporate in regional plans

Discussion: - No discussion.

7) Discussion: Kansas City Missouri Bikeway Master Plan process (10 min, Joe Blankenship)

Joe Blankenship shared a project schedule about the KCMO Bikeway Master Plan process with the group. Over the past year, we conducted an audit of the BikeKC Plan. Will it lead to meet the goal of Platinum Bicycle Friendly Community by 2020? The result of that audit was the conclusion that the plan is insufficient to meet this goal. The City Council took two actions. First,
they moved the BikeKC Plan process update into the Planning Department. Second, they moved implementation of the plan into the City Manager’s office. We have formed three groups to move forward.

- Community Stakeholders
- Steering Committee Meeting
- Technical Committee

The process will reevaluate the network for ease of use. The process will identify implementation actions to propel the plan forward. This process will also evaluate the programmatic aspects of a city program such as education to build better ties to community groups. We need to look at wayfinding.

Public Meetings:

Two at the end of April

We are excited to get the process under way and expect to complete the update by the first part of 2018.

Discussion: - No discussion.

8) Local Round Table Reports (15 min)

a) Aaron Bartlett, MARC
   i) Monthly APBA webinar
   ii) May Bike Month planning is underway
   iii) Art inquired about the Destination Safe event on April 6. Aaron shared that the Coalition will host national speaker David Teeter at the Kauffman Foundation Conference Center. Bill Whitfield, MoDOT Highway Safety Director, will speak on the “hOUR” program. David will address distracted driving policy for businesses. We have breakout sessions in the afternoon. There will be panel discussion after Mr. Teeter discussion. This approach is focusing on private companies instead of State legislation.

b) Brian Anderson, Leawood, KS
   i) Signing two loops in the City hope to have competed by the end of the year
   ii) Tomahawk Creek Trail renovation will occur in locations where it is getting too close to the stream.

c) Danielle Sitzman, Mission, KS
   i) We have seen more pedestrian use of Johnson Drive and we have dropped the speed limit to 25 mph. We are also using speed trailers to give driver feedback. We have a few SRTS projects we are working on.

d) Nichole Brown, Johnson County Health Department.
i) Roseland Elementary School will be part of two-day SRTS workshop through a Safe Kids Worldwide grant.

ii) We are working with the Shawnee Mission School District. We are working with the Wellness Committee. They are working on new outreach to cities related to SRTS.

e) John Hornbeck, 20.20.20 Movement

i) 20.20.20 is working on a Bike Month event in cooperation with the American Heart Association, My City Bikes (www.mycitybikes.com), and the UG Parks & Recreation Department to conduct a bike ride on May 1st. It will start and end at Kaw Point. The purpose of the ride is to educate novice cyclists. We will help teach the “rules of the road”.

ii) In 2012, the UG developed a Master Plan for Sidewalks and Trails. We are intensifying efforts to research the corridors identified for trails in preparation for future funding applications. This will be an update of that portion of the plan.

f) Kaitlyn Service, MARC

i) Elaborated on the pedestrian work through Active Transportation Programming Committee. The committee wants to improve the scoring criteria to give SRTS and sidewalk projects the same opportunities to score as bicycle and trail projects.

g) Gladstone Rock Creek Greenway Trail 3.0 mile that links to Happy Rock Trail is being completed

h) Pleasant valley road 6.0 million with trails and bike lanes

i) DuJuan Hord, Safe Kids Metro KC

i) He is building partnerships in Wyandotte County to conduct a safety event in May. He wants to conduct a similar event in the Northland and would appreciate any suggested contacts.

j) Brian Shields, Overland Park, KS

i) We are getting ready to start our bike-counting program this spring. We are trying to get the Kansas Legislature to do away with the mandatory sidepath law.

ii) He shared a map of Overland Park that showed CMAQ improvements, completed projects and recently road overlay projects.

Next Meeting May 10, 2017, at 1:30 pm.
The meeting adjourned.