1) Welcome/Introduction (3 min, )  
Mark McHenry, Missouri Co-Chair, called the meeting to order and requested introductions from those present.

2) Draft: July BPAC Summary* (2 min, Bartlett)  
The summary notes were approved unanimously.

3) Update: Regional Pedestrian Policy Plan (RPPP) (30 min, Bartlett)  
Aaron Bartlett provided a brief overview of the purpose of the project. Many of the meeting attendees were visitors, so Aaron provided a brief background to give context for the project. Updates were provided in the March, May and July meetings.

a) Stakeholder Listening Session Handouts  
The RPPP helps to defined both regional and local roles in developing walkable areas. This is a process that will be completed in a little over two-years. Aaron reviewed a one-page handout.
MARC developed a Local Government Pedestrian Inventory in 2016 to assess work at the local level by area municipals.

MARC conducted a regional review of MPO plans, policies and programs to identify opportunities to improve work at both regional and local levels. The plan elevates pedestrian issues and sets in motion recommendations that will affect future efforts and decisions regarding regional investments.

b) “Poll Everywhere” Exercise and Results
On August 24, MARC held a stakeholder engagement listening session, using a program called ‘Poll Everywhere’ to gain feedback to address preliminary recommendations coming out of the assessment. Preliminary recommendations were made both at the regional and local levels. Mr. Bartlett reviewed feedback from this stakeholder engagement.

Mr. Bartlett focused on four questions and feedback generated at the August Stakeholder Engagement.

Regional policy #1:
Prioritize sidewalk improvements near activity centers, mobility hubs, transit corridors and schools and address barriers across major rivers and freeways.

When asked if the policy was too weak, just right, or too strong 57%, or 8 our 14, felt it was “too weak”. 43% or, 6 of 14, said it was “just right”, and no one indicated it was “too strong”.

When asked why it was too weak, individuals indicated that terms like “near" were vague. They also were concerned that the policy tried to address both areas of need & barriers together; and that it would be easier to understand if it were replaced with two separate, but complementary policy statements. There was also strong agreement that parks should be added to the list of priority areas.

Regional policy #2: Revise scoring scale in STP/TAP/5310 programs to elevate pedestrian system and/or operational improvements.

When asked if the policy was too weak, just right, or too strong no one felt it was “too weak”. 80%, or 12 of 15, said it was “just right”; and 20%, or 3 of 15, indicated it was “too strong”.

Regional policy #3: 
Increase resources directed toward sidewalk improvements near activity centers, mobility
hubs, transit corridors and schools.

When asked if the policy was too weak, just right or too strong 18%, or 3 of 17, felt it was “too weak”. 76%, or 13 of 17, said it was “just right”; and 6%, or 1 of 17, indicated it was “too strong”.

We then asked stakeholders to tell us if we were missing anything. Participates were able to see the responses of others and to add a vote up or down if they agreed or disagreed. The following responses were provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Up votes</th>
<th>Down votes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity as a key factor in transportation planning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A desire for full integration of pedestrian, bikeway, and greenway infrastructure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connections across jurisdictional lines</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better coordination with transit systems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy recommendations for local jurisdictions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity center definition. Is this all-encompassing?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make equity a central theme of the plan and the prioritization framework</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies that balance the needs of urban, suburban, and rural communities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing policies of local jurisdictions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all of the feedback identified missed items; in some cases, it reinforced existing elements.

**Missed:**
- Equity
- Integration of modes and
- Connections of pedestrian network.

**General Consensus = 5 or more up votes.**
A clear majority favored those topics, with 5 or more up votes. However, the wording of grouped topics received different responses.
- Equity - Equity receive the most up votes yet; when asked if it should be a central theme or part of the prioritization framework, it got far fewer votes and with some decent.
- Integration w/trails
- Connections
Transit Support without opposition

Activity center definition

Controversial Issues, got 5 or fewer up votes and at least 1 down vote

- Recommending policy for local governments was received with general support; however, changing polices was not, as the later implies a requirement.
- Balance of needs across built environments.

Noteworthy comments

- Some felt that requirements to apply for federal funds should be a focus. There were divergent opinions. The “carrot and stick” analogy was used. Scoring criteria development is a function of the Progaming Committees (ATPC, STP MO/KS and CMAQ), which derive their direction from the Total Transportation Policy Committee (TTPC).
- Community engagement was also stressed during the project planning and development phases.

Local policy #1:
Consider sidewalk construction and replacement prioritization plan, with dedicated multi-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

When asked if the policy was too weak, just right or too strong 14%, or 2 of 14, felt it was “too weak”. 86%, or 12 of 14, said it was “just right”; and nobody indicated it was “too strong”.

Local policy #2:
Prioritize sidewalk improvements near activity centers, mobility hubs, transit corridors and schools.

When asked if the policy was too weak, just right or too strong 14%, or 2 of 14, felt it was “too weak”. 86%, or 12 of 14, said it was “just right”; and nobody indicated it was “too strong”.

Local policy #3:
Develop plans and regulatory zoning tools to ensure pedestrian connectivity.

When asked if the policy was too weak, just right, or too strong no one felt it was “too weak”. 100%, or 11 of 11, said it was “just right”; and no one indicated it was “too strong”.
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We then asked stakeholders to tell us if we were missing anything. Participates were able to see the responses of others and to add a vote up or down if they agreed or disagreed. The following responses were provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Up votes</th>
<th>Down votes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for active transportation encouragement and education.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a &quot;Vision Zero&quot; type policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for integrating local pedestrian and bicycle networks.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of community engagement for local prioritization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planners include sidewalk connectivity to all plans.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and comfortable street crossings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies to require and integrate new pedestrian infrastructure with existing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities that put sidewalk maintenance on property owners have no need for multiyear sidewalk replacement program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Next Steps
MARC will hold a public engagement on October 12, and will work to incorporate feedback into a final draft document to share with BPAC and TTPC in November. Before the full draft document is released, MARC Public Relations and other members of the project team will review it. The full draft will come back to BPAC in December.

**Discussion:**
We discussed the stakeholder makeup of the meeting, consisting of: Planners, engineers, law enforcement and special interest groups.

Shared-use paths are also a type of facility that serve pedestrians, and are popular facility types throughout the region. The intent of the plan is to promote all types of pedestrian facilities, including those that are shared-use.

Comments were positive, affirming the importance of elevating pedestrian issues both regionally and locally.

4) Discussion: Clean Air Action Plan
Doug Norsby reported on one of the major efforts of the Air Quality Program is the Kansas
City Regional Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP); which is a comprehensive, community-based voluntary strategy for reducing ground level ozone in the Kansas City metro area, coordinated by MARC. The original CAAP was created in 2005 and updated in 2011 by a working group made up of representatives from various agencies, community groups, and industries.

The purpose of the plan is to set forth a variety of voluntary strategies to reduce ground-level ozone pollution. Current strategies encompass education, green infrastructure, mobility options (bike, ped, transit), diversified energy sources, green building, etc.

In addition to establishing and reaffirming a shared commitment on improving air quality among stakeholders, the CAAP is important to the region as it serves to fulfill requirements for participation in the EPA Ozone Advance Program. Periodic updates are made to this document – called Path Forward updates – to demonstrate the advances made on previous priorities, and to determine new or shifting emphases on program areas for the plan. In turn, the EPA Ozone Advance Program supports local governments in attainment areas that want to take proactive steps to keep their air clean by awarding extra evaluation points during reviews for various competitively awarded environmental projects.

Over the past 12 years, MARC, the Air Quality Forum, businesses and agencies across the Kansas City Metro have implemented projects, research and programs outlined in the CAAPs that enhance the air quality benefits for the region. It is now time for those enhancements to once again be reflected and built-upon by a revised CAAP.

The 2017 CAAP update will comprise the “next steps” in the region’s efforts towards remaining in attainment for ozone. Feedback provided by members of BPAC will be included with other engagement discussions to establish those priorities that will make up the 2017 CAAP.

During the meeting, worksheets were distributed soliciting information about which actions, activities, programs, or initiatives were most important to them individually across eight categories, using pairwise comparisons in order to weight the specific importance of each category. Additional open-ended feedback was also obtained to see if any categories of interest were left out of the conversation, and to offer individuals a chance to propose specific steps forward in pursuit of top areas of interest. Following the written survey, a short discussion was held about both the process for sharing information and to describe how the information would be used in priority evaluation. A copy of the worksheet is available upon request.

Discussion:
The group discussed the need to implement some of the programs in schools at the district level. The information was gathered.

5) Discussion: Summit Take-a-ways
Mr. Bartlett asked everyone to share one takeaway from today’s SRTS Regional Summit.

Discussion:
In general, many people commented on how well the summit was organized, and the number of people that attended exceeded their expectations. Many of the breakout sessions focused on programs within the region. Many people felt the summit was well worth their time and hoped that it would continue to be an annual event. People felt it was a great networking opportunity. Many of the presentations provided good examples of how to get programs moving. The need for collaboration and partnerships was self-evident. The attendance of the diversity of backgrounds of people from different parts of the region and far away parts of the state was encouraging.

Next Meeting November 8, 2017, at 1:30 pm. The meeting adjourned.