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

2) **Draft: November BPAC Summary* (2 min, Bartlett)**
The summary notes were approved unanimously without revision.

3) **Draft: Regional Pedestrian Policy Plan (RPPP) (20 min, Bartlett)**
Aaron Bartlett provided a brief report that addressed the most recent revisions to the document structure and focused on the policy recommendations. He also reviewed the policy statements at the regional and local level, and addressed a number of topics related to the recommendations. The policy statements have been updated to reflect MARC’s adopted activity center distinctions.

The full draft is a little over 40 pages with attachments, and has been posted in its revised form at: [www.marc.org/pedplan](http://www.marc.org/pedplan). The plan has been reorganized to make navigation easier for the reader. The draft document is now going to all of the modal and programming committees. The TTPC will receive a staff report in December, the presentation will be
completed in February, and it will then proceed to TTPC in March for a vote.

BPAC will be able to use the plan to address pedestrian aspects of projects that will be submitted in the 2018 call for projects. It will help to guide future discussions around the update of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, and the identification of future performance measures to evaluate the regions progress toward advancing the pedestrian mode.

Mr. Bartlett also asked for questions and feedback, which is listed below.

Discussion:
Has there been any discussion of ADA Transition Plans?
Many communities did not respond or indicated that they did not have an ADA Transition Plan, in reference to The Local Government Pedestrian Inventory. We believe this will elevate awareness of this issue and the need for communities to develop inventories of sidewalks, curb ramps, and crosswalks within the public right-of-way.

Motion:
With no further questions, Aaron made a request for BPAC to forward the plan to TTPC with a recommendation that the plan proceed through the review & approval process. The motion was made and seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

4) Discussion Kansas City Bike Plan Update (20 min, Blankenship)
Joe Blankenship provided a report. In the fall, the city conducted a public meeting regarding the plan update. The project will set vision statement and goals, with a purpose to set a clear vision for cycling in Kansas City. Additionally, it will set specific goals and strategies while prioritizing project areas, including funding strategies. This is not an update of the Walkability Plan, TrailsKC or Trails Nexus Study.

The public has seen the vision statement and network analysis process, and we are working on the draft document; with an anticipated adoption in the 1st quarter of 2018. There was a discussion concerning a phasing approach and project prioritization process, which provided a better understanding of public expectations and desires.

We conducted a public survey and received over 1,500 responses, and used an interactive mapping tool to gather information. We have also reached out to students through focus group sessions in addition to the public meetings and special events.

During the summer, we researched peer education programs; and are recommending experimental projects, with low cost temporary roadway repurposing. The city of Memphi took a similar approach.
Based on what we have heard in the public surveys, here are some take-a-ways. Seventy-nine percent of Kansas City cyclist do not believe that cycling is safe, convenient, and practical. People described bicycling as difficult, challenging, and scary on one hand; and on the other, some felt it was getting better and growing in popularity.

The users were grouped into “strong & fearless”, “enthuse & confident”, “interested but concerned”, and “no way, no how”. At the national level “interested but concerned”, make up 60% of the population, while in Kansas City, this group makes up 42% of those surveyed. Still, a large number of people would ride more if dedicated bike lanes existed, speeding was addressed, pavement conditions fixed, and facilities connected; especially to transit.

People would also like more protection from traffic with buffer bike lanes, barrier separated bike lanes, cycle tracks, and share use paths. More people leaned toward facilities with more protection.

Key destinations include typology: work, schools, transit, retail, trails, parks, and grocery stores. These destinations correspond to population and employment density. This information was studied using GIS, and was combined in a concentration of overlapping typologies. This corresponds to the MARC activity centers.

The draft Bike KC Network now includes more than 850 miles of roadways to provide connections to the destinations identified; although, some are new additions. The new system provides more access to low stress routes. We are approaching an opportunity to look at a 5-year plan cycle for the map.

The feedback received was positive, and they would like to see a plan implemented. We could look at building out the areas with the greatest latent demand, or create a trunk line approach that provides for longer trips, but less density in the beginning.

Our focus is now on the 5-year plan to implement the new plan in phases. We are committed to complete what we have started and then begin to addressing the next phase of improvements based on the direction we get.

Discussion:
Does your community work well with the development community?
Yes, we work to include them. Hunt Mid-West is on our Steering Committee, but will need to continue to educate & communicate the importance of these facilities to strong and profitable developments.

Have you looked at any economic benefits?
We have looked at the benefits to those with less access to jobs and transit. We make the case that this will help address upper-ward mobility.
Do you have concerns about the piece meal approach of resurfacing verses the larger project improvements?
We are going to look at all opportunities. The resurfacing program can help us address paint only projects, but not the protected bike lanes. The Complete Street Ordinance may change and make it easier to implement the project improvements.

The bike lane design requires removal of parking which is a political issue but the alternative share lane markings are insufficient for some riders. How is KC approaching this challenge?
We will have the same type of challenges. However, the only place where share lane markings will work is where the street speed and surrounding land use are compatible with this design.

What are the remaining steps?
The plan will need to go to the Steering Committee, the city BPAC, and the City Council for approval.

Would it help the MARC BPAC to support?
We could recommend that the MARC BPAC issue a statement of endorsement for the new plan and take this to TTPC for their consent. A final presentation would be provided to the MARC BPAC in order to make this request.

5) **Discussion MoDOT 2017 Planning Scenario Exercise (10 min, Landvik)**
Mr. Landvik reported on a new planning exercise/ scenario. MoDOT has taken the initiative to provide a list of potential projects that would consider if additional funding were made available. If funding does come available, then the process would be refined to better identify projects.

The funding would be distributed to districts, and for a ten-year period the KC District could see about 90 million non-motorized projects.

A handout was provided that will be shared with TTPC. The handout included a list of preliminary ideas of what this pot funds might represent. If the exercise were to move forward, there will be further discussion on how to fill these project descriptions. The following locations where submitted by local agencies. We are now asking the communities to rank order the projects that will be shared with TTPC. We do not know what the rules of the new funds might include, so this is purely a planning level exercise without any guaranteed outcomes.

Discussion:
The group discussed the ideas, and decided that it would be good to look at projects that would provide multi-jurisdictional regional benefits.

6) **Local Round Table Reports (15 min)**
Michael McDonald reminded the committee to be engaged in the design of the new Buck O’Neil Bridge to ensure we get the right bike/ped facility design.
It is important to look at the I-69 Highway project and ensure that bike and pedestrian are addressed.

Brian Shields announced approval has been given to move forward with the bike lane-marking project near downtown.

Matt Davis reported that the contract for Phase 1 was approved last Monday, and is moving forward to execute the contract. Phase 2 will go out to bid next year.

Mike Latka reported that the Meadow Lane Trail is under construction. In addition, the Bike Share Feasibility Study should be completed by January.

Danielle Sitzman reported that Mission is considering a pop-up or demo project to get sidewalk connections to Johnson Drive.

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