OPEN MEETING NOTICE
TOTAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE
Chuck Adams, Kansas Co-Chair
Carson Ross, Missouri Co-Chair

There will be a meeting of MARC’s Total Transportation Policy Committee on Tuesday, March 19, 2019, at 9:30 a.m. in the Board Room on the second floor of the Rivergate Center, 600 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri.

AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. REPORT: Kansas Secretary of Transportation Julie Lorenz Presentation
3. VOTE: February 19, 2019 Minutes*
4. VOTE: 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the 2018-22 Transportation Improvement Program
5. VOTE: 2019 2nd Quarter Amendment to the 2018-22 TIP for Public Review & Comment
6. VOTE: Regional Performance Targets for Transit State of Good Repair
7. REPORT: MoDOT Automated Truck Mounted Attenuator Pilot Project
8. REPORT: KC Scout/Operation Green Light Work Zone Coordination Update
9. REPORT: Green Infrastructure Framework
10. REPORT: Regional Transportation Safety Report
11. Other Business
12. Adjournment

*Action Items

Getting to MARC: Information on transportation options to the MARC offices, including directions, parking, transit, carpooling, and bicycling, can be found online. If driving, visitors and guests should enter the Rivergate Center parking lot from Broadway and park on the upper level of the garage. An entrance directly into the conference area is available from this level.

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.

Special Accommodations: Please notify MARC 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). MARC programs are non-discriminatory as stated by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, call 816-474-4240 or visit our webpage.
ISSUE:
REPORT: Kansas Secretary of Transportation Julie Lorenz Presentation

BACKGROUND:
Secretary of Transportation Julie Lorenz has recently been appointed to lead the Kansas Department of Transportation. Secretary Lorenz is familiar with work at MARC, having previously been involved in the SmartMoves 3.0 and Beyond the Loop Planning & Environmental Linkages studies. Given her new role at KDOT, MARC Staff has invited the Secretary to make a few remarks to the TTPC about direction of this state agency under her leadership.

In addition to the Secretary’s remarks, KDOT staff will also provide an update on the work convened by the Kansas Legislature last year through the Joint Legislative Transportation Vision Taskforce. This taskforce, comprised of 35 members from across the state, was co-chaired by Senator Carolyn McGinn and Representative Richard Proehl. Johnson County Commissioner Jim Allen, MARC TTPC member, served as a Task Force member. The taskforce met from August to November 2018. It convened nine regional meetings to gather stakeholder input, and members participated in a two-day session to draft recommendations. The Taskforce completed their statewide meetings and developed recommendations which are detailed in a final report, linked here.

Finally, KDOT staff will also provide an update on any ongoing legislative or other agency activity related to the recommendations of the KS Transportation Vision taskforce.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Martin Rivarola
Ron Achelpohl
Total Transportation Policy Committee
February 19, 2019
Meeting Summary
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1) Welcome/Introductions
Mayor Carson Ross, MO Co-Chair, called the meeting to order and self-introductions followed.

2) Approval of January 15, 2019 Meeting Summary*
There were no changes to the January 15, 2019 meeting summary. Mayor David Slater moved to approve the meeting summary, Mayor John Smedley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

3) 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the 2018-22 TIP for Public Review & Comment*
The proposed 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the 2018-22 TIP includes 9 projects:

- 1 new project to be added:
  - #280152 – I-70 & Turner Diagonal Interchange in Wyandotte County

- 8 projects to be modified for revisions to the budget, schedule or scope:
  - #180074 – Rehabilitation on bridge #026 on K-92 in Leavenworth County
  - #280136 – Surfacing on I-70 from Quarry Road bridge to 38th Street bridge
  - #280142 – Rehabilitation on bridge #042 (42nd St), 0.2mi north of old K-32
  - #280145 – Rehabilitation on bridge #043 (Speaker Rd), 0.39mi north of old K-32
  - #280148 – Surfacing on I-70 from 18th Street to I-670
  - #380155 – Surfacing on I-435 in Johnson and Wyandotte Counties
  - #380159 – Rehabilitation on bridge #234 on K-10 in Johnson County
  - #380163 – Rehabilitation on bridge #103 (151st St), 8.05mi north of Miami County

Details of these projects are available for review on the Internet at: [http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Plans-Studies/Transportation-Plans-and-Studies/TIP/TIP-Amendment-Archive/Archive-assets/19SA1amend.aspx](http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Plans-Studies/Transportation-Plans-and-Studies/TIP/TIP-Amendment-Archive/Archive-assets/19SA1amend.aspx)

MARC’s Public Involvement Plan requires that proposed amendments to the TIP be released for public review and comment prior to adoption.

Commissioner Jim Walters moved to approve the release of the 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the FFY 2018-2022 TIP for Public Review & Comment, Sherri McIntyre seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

4) 18th Street Bridge Replacement Study
Ben Ware (KDOT) Brian Hash (HNTB), briefed the committee on the scope, timeline, and future steps related to this study. The study will evaluate improvement alternatives to replace the 18th Street Expressway (US-69) bridge over the Kansas River. The study process and recommendations will be documented in a Concept Study Report. The concept study will be organized into three primary phases which include: Baseline conditions, Alternatives Development and Analysis, and Preferred Alternative Documentation.

A Concept Study Report will be prepared to document the concept study process. Final stakeholder briefings will be conducted in addition to a Public Meeting Open House to share the Preferred Alternative and selection process.

MARC’s policy on bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on Missouri and Kansas River bridges applies to this study area. Highway Committee has been briefed on this study. A briefing to the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee is scheduled for March.

A committee member asked for a rough estimate of the replacement costs that are eligible for federal funding, and Mr. Ware responded that he isn’t completely sure, but it’s possibly around $50-60 million.
There was inquiry if all 3 trusses would have to be replaced and if the pier is still viable, and Mr. Ware confirmed that all 3 would be replaced. As for the pier, they looked at keeping it in Phase 1, but don’t believe it will be an option due to modern day structural criteria.

Someone questioned if it will be wide enough to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians, and Mr. Ware affirmed that it would be.

It was asked what environmental classifications they anticipate for the project, and Mr. Ware answered that he isn’t sure at this time.

One of the committee members inquired if there is any additional information regarding bicycle and pedestrians, and Mr. Ware said they plan to address those issues in Phase 2.

5) US-169 (Buck O’Neil) Environmental Assessment Study
Gerri Doyle, with MoDOT, briefed the committee on the scope, timeline, and future steps related to this study. The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) has recently launched an Environmental Assessment (EA) study, in partnership with the City of Kansas City, MO for study of improvement alternatives of the US-169 (Buck O’Neil) Bridge across the Missouri River. In addition, various public agencies and the public at large will be engaged in the study process.

This EA study will evaluate the impacts of the proposed Buck O’Neil bridge project on a number of resources including historic resources; endangered species and their habitats; community facilities; residences and businesses; and public spaces. The purpose of a new or rehabilitated river crossing is to facilitate the safe movement of people and goods along US 169 while improving mobility, connectivity, and accessibility across the Missouri River.

MARC’s policy on bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on Missouri and Kansas River bridges applies to this study area. Various planning committees, the TTPC and the MARC Board of Directors have previously been briefed on and provided feedback to a precursor “Planning & Environmental Linkages” study, Beyond the Loop, which has informed this EA study.

6) Missouri STIP Program Allocation Policy
Griffin Smith, with MoDOT, provided additional information about the new STIP allocation policy. The STIP program changes will take effect in SFY 2022 and will deduct costs for engineering, the statewide Transportation Alternative Program and federal open-container penalties prior to distributing remaining funds through the Safety, Asset Management (AM) and System Improvement (SI) programs in the STIP. Funds for the Safety program will be reduced from $35 million per year under the previous formula to $29 million per year, the AM program will replace the previous Taking Care of Our System program and will increase from $362 million per year to $583 million plus three percent annual growth. Within the new AM program, a new Major Bridge (MB) program will replace the former Statewide Interstate and Major Bridge (SWMB) program with reduced funds from $125 m/year for SWMB to $94 m/year for MB. The remaining funds will then be distributed to the new SI program which replaces the previous Flexible Funds program.

MARC staff is still reviewing information about the new allocation formula but estimates that these changes will result in a transfer of approximately $135 million or 5% of the statewide program from the three large urban areas to rural districts from 2022 to 2024, with a total reduction of $31 million or 8% for the Kansas City area’s portion of the STIP over these three years.

MoDOT reviewed changes to the STIP program allocation policy with the Missouri STP Priorities Committee at their meeting on February 12, 2019. Projects that are currently in the STIP will be held harmless by these program
changes. These changes will not impact the distribution of sub-allocated federal funds including Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) or Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds.

One of the committee members inquired if the legislature has been a part of the decision-making process regarding the $125 million that’s a part of taking care of the system, and Mr. Smith remarked that they are not.

Someone remarked that there needs to be more urban representation on the commission board.

7) Comments on Missouri Legislation to Update Vehicle Registration Fees
Karen Clawson reported on the analysis of the proposed fee schedule for vehicle registration fees and shared a comment letter approved by the Air Quality Forum for submission. Missouri is currently the only state to base VRF on horsepower. However, vehicle registration fees based on fuel economy—where higher fuel economy means higher fees—may be a disincentive to increase market saturation of electric and hybrid-electric vehicles. Two bills are currently filed in the state of Missouri that attempt to update vehicle registration fees to be based on fuel economy.

MARC’s Clean Air Action Plan strategies call for increased use of electric vehicles in the region. This comment letter expresses concerns regarding possible disincentives that may result from the proposed vehicle registration fee schedule for owners of fuel-efficient vehicles (including electric vehicles) and discourages potential buyers. The MARC Air Quality Forum reviewed and APPROVED this comment letter.

A committee member asked if the House and Senate bills are the same, and Mrs. Clawson replied that there are some similarities, but there are subtle differences between the two.

There was inquiry if MARC could get more involved in the legislatures regarding these types of bills, and have a more proactive position on additional funding streams. Mr. Achelpohl responded that MARC has a long standing position of supporting increased revenues for transportation in both states and that staff would be open to developing more specific positions on potential revenue sources.

8) Regional Transportation Plan 2050 (RTP2050) Update
Martin Rivarola reported on upcoming future steps. As a major next step towards completion of RTP2050, MARC will be deploying a process to develop this listing of projects over various months in 2019. The next steps include:

   - **February:** Launch “Call for Projects” (Tentative February 26th)
   - **March:** Pre-Application Workshop (Tentative March 6th)
   - **April:** Close “Call for Projects” (April 25th)

The plan identifies needs and budget federal transportation funds that the metro area expects to receive over the next three decades. Currently, TO2040 contains:

- **Vision:** a long-term vision for the region’s transportation system.
- **Goals and strategies:** what we want to achieve by the year 2040 and how we plan to do it.
- **Transportation projects:** major regional transportation investments to help accomplish goals.

Sustainable Places Policy Committee, Air Quality Forum, Regional Transit Coordinating Council, Highway, Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Aviation, Goods Movement, Technical Forecast Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors have all participated in prior discussions to support this work.

Once adopted, updated policies/goals and strategies identified in the MTP will guide transportation investments in our region in future years. For more information, please see: [www.marc.org/2050](http://www.marc.org/2050)
9) Operation Green Light Program 2019 Work Plan and Update
Ray Webb provided an update on 2019 planned activities including signal timing efforts on a variety of corridors, latest partnerships, and details regarding the sharing of traffic signal data to 3rd party vendors specifically the recent MoDOT efforts with Audi/Traffic Technology Services.
The OGL program provides and maintains real-time data communications with each intersection and manages the regionally shared Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) software.

OGL also hosts on its servers over 100 closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras for many of the area agencies that support the oversight of traffic signal operations, identification of signal malfunctions and incident management.

OGL continues to grow in its capacity to coordinate operations with the Kansas City Scout freeway management system to support traffic incident management activities ranging from unplanned events to regional roadway construction work.

10) Green Infrastructure Framework
Due to time constraints, this report was moved to the next meeting.

11) Other Business
   • There was no further business to discuss.

12) Adjournment
With no further business the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting of TTPC will be held March 19, 2019.
ISSUE:
VOTE: 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the 2018-22 Transportation Improvement Program

BACKGROUND:
The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the region’s short-range program, identifying projects to receive federal funds and projects of regional significance to be implemented over the next three to five year period. MARC amends the TIP on both a quarterly cycle and as needed to accommodate changes to projects in the TIP.

The proposed 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the 2018-22 TIP includes 9 projects:

- 1 new project to be added:
  - #280152 - I-70 & Turner Diagonal Interchange in Wyandotte County
- 8 projects to be modified for revisions to the budget, schedule or scope:
  - #180074 - Rehabilitation on bridge #026 on K-92 in Leavenworth County
  - #280136 - Surfacing on I-70 from Quarry Road bridge to 38th Street bridge
  - #280142 - Rehabilitation on bridge #042 (42nd St), 0.2mi north of old K-32
  - #280145 - Rehabilitation on bridge #043 (Speaker Rd), 0.39mi north of old K-32
  - #280148 - Surfacing on I-70 from 18th Street to I-670
  - #380155 - Surfacing on I-435 in Johnson and Wyandotte Counties
  - #380159 - Rehabilitation on bridge #234 on K-10 in Johnson County
  - #380163 - Rehabilitation on bridge #103 (151st St), 8.05mi north of Miami County

Details of these projects are available for review on the Internet at:

http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Plans-Studies/Transportation-Plans-and-Studies/TIP/TIP-Amendment-Archive/Archive-assets/19SA1amend.aspx

MARC’s Public Involvement Plan requires that proposed amendments to the TIP be released for public review and comment prior to adoption. No comments were received.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the 2019 Special Amendment #1 to the FFY 2018-2022 TIP.

STAFF CONTACT
Marc Hansen
ISSUE:
VOTE: 2019 2\textsuperscript{nd} Quarter Amendment to the 2018-22 TIP for Public Review & Comment

BACKGROUND:
The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the region’s short-range program, identifying projects to receive federal funds and projects of regional significance to be implemented over the next three to five year period. MARC amends the TIP on a quarterly cycle to accommodate changes to projects in the TIP.

The proposed 2019 2\textsuperscript{nd} Quarter Amendment to the 2018-22 TIP includes 16 projects:

- 9 new projects to be added, including, but not limited to:
  - #280152 - Roadway Additions for the American Royal Development
  - #690532 - M-7, Pavement Resurfacing and Guardrail Replacement from Oak Haven Drive to the M-150 Intersection
  - #867006 - Bridge replacement on 263rd St. over North Wea Creek in Miami County
  - #980032 - KC Scout Camera and Communication Device Replacement

- 7 modified projects, including, but not limited to:
  - #345126 - 95\textsuperscript{th} and Santa Fe Trail Drive Intersection Improvements
  - #995002 - Revenue Rolling Stock including Vanpool Program Expansion

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) requires State DOTs and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) to conduct performance-based planning and programming by tracking performance measures, setting data-driven targets for each measure, and selecting projects to help meet those targets related to seven national goals.

Safety is the first national goal identified in the FAST Act and MPO’s must report their safety targets to the State DOT, and include these targets and progress toward meeting them in any Transportation Improvement Program or Metropolitan Transportation Plan amendments after May 27, 2018.

FHWA requires the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) to establish safety targets on an annual basis, beginning with targets for calendar year (CY) 2018. The MARC Board of Directors approved the most recent regional safety targets on December 18, 2018. MARC has included this information as part of the amendment packet and will incorporate the information into the “Measuring Progress” section of the 2018-2022 TIP.

Details of these projects are available for review on the Internet at:

http://www.marc.org/Transportation/Plans-Studies/Transportation-Plans-and-Studies/TIP/TIP-Amendment-Archive/Archive-assets/19Q2amend.aspx
MARC’s Public Involvement Plan requires that proposed amendments to the TIP be released for public review and comment prior to adoption.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
None.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the release of the 2019 2nd Quarter Amendment to the FFY 2018-2022 TIP for Public Review & Comment.

STAFF CONTACT
Marc Hansen
ISSUE
VOTE: Regional Performance Targets for Transit State of Good Repair

BACKGROUND
When Congress passed the federal transportation bill MAP-21 in July 2012, it included a series of provisions for Transportation Performance Management (TPM). In the intervening years, Congress passed the FAST Act in December 2015, which essentially maintained and reaffirmed the performance management provisions of MAP-21. Since the passage of MAP-21, USDOT has worked through the federal rulemaking process to establish a series of performance measures and corresponding target setting requirements. Generally, the performance measures relate to national goals of safety, infrastructure condition, air quality, and transportation system performance. As the proposed rules were issued, various stakeholders and MARC committees were engaged to review and develop comments. In many cases, final rules reflected substance of comments submitted by MARC.

In the last year, transit providers in the Kansas City metropolitan planning area—KCATA, KC Streetcar, KDOT, MoDOT—have established targets for transit state of good repair through the development of Transit Asset Management Plans. Metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) like MARC must establish performance targets 180 days after the State DOTs or transit providers have established their targets. MARC has until March 30th to submit the regional targets to the State DOTs and has based the recommended targets on information provided from the transit agencies.

The proposed regional targets for transit state of good repair are attached to this report and have not changed since they were established in 2018.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
The targets established for the Kansas City metropolitan region will be incorporated into the regional performance-based planning process. Performance measures and progress towards achieving targets will be reported in the Annual Performance Measures Report. Performance measures and targets must also be integrated with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:
None.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve the regional targets for Transit State of Good Repair.

STAFF CONTACT:
Caitlin Zibers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Target Description</th>
<th>KS Group Plan</th>
<th>MO Group Plan</th>
<th>KCATA/RideKC</th>
<th>KC Streetcar</th>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stock (revenue vehicles by mode)</td>
<td>Over-the-road buses</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>% met or exceeded FTA Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>14 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRT/40-foot buses</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 25%</td>
<td>14 45%</td>
<td>14 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-foot buses</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cutaways</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 25%</td>
<td>10 45%</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vans</td>
<td>VN</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 25%</td>
<td>8 45%</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minivans</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 25%</td>
<td>8 45%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 45%</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railcars</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25 0%</td>
<td>25 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (non-revenue vehicles)</td>
<td>Vans</td>
<td>VN</td>
<td>% met or exceeded FTA Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>8 75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minivans</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport Utility Vehicles</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (other over $50,000)</td>
<td>Construction/Maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% of track segments that have performance restrictions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 0%</td>
<td>12 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (rail)</td>
<td>Track Segments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 0%</td>
<td>50 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>F-ADMIN</td>
<td>% with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA TERM scale</td>
<td>4 25%</td>
<td>4 30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40 0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>F-MAINT</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 25%</td>
<td>4 25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40 0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>F-PARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger</td>
<td>F-PASS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 25%</td>
<td>4 30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25 0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISSUE
REPORT: MoDOT Automated Truck Mounted Attenuator Pilot Project

BACKGROUND
MoDOT is testing new technologies to improve the safety of workers and motorists in work zones for maintenance operations. MoDOT has used conventional Truck Mounted Attenuators (TMAs) as safety devices during maintenance and construction operations for many years. These devices are designed to absorb the impact of collisions with errant vehicles to reduce the severity of work zone crashes and protect personnel working in the roadway or in other vehicles or equipment downstream of the TMA.

Unfortunately, personnel who must be in the vehicle to operate a conventional TMA are still at some risk of serious injury or death. MoDOT has recently begun experimenting with new technologies to allow remote operation of TMA vehicles in hopes of eventually being able to operate these vehicles without placing workers in them.

Chris Redline, MoDOT’s Northwest District Engineer, is currently leading this pilot project and will report on it’s progress at the meeting.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
Reducing work zone fatalities is a focus area of the Kansas City Regional Transportation Safety Blueprint.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:
None.

RECOMMENDATION:
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT:
Ron Achelpohl
ISSUE
REPORT: KC Scout/Operation Green Light Work Zone Coordination Update

BACKGROUND
As the 2019 highway construction season begins, Kansas City Scout and Operation Green Light have coordinated with KDOT, MoDOT and area local governments on traffic management plans for several upcoming projects.

Mark Sommerhauser, MoDOT's project manager for Kansas City Scout, will report on these activities at the meeting.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
Reducing work zone fatalities is a focus area of the Kansas City Regional Transportation Safety Blueprint.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:
None.

RECOMMENDATION:
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT:
Ron Achelpohl
ISSUE:
REPORT: Green Infrastructure Framework

BACKGROUND:
MARC has long engaged in a broad range of regional green infrastructure conservation efforts, including efforts focused on MetroGreen, stormwater, urban forestry, stream protection, green/complete streets, and the regional natural resources inventory. Each of these efforts is integral to Planning Sustainable Places, the Climate Resilience Strategy, Clean Air Action Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan. However, these efforts are programmatically disconnected, and typically funded at a level that does not align with the potential benefits.

Since 2016, MARC has developed a three-part Green Infrastructure Framework, including an Atlas, Playbook and attendant policy recommendations. The framework offers a set of goals, an integrated planning approach, playbook case studies (including the Rock Island Corridor), and a set of policy recommendations.

The approach is intended to inform the Regional Transportation Plan in a variety of ways. First, if offers guidance and specificity related policy goals associate with climate resilience, natural resource protection, public health, environmental justice, centers and corridors, and alternative transportation. Second, it aligns with key regional strategies such as green and complete streets and transit-oriented development. Third, it provides a basis for the development of regional projects and strategies to advance future implementation. And finally, the approach is intended complement and strengthen previous efforts in ways that support achievement of environmental and transportation goals - at the same time.

Staff will provide an overview of the framework, and request committee endorsement of the framework at its March meeting, if appropriate.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None.

COMMITTEE ACTION
The MARC Sustainable Places Policy Committee (SPPC) voted to endorse the Green Infrastructure Framework at its March committee meeting. SPPC provides leadership and policy advice to MARC’s Board of Directors in regional sustainable development.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Informational Only.

STAFF CONTACT
Tom Jacobs
Fulfilling our regional vision requires great commitment and care, and a new level of cooperation among public, private and nonprofit organizations. A well-informed relationship between people and nature is necessary to grow thriving communities in the Heartland.

The Green Infrastructure Framework offers a planning and design approach to grow communities in ways that simultaneously tend to neighborhoods, jobs and nature. For example, we can care for every drop of water by increasing the health of the soil that it falls upon; catching it, cleaning and reusing it when it falls on hard surfaces; and making sure it doesn’t carry pollutants into streams. Similarly, when developing a parcel of land, we should strive to maintain the ecosystem services the land currently provides, ensuring that the landscape is sequestering carbon and creating habitat, buildings and structures are not making the air hotter, and people can gather and learn about the design process that make each place unique.

As green infrastructure becomes part of the mosaic of all local land uses, it can be designed and managed in ways that meet local needs while providing both local and broader community environmental benefits. When green infrastructure is an integrated part of land use, it can also have a significant and positive impact on mobility planning. Forests, streams, wetlands and prairies provide ecological benefits as well as great walking and biking environments. Linking communities through trails and complete green streets not only increases quality of life and economic vitality, but also provides health benefits and increases equitable opportunities to access education and jobs.

Integrated processes — especially those with new approaches — require a wide variety of participation and perspectives. Adoption of commonly held policies provides consistent guidance across jurisdictions, sectors and practices in the region. During the Regional Green Infrastructure Policy Study, three overarching policy recommendations emerged from stakeholder discussions: creating model ordinances; updating stormwater management guidelines and engineering standards; and linking conservation and transportation planning.

Participants framed progress on these three priorities within a larger context of supporting strategies. They noted substantial needs regarding regional collaboration, leadership development and capacity building, communications and education, tools and data, integrated regional/local planning, funding, and implementation of multi-benefit projects.

Implementation of the study’s recommendations will focus on convening and mobilizing the diverse communities of our region to use the data and tools at our fingertips and create new policy to support resilient decision-making together.
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

After two community stakeholder workshops, participants developed and prioritized a set of over 50 policy and planning recommendations. Three overarching policy recommendations emerged from stakeholder discussions:

1. Develop a package of model, local green infrastructure-friendly ordinances.
2. Update local stormwater management planning guidelines and engineering standards.
3. Better link conservation and transportation planning.

Descriptions of each recommendation, along with additional context and rationale, are provided below.

I. MODEL ORDINANCES

MARC will work with local governments and area stakeholders to develop model ordinances to eliminate barriers to green infrastructure, or conversely, to incentivize its application. Key policy questions were raised for the following local government ordinances:

Trees and urban forestry
Under what conditions, and to what degree may trees be protected during the development/redevelopment process? What tree replacement policies should be required to sustain ecosystem services? What are the roles and responsibilities of different city departments in protecting, planting, maintaining and monitoring the urban forest? What incentives or practices enable the community to protect and enhance its urban tree canopy?

Weeds and landscaping
Native plants create habitat, improve water and air quality, and sequester carbon. Yet, in some instances, landscaping ordinances effectively constrain, or even ban their use because of the definition of a weed, or maximum plant height requirements (e.g., 6”–18”). How can we clarify the establishment and management of native landscapes without sacrificing other community health and safety goals?

Invasive species
A variety of invasive species, from Bradford pear trees to bush honeysuckle, have substantially impaired the quality and health of natural ecosystems. What regulations might govern or restrict the use of invasive species to achieve stated policy goals?

Green infrastructure-focused planning and zoning
Local planning and zoning regulations may impede the application of ecologically-sensitive site design. What planning guidelines are needed to facilitate multi-benefit projects and supplement engineering design standards and specifications, ensuring that public and private infrastructure creates multi-benefit, contextually-sensitive solutions?

Recommendation:
Develop a suite of model ordinances related to trees, weeds, landscaping, invasive species and other relevant planning/zoning regulations, using an inclusive stakeholder process. Ideally, this process would be piloted in one or more local communities that are interested in adopting appropriate revisions. It would also complement stormwater standards and specifications described on the next page.
2. STORMWATER ENGINEERING STANDARDS AND PLANNING GUIDELINES

In 2003, the Kansas City Chapter of the American Public Works Association (APWA) adopted standards for stormwater management known as Section 5600, while also endorsing the MARC/APWA Manual to Protect Water Quality. Those efforts were the product of a collaborative, regional effort to reduce flood risks and protect water quality in the aftermath of the 1998 flood. Since that time, substantial changes in technology, best management practices and integrated planning/design approaches compel the region to revisit these standards.

These standards are silent on several key policy questions, including:

♦ What stormwater management requirements should be instituted for redevelopment projects?
♦ How can stormwater management practices advance complementary community goals related to transportation, housing, parks, public health, food security, ecosystem vitality or social equity?
♦ What standards should be required to ensure proper maintenance of green infrastructure?
♦ To what degree do stormwater standards prepare the region to be more climate resilient?
♦ How are stormwater management standards embedded within emerging goals of “one water” or integrated watershed management?

Recommendation:
Update existing standards and planning guidelines, rooted in the approach articulated within the Green Infrastructure Framework. Implement a multidisciplinary, cross-sector stakeholder process to fund, scope, develop and adopt amended engineering standards and planning guidelines.

3. LINKING CONSERVATION AND TRANSPORTATION

In 2008, the MARC Board of Directors adopted an Eco-Logical Action Plan. The integration of green infrastructure into transportation policy, programs, projects and practices creates an opportunity to address mobility and environmental quality at the same time. Four key efforts provide important antecedents for this agenda:

♦ To date, approximately 350 miles of MetroGreen™ corridors have been developed, with another 90,000 streamside acres protected by stream buffer requirements.
♦ Regional complete street policy includes “green” streets within its purview.
♦ MARC’s Planning Sustainable Places program provides a platform for integrated environmental, land use and transportation planning.
♦ Pilot native landscaping efforts along highway rights of way provide habitat for migrating monarch butterflies.

Opportunities exist to build from previous successes. While stream buffers and greenways are protected, most area streams are designated as impaired. Integrated land use/transportation projects are increasing in visibility, but the environmental dimensions have been largely unaddressed. And, while transportation facilities are one of the region’s most significant classes of runoff-generating impervious areas, no requirements exist to protect water quality from transportation facilities.
Recommendation:
Fully integrate green infrastructure conservation and restoration goals into the regional transportation plan, policies, program, performance measures, and project evaluation criteria.

Opportunities exist to:
- Include green infrastructure-focused projects on the project list for the long-range transportation plan.
- Strengthen evaluation criteria in the project selection process to provide incentives for inclusion of green infrastructure in transportation facilities.
- Allocate additional funds in the Planning Sustainable Places program to support projects focused at the nexus of green infrastructure, transportation and land use.
- Link water quality approaches with transportation planning and design by developing stormwater quality requirements for transportation facility design, along with an in-lieu fee system for projects unable to implement water quality protection measures within their project area.
- Convert targeted transportation rights of way to native landscaping, with a focus on multi-benefit solutions that simultaneously advance environmental, watershed and mobility goals.

ADDITIONAL STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

Participants in green infrastructure workshops and planning sessions framed the three priority strategies within a larger context, identifying substantial opportunities regarding regional collaboration, leadership development and capacity building, communications and education, tools and data, integrated regional/local planning, funding, and implementation of multi-benefit projects.

Regional collaboration and leadership
A formalized collaborative, cross-sector regional forum is needed to address connected policy, planning and funding needs. The forum could provide regional leadership and facilitate higher levels of coordination among area conservation agencies and organizations.

Data and tools
Planning tools are foundational to the advancement of this framework. Investment in tools and data like the Natural Resources Inventory, performance metrics and indicators, and geospatial analysis is critical for the region to identify and address integrated ecosystem, human health and social equity values and needs.

Communication and education
Many barriers to green infrastructure implementation are related to uneven public and professional understanding and support. In response, a comprehensive communications strategy is needed, along with strategic professional development with a focus on green infrastructure maintenance, and certification programs for construction and maintenance standards. In addition, public recognition of exemplary efforts provides wider understanding of successful practices and replicable models.

Integrated planning
At the regional scale, multiple plans reflect the importance of green infrastructure conservation and restoration. At the local level, comprehensive plans may include green infrastructure elements in each topic area of recommendations to explicitly identify how green infrastructure may help address local goals and objectives. Interjurisdictional cooperation on integrated watershed management, or “one water” plans, offers another substantial opportunity to address water quality and quantity goals along with other community goals.

Project implementation
Stakeholder discussions focused on land use, watersheds, transportation and parks as key areas of momentum, potential funding and public influence. Opportunities to advance more integrated, multi-benefit projects exist within each of these realms. These opportunities include development of common ordinances for land use and zoning, as well as standards for public streetscapes and landscapes. Coordinating nonprofit education and advocacy programs with projects on public land and waterways also provides visibility and access to projects, creating wider educational benefit and recreation opportunities.
GEOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

The maps shown below inform an integrated approach to green infrastructure planning, accounting for ecological value, ecological impact or need, and social need. Close-up views are shown for the northern section of the Rock Island corridor, which was a subject of analysis for the Green Infrastructure Playbook. Maps were developed from the regional natural resource inventory and from Census data.

ECOLOGICAL VALUE

The Ecological Value map serves to identify areas where multiple ecological value criteria overlap, and where green infrastructure networks could be most effective for protecting and improving existing high value resources. Darker areas reflect a higher number of good quality attributes for conservation. Lighter areas suggest areas that may be better suited for potential restoration, mitigation, or development compatibility.
ROCK ISLAND CORRIDOR DETAIL

Higher resolution imagery allows a clearer view of the relationship between the built and natural environment, and community needs. Playbook analysis identified opportunities for sustainable development activities at certain nodes, to create community linkages and to make environmental improvements along the corridor.
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NEED / ECOLOGICAL IMPACT

This map identifies areas with ecological degradation, where green infrastructure installations may reduce the degradation and/or negative impacts to ecological and human health.

Rock Island Corridor Detail
SOCIAL NEED

This map prioritizes areas with disadvantaged or vulnerable populations using criteria such as zero-vehicle households, minority population, low educational attainment, poverty, population decline, and population with poor access to parks.

Rock Island Corridor Detail
Data overlayed on aerial for orientation.
The value of green infrastructure exists in the potential it has to enhance the health and well-being of our communities. Locations where ecological needs intersect with social needs become ideal places to focus attention and investment. In these places, the connection between the ecological functions of the land and the communities who live there are most direct. These places are illustrated in the maps below. Social needs can be varied and wide-ranging and depend greatly on the context and history of a place. In general, measures of community health, mobility, economic opportunity, and equity can provide a measure of social need.

The quantitative analysis used was an intersection analysis to view ecological value and need and social need jointly and holistically. This is a trivariate map, where each unique color represents a different combination of intersection. Light pink indicates the presence of high value ecological resources and conservation needs, but no other need intersection. Green and blue indicate ecological need for restoration and social need, respectively. Darker shades are used to represent greater intersection: dark teal for areas of social need and restoration intersection, dark pink for social need and conservation intersection, and orange for restoration and conservation intersection. Gray indicates an intersection of all three needs.
JOIN THE CONSERVATION.

The Here We Grow brand has been created to encompass all green infrastructure initiatives at the regional level. We are happy to share this logo to incorporate into your green infrastructure projects and messaging. Please contact us for your copy.

marc.org/GIframework

The Green Infrastructure Framework and Green Infrastructure Playbook can be found at marc.org/GIframework. The full report on Policy, Planning and Action will join previous work in the near future.

PROTECT against harmful pollutants and climate change
PRESERVE your neighborhood for future generations
RESTORE natural areas to increase recreational activity

Tom Jacobs
Director of Environmental Programs
tjacobs@marc.org • 816-701-8352
ISSUE:
REPORT: Regional Transportation Safety Report

BACKGROUND:
The attached report addresses the 4th Quarter, Kansas City Regional Fatalities ending December 31, 2018. The report tracks 15 Focus Areas identified in the Kansas City Regional Transportation Safety Blueprint: Together Toward Zero 2018-2022. The plan promotes a multidisciplinary approach through proven strategies to reduce crashes, fatalities and serious injuries.

Each quarterly report represents the total recorded year-to-date roadway fatalities for the 13 county area. Fatalities through 2018 reached 251, which exceeded the set goal of 211 or fewer fatalities. Fatalities in 2018 increased 14.4% over the five-year average of 219.4. Fatalities increased from 206 in 2015 to 231 in 2016 and peaked in 2017 at 285. Fatalities are trending significantly higher than the five-year average. In response, this year local law enforcement agencies are coordinating traffic enforcement efforts on the first Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday or each month.

In prior years significant increases were noticed in the urbanize counties specifically Jackson County. This year the increase were distributed over multiple counties including both urban and rural populations. The strong economy and low gas prices are factors that increase discretionary driving resulting in higher than average fatalities. This year the months between May - September and December ended in higher than average fatalities. Impaired driving and distracted driving involvement had noticeable declines. Infrastructure focus areas did not change dramatically. Pedestrian fatalities are atypically high. We will report again in May of 2019.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
One of the regional goals of Transportation Outlook 2040 Update is to “… improve safety and security for all transportation users.”

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS
None

COMMITTEE ACTION
The Destination Safe Leadership Team adopted the Kansas City Regional Transportation Safety Blueprint: Together Toward Zero 2018-2022.

RECOMMENDATION
None. Information only.

STAFF CONTACT
Aaron Bartlett
Martin Rivarola
2018 Quarterly Fatality Report
Ending Dec. 31, 2018

The 2018 goal is 211 or fewer fatalities.

YTD fatalities are up 14% from the five-year YTD average.

Q. What is the five-year YTD average?

A. The five-year average for each quarterly report is an average of total fatalities for the same year-to-date (YTD) period over the previous five years (2013–2017). This report compares YTD 2018 with the same period five-year YTD average.

Produced in partnership with

Preliminary data provided by Kansas and Missouri Departments of Transportation. Some information calculated by MARC.

This document is exempt under discovery or admission as part of 23 USC § 409. The collection of safety data in the Kansas City region is encouraged to actively address safety issues on regional, local and site-specific levels. Congress has enacted a law, 23 USC § 409, which prohibits the discovery or admission of crash and safety data from being admitted into evidence in a federal or state court proceeding. This document contains wording, charts, tables, graphs, lists and diagrams for the purpose of identifying and evaluating safety enhancements in the Kansas City region. These materials are protected under 23 USC § 409. Congress’ rationale behind 23 USC § 409 is that safety data is compiled and collected to help prevent future crashes, injuries and deaths on our nation’s transportation system.

Roadway fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-to-date target</th>
<th>211 or fewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YTD, ending Dec. 31, 2018</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year YTD average, ending Dec. 31, 2017</td>
<td>219.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway fatality locations by county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>YTD 2018</th>
<th>Five-year YTD average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (KS)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (MO)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Month-by-month regional fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Five-year YTD average</th>
<th>YTD 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jan  Feb  March  April  May  June  July  Aug  Sept  Oct  Nov  Dec
### Priority Issues

as identified by the Destination Safe Coalition in the Regional Transportation Safety Blueprint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral priorities</th>
<th>Infrastructure-related issues</th>
<th>Special user priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestrained occupants</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality in which the person killed was not using safety belt or restraint device.</td>
<td><strong>Lane departure</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality that involves a vehicle crossing into an adjacent lane of traffic or leaving the roadway.</td>
<td><strong>Motorists 15–24 years old</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality of a person of any age that involved a driver between the ages of 15 and 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>174.4</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive driving</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality involving a combination of moving traffic offenses (primarily speeding) that endanger other persons or property.</td>
<td><strong>Fixed object</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality that involves a vehicle that leaves its lane and runs into a ditch, an object or a barrier.</td>
<td><strong>Motorcycle/moped</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality of a person operating a motorcycle or moped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impaired driving</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality caused by a driver who is impaired by alcohol, drugs or other substance.</td>
<td><strong>Horizontal curves</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality resulting from a crash that occurred in a roadway change in the horizontal alignment or direction of a road.</td>
<td><strong>Motorists 65 years old and older</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality of a person of any age that involved an older adult driver over the age of 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unlicensed driver</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality caused by a driver who is not licensed or whose license is revoked or suspended.</td>
<td><strong>Intersections</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality that occurs at a road junction, where two or more roads either meet or cross.</td>
<td><strong>Pedestrians</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality of a person not in or on a vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distracted driving</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality involving a driver whose attention is diverted from the primary task of driving — manually, mentally or visually.</td>
<td><strong>Head-on collisions</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality that results from two opposing vehicles colliding.</td>
<td><strong>Large trucks</strong>&lt;br&gt;A fatality involving a vehicle that exceeds 10,000 pounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of 2018 YTD fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
<td>Five-year YTD avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>