

# Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting Summary

Wednesday, March 13, 2024 – 1:30 PM

---

## Members/Alternates & Visitors in Attendance

Art Gough, Citizen	Nick Ward Bopp, Johnson County Parks + Rec
Brian Shields, City of Overland Park	Fernando Olivera, Affinis
Chuck Soules, City of Smithville	Bailey Waters, City of KCMO
Eric Rogers, BikeWalkKC	Michael Park, City of Lee's Summit Public Works
Matt Davis, (Co-Chair) Jackson County Parks + Rec	Andrew Robertson, GBA
Krystal Jolly, MoDOT	Haden Mattke, City of Belton
Michael Kelley, BikeWalkKC	Mira Felzien, KCATA
Noel Bennion, City of Riverside	John Davis, Clay County Parks
Sherri McIntyre, City of Liberty	Todd Hueser, City of Olathe
Jan Faidley, City of Roland Park	Katie Jardieu, MoDOT
Ron McLinden, Unknown	Donald Schoenborn, MoDOT
Andrew Ngui, City of KCMO	Nicole Brown, Johnson County Dept. of Health + Environment
Bobby Evans, City of KCMO	Chad Thompson, City of KCMO
Brett McCubbin, City of Shawnee	

## MARC staff in attendance

Martin Rivarola	Patrick Trouba
Raymart Dinglas	Beth Dawson

### 1) Welcome and Introductions

### 2) VOTE: Approval of the January 10 meeting summary

- a) Motion passes, summary approved.

### 3) Discussion and VOTE: Missouri Unfunded Needs – bicycle/pedestrian list prioritization (Patrick Trouba)

- a) First was an overview of the process. MoDOT works with MARC to identify and prioritize projects where no funding has yet been identified. Getting an initial list from interested parties and committee members of this committee, the Active Transportation Programming Committee and the Missouri Surface Transportation Program Committee. These projects are then vetted and ranked by committee members of just the ATPC and BPAC.
- b) There was a total of 28 projects submitted. MARC received 30 evaluations regarding these projects. The combined funding for all projects amounted to \$218.6 million. The target amount for the Unfunded Needs list is \$60 million. Given the financial constraints, MARC has created two prioritization lists and is asking BPAC for a vote of prioritization recommendation to send to ATPC. The first list is a result just by score only, with lower score being a better ranking. The second list is the recommendation by MARC. This scenario was a result of how often these projects were in the top-ten choices by the evaluators. The two lists share a lot of the same project names with little variation. But MARC staff recommends the top-ten list. Martin: We must get a recommendation by May for MoDOT.
- c) Discussion: When the next round of funding comes around, why would we not use this list? Martin: We could do this; these are potentially good candidates for funding. These are projects are looking for funding from all pots of funding that they may be eligible for. We are looking for the top regional projects.

- d) Katie: Is there a way to look at if sponsors already have projects completed successfully and on time. A concern of MoDOT is the balance issue of projects getting completed on time. And to go off the previous question, why are these projects not included when there is an overbalance issue, and we have the funding to complete one of these projects? Martin: These projects have not gone through the MARC process to vet projects for funding. These could be good potential candidates for the next round of funding.
- e) Question: If MoDOT got money, would we still have to go through a vetting process to see these projects get funding. How does MoDOT use this list? Joann: Since this list focuses on sidewalks and trails and MoDOT is focused on completing the ADA transition plan around 2027. MoDOT normally does not have funding for projects solely focused on sidewalks and trails. Usually MoDOT projects are automobile centric, with possibly adding these pedestrian/bikeway features. The TIP funding usually does not focus on pedestrian or bikeways. It is usually through grants and with local jurisdictions assistance, that MoDOT gets involved in these pedestrian level projects.
- f) Martin: The goal of this process is to show the Missouri legislature that there are these potential needs and if funds can be dedicated towards bike/ped projects. We have not yet seen that in bike/ped projects. The legislature has funded some of the Highway Committees Unfunded Needs project list before. What we are asking today is this priority list a good list, is the committee willing to recommend it? If it is not, is there a better way to prioritize these projects?
- g) Comment: I'm curious if the municipalities knew to put sidewalk projects on this list. Martin: Did we specify sidewalks on the survey? Patrick: We specified if a project served bikes or pedestrians or both. Question: Does the suballocated list of projects get a lot of sidewalk projects? Patrick: Occasionally, yes. But usually a part of a larger project. Question: A lot of smaller communities have sidewalk requested projects; do they not score as well?
- h) Question: Does the ranking take into consideration the destination? Martin: The survey asked you, committee members on the Missouri side, to rank the projects. These committee members could be seen as experts on certain suggested projects. If there is a different way of things you would like to see, there is a little time before the suggested list is due to MoDOT. The challenge is that we won't meet again until May, after ATPC meets and votes on this matter. As well the Unfunded Needs list is also due in May.
- i) Bailey: I would be interested in an additional column stating if these projects go over a barrier (river, highway or railroad crossings). Joann: You are talking about the demand for network connection. Bailey: Yes, that it is crossing a barrier means that has a more difficult need of a connection.
- j) Martin: I don't think it matters if you are first on this list or last on this list. The order is not necessarily relevant, the more important fact is that this list was compiled on and to get it sent out.
- k) Comment: We have been looking at Department of Transportation Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) maps, to judge the equity impacts of a project. We could use this to throw an equity component in this ranking system.
- l) Question: Do the rest of the projects below the \$68.5 million mark, not get through the MoDOT part of the process. Martin: We will keep this list internal at MARC, and we will track them as we try to do this annually.
- m) Question: Are some of the sidewalks on private residences? Do the trails go through public ROW? Patrick: Our survey did not specifically ask this question. It seems that most of the projects are area based.
- n) Question: If the projects submitted by the private individual, and the one submitted by the non-profit got their local jurisdiction to sign-off on the projects? The speaker would be hesitant to advance them if the jurisdiction was unaware of the project. Patrick: No, they haven't been vetted by the jurisdiction.

- o) Question: Do we have a sidewalk inventory? If sidewalks aren't going to score well on this list, is there a way we can create a specific sidewalk list? To where we can slowly chip away at the sidewalk improvements and creation. Question: Is this going to pit sidewalks against trails and bikeway funding? Question: How appropriate is it to use federal funds to fix a local planning mistake, where there are missing sidewalks? Maybe a question to consider for the survey: why is a sidewalk being requested?
- p) Ron: Should the survey specify how many miles they cover?
- q) VOTE: Recommended list approved.

**4) Presentation: Regional Trails and Bikeway Map 2024 print edition preview (Patrick Trouba)**

- a) This is a preview of the newest reedition of the bikeways map that MARC develops annually, with the first edition completed in 2004. With the 2016 edition being the first one to be printed bi-annually. There is a companion online version that features ongoing updates.
- b) The 2024 edition includes new features. Adding the RideKC bike hubs. Removing the streetcar route and transit centers from the map. A color palette changes to highlight separate facilities over shared roadways and improve readability. Distinguishing between bike lanes and separated bike lanes. Combining "Marked Bike Route" and "Marked – Share the Road" as "Marked Bike Route". Removing "Share the Road" signage and National Historic Trails.
- c) The map will be distributed at the beginning of May and the online version will be updated around the same time. Unable to change aspects like colors of the facility types at this point in the process. But notice of new facilities or facilities in error are welcome. Seeking suggestions and corrections; MARC is doing its best to create an online map with any updates.
- d) Facilities that will be included in this map: Shared Use Paths, Separated Bike Lanes, Bike Lanes, Marked Bike Route, Mountain Bike Trail, Walking Trail, Equestrian Trail and Paved Shoulder. The Paved Shoulder feature is not comprehensive yet, it is just starting to get built out.
- e) Question: The previous editions had transit centers, why did this version get rid of transit centers from the map? Does this suggest that users will more likely drive to the bike trails in lieu of taking transit. Patrick: We must be strategic about what we put on these maps. Bus routes have different frequencies, and the routes change often. There is a lot of data on the map as it is, and putting one portion of the transit facilities you may have to include the rest of the transit infrastructure – the map will become cluttered with information making the map useless. Comment: Transit layers can be available on the online version, with them initially turned off, allowing users to turn that layer on.
- f) Question: Does MARC want to include bike boulevards, or neighborhood connectors? Patrick: We don't know of any designated bike boulevards in the region.

**5) Presentation: Connected KC 2050 (Martin Rivarola)**

- a) During the meeting, a review of completed activities from the previous year was presented, highlighting MARC's efforts in public outreach and engagement. These included updates to the plan, an introductory video, pop-up events, a public house, online meetings, and surveys. While one survey received a satisfactory response, another ongoing survey aims to gather more insights into regional needs and financial constraints. MARC reiterated its commitment to outreach and offered to share information with other agencies regarding the long-range plan.
- b) The discussion then shifted to project prioritization, focusing on surface transportation projects deemed regionally significant. A call for projects was conducted in late 2023, resulting in 456 submissions. Of these, 259 projects were retained with updates, while 197 were not resubmitted and require further review. Additionally, 132 new projects were submitted and scored using the same assessment process as five years ago. The scoring assessments will be reviewed by the committee in March 2024, aligning them with the updated financial capacity analysis.
- c) Notably, the ranking system used for project prioritization ranges up to 200, with an average score of 79. While helpful, this score is primarily influenced by the quality of project applications. MARC plans to provide a more accessible list of projects to committees in May to facilitate further

discussions on prioritization. Following the meeting, MARC outlined a timeline for the next phases of project prioritization and planning:

- i) First Two Quarters (Q1-Q2) of 2024: MARC will prioritize projects based on scoring assessments and financial analysis.
  - ii) Second and Third Quarters (Q2-Q3) of 2024: Committees will collaborate to develop a financially constrained and illustrative project list, incorporating feedback and insights from stakeholders.
  - iii) Last Two Quarters (Q3-Q4) of 2024: MARC will focus on creating a travel demand model and conducting an environmental justice analysis to further refine project selections and ensure equitable outcomes. Additional public outreach and engagement efforts will be undertaken during this period to gather input and address concerns.
  - iv) First Half (Q1-Q2) of 2025: A final plan write-up will be completed, incorporating the findings from the travel demand model, environmental justice analysis, and public feedback. This comprehensive plan will serve as a roadmap for the region's long-term transportation development.
- d) Question: is there any way to group them thematically? Martin: Absolutely, we separate them by local, state or regional projects. We may also look at them by different modes.
  - e) Question: Is this new prioritization using the same scoring? And can we be more rigid on climate change impactful projects? Martin: The scoring is virtually the same as the last round of project prioritization. Short on time and this climate change prioritization is brought up again and answered in the next question.
  - f) Question: With climate change being a main concern, how are we addressing this in terms of future development, natural resources and financial resources? Martin: We are looking at this very closely and we are updating our land use forecast and policies to address these issues. We are looking at this in terms of growth rate and migration, will we see an increase in inflow of migration? This will inform how we will forecast growth in the impact of climate change. Question: How often does MARC update its AADT projections for regional roadways? Martin: That is a part of this work. We create a project list, and we will run simulations to run off migration forecasts.
  - g) Question: Do agencies need to check if their projects are a part of the 197 that need to be re-submitted? Martin: MARC will reach out to the agencies. Still trying to figure out the best strategy to do this.
  - h) Question: Is there an opportunity to look at the goals, specifically the modal targets, or performance measures of this plan and reevaluate them to make them more aggressive in the face of climate change? Martin: MARC looks at these once a year. A lot of this has to do with what we can afford to do.

**6) Presentation: 2024 suballocated funding call for projects**

- a) 2024 Suballocated Programs Call for Projects -MARC initiated the call for projects for various programs, including the Carbon Reduction Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, Surface Transportation Block Grant Program, and Transportation Alternatives. The process involves two steps:
  - i) Pre-Application Assessment: A pre-application workshop was held, and interested parties can access information on the website. Projects undergoing an initial assessment by MARC staff will evaluate project scopes. Then committees will provide recommendations and comments. Projects will be categorized as highly aligned, aligned, or not aligned with Connected KC 2050 based on conformance with policies and advancement of strategies outlined in the plan.
  - ii) Technical Application: After the pre-application assessment, projects proceed to the technical application stage. Both steps are mandatory for project consideration.
- b) Key Dates: The call for pre-applications closed on April 5, following which MARC will assess alignment with Connected KC 2050.

- c) The assessment results will be compiled and shared, followed by a planning committee workshop. Programs without a designated committee, such as CMAQ and Carbon Reduction, may prompt the creation of new committees or fall under existing ones like the Active Transportation Committee. Moving forward, stakeholders will engage in the survey process in May to provide feedback on the projects/programs, facilitating a collaborative approach to project selection and implementation in alignment with the region's long-term transportation goals outlined in Connected KC 2050.

**7) Roundtable updates**

- a) BikeWalkKC is hosting Veronica Davis in April. The information can be found on BikeWalkKC website under events.
- b) Michael: Every state was required to do a vulnerable road user assessment. BikeWalkKC reviewed both Kansas and Missouri reports. Kansas had a better one. There are some good elements in this review that we wanted to highlight. Through this assessment and other work, we are hoping both states to improve vulnerable road users' ability to travel. If anyone wants to see this, we would be happy to share it.
- c) Ron: About the Bikeway Map, MARC should identify trailways with transit routes. That would implant the idea that transit can be used to get to a trail.
- d) Bike Month is in May.
- e) The City of Kansas City is ramping up its Vision 0 task force by having more regular meetings, possibly assembling a board and trying to get more turn-out for anyone who is interested.