

Bike Friendly Kalamazoo
October 2, 2014 Session Meeting Minutes
KRESA West Campus

Attendees

Emily Betros, Head Start Family Advocate, KRESA
Marsha Drouin, Treasurer, Richland Township
Jim Hoekstra, Traffic Engineer, City of Kalamazoo & KCRC
Pastor Dale Krueger, Member, Kalamazoo Bicycle Club
Laura J. Lam, Director of Community Planning & Development, City of Kalamazoo
Greg Milliken, Planning Director, Oshtemo Township; Zoning Administrator and Planning, Kalamazoo Township
Carl Newton, Mayor, City of Galesburg
Ron Reid, Supervisor, Kalamazoo Township
Paul Selden, Director of Road Safety, KBC; Member, TriKats
Ray Waurio, Deputy Director of Streets & Parks Maintenance, City of Portage
John Zull, District 11 Kalamazoo County Commissioner

Session Goals:

- Organize suggested topic of a “typical” local non-motorized plan (NMP).
- Find/assemble suitable content examples for as many of the main sections as possible, online

Agenda

Welcome and Introductions – Paul Selden

Background on Bike Friendly Kalamazoo and BFK’s goals for 2014

BFK: a communications network of volunteer participants/delegates from community stakeholders
(for more information, see www.bikefriendlykalamazoo.org)

Main 2014 goals include awareness-building, education and route planning

In-Session Project Work – Small Group – Paul Selden

Participants worked on three mini-projects:

- a) identifying the table of contents headings under which to consider general ideas and broad considerations previously suggested in the documents entitled “Ideas for Typical Non-Motorized Plan” by Paul Selden and “Thoughts on Non-Motorized Plans” by Norm Cox;
- b) categorizing previously suggested NMP topics under their related table of contents headings; and,
- c) finding suitable content examples representing each of the sections in the table of contents.

The work product from each small group follows on separate pages, beginning on the next page.

Summary / Next Steps – Group – Paul Selden

All groups completed their mini-projects. Some constraints were placed on the projects so they could be completed within the one hour meeting:

- 1) Groups reviewing non-motorized plans to find suitable models confined their reviews to NMPs from within the State of Michigan posted on the www.bikefriendlykalamazoo.org web site.
- 2) Some of the table of contents sections were not assigned. (A volunteer is completing one of these sections independently; the remaining sections will be worked on at a future meeting.)
- 3) The suggested order and items within the Table of Contents prototype may need further refinement.

Participants agreed there was a limit to how far the assembly of “generic model language” can be taken without knowing more about a specific jurisdiction’s plans.

The NMP known as “Ferndale Moves” suggested by Norm Cox seems to provide a model for how NMPs can be put entirely online as a living document instead of “frozen” in time as a PDF file.

Participants were thanked for their contributions.

Special thanks to KRESA for providing the meeting space!

Mini-Projects 1a and 1b – Keying general ideas and broad considerations to Table of Contents headings

Instructions were to key sections within the previously distributed documents (below), to the following Table of Contents:

- 1. Resolution of Approval**
- 2. Executive Summary**
- 3. Goals & Benefits**
- 4. Design Elements and Considerations**
- 5. Area-Wide Connectors**
- 6. Proposed Non-Motorized Network**
- 7. Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Network**
- 8. Safety (Analysis/Current Data)**
- 9. Public Participation Process**
- 10. Community Awareness & Education**
- 11. Project Costs**
- 12. Project Funding**

Note

Some comments are in order that were not discussed in the meeting.

The Table of Contents used for this purpose was loosely drawn from the NMP used by the Michigan-based Macatawa Area Coordinating Council (MACC). Their plan seems to incorporate most of the topic areas found in other, previously adopted plans, as well as categories suggested earlier by BFK Paul Guthrie. BFK has posted MACC's NMP at [www.](http://bikefriendlykalamazoo.org/planning-policy-examples/)

<http://bikefriendlykalamazoo.org/planning-policy-examples/>

This is not to say that jurisdictions should limit their own contents to what BFK is using, nor does it limit BFK from evolving its own model as more experience is gained.

As BFK refines its work on this project, the current plan is to place the comments to serve as guidelines introducing each section of our generic NMP.

For expediency's sake in preparing these Minutes, participants working on these first two mini-projects underscored certain passages in the documents and keyed them to the numbering system above. Participant underscores and keys to the above Table of Contents are reproduced here.

Mini-Project 1a -- Completed by Jim Hoekstra

Ideas for Typical Non-Motorized Plan -- Paul Selden

1. Decide that the purpose of a non-motorized plan is more than a civil engineering specification (3). Its broader purpose is to help make your community a better place to live, work and play (3) (2), as expressed from the perspective of those using the community's "non-motorized facilities," viewed broadly as including hard and soft resources. Thinking in this strategic way, the NMP can be viewed as your community's vision that it be worthy, say, of one day earning a Bicycle Friendly Community Award (3) or that it become known as an integral part of marketing bicycle tourism in a Pure Michigan campaign (3). These expressions are related to bicycling, but the NMP can be viewed in a similar fashion that integrates comparable awards and recognition presented by other "non-motorized" users,

such as pedestrians, runners and persons with disabilities. Think big, then set a course and act to make it happen.

2. Decide on overall leadership and delegate roles and responsibilities. This means deciding who “owns” and champions the overall plan (2) within your community in keeping with the purpose of the NMP, then articulating who will plan and implement each component (2) (9). Departments/commissions of planning, community development, parks and recreation and engineering, etc. each have possible roles.
3. Include plans for marketing the community’s non-motorized resources (10) (e.g., promotional literature that highlights the number of miles of bike routes, working toward applying for Bicycle Friendly Community Award, etc.), planning and implementing infrastructure-related improvements (5) (6) (7) (e.g., on-road bicycling facilities, pedestrian crossings) and planning use of the community’s facilities from an educational/ recreational point of view (10) (e.g., parks programs, public service placement of educational posters and messages in places likely to be seen by bicyclists of all abilities).
4. Keep the plan itself as short as possible so that it is easy to use as a day to day guide to decision making (2).
5. Include a brief section describing the principles and main policies that are driving the plan, of perhaps no (2) more than a few pages in length.

As a temporary expedient, incorporate by reference the best practices (4) implied as embodied in the League of American Bicyclists’ Bicycle Friendly Communities Award application and the non-motorized policies embodied in Complete Streets, reworded to suit your jurisdiction. Incorporate elements such as this year’s engineering, community development, and parks & recreation projects (6) that relate to non-motorized interests, making sure to list them in a way that clearly lets the reader know in what way each of these projects includes a non-motorized component. Incorporate by reference the MPO-wide bike route network (6) (7) being planned by Bike Friendly Kalamazoo and the Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study, those stretches that are within your community. Couch the incorporation of all the above items with language that permits flexibility, using words such as “where feasible,” or “if, in the community’s judgment it makes sense,” or “Prior to more formal adoption, staff should attempt to”, or some such phrasing.

Summarize and list in “one page” a list of key practices (4) (“hard” and “soft”) to be alert for implementing on an ongoing basis where feasible, as a guide, an aid to memory, and to facilitate easy reference and discussion.

List specific projects to implement (6) in any given year, within the body of the plan. Most of those elements can be cross-referenced and/or pulled from their departmental plans.

Inventory the lengths of, and map the portions of the current NMP (7), that have been completed, noting which have not yet been implemented. Note where new techniques (e.g., shared-lane markings), will be implemented, etc.

If done using this sort of “hyperlink” and “cut and paste” approach, the NMP will require fewer resources to compile and be relatively easier to work into the daily routine, and then, to institutionalize.

6. Make use of the process for public involvement and obtaining public comments (9) epitomized in comparable situations by other organizations. Examples are used by the Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study. In particular, directly invite public input from appropriate third-party representatives (9) such as Bike Friendly Kalamazoo (which includes delegates from the Kalamazoo Area Runners Association and the Disability Network for Southwest Michigan, among many others), at key stages of the annual plan development.
7. Use volunteer resources to reduce demands on your staff and administration where possible. Don't overestimate the burden on staff and administration; volunteer resources may be able to help with tasks such as conducting an inventory of existing hard and soft NMP resources and brainstorm ideas for making the NMP an integral component for your community's marketing plan.
8. Update the NMP every "X" years (2) (1) or in real-time as circumstances warrant so it can evolve over time but remain nimble enough to accommodate innovations and a widened pallet of feasible options, etc., as they arise. Time horizons for each section can conform to each department's usual planning and implementation schedules; some time horizons may be longer than others. In the next four weeks, at least set key dates for updating the plan (including decisions regarding these recommendations).

Dates can be set then modified if need be, but setting even tentative dates will allow those involved to work them into their work plans and schedules, and at least gain some positive movement forward.

This can be done by filling in the following blanks (for example):

201x

- _____, 201x: present this template to [appropriate body/person]
- _____, 201x: internal planning meeting to frame next steps in the update process
- _____, 201x: internal and community engagement process articulation: e.g., NMP facilities design v.v. interface with public comments and BFK
- _____, 201x: discussion with representatives from key community Stakeholders (such as from Bike Friendly Kalamazoo, and others as makes sense) regarding all of the above
- _____, 201x: update of inventory of current NMP infrastructure complete (maps of bike lanes, routes, inventory of route mileage, counts of major pedestrian friendly features, etc.)

Annually

January or _____: review of NMP and current year projects

[List others]

Project Costs (11) – missing

Project Funding (12) – missing

Thoughts on Non-Motorized Plans – Norm Cox

A "non-motorized plan" can be a bit of a misnomer even though the term is commonly used. A multi-modal plan or a complete streets plan may be the better moniker. Pedestrians and bicyclists can not be looked at in isolation. What you end up doing is looking at all of the road users and rebalancing streets and networks. The plan will have an impact transit, trucks and private motor vehicles. We tend to look at a street or network and say how can we make this function better for everyone and make it safer. (2) Many of the recommendations in our plans could be justified simply by the safety improvements for motor vehicles alone. Specifically, issues such as how to accommodate elderly drivers is something that you will be addressing.

I know I am preaching to the choir here, but make sure to go beyond the infrastructure improvements (4). Policies, programs and how you measure performance (4) are critical. One only has to recall last winter to understand how important something like community snow maintenance policies and enforcement are on pedestrian access and mobility.

The economic justification (11) for the project is going to come primarily from three fronts. Reduction of fatal and severe crashes, improved physical well being and place making. The economic benefit from the crash reductions alone will dwarf the cost of any improvements proposed. Highlight these savings as a way to promote your project. You would be hard pressed to find a community effort that has the same economic and quality of life return on investment. There are a lot of related issues that will help bring people to the table (8). There are the obvious ones like Safe Routes to School and traffic calming, but also less obvious ones such as storm water mitigation.

Every year it gets harder to get people to show up for a classic evening public workshop and multi-day charrettes (9) (10) are impossible for most working adults. Those who do show up tend to be the usual suspects. The use of web surveys, crowdsourcing web maps and on-the-street intercept interviews are key to broaden public input.

Typical PDF "Plans" (7) (also 6) like the City of Novi Non-motorized Master Plan you mentioned, the Birmingham Multi-modal Transportation Plan or City of Springboro Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan that we completed over the last few years are anachronisms (even though we think they are pretty good plans). Our last two plans have been websites.

Check out Ferndale Moves! All of the inventory, analysis, draft and final plans (6) have been done in Google Maps and crowdsourcing web maps where used throughout the process. Citizens have the same level of access to the plans that we do and can explore places in detail. Links can be provided to external resources (6) like NACTO for those who want to explore issues in more detail. It is also a living resource for projects being developed and requests for new information. We can't see doing a printed report again.

We have done some regional and county plans with some detailed recommendations for smaller communities within the project area. The key, as you alluded to, is not to overwhelm them. (7)

Through public engagement we try to identify the top issues there and then identify reasonable near-term solutions that they could realistically implement over the next 5 to 10 years. (3) (also 10) We recently did an Active Transportation Plan for Allen County Ohio where the recommendations for regional connections are separated from the recommendations for each

community. Thus when it came time to ID roles, responsibilities and potential funding sources it all seemed a lot more manageable to the various entities. The Thumb Region Non-motorized Transportation Plan also divided regional strategies from local improvements.

Defining essentials (4) can be tricky. You want to make sure any network recommendations are realistic and improvements actually link key destinations. So, the best bet is to focus on the backbone network and develop a solid implementation plan for the core system. If successful, the rest will follow. Likewise prioritize the policies and programs early on and then develop detailed recommendations for the ones you feel you can implement quickly. The City of Athens Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan has a section on Priority Corridors starting on Page 48 that has a simple facing page set up that shows the existing conditions on one page and then the proposed near, mid and long-term improvements on the facing page. This worked well in both report and at public workshops.

Oh and a consultant doesn't hurt either :-). Doing this on a daily bases we are familiar with many of the pitfalls and can help you avoid at least some of them. We have in the past done partnerships with public agencies such as the City of Grand Rapids where the public agency does the heavy lifting and we come in at key junctures. If this is something that you are interested in I would be please to come over to discuss further. (10)

PS then asked:

Are these public documents, whose contents may be excerpted and re-used by our local jurisdictions, without copyright infringement?

NC replied:

Not our say really. They are public documents but they are the property of our clients. So you would need permission from them to re-use any information.

**Mini-Project 2 -- Categorizing previously suggested NMP topics under Table of Contents headings
– Completed by Laura Lam and Ray Waurio**

Participants sorted a deck of NMP topic ideas under Table of Contents headings, resulting in the order below. Topic ideas were brainstormed/suggested by participants in the public BFK session held on August 20, 2014. Participants added new Table of Contents headings as they judged best to capture the topics.

1 Executive Summary

- 1a Executive Summary, or similar term, maybe for "folksy" - "What's this all about?"
- 1b Names of Staff and Roles
- 1c Benefits of Non Motorized Plan

2 Introduction

- 2a Who/What/When/Where/Why Sections
- 2b Why are we doing this?
- 2c Who will benefit?
- 2d Types of Routes
- 2e Mission
- 2f Purpose/Vision/Philosophy

3 Goals/Benefits

- 3a Plan Goals
- 3b Vision and Goals of the Plan
- 3c Goals (Non-Motorized Plan, Community)
- 3d KEEPING: us, our community, our kids and our seniors HEALTHY
- 3e Link to Jurisdiction Goals

4 Public Participation

- 4a Planning Process: Neighborhood association & business community input on facilities and routes
- 4b Public Input for All Parties
- 4c Building Stakeholder Partnerships
- 4d Stakeholders -Needs Assessment
- 4e Strava [a route-mapping tool that provides "heat-maps" of route usage]
- 4f Study of Community to Identify Trip "Starts" (Neighborhoods)
- 4g Volunteer Recognition: Names, etc.
- 4h Public Comments
- 4i Public Involvement Process
- 4j Community Buy-in
- 4k Obtaining Community Buy-in

5 Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Network

- 5a Existing System
- 5b Existing Conditions
- 5c Key Origins and Destinations
- 5d Sidewalk Inventory
- 5e Inventory of Existing Facilities
- 5e Quality of Routes
- 5f Current Bikeability Score
- 5g Transit Inventory

6 Proposed Non-Motorized Network

- 6a Non Motorized Facility Plan
- 6b Non Motorized - Alternative Modes to Accommodate All Users
- 6c Planned Non Motorized Facilities

- 6d Map
- 6e What will it look like?
- 6f Directive to Staff: Map to show location and proposed facility

7 Design Elements and Considerations

- 7a K.I.S.S. Principle - small and current
- 7b Security - No abductions
- 7c Study of Community to Identify Destinations: Retail, Employment, Recreation, Dining
- 7d Land Use/Zoning- Requirement for new development
- 7e Timing of Implementation
- 7f Where will it be built?
- 7g Land Use/Planning- Are certain areas more likely to be more applicable than others
- 7h Adjacent Jurisdiction Plan Compatibility
- 7i Incentive For Development: Inside bike storage, Employee credit to forego parking pass, Adjacent green
- 7j Facility Design Guidance
- 7k Length of Routes
- 7l Bike to School Routes
- 7m Design Requirements - General reference to national/MDOT local standards
- 7n Entertainment and Convention Facilities
- 7o Performance Indicators
- 7p Plan Phases
- 7q Bike Racks at Schools
- 7q Plan Elements
- 7r Parking

8 Safety

- 8a Friendly Patrol - Safety and Anti vandal patrol by police
- 8b Best Times to Ride (Least Traffic)
- 8c Crash and Accident Statistics

9 Project Costs

- 9a Cost Estimate

- 10 Project Funding
- 10a Project Funding
- 10b Funding Sources
- 10c Potential Revenue Sources
- 10d LEED Credit
- 10e List of "X" Year's Worth of Projects

11 Action Plan

- 11a Implementation Strategies
- 11b How to Implement at Non Motorized Plan
- 11c Implementation Process - How will these facilities be constructed/built?
- 11e Schedule for Plan Updates
- 11f When will it be built?
- 11g This Year's Project
- 11h Performance Measures
- 11i Evaluation - Getting feedback to see if plan works

12 Resolution of Approval

- 12a Approval and Regulatory Process Hurdles

- 13a Links to Guidelines for Selecting Facilities

- 13b Types of Non-Motorized Facilities (Examples/Glossary)
- 13c Directive to Staff: Utilize for future road/infrastructure project scoping

14 Area-Wide Connectors

- 14a Regional Trail Connections
- 14b Access to Routes
- 14c Current Walkability
- 14d Current Inventory

15 Community Awareness & Education

- 15a Widen the Audience
- 15b Key Stakeholders
- 15c Creating Info and Networking Links to Campgrounds, Hotels & Bike Consumer Resources
- 15d Educating the Community on Non Motorized Plans

16 Other

- 16a Words that relate: bikes, boards, buggies, feet, skates, dogs, skis, wheels
- 16b Bike Friendly Kalamazoo Assessment

17 Uncategorized/Redundant

- 17 Executive Summary
- 17 Goals
- 17 Goals of a Non-Motorized Plan
- 17 Maps
- 17 Maps
- 17 Public Involvement/Input process
- 17 Purpose
- 17 Purpose Statement

Mini Project 3 -- Finding content examples for each Table of Contents section – Completed by Emily Betros, Marsha Drouin, Dale Krueger, Greg Milliken, Carl Newto and Ron Reid

Participants reviewed non-motorized plans to find suitable models. They were instructed to limit their reviews to NMPs from within the State of Michigan posted on the www.bikefriendlykalamazoo.org web site. To match projects to the number of volunteers attending, not all of the previously mentioned table of contents sections were assigned. (Volunteers are completing some of these sections on their own; the remaining sections will be worked on at a future meeting. Only those completed during the meeting are reported on, below.) The assignment was to review the NMPs, and email links to the “best” ones to the workshop facilitator.

The topics, links and names of the participants performing each review are listed below. For expediency’s sake, the relevant excerpts from participant emails are presented below, verbatim.

Resolution of Approval

<http://bikefriendlykalamazoo.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/12-02WalkableCommunityInitiativeFinal.pdf>

-- Ron Reid

Goals and Benefits

and

Community Awareness and Education

https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B_F4fZwInbbFOWNKQnkwOVNxVjQ/edit

http://www.gc4me.com/departments/planning_commission/transportation/docs/2014_Genesee_County_Regional_Non_Motorized_Plan.pdf

<http://www.uniontownshipmi.com/Portals/0/Documents/Community%20Information/bike%20walk/Reduce%20Greater%20Mt%20Pleasant%20Area%20Non-Motorized%20Plan.pdf>

-- Emily Betros

Design Elements and Considerations

Here are plans with best graphics I found:

Oshtemo- <http://www.oshtemo.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Non-motorized-Plan-Update.pdf>

Ferndale- tough to use on a phone but cool access for public and neat graphics in the Google map
<http://ferndalemoves.com/plan/>

Mt pleasant- great ps and analysis. Lot of design guidelines at rear
<http://www.uniontownshipmi.com/Portals/0/Documents/Community%20Information/bike%20walk/Reduce%20Greater%20Mt%20Pleasant%20Area%20Non-Motorized%20Plan.pdf>

Did not get to out of state ones but recommend review of those as design recommendations are fairly universal.

-- Greg Milliken

Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Network

<http://bikefriendlykalamazoo.org/trails-routes/>

(e.g., commuter routes, KRVT links)

-- Dale Krueger

Project Funding/Project Costs

<http://ferndalemoves.com/plan/network-implementation-plan/>

http://www.apta.com/gap/policyresearch/Documents/funding_guarantees.pdf

https://www.google.com/search?q=tea+21+grants&rlz=1C1SKPL_enUS453&oq=TEA+grants&aqs=chrome.5.69i57j0l5.58432j0j8&sourceid=chrome&es_sm=93&ie=UTF-8

-- Marsha Drouin and Carl Newton

Area-Wide Connectors

<http://bikefriendlykalamazoo.org/trails-routes/>

(e.g., links on that page for: Southwest Michigan: Road and Trail Bicycle Guide, commuter routes, KRVT, City of Kalamazoo Bicycle System, Portage Bikeway, etc)

-- Paul Selden

Safety

<http://ferndalemoves.com/analysis/pedestrian-crashes/>

-- Paul Selden

Sections to be completed per the above assignment:

- Executive Summary
- Community Awareness and Input
- Proposed Non-Motorized Network

Section being worked on by volunteer:

- Public Participation Process