

Bike Friendly Kalamazoo
August 20, 2014 Session Meeting Minutes
KRESA Main Campus

Attendees

Lee Adams, Resource Coordinator, Kalamazoo County Department of Planning and Community Development; Administrator, Southcentral Michigan Planning Council
Tom Anthony, Superintendent of Public Works, Village of Mattawan
Chris Barnes, Director, Transportation and Utilities, City of Portage
Kyle Doster, Officer, Portage Department of Public Safety
Paul Guthrie, Laboratory Manager, Bronson Methodist Hospital
Darrell Harden, Transportation Planner, MDOT
Tom Hohm, Chief Engineer, KCRC
Jeanette Holm, Member, Kalamazoo Bicycle Club
Jim Kirklin, Parks and Recreation, Village of Mattawan
Matt Lechel, Commissioner, Kalamazoo County Parks
Ryan Minkus, Project Engineer, KCRC
Carl Newton, Mayor, City of Galesburg
Ronald E. Reid, Supervisor, Kalamazoo Township
Ed Sackley, Office of State Representative Margaret O'Brien
Paul Selden, Director of Road Safety, KBC; Member, TriKats
Mark Stackhouse, Member, Kalamazoo Bicycle Club
Edie Trent, Legislative Aide to State Representative Sean A. McCann

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

Goal For Meeting: Develop template for the table of contents of a “typical” local non-motorized plan.

The intention is to end up with something that is easy and less expensive to adjust and adapt to fit local needs.

In-Session Project Work – Group – Paul Selden

Participants brainstormed and listed topics to include in the table of contents for a non-motorized plan “template.” Participants reviewed examples of non-motorized plans from jurisdictions that included Oshemo Township, Ann Arbor, Grand Rapids and Kinross Township (all in MI). A list of non-motorized plan “thought-starters” was also included (see Appendix A).

The 90+ topics submitted are listed below verbatim (duplicate ideas included), first in alphabetical order, then categorized (both thanks to Paul Guthrie).

Potential Items in Non-Motorized Plan Table of Contents, Listed Alphabetically

Access to Routes
Adjacent Jurisdiction Plan Compatibility
Approval and Regulatory Process Hurdles
Best Times to Ride (Least Traffic)
Bike Friendly Kalamazoo Assessment
Bike Racks at Schools
Bike to School Routes
Building Stakeholder Partnerships

Community Buy-in
Cost Estimate
Creating Info and Networking Links to Campgrounds, Hotels & Bike Consumer Resources
Current Bikeability Score
Current Inventory
Current Walkability
Design Requirements - General reference to national/MDOT local standards
Directive to Staff: Utilize for future road/infrastructure project scoping
Directive to Staff: Map to show location and proposed facility
Educating the Community on Non Motorized Plans
Entertainment and Convention Facilities
Evaluation - Getting feedback to see if plan works
Executive Summary
Executive Summary, or similar term, maybe for "folksy" - "What's this all about?"
Existing System
Existing Conditions
Facility Design Guidance
Friendly Patrol - Safety and Anti vandal patrol by police
Funding Sources
Goals
Goals of a Non-Motorized Plan
How to Implement at Non Motorized Plan
Implementation Process - How will these facilities be constructed/built?
Implementation Strategies
Incentive For Development: Inside bike storage, Employee credit to forego parking pass, Adjacent green
Inventory of Existing Facilities
K.I.S.S. Principle - small and current
KEEPING: us, our community, our kids and our seniors HEALTHY
Key Origins and Destinations
Key Stakeholders
Land Use/Planning- Are certain areas more likely to be more applicable than others
Land Use/Zoning- Requirement for new development
LEED Credit
Length of Routes
Link to Jurisdiction Goals
Links to Guidelines for Selecting Facilities
List of "X" Year's Worth of Projects
Map
Maps
Maps
Mission
Names of Staff and Roles
Non Motorized - Alternative Modes to Accommodate All Users
Non Motorized Facility Plan
Obtaining Community Buy-in
Parking
Performance Indicators
Performance Measures
Plan Elements
Plan Goals
Plan Phases
Planned Non Motorized Facilities
Planning Process: Neighborhood association & business community input on facilities and routes
Potential Revenue Sources
Project Funding

Public Comments
 Public Input for All Parties
 Public Involvement Process
 Public Involvement/Input process
 Purpose/Vision/Philosophy
 Purpose
 Purpose Statement
 Quality of Routes
 Regional Trail Connections
 Schedule for Plan Updates
 Security - No abductions
 Sidewalk Inventory
 Stakeholders -Needs Assessment
 Strava
 Study of Community to Identify Destinations: Retail, Employment, Recreation, Dining
 Study of Community to Identify Trip "Starts" (Neighborhoods)
 The Benefits of a Non Motorized Plan
 This Year's Project
 Timing of Implementation
 Transit Inventory
 Types of Non-Motorized Facilities (Examples/Glossary)
 Types of Routes
 Vision and Goals of the Plan
 Volunteer Recognition: Names, etc.
 What will it look like?
 When will it be built?
 Where will it be built?
 Who will benefit?
 Who/What/When/Where/Why Sections
 Why are we doing this?
 Widen the Audience
 Words that relate: bikes, boards, buggies, feet, skates, dogs, skis, wheels

Potential Items in Non-Motorized Plan Table of Contents, Categorized

Category	Ideas from Post-It Notes
1. Assessment	Bike Friendly Kalamazoo Assessment
1. Assessment	Current Bikeability Score
1. Assessment	Current Inventory
1. Assessment	Current Walkability
1. Assessment	Evaluation - Getting feedback to see if plan works
1. Assessment	Existing Conditions
1. Assessment	Existing System
1. Assessment	Inventory of Existing Facilities
1. Assessment	Regional Trail Connections
1. Assessment	Sidewalk Inventory
1. Assessment	Stakeholders -Needs Assessment
1. Assessment	Study of Community to Identify Trip "Starts" (Neighborhoods)
1. Assessment	Study of Community to Identify Destinations: Retail, Employment, Recreation, Dining
1. Assessment	Transit Inventory
2. Planning/Input	Access to Routes
2. Planning/Input	Adjacent Jurisdiction Plan Compatibility
2. Planning/Input	Building Stakeholder Partnerships
2. Planning/Input	Community Buy-in
2. Planning/Input	Educating the Community on Non Motorized Plans

2. Planning/Input	Goals
2. Planning/Input	Goals of a Non-Motorized Plan
2. Planning/Input	Key Origins and Destinations
2. Planning/Input	Key Stakeholders
2. Planning/Input	Land Use/Planning- Are certain areas more likely to be more applicable than others
2. Planning/Input	List of "X" Year's Worth of Projects
2. Planning/Input	Non Motorized - Alternative Modes to Accommodate All Users
2. Planning/Input	Non Motorized Facility Plan
2. Planning/Input	Obtaining Community Buy-in
2. Planning/Input	Plan Elements
2. Planning/Input	Plan Goals
2. Planning/Input	Planned Non Motorized Facilities
2. Planning/Input	Planning Process: Neighborhood association & business community input on facilities and routes
2. Planning/Input	Public Comments
2. Planning/Input	Public Input for All Parties
2. Planning/Input	Public Involvement Process
2. Planning/Input	Public Involvement/Input process
2. Planning/Input	Purpose
2. Planning/Input	Purpose Statement
2. Planning/Input	Purpose/Vision/Philosophy
2. Planning/Input	The Benefits of a Non Motorized Plan
2. Planning/Input	Vision and Goals of the Plan
2. Planning/Input	What will it look like?
2. Planning/Input	When will it be built?
2. Planning/Input	Where will it be built?
2. Planning/Input	Who will benefit?
2. Planning/Input	Who/What/When/Where/Why Sections
2. Planning/Input	Why are we doing this?
2. Planning/Input	Widen the Audience
3. Requirements/Resources	Approval and Regulatory Process Hurdles
3. Requirements/Resources	Cost Estimate
3. Requirements/Resources	Design Requirements - General reference to national/MDOT local standards
3. Requirements/Resources	Directive to Staff: Utilize for future road/infrastructure project scoping
3. Requirements/Resources	Directive to Staff: Map to show location and proposed facility
3. Requirements/Resources	Facility Design Guidance
3. Requirements/Resources	Funding Sources
3. Requirements/Resources	Land Use/Zoning- Requirement for new development
3. Requirements/Resources	Link to Jurisdiction Goals
3. Requirements/Resources	Links to Guidelines for Selecting Facilities
3. Requirements/Resources	Potential Revenue Sources
3. Requirements/Resources	Project Funding
4. Suggestions/Content	Best Times to Ride (Least Traffic)
4. Suggestions/Content	Bike Racks at Schools
4. Suggestions/Content	Bike to School Routes
4. Suggestions/Content	Creating Info and Networking Links to Campgrounds, Hotels & Bike Consumer Resources
4. Suggestions/Content	Entertainment and Convention Facilities
4. Suggestions/Content	Friendly Patrol - Safety and anti vandal patrol by police
4. Suggestions/Content	Incentive For Development: Inside bike storage, Employee credit to forego parking pass, Adjacent green
4. Suggestions/Content	Length of Routes

4. Suggestions/Content	Map
4. Suggestions/Content	Maps
4. Suggestions/Content	Maps
4. Suggestions/Content	Names of Staff and Roles
4. Suggestions/Content	Parking
4. Suggestions/Content	Quality of Routes
4. Suggestions/Content	Security - No abductions
4. Suggestions/Content	Strava
4. Suggestions/Content	Types of Non-Motorized Facilities (Examples/Glossary)
4. Suggestions/Content	Types of Routes
4. Suggestions/Content	Volunteer Recognition: Names, etc.
4. Suggestions/Content	Words that relate: bikes, boards, buggies, feet, skates, dogs, skis, wheels
5. Implementation	How to Implement at Non Motorized Plan
5. Implementation	Implementation Process - How will these facilities be constructed/built?
5. Implementation	Implementation Strategies
5. Implementation	Plan Phases
5. Implementation	Schedule for Plan Updates
5. Implementation	Timing of Implementation
6. Other	Executive Summary
6. Other	Executive Summary, or similar term, maybe for "folksy" - "What's this all about?"
6. Other	K.I.S.S. Principle - small and current
6. Other	KEEPING: us, our community, our kids and our seniors HEALTHY
6. Other	LEED Credit
6. Other	Mission
6. Other	Performance Indicators
6. Other	Performance Measures
6. Other	This Year's Project

Summary / Next Steps – Group – Paul Selden

Chris Barnes said that the audience invited to participate in this process could / should be broadened. After discussion as to who the appropriate next participants might be, he and Ron Reid volunteered to ask that KATS make it a discussion item on one of their upcoming Technical and Policy agendas. Paul Selden agreed to set up a follow up BFK meeting where these KATS representatives would be invited.

Tom Hohm suggested that another step would be to review what national experts are saying about this topic, for example, at the Transportation Research Center for Livable Communities at WMU.

[**Note:** Paul Selden later emailed Norm Cox, President of The Greenway Collaborative (a group that has assisted many jurisdictions in developing non-motorized plans), and received very helpful information. Relevant excerpts from this email exchange are included in Appendix B. Also, thanks to Norm Cox, the non-motorized plans from Ferndale, MI and Novi, MI and Athens, OH now have links on the BFK website under the Resources > Planning and Policy Examples tab, at <http://bikefriendlykalamazoo.org/planning-policy-examples/> .]

Paul Guthrie volunteered to type up the brainstorming ideas submitted during this meeting. [A big thanks to Paul Guthrie for his timely and extremely helpful work on this!]

Minutes prepared by Paul Selden.

Special thanks to KRESA for providing the meeting space!

Appendix A: Ideas for Typical Non-Motorized Plan

1. Decide that the purpose of a non-motorized plan is more than a civil engineering specification. Its broader purpose is to help make your community a better place to live, work and play, 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 or that it become known as an integral part of marketing bicycle tourism in a Pure Michigan campaign. 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 within your community in keeping with the purpose of the NMP, then articulating who will plan and implement each component. 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 (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 (e.g., on-road bicycling facilities, pedestrian crossings) and planning use of the community's facilities from an educational/ recreational point of view (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.
5. Include a brief section describing the principles and main policies that are driving the plan, of perhaps no more than a few pages in length.

As a temporary expedient, incorporate by reference the best practices 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 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 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 ("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 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, 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 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 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 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]

Appendix B: 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. 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. Policies, programs and how you measure performance 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 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. 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 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" 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 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 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.

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. 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 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.

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.