## Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee

April 5, 2017

10:00 a.m.

2208 W. Chesterfield Boulevard, Suite 101, Springfield, MO

### Members Present

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Randy Brown | Jeremy Parsons |
| Rachael Garrett | Jason Ray |
| David Hutchison | Kelly Turner |
| Frank Miller | Terry Whaley |

### Guests Present

|  |
| --- |
| Dallas Joplin  Charlie LePage  Dane Seiler  Paul Wojciechowski |

### Staff Present

|  |
| --- |
| Sara Fields  Natasha Longpine  Andy Thomason |

### Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 am.

Before discussing and determining values for the trail study, Mr. Wojchiechowski had the Committee develop a mission and goals. The study purpose discussed included an interconnected priority trail network, planning for the implementation of a regional connected prioritized trail network, and to use the study to tell the public what OTO is doing.

Mission – Create a plan connecting communities with a regional trail network

Goals –

* Interconnected network
* Prioritize investments
* Opportunities, constraints, and costs
* Environmental documentation
* Transportation choices
* Healthy, efficient, attractive connections
* Collaborative planning
* Support economic development

### 1. Summary of Parcel/Ownership Information

Items discussed regarding property ownership included the work to identify challenging properties, looking for opportunities like city owned property, and examination of easements (sewer and electrical). It would be good to coordinate trail projects with stormwater projects, tracking known upcoming projects. It is also good to know receptive property owners and those who wouldn’t be.

The PEL information should be readily available and is being developed for high and medium priority trails. This includes looking at natural features, public properties, and environmental issues. One area of difficulty is the archaeological information. It was recommended to try the MSU Center for Archaeological Research. Recommendations will be made for stream crossings, to make them perpendicular, narrow, and with similar bank elevations.

### 2. High Level Prioritization of Corridors

Mr. Wojchiechowski presented a series of questions and value statements to be prioritized as High, Medium, and Long-Term. Some are qualitative and others are quantitative. In summary –

* H-Does corridor segment fill a gap in the built network - Yes, need to define "corridor segment"
* L-Is there an existing low stress on-street network connection that makes the connection - drop it a little? vs a corridor that has no option (still a stepping stone solution, but not the ultimate)
* H-Active Programmed Project
* H-Is there a significant effort in progress and opportunities for property acquisition in the corridor? Property acquisition and supportive property owners
* H/M (depending on how many)-Are there key destinations for the connection to like to other corridors? other trails, parks, schools, business districts - weights within weights?
* L-Are there environmental or other limiting concerns that restrict implementation? Cultural, bridges, grade, RRs, streams > could there be an on-street connection? Keep ultimate on the table? Some alternatives may be medium-stress, but what can be done to the road to reduce stress?
* M-Is there a demand for the corridor connection? Public? Latent? Is there a user base? Is there a political demand? Is there public comment? Future attraction?
* Don't include Agency Support or Funding - can always change

### 3. Public Engagement

*Website*Once the website is approved, it will have a unique web address. It has a map which shows priority trails and the built network; people can drop pins and notes. There was discussion about the colors and having the legend open with the map.

*Workshops*  
There will be a sign-in table, and stations addressing Goals and Objectives, Process, Evaluation Criteria, Mapping and Comments for the big picture and for priority corridor quadrants, Property Ownership, and Environmental Information.

Additional discussion followed on getting the word out and having the communities there to help answer questions.

### 4. Alignment Evaluation Criteria

The following was discussed for alignment evaluation –

* Network Connections
* Route Directness
* Cultural/Natural Resources
* Ownership/Right-of-Way
* Environmental Conditions
* Enhances Biking and Walking
* Logical Segments
* User Experience
* Cost
* Both high level and low cost in corridor analysis

Additional discussion included using numbers or shaded balls to symbolize scores. It was suggested to use the shaded balls, but have the numbers in the background.

### 4. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 am.