

Appendix E: Listening Sessions

Kansas Department of Transportation Listening Session

The listening session was conducted with Becky Pepper the State Pedestrian and Bicycle Coordinator.

1. What design guidance does KDOT use? (FHWA, NACTO, does KDOT have their own?)

KDOT follows AASHTO and the MUTCD for signs and markings.

2. If and or how design guidance is tied to funding e.g. do you have to follow x guidance to get money from y?

For federally funded projects, KDOT must follow ADA, AASHTO and the MUTCD. For state funded project KDOT standards are followed.

KDOT provides funding for Safe Routes to School SRTS and through Transportation Alternatives programs. These funds are disbursed through regional planning bodies. Funding for Wichita projects would come from WAMPO and projects awarded with funds from the Transportation Alternatives Program must follow federal guidelines, which establish that project must be designed to meet AASHTO, ADA, and MUTCD compliance.

3. What is KDOT's roles and responsibilities for pedestrian improvements, programs, policies, etc.?

Becky referred to other KDOT staff as she is not as familiar with KDOTs roles and responsibilities. She did mention that if state dollars are spent for a local project, the federal exchange program reimburses 80% of the cost. KDOT uses this for funding of local projects.

More information on the Federal Fund Exchange Program can be found here:

[http://www.ksdot.org/Assets/wwwksdotorg/bureaus/burlocalproj/BLPDocuments/Fund Exchange Program Guidelines.pdf](http://www.ksdot.org/Assets/wwwksdotorg/bureaus/burlocalproj/BLPDocuments/Fund_Exchange_Program_Guidelines.pdf)

4. Just generally, can you provide an overview about how KDOT's pedestrian projects come to fruition?

KDOT projects will include local input on what type of pedestrian facilities are included in the overall project. KDOT likes to see that there are plans developed with community input. The determination as to who will pay for pedestrian infrastructure is based on a negotiation process.

With the advent of Map 21, WAMPO disburses funding through a competitive process for the Wichita area, rather than KDOT for pedestrian and bicycle related projects. KDOT funds will

exclude areas with TMAs which receive sub allocated funding— such as WAMPO and MARC. Brent Holper at WAMPO is doing a competitive process through their TIP and Transportation Alternatives projects.

5. Is there anything that you want us to know?

The Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan helps KDOT understand the community’s priorities. It’s also a way for the community to show projects in the CIP or priority project list.

Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce and Young Professionals of Wichita Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce and Young Professionals of Wichita
	Meeting Summary
	July 16, 2013, 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
	Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce 350 West Douglas Avenue

Attendance

Participants: Suzie Ahlstrand, Janelle Bogan, Nichole Robinson, Suzy Finn, Jaime Dupy, Courtney Sendall, Kresta Dundas, Angie Prather

Project Team: Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle,

Others: None

Suzie Ahlstrand welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1. Introductions
 - a. Everyone introduced themselves.

2. Why a Pedestrian Master Plan?

- a. Ciara and Scott provided a brief overview of why the City was undertaking the planning process, how it will be funded, and what the planning process includes.

3. Discussion – achieving Wichita’s Vision

This portion of the agenda provided an opportunity for the participants to share their thoughts about the community related to walking, conversation highlights are listed below and are organized according to topic areas.

- a. A pedestrian plan is really needed.
- b. Young Professionals
 - i. Walkable areas are desirable
 - 1. Many friends have moved to Austin and other places with downtowns where you can walk. People are choosing to live where they can walk to destinations – including shops. People are choosing to live where they don’t have to drive.
 - 2. One participant indicated her family looked for and did purchase a house in an area with sidewalks
 - ii. More than 50% of the Young Professionals of Wichita members indicated that running or activities outside are their favorite hobby.
- c. Better connections (especially transit) are needed between walkable areas (ped pockets) in Wichita. These locations include the following.
 - i. Delano
 - ii. College Hill (Clifton Squire, Oliver and Douglas)
 - iii. Downtown
 - iv. Riverside (near the former Riverside Perk)
 - v. Arena / Commerce Street
 - vi. Government Center
 - vii. Wichita State University
- d. At least one member of the chamber is planning on developing a business that is oriented toward grabbing sidewalk business. The business would be walker and dog friendly. It would be looking to attract customers that live downtown.
- e. Delano has a lot of good stuff going on.
- f. Safety is a key issue
 - i. Challenges
 - 1. Portions of the river paths can feel dangerous because of homeless encampments under the bridges
 - 2. Some locations in Old Town can feel dangerous in the evenings when you have to park away from the active areas.
 - 3. Lighting is important
 - ii. Opportunities
 - 1. Could have more cops on bicycles
 - 2. Install emergency telephones
- g. Downtown
 - i. More green areas are needed in downtown, in order to provide people with attractive destinations.
 - 1. They could be a way to attract donors, for development etc.

- ii. One participant knew four people who had been involved in a crash with a motor vehicle while walking in downtown.
- iii. Downtown has really large north-south blocks and this can be problematic for pedestrians.
- iv. Needs more coffee shops and land uses that make for attractive destinations for walkers
- h. Wichita State University
 - i. Many out of state and out of country students who don't drive
 - 1. Makes it difficult to have a social life.
 - ii. Needs transportation connections to interesting areas
 - iii. It is difficult to get to campus from 21st Street
 - iv. Signs to stay off the grass
 - v. People running in the road
- i. Missing sidewalks / sidewalk conditions
 - i. One example of an area without sidewalks is the east YMCA on Douglas – you have to drive there.
 - ii. Why don't HOAs build sidewalks?
 - iii. When and how does the City require sidewalks?
 - iv. Developers get a deal in Wichita because so much infrastructure is paid through specials, the costs aren't up front.
- j. The bike lanes in College Hill have been a good improvement
 - i. Walkers use the bike lanes, probably because of the condition of the sidewalks
- k. Visioneering
 - i. Earlier focus was on cleaning up the river and getting more access to the river, not a lot of energy around walking, running, bicycling.
 - ii. Now – more than 16,000 residents identified outdoor activities as one of the top 5 community priorities.

Wichita Downtown Design Group Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	Wichita Downtown Design Group
	Meeting Summary
	July 17, 2013, 3:00 pm – 4:00 pm
	Wichita Downtown Development Corporation 507 E. Douglas Avenue

Attendance

Participants: Jason Gregory, Scott Knebel

Project Team: Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle

Others: None

1. Introductions

- a. Everyone introduced themselves.

2. Why a Pedestrian Master Plan?

- a. Ciara, Pete, and Scott provided a brief overview of why the City was undertaking the planning process, how it will be funded, and what the planning process includes.

3. Discussion – kid safety issues and opportunities for improvement

This portion of the agenda provided an opportunity for the participants to share their thoughts about the community related to walking, conversation highlights are listed below and are organized according to topic areas.

a. Perception

- i. Wichita residents are very car centric
- ii. Community designed with car focus

b. Downtown

- i. High level of pedestrian activity downtown
 1. Employment
 - a. 20,000 employees walking to and from cars
 2. Events
 - a. Attendees going to and from event to cars
 3. Old town area
 - a. Residential, commercial, and office functions
 - i. Residents downtown tend to be young professionals and seniors
 - ii. Almost 100% occupancy rate
- ii. Geography – the downtown is very large compared to others
 1. Pockets of activity with distance between
 2. Connections are starting to fill in

c. Downtown Plan/Streetscape Guidelines (covers 800 acres)

- i. Downtown streets are all minor arterials
 1. For the plan, created street hierarchy
 - a. Balanced streets
 - b. Green = pedestrian streets
 - c. others
- ii. New business at St. Francis showcases these guidelines
 1. 3 lane one-way southbound converted to two way, with angle parking and sidewalks expanded on both sides of the road

2. 2,000-3,000 average daily traffic
 3. Successful – is “parked up” and busy
 4. Designed to bare minimum of the guidelines
 5. Reflections: Tree grates increased cost, decreased benches
 6. Working on the design community mindset – this project was also an educational opportunity for them – some wanted a more standard design with a center turn lane (not appropriate for this location)
- d. Walkability is critical
- i. Education is key
 - ii. Need an interesting and pleasing walking environment
 - iii. Must address issues of comfort
 1. Small window of comfortable weather for walking
 2. Inconsistent tree canopy
 - a. Design and maintenance mismatch
 - i. Need adjacent property owner to help maintain
 - iv. Should include wayfinding elements
 1. Small project with Douglas Corridor to enhance wayfinding
 - a. Six kiosks
- e. Safety is an important issue in enhancing walkability
- i. Long crossing distances – too short of signal timing
 1. i.e., new pedestrian signal at an intersection in Old Town
 - ii. Issue at night time in certain areas make people reluctant to walk
 1. i.e., Transit Center
 - iii. Unsafe parking to walk to in commerce area
 1. Complaints from residents and employees at nearby businesses
 2. Lots of vacant buildings
 - iv. Perceptions of walking safety have roots in that “other people aren’t around”.
- f. Issues with accessibility to pedestrian facilities
- i. Distances between walkable areas
 1. i.e., Old Town and Delano
 - ii. Railroad tracks
 - iii. Douglas bridge
 - iv. 600’ N/S, 300’ E/W blocks
 - v. Market or signalized crossings between Douglas and 1st St.
- g. Douglas Corridor is essential – must cater to pedestrians
- i. Several issues impacting pedestrian traffic
 1. Transit shelter bulb outs
 2. Pulled back stop bars
 3. Issues with wayfinding
 - a. Not consistent with MUTCD
- h. Public art can impact pedestrian use
- i. Public art managed by the Arts Council
 - ii. Design Council
 1. recommends special consideration projects incorporate art to be funded out of the project budget
 2. Committee of various professionals
- i. “Take-away” messages
- i. Streets aren’t just for cars

- ii. Plan provides a forum for pedestrians to come out and show support
- j. Ped Plan should
 - i. Educate the public so that they want to walk and use pedestrian facilities
 - 1. Many streetscapes in downtown Wichita are successful but unused.
 - ii. Public art considerations should be included in design treatment templates
 - 1. Use Douglas Corridor plan as an example
- k. Street Trees
 - i. Poor connection between design and maintenance efforts
 - ii. Adjoining property owners can be part of the problem
- 4. Discuss engineering, permitting, code enforcement roles
- 5. Discuss implementation process

Walking Advocates Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	Walking Advocates
	Meeting Summary
	July 17, 2013, 7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.
	Wichita City Hall Cafe, 2 nd Floor 455 N. Main, Wichita

Attendance

Participants: Michael Aaron, Karlee Martinez, Alex Limberger, Kevin Swindel, Charlie Claycomb, Barry Carroll, Russell Warren, Jane Byrnes, Charlie Fair, Elizabeth Ablah, Alden Wilner

Project Team: Peter Lagerwey, Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle

Others: None

1. Introductions
 - a. Everyone introduced themselves.

2. Why a Pedestrian Master Plan?

- a. Ciara, Pete, and Scott provided a brief overview of why the City was undertaking the planning process, how it will be funded, and what the planning process includes.

3. Discussion: walking/running issues and opportunities for improvement

This portion of the agenda provided an opportunity for the participants to share their thoughts about the community related to walking, conversation highlights are listed below and are organized according to topic areas.

- a. One participant expressed excitement that Toole was helping prepare the Pedestrian Plan.
 - i. They felt that this would give continuity from the Bicycle Master Plan
 - ii. Toole's experience brings the perspective of having worked in other cities
- b. Walking is beneficial
 - i. Good for individual health
 - ii. The Sedgwick County Bulletin publicizes the benefits of walking
- c. Safety is an important issue
 - i. Children walking to and from school
 1. Parental perception of safety is important
 2. Poor walkability, i.e. Jackson Elementary
 - ii. Traffic congestion is a threat to safety
 - iii. Seniors are concerned about their safety
 1. They are afraid they may have to use a walking stick or club to fend off intruders
 - iv. Safety in numbers – more people being out walking would enhance feelings of safety
 - v. Poor lighting
 - vi. Tripping hazards
 - vii. Pedestrians tend to have high crash corridors
 1. Should identify those corridors
 2. Reducing speed limits really helps address crashes
 - a. Folks feel entitled to high speed roads
 3. Specific areas of concern are:
 - a. Washington & Douglas (permissive left turn)
 - b. 37th & Rock Road
 - c. 21st & Rock Road
- d. Suggestions for improving walkability:
 - i. Incorporate mulch or use different materials
 - ii. Increase the number of trash cans
 - iii. Improve lighting
 - iv. Develop pedestrian "single track" and bike boulevards
 - v. Address water and vegetation issues
 1. Trees may be down on walking paths
 - vi. Focus on the 17th Street rail-to-trail
 - vii. Improve safety on sidewalks
 1. Especially on the West side of town
 - viii. Publicize walking on the right-of-way
 1. Run Facebook pages to publicize walking

- ix. Publish a map and a list of walking paths
 - 1. People often walk on “unpublished routes” (off-road)
 - 2. 60 miles of paths, but not all are signed for shared use
 - 3. Wilderness trails are not paved
 - a. These are not part of the pedestrian plan
 - x. Address issues related to snow and ice
 - xi. Address bicycle/pedestrian conflicts
 - e. More pedestrian facilities should be built
 - i. More sidewalks are needed on major streets
 - 1. E. Douglas, past Oliver
 - 2. Edgemoor, past Woodlawn
 - ii. Most of West Wichita does not have sidewalks
 - iii. Should do all improvements on one street in one year
 - f. Pedestrian usage should be incorporated into broader future plans
 - i. Complete Streets policy should be emphasized
 - 1. This is not a formula, but rather what is appropriate for each road
 - a. Should do what’s appropriate for each mode on the street
 - 2. There was a policy discussion in the past, but it has not been passed
 - 3. Policy and implementation are critical here
 - 4. Goal should be for City Council to adopt a Complete Streets policy
 - ii. Need to develop destinations for walking
 - 1. These should include running errands
 - iii. The school board should implement pedestrian-friendly school siting policies
 - 1. Schools should be built in the middle of nature
 - iv. Improving transit/bus service could increase walkability
 - 1. Need to increase funding to make this happen
 - v. The “number 1 issue” to solve is not getting through town in a car in under five minutes
 - g. Pedestrian plan provides a road map for moving forward with increasing walkability in Wichita
 - i. Provides guidance for several areas:
 - 1. Crossing streets
 - 2. Vulnerable populations
 - 3. Design treatments
 - ii. This plan is all about implementation and funding
 - h. Data collection is important in improving pedestrian safety
 - i. You can’t manage what you can’t measure
 - ii. Should collect crash data from 911, Trauma Centers, and police records
 - iii. WAMPO travel survey
 - iv. Need to capture trips taken using other modes of transportation
4. Future opportunities for community engagement
5. Wrap up and next steps

Transit Department Staff Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	Meeting with Transit Department Staff
	Meeting Summary
	July 17, 2013, 3:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.
	City Hall, 10 th Floor 455 N. Main St.

Attendance

Participants: Michelle Stroot

Planning Team: Peter Lagerwey, Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle

Others: None

This meeting was an informal opportunity to learn more about Wichita Transit related to the walking in Wichita. The meeting did not have a formal agenda. Below are highlights from the conversation.

1. The Wichita Transit system does not have formal bus stops, instead a flag system is utilized. Wichita Transit staff members are exploring the possibility of establishing bus stops.
2. Wichita Transit does have benches, bike racks, and shelters at many locations.
 - a. The locations are generally not coordinated with crossings.
 - b. The locations do follow Wichita Transit guidelines for where to locate the Wichita Transit racks, benches, shelters, along the roadway.
 - i. Far side location
 - ii. Must allow for ADA
 - c. In some locations the Wichita Transit benches, shelters, and racks cannot be installed because of ADA constraints.
3. Wichita Transit does utilize funding to make pedestrian related improvements.
 - a. Wichita Transit has installed walkways to connect bench and shelter locations to existing pavement (i.e. Towne East Mall connection to the parking lot along the north parking lot).
 - b. Generally the improvements are limited to the bench/shelter locations and not leading to the location.
 - c. The Douglas TOD is an example of transit improvements with bus stops.

4. Wichita Transit is currently exploring potential system changes, including routes and frequency.
5. The Westside route is being improved, with new service along Maize Road. This has occurred through the consolidation of two previous routes and expansion of the route.
6. Transit does collect information about where riders embark on the buses.
7. Para transit rides are an important service. Para transit services are generally more expensive than regular bus routes. Wichita Transit will be running a pilot project for a neighborhood feeder in an area where para transit ridership is high.
 - a. The para transit ride application is available on the Wichita Transit website.
8. Transit Use
 - a. Ridership for the entire system was up in 2005 and down in 2012. The drop in 2012 might be related to the cuts in service and may not be reflective of individual routes.

State/Regional Agency Staff Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	State/Regional Agency Staff
	Meeting Summary
	July 17, 2013, 9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
	Wichita City Hall, 10 th Floor
	455 N. Main, Wichita

Attendance

Participants: Kristen Zimmerman, Jim Weber, Zach Edwardson

Project Team: Ciara Schlichting, Peter Lagerwey, Scott Wadle

Others: None

1. Introductions
 - a. Everyone introduced themselves.

2. Why a Pedestrian Master Plan?
 - a. Ciara, Pete, and Scott provided a brief overview of why the City was undertaking the planning process, how it will be funded, and what the planning process includes.

3. Discussion – kid safety issues and opportunities for improvement

This portion of the agenda provided an opportunity for the participants to share their thoughts about the community related to walking, conversation highlights are listed below and are organized according to topic areas.

 - a. WAMPO planning process
 - i. Long Range Transportation Plan
 1. Fall 2013 to Summer 2015
 2. Includes visioning process
 3. Includes prioritization process for funding applications
 - ii. Transportation Improvement Plan
 1. Currently under development
 2. \$12M total
 - a. \$850,000 for Transportation Alternatives
 - iii. Functional Classification System
 1. Update underway
 2. Other principal arterials need to be classified as on National Highway System according to MAP21
 - b. WAMPO Pathway Plan
 - i. not well implemented
 - ii. Connections between WAMPO LRP and local plans
 1. Are referenced
 2. No funding criteria points for facilities adapted in local plan
 - c. WAMPO Bicycle/pedestrian counts
 - i. 2012;
 - ii. 2013 (planned)
 - d. WAMPO Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Funding
 - i. Need pedestrian facilities near increased trip generators
 - ii. “Regional” pedestrian facilities are difficult to identify
 - iii. Funding bicycle/pedestrian projects is new for WAMPO
 - a. Was previously KDOT that allocated the TE funds
 - e. Sedgwick County
 1. Good relationships between WAMPO, county, and city
 - a. Have monthly meetings
 2. Citizens look to county to build connections to Wichita
 3. Cities don’t want to spend their own funds - want federal funds for bicycle and pedestrian facilities
 4. Don’t have plan, but have CIP
 - a. Locals drive their projects
 - b. Need pedestrian demand to justify building pedestrian facilities

- 5. Communities asking the County to make connections between communities
- 6. Current bike/ped project is the Derby and Wichita “aviation pathway,” from McGove to K-15
- ii. Sedgwick County arterials
 - 1. Traditionally, sidewalks were built in county, then inherited by city through annexation
 - 2. Now consist of 2-lane rural roadways
 - a. 2-in design – a couple of feet of shoulder
 - 3. In rural areas, county builds roads with an open ditch
 - a. Locals may then build sidewalk
 - i. i.e., Maize Road from Wichita to Maize, near 21st St.
 - ii. Goddard school at 126h St. & Maple
 - iii. Need safe pedestrian route to this school
 - iv. Need a design template
 - 4. Wichita/Sedgwick subdivisions
 - a. 120 ROW on arterials
 - b. 60 ROW (existing) – buy ROW for expansion projects, set 100’ total
 - 5. Difficult to implement stormwater regulations
- iii. Pedestrian plan recommendations
 - 1. Engage ADA stakeholders
 - a. Use their assistance to identify curb ramps
 - 2. Need to negotiate scoring for applications
 - a. Applications come in, then go to committee
 - b. No clear criteria or scoring
 - c. No plan in place that identifies project priorities
 - i. Potential to use regional transit system to justify these criteria
 - d. Negotiations will be a political process at the TAC
 - e. Need a transparent and fair process

4. Wrap up and next steps

Fire Department Staff Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	Meeting with Fire Department Staff
	Meeting Summary
	July 17, 2013, 3:20 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.
	City Hall, 10 th Floor
	455 N. Main St.

Attendance

Participants: Robert Thompson

Planning Team: Peter Lagerwey, Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle

Others: None

This meeting was an informal opportunity to learn more about the Fire Department authority and influence on the design of subdivisions in Wichita. The meeting did not have a formal agenda. Below are highlights from the conversation.

1. The Planning Team members thanked Mr. Thompson for joining them on such short notice, and introduced themselves.
2. The Subdivision Regulations specify the length of streets that are allowed.
3. Fire Code
 - a. The Fire Code trumps the Subdivision Regulations, per the City Council decision.
 - b. The City of Wichita utilizes the International Fire Code, with some modifications.
 - i. The City of Wichita increased the amount of housing units from 30 to 50 that require a second entrance to the subdivision.
 - ii. Generally, developers usually work pretty close with staff and are willing to do what is necessary for fire protection purposes.
4. Second Entrance
 - a. A second entrance to a subdivision can be provided by away of a gated entrance that the Fire Department can access in the event of an emergency.
 - i. The Fire Department is comfortable with the second entrance prohibiting non-emergency motor vehicle access but allowing pedestrian access.
 - ii. The Fire Department does not allow unpaved or partially paved with grass surfaces for new second entrances for emergency purposes. Any new second entrances required for emergency purposes must also have curbs.
 - b. Generally, the second entrance provides access to an arterial.
 - i. These can consist of a regular street access, or a cul-de-sac with a gate to prevent non-emergency motor vehicle access.
 - c. In some cases, the second subdivision entrance can be provided by connecting the internal subdivision roadway to an internal roadway within a different subdivision.
 - i. In some cases, this has resulted in highly controversial platting cases because the adjoining subdivision did not want the connection.

1. In some cases this has been resolved by installing a gate to prevent non-emergency access.
 - a. An example of this approach can be seen at the Preston Trails subdivision.

Health Organizations Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	Health Organizations Listening Session
	Meeting Summary
	July 17, 2013, 7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.
	Central YMCA 402 N. Market

Attendance

Participants: Mim McKenzie, Jeff Usher

Project Team: Peter Lagerwey, Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle

Others: None

1. Introductions
 - a. Everyone introduced themselves.
2. Why a Pedestrian Master Plan?
 - a. Ciara, Pete, and Scott provided a brief overview of why the City was undertaking the planning process.
3. Discussion – Walking in Wichita

This portion of the agenda provided an opportunity for the participants to share their thoughts about the community related to walking, conversation highlights are listed below and are organized according to topic areas.

 - a. Future development should consider walkability
 - i. A policy should be instituted to require consideration of walking and bicycling

- ii. Need to develop incentives to do the right thing (i.e. projects that help people to be healthier, like mixed-use developments, etc.)
 - 1. By not doing so, missed opportunity
- iii. Siting and design policies should consider walking and bicycling
 - 1. Schools
 - a. i.e., Walkability not raised during Southeast High School relocation discussion
 - b. still have neighborhood schools
 - c. Locating schools on the edge of the City has infrastructure costs beyond the school district (i.e. sidewalks etc.)
 - 2. City parks
 - a. Council Member indicated at a function that the City was not going to be providing neighborhood scale parks and would focus on regional parks
 - b. Many parks are not accessible by walking or bicycling Sedgwick County Park should become a pedestrian destination
 - c. Currently, people drive to use the park
 - d. Need more walkable/bike-able routes to destination parks
- iv. Encourage usage of neighborhood parks
 - 1. People don't use them enough
 - 2. It is a bad idea to focus only on destination parks
 - a.
- b. Design matters in enhancing walkability
 - i. Need policies to require adequate design to enhance walkability
- c. Need seniors within walking distance of businesses and services
 - i. There are empty retail locations
 - ii. Grocery stores not in walking distance for seniors
- d. Safety and repair is critical in walkability
 - i. What Mim hears from neighborhood groups:
 - 1. Inadequate lighting
 - 2. Sidewalks in disrepair, including issues with trees and cracks
 - 3. Residents need to repair sidewalks in front of their homes
 - 4. Costs can be an issue – some property owners have a challenge to pay for the sidewalk repairs
 - 5. Should use CBDG funds and other funds for sidewalk repairs
 - 6. Maybe the neighborhood associations or HOAs can provide matching funding
 - ii. Kid safety is important
 - 1. Kids can't walk or ride on sidewalks
 - 2. Parents don't feel it's safe to walk to school
 - 3. Riding the bus isn't perceived as cool for teens and isn't safe, but provides freedom
 - iii. Downtown area is fine
 - 1. Signage is fine, but counts are down
 - iv. Needs related to walking
 - 1. Need longer pedestrian signals
 - 2. Crosswalks are not marked well
 - a. Need stop bars for automobiles

- b. Many crosswalks are brick and don't stand out
 - 3. Need to incorporate bicycle/pedestrian education in drivers' Ed and KDOT testing for license
 - a. This is important, because cars rule in the Midwest
- e. Several goals were identified during this session:
 - i. Intertwine pedestrian master plan with bicycle master plan
 - 1. This isn't a huge to-do list
 - 2. It should be part of a bigger plan
 - 3. Need to look at bicyclists and pedestrians together
 - a. Both are forms of active transportation
 - 4. Also look at Parks Recreation and Open Space Plan
- f. Attendees identified several key messages:
 - i. Pedestrian enhancements should be multi-generational
 - 1. Make it so kids and moms can walk
 - ii. Don't have any income-related messages in regard to pedestrian usage
 - 1. Don't point out low income neighborhoods
 - iii. Make sure that kids can walk to school
 - 1. Include magnet schools
 - a. They are currently designed for busing
 - 2. Include neighborhood schools
 - iv. Don't frame pedestrian activity as an individual behavior
 - 1. Need to create an environment that is favorable to walking
 - a. Only 25% of people have been shown to properly exercise
 - b. Need to have a daily routine, which walking can be a part of
 - c. People need the desire to be active
 - v. Frame pedestrian activity as a lifestyle, and not just intentional fitness
 - 1. Increase stair use
 - 2. Increase walking by parking farther away
 - vi. Frame pedestrian improvements as economic development
 - 1. Creating an area where young professionals want to be
 - vii. Increasing walkability supports economic development
 - 1. Draws more young professionals to town
 - viii. Data collection is important
 - 1. We should be measuring success
 - 2. WAMPO Bicycle/pedestrian counts in September
 - 3. YMCA statistics
 - 4. Track Walktober and Bike Month events
 - 5. Youth risk surveys from the health department
 - 6. Conduct a perception survey every 3 years
 - 7. Should come back to review drafts
 - ix. Create a culture of walking and walkability
 - 1. Increase awareness of bike path along river
 - a. Need safety in numbers by increasing usage
 - i. Not perceived as safe because of homeless individuals present
 - b. Many people don't know about the path
 - 2. Create this culture in neighborhoods
 - a. Support recreational walking

- b. Need to make walking a lifestyle
 - 3. Master Bicycle Plan an important part of changing culture
 - a. This is because of both the practical use and the policy aspect
 - 4. Embrace the changing demographics of Wichita
 - a. Don't try to resist these changes
- 4. Future opportunities for community engagement
- 5. Wrap up and next steps

Wichita City Staff Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	City Staff
	Meeting Summary
	July 16, 2013, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
	Wichita City Hall, 10 th Floor 455 N. Main, Wichita

Attendance

Participants: Neil Strahl, Linda Firsching, Jess McNeely, Paul Gunzelman, Julianne Kallman, Paul Hays

PlanningTeam: Peter Lagerwey, Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle

Others: None

1. Introductions
 - a. Everyone introduced themselves.
2. Why a Pedestrian Master Plan?
 - a. Ciara, Pete, and Scott provided a brief overview of why the City was undertaking the planning process, how it will be funded, and what the planning process includes.

3. Discussion

This portion of the agenda provided an opportunity for the participants to share their thoughts about the community related to walking, conversation highlights are listed below and are organized according to topic areas.

a. New Development

i. Sidewalk Ordinance

1. 1979 sidewalk ordinance provides subdivision regulations
2. New subdivisions are required to have sidewalks on collectors
3. 48 lots triggers sidewalks on one side, but there is no requirement if through connectivity
4. If plot adjoins a school or park, then must connect
5. Connectivity on stub streets should be encouraged
6. Ultimately, the City Council makes the call about whether sidewalks are required or not.

ii. Subdivision Regulations

1. Fire and Police access for 50 lots
 - a. Two points of access required for emergency vehicles
2. Process for standard plats
 - a. Staff create recommendation
 - b. Planning Commission gets recommendation from staff, but PC ultimately has final decision
 - c. Appeals to PC are met with inconsistent decisions
 - i. This is due to expense, cut thru traffic, and connecting neighborhoods with different price points
 1. Residents generally do not want to connect neighborhoods with different price points
 - d. City Council makes the final decision

iii. Community Unit Plan

1. Required for commercial 6 acres in size or more
2. Reviewed by Planning staff
3. doesn't require pedestrian circulation, Planning staff recommend that the CUP site plans include it
4. Requires site plan
5. The first parcel in makes the first pedestrian connection to the arterial sidewalk

iv. Commercial and not a PUD

1. Metro Building and Code Enforcement plans examiner will review for compliance with the sidewalk ordinance

v. Driveway or curb-cut

1. Inspected by Public Works and Utilities, Engineering sidewalk inspectors

b. CIP

i. \$450,000 budgeted each year for arterial sidewalks and curb ramps

1. Focus was on wheelchair ramps due to previous lawsuits
2. Current focus is on complains, requests, and desires
 - a. Some requests for 33rd – 25th
 - b. Requests have generally been along arterials, not many on collectors

- c. Are working with schools on crosswalks
- c. ADA transition plan is needed
 - 1. CIP projects usually get built right
 - a. They have strong ADA requirements
 - 2. Redevelopment doesn't require a site plan review
 - a. Pedestrian circulation required if it is a PUD
 - 3. Industrial areas don't always meet cross slope requirements
- d. Schools
 - i. Put a sidewalk on their properties
 - ii. Request city to put in sidewalks
 - iii. For new residential developments, connections to nearby schools are internal to the development
- e. Repair and Maintenance
 - i. The City operates a revolving budget of \$150,000 a year
 - 1. Complaint-driven
 - 2. City generates cost estimates, then gives options to property owners for repair
 - a. Renters talk to landlord first
 - b. Repairs or replacements
 - i. City makes the repair (5 year special assessment)
 - ii. Property owner can replace on their own
 - c. If a shared-use path, then the City only charges for the replacement costs of a regular sidewalk
 - ii. CDBG funds of \$75,000 a year for repair and maintenance
 - 1. Complaint-driven repairs
 - 2. Repair whole blocks
 - 3. Some funds are used for corner curb ramps
- f. Crossings
 - i. Mid-block crossings are installed by city
 - 1. Many of these requests are from schools
 - 2. There are no official school walking routes
- g. Missing links and connectivity
 - i. There are unique engineering issues related to constructability of pedestrian facilities
- h. Curb cut
 - i. removal:
 - 1. Through plotting process, will close
 - 2. Through condemned sidewalk program
- i. Pedestrian detours
 - i. "Sidewalk closed" sign not required to detour pedestrian traffic
 - ii. Traffic detours
 - 1. Street permit used
 - a. Parking removed
 - b. Lane detours
- j. Sidewalk obstructions
 - i. Chapter 10
 - 1. City sends out letters if obstruction reported
 - ii. Snow removal

- iii. Obstruction ordinance used to get snow removal outside of downtown
- k. Minor Street Privilege
 - i. Sidewalk Café Plan
 - 1. Review design standards
 - a. Must maintain 6' clearance
 - b. Located next to buildings
- l. Examples of challenges
 - i. Oliver, south of 21st St. at WSU
 - 1. Has a golf course, so no walking allowed
 - ii. Bradley Fair
 - 1. Stormwater issues – PVC pipe dumps onto sidewalk
 - iii. E. Douglas
 - 1. Cars on sidewalk on Douglas

4. The Planning Team members thanked the participants for meeting with them and the meeting was concluded on time.

Safe Kids Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	Safe Kids
	Meeting Summary
	July 15, 2013, 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
	Wichita City Hall, 10 th Floor
	455 N. Main, Wichita

Attendance

Participants: Ronda Lusk, Charlie Fair

Planning Team: Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle

Others: None

1. Introductions
 - a. Everyone introduced themselves.

2. Why a Pedestrian Master Plan?
 - a. Ciara and Scott provided a brief overview of why the City was undertaking the planning process, how it will be funded, and what the planning process includes.

3. Discussion – kid safety issues and opportunities for improvement

This portion of the agenda provided an opportunity for the participants to share their thoughts about the community related to walking, conversation highlights are listed below and are organized according to topic areas.

 - a. There are a number of current activities in place
 - i. Safe Kids
 1. Celebrating 25 years in Wichita
 2. Focus on unintentional injuries
 3. Membership includes (not limited to)
 - a. USD 259 representative
 - b. WPD representative
 - ii. Safe Kids - Pedestrian safety committee, sponsored by FedEx
 - iii. Safety town events (sponsored by Kohl's and Via Christi)
 1. Trailers (such as in schools and city hall)
 2. Stop signs
 3. Pedestrian treatments
 4. Pop-up safety tents
 - iv. Walk to School Day has been in place for 12 years
 - v. Halloween in the Park – 1,200 kids
 1. College Park neighborhood shuts down streets
 - b. Not many kids walk to school because of...
 - a. safety concerns
 - b. Inclement weather (rain, heat)
 - c. Traffic congestion (especially around drop offs)
 - d. Lack of safe routes from cars to school
 - e. Distracted walkers and drivers
 - i. Fewer districted individuals than in other communities, but those who were districted were significantly districted
 - f. Closing elementary schools, community schools, neighborhood schools detrimental to pedestrian issues
 - g. Fewer community schools, lots of magnet schools.
 - h. Schools be constructed on the outskirts of cities, some out in fields without sidewalks to access the schools.
 - c. Issues were identified at specific schools
 - i. Pleasant Valley Elementary School and Bryant Middle School
 1. Close calls with drop offs
 2. Issues with mid-block crossings
 3. Distracted walkers

- 4. Residents and drivers complain about 2 blocks away
 - ii. McCollum Elementary School
 - 1. Walk around school or walk to school
 - 2. Stop a couple of blocks away (without parents dropping off)
 - iii. Marshall Middle School
 - 1. Nice drop off on 17th, but not used
 - iv. Harry St. Elementary School
 - 1. Create direct paths (mid-block) and put in crossing signal
- d. Drop offs are of particular concern
 - i. Need attractive and convenient drop offs and speed reduction
 - ii. Motor vehicle congestion at the drop off locations is a problem
 - iii. Parents drop of children up to three blocks away from school to avoid the congestion near the school.
 - iv. Maybe drop off locations could include shelters like the one at the 21st Street Nomar site?
- e. Need to evaluate all schools in terms of their walkability
 - i. Crosswalks
 - 1. More are needed
 - 2. Some don't connect to sidewalks
 - ii. Sidewalks
 - 1. Are often limited and are in poor condition
 - iii. Walking to and from school buses to school
 - 1. To and from school is different
 - iv. Drop off patterns
- f. More data needs to be collected regarding pedestrian safety
 - i. Investigate middle schools more
 - 1. Students and parents
 - a. Safety survey: "Why don't your kids walk"?
 - ii. Motor vehicle crashes with pedestrians in and around vehicles, as well as "near misses"
 - 1. Data from Level 1, 2 and 3 Trauma Centers for South Central Kansas
 - 2. Not a lot of money when not an increase in number of deaths
 - ii. Principals have also report a number of near misses to Safe Kids representatives.
- g. Suggestions to increase walking to school and safety
 - i. Adopt a culture of safety
 - ii. Schools being able to inform parents that their children has arrived
 - iii. Safe routes to school using GIS data
 - 1. Create open source/geo wiki to report problems
 - a. University of Oregon as an example
 - iv. Have assemblies in school
 - v. Teach safety education in schools
 - 1. None required, but some do it (such as Goddard High School)
 - 2. Most don't do it
 - 3. Can be taught as part of Physical Education
 - viii. More money and volunteers needed
 - ix. Need to observe locations on good and bad weather days.

- x. Need a better system to let parents know if a child did or did not make it to school. The current system can take until the afternoon to notify parents.
 - xi. The City should...
 - 1. review all school sites for improvements
 - a. Crosswalks
 - b. Markings
 - c. Signals
 - 2. Help form a walking school bus
 - 3. Conduct evidenced based pedestrian planning
 - 4. Utilize an online / phone application reporting system like Shareabouts for individuals to report problems with sidewalks, etc.
 - 5. Bring back the Safe and Drug Free Schools Wichita Police. They were wonderful about educating students.
 - 6. Contact the Sedgwick County Health Department staff for more information about pedestrian related efforts.
 - ii. Consider creating a pop-up event where helmets, reflectors, and water bottles are distributed.
4. Safe Routes to School
 - a. Safe Kids partnered with the WAMPO, USD 259 and others to produce a SRTS plan for two schools in Wichita.
 - i. Looked at crash data
 - ii. Installed improvements
 - 1. Ped signals
 - 2. Crosswalk
 - iii. Did not have funding for a walking school bus, but wanted to try one.
 - iv. Looked at the sexual offender registry too.
5. Future opportunities for community engagement
6. Wrap up and next steps

Seniors Organizations Listening Session

	Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan
	Seniors Organizations
	Meeting Summary
	July 15, 2013, 4:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.
	Wichita City Hall, 10 th Floor 455 N. Main, Wichita

Attendance

Participants: Annette Graham, Sharon Fearey, Lisa Collier (called in), Cathy Landwehr

Project Team: Ciara Schlichting, Scott Wadle

Others: None

1. Introductions

- a. Everyone introduced themselves.

2. Why a Pedestrian Master Plan?

- a. Ciara and Scott provided a brief overview of why the City was undertaking the planning process, how it will be funded, and what the planning process includes.

3. Discussion – seniors mobility challenges and opportunities for improvement

This portion of the agenda provided an opportunity for the participants to share their thoughts about the community related to walking, conversation highlights are listed below and are organized according to topic areas.

a. Walking

i. Malls are popular sites for seniors to walk

1. Safe, easy access, climate controlled, and even surface
2. They drive or take bus to get there
3. Fear of falling

ii. Neighborhoods

1. Overgrowth
2. Uneven sidewalks
3. Not well maintained walking infrastructure
4. Sidewalks sometimes in poor locations – right up against the street

b. More people walking makes seniors feel safer as pedestrians

i. Eyes on the street

c. Seniors “aging in place” - need connections to services

i. Utilitarian – need to access pharmacies, grocery stores, etc.

ii. Need to look at sidewalk connections to services

iii. Former neighborhood services, such as grocery stores, have closed

iv. Seniors will drive as long as they can (not during rush hour or on certain roads); once they can't drive they typically don't walk far

d. Public transportation needs to be improved

i. Regular bus takes too long

1. Need to come downtown to go West/East
2. May not have amenities, shelters, or are paved
3. Few seniors use buses to get to senior centers

- ii. Medical (Red Cross) transportation (door-to-door) and Para-transit popular alternatives
- e. Seniors need improvements as pedestrians
 - i. Improve drainage
 - 1. Shouldn't have to step over mud
 - ii. Need more time from cross walk signals
 - 1. Identified Douglas Avenue, across from Century II as specific location for this
 - iii. Need senior crossing signs, similar to school crossing signs
 - iv. Need more even sidewalk surfaces
- f. They believe that taxes should be raised to fund:
 - i. Crosswalks
 - ii. Repair sidewalks
 - iii. Wheelchair-accessible curb cuts
 - iv. Traffic calming
 - v. Crosswalk timing
 - vi. Creating safe, well-lit ways to get to public transportation so that it will be used
 - vii. Public transit needs to be improved – takes a long time to get anywhere
 - 1. Frequency
 - 2. Access
- g. Sidewalks need to be improved
 - i. Not well maintained
 - 1. Vegetation problems
 - ii. No buffer along roadway
 - iii. Crossings are not convenient
 - 1. Have to go out of the way to cross streets
 - iv. Missing or impassible sidewalks
 - 1. Washington Blvd, Lincoln
- h. Incentives needed to get people walking
 - i. Walking groups
 - ii. Programs exist to encourage seniors to walk
 - 1. Greenway, McLean
 - a. Cross Walk Tennis Club
 - b. Park
 - 2. AARP has a walking program
 - 3. Schreiber Park Plan with Dan Burden
 - 4. Walk with Ease
 - a. Arthritis-based walking program
 - 5. Sedgwick County Department on Aging Silver Sneaker program
 - a. Teach them to walk safely
 - b. Get them into walking groups
 - c. Prizes
 - d. Socialization is key – peer pressure
- i. Should connect land use for seniors with pedestrian access
 - i. Locate senior housing close enough to services that they can walk to
 - ii. Need to be in locations where sidewalks are available
 - iii. Need mixed use zoning
 - iv. Need the city to be planned for purposeful walking

- j. Need to look at locations of seniors and improve pedestrian access in these areas
 - 1. 31st & Colvin
 - 2. Planeview Neighborhood
 - 3. Save-a-lot good for senior housing along 13th
 - 4. McAdams
 - 5. NE Bel Aire
 - 6. Central NE
 - 7. 21st & Summerset
 - 8. 13th & West by Dillons (West Park Towers)
 - 9. 21st & Amidon
 - a. Need intersection improvements here to increase access to Dillon's and Dollar General
 - 10. Pawnee/Broadway (west)
 - 11. North Houston Center
 - 12. Indian Hills
 - 13. Schwitter Neighborhood (AARP)
 - 14. Dan Burden
 - 15. Park Lane Manor (old Salvation Army)
 - 16. Lincoln & Harry, east of Oliver (WWII housing)
 - 17. Blvd. Plaza
 - a. Safe place for shops, services
 - b. Need roundabout, parking along storefronts
- 4. Future opportunities for community engagement
- 5. Wrap up and next steps