# Appendices



# **APPENDIX A** Community Pedestrian Workshops

Summary of Community Workshop No.1

## Meeting Date: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 at 6 p.m.

#### **OVERVIEW**

As part of the planning process for the first-ever Topeka Pedestrian Master Plan, a community workshop was held on Tuesday, March 24, 2015 from 6 to 8 p.m. at the Holliday Building (620 SE Madison) in downtown Topeka. Its purpose was to:

- Gather community feedback about:
  - The Ideas for a possible vision and goals for walkability in Topeka
  - Key issues, problems and/or concerns with walkability in the community
  - Potential strategies/solutions for addressing key issues, problems, and/or concerns
  - Top priorities for walkability
  - Other comments
- Incorporate the information gathered into a review and inventory of existing sidewalk and pedestrian facilities.
- Use the information to inform the selection of focus areas and recommendations that could be included in the initial and final drafts of the pedestrian plan.

A total of 23 people attended the workshop, including elected officials, staff from the City of Topeka and its Metropolitan Planning Organization, Neighborhood Improvement Areas (North Topeka West, Central Highland Park, and others), Topeka Metro, the Advisory Committee for the Topeka Pedestrian Master Plan, Shawnee County Parks and Recreation Department, Heartland Healthy Neighborhoods, Security Benefit, residents, the media, and others. Notice for the meeting was provided via a combination of press release, social media posts, and e-blasts via NEXTDOOR: Topeka.

The workshop began with a short presentation that provided an overview of pedestrian planning and outlined key elements of the planning process for the Topeka Pedestrian Plan, including its intended adoption by year's end and implementation funding available via the City's capital improvements program. Then participants were asked to use maps, dots, and markers to share their opinions about the best (green dots and markers) and worse (red dots and markers) places for walking in Topeka, potential improvement strategies for issues (blue dots and markers), and priority improvement locations (yellow dots). An online version of the mapping exercise was made available via topeka.org/pedplan through April 30.

Workshop participants also discussed their favorite places to walk today, where they would like to walk in the future, important issues to address through the pedestrian master plan, and key items to accomplish in the coming years. At the conclusion of the workshop, participants were advised that they could continue the evening's discussion by visiting the online town hall meeting at topeka.mindmixer.com and/or responding to the survey at topeka.org/pedplan.



## Discussion

During the workshop, three tables of participants (also known as Groups 3, 4, and 5) shared their feedback with the study team. A summary of their responses to key questions regarding favorite walking locations, key issues, and priority accomplishments are included in the pages that follow.

Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Where's your FAVORITE place to v	valk?	
o Shunga Trail	o McFarland Farms Neighborhood	o Trails
o Trails looping around Governor's Mansion	o Shunga Trail	o Neighborhood
o Shunga Trail in East Topeka	o Highland Park	o Washburn University
o Downtown Topeka	o Along Levee	o Older neighborhoods
o In my neighborhood near the Library. Walk to the nearby shops, Walgreens, Doctor's Office, etc.	<ul> <li>Downtown Lawrence; close to shopping, food, entertainment, and other daily needs</li> </ul>	o Ward Meade Neighborhood Improvement Area
o Santa Fe Park and Oakland- Billard Park in Northeast Topeka	o Gage Park	o Around Chesney Park (Mural at 19th and Weston)
o Central Highland Park and Lake Shawnee	o Mt. Hope Cemetery and Seabrooke Neighborhood	



Group 3	Group 4	Group 5		
Where would you li	Where would you like to walk in the FUTURE?			
o No responses	<ul> <li>o To the Zoo, from McFarland Farms Neighborhood</li> <li>o To work, from Briarwood to High Crest</li> <li>o To Downtown and Lake Shawnee, from California Ave</li> <li>o Improved accessibility in North Topeka</li> <li>o Downtown Topeka; hustle and bustle in future</li> <li>o Improved Gage Park</li> <li>o No sidewalks in Seabrooke neighborhood, would love to have sidewalks in this neighborhood.</li> <li>o North side of Fist Street between Clay and Fillmore</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>o Trails</li> <li>o Neighborhood</li> <li>o All places with no sidewalks or curbs, just ditches. Dangerous.</li> <li>o N. Tyler Road</li> <li>o NW Taylor Road</li> <li>o NU Taylor Road</li> <li>o N Lineman Road; kids have nowhere to walk; pedestrians have been hit and killed. Also, dangerous railroad track crossing.</li> <li>o East Topeka</li> <li>o South Topeka Boulevard</li> <li>o Downtown Topeka</li> <li>o Old Prairie Town (124 NW Fillmore)</li> <li>o 6th Street Business Corridor</li> <li>o No sidewalk down Oakley</li> <li>o East Topeka and other districts that need to be improved at the same level as those in West Topeka</li> <li>o North side of Fist Street between Clay and Fillmore</li> </ul>		



Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
In 2020 walking	g should be	in Topeka?
o No responses	o Easy o Safe o Plentiful o Connected	<ul> <li>o Safe: Don't have to walk in ditches, in the street, or jump out of the way of trucks</li> <li>o Practical, easy to walk and don't have to go out of your way</li> <li>o Accessible (ADA too)</li> <li>o Connected and complete (No holes)</li> <li>o Protected by adopted policy</li> <li>o Aesthetically pleasing (landscaped, weed free)</li> <li>o Grades aren't dangerous (grade differentials addressed); often caused by uprooting trees</li> <li>o Walking on sidewalks that are in good repair</li> <li>o Sidewalks that matchup on both sides of the street</li> <li>o Complete Streets and/or "Complete Corridors" so bikes and cars work well together</li> </ul>



Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	
What is the BIGGEST ISSUE facing walkability today?			
<ul> <li>o No. 1 - Safe sidewalks to and around all Topeka schools; Implementation of 'Safe Routes to Schools.'</li> <li>o No. 2 Limited accessibility around West Ridge Mall. Ramps are not provided at most intersections.</li> <li>o No. 3 - Safety and Connectivity. No sidewalks or intermittent sidewalks along Washington Street and Hudson Boulevard in the Highland Park Neighborhood.</li> <li>o No. 4 - Limited accessibility in neighborhoods around Hospitals and Medical Buildings.</li> <li>o No. 5 Limited accessibility for mobility impaired – EVERYWHERE</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>o No. 1 - Safety, including: <ul> <li>Signal Light timing</li> <li>Lighting</li> <li>Lack of Sidewalk</li> <li>Disrepair</li> <li>Not to Code</li> <li>Pedestrians vs. Vehicles</li> <li>Auto Oriented</li> <li>Open Ditches along roadways</li> </ul> </li> <li>o No. 2 - Connectivity, including: <ul> <li>Large, privately owned land tracts are barriers</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>o Central Topeka, continuity issues</li> <li>o Sidewalks are mental boundaries between public and private – They are the ribbon that binds neighbors together; also helps with crime prevention</li> <li>o East Topeka, North Topeka, and Oakland Neighborhoods have been forgotten about</li> <li>o Need better planning for the development of Central Topeka</li> <li>o Need better working relationship between City and County</li> </ul>	



Group 3	Group 4	Group 5		
What's the top thing five years?	What's the top thing you'd like the Topeka Pedestrian Master Plan to ACCOMPLISH in the next five years?			
o No responses	<ul> <li>o No. 1 - Highland Park Neighborhood Improvements</li> <li>o No. 2 - Neighborhood Improvements along Gage Boulevard between Gage Park and Big Shunga Park</li> <li>o No. 3 - North Topeka Improvements (around Kansas Ave.)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Overarching policy to put in sidewalks where they don't already exist. (Note: Be careful and don't force them on areas that don't want them).</li> <li>O Coordinate new street development with sidewalk development so sidewalks aren't torn up during construction.</li> </ul>		

#### Meeting Attendees Overall Outreach Ideas/Concerns

- Reach those who don't have computers
- Neighborhood associations are willing to send and/or hand out hardcopies of the online survey
- Use sidewalk inventories that neighborhood associations have already completed
  - o MPO can attend neighborhood meetings and provide updates to them during the planning process





## BLUE = IMPROVEMENT YELLOW = PRIORITIES MTPO Pedestrian Master Plan

Group#3

Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
10	NORTH OF SARDON TO
	COPANT, WABASH, THOMAS, ETC.
7	CHASE STATE STREET SCHOOLS
8	SEZIST - 25TH ANOTHING TO CALIF. No SUGWALKS
a	11 Il INDIANA TO ADAMS
	25th Is Bus Rov
10	SE CAL 1-70 NORTH & South ALONG CEMETARY NO SIDEWARK
11	RANDOLPH ELEMENTERY (1177)
2	CROSS & STREETS TO KANSAS 674 TO 107
6	WARANAKER
3	NO RAMPS DN 17 H MID BLOCK To CAOSS MAN TO KOHS
4	CONNECT MALL OUTLOTS TO S/W ON WANAMAKER



## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
8	UPRR CROSSING KS. ANE./
(16)	NW TYLER - BUSY, NAPROW No SIDEWAYKS
(17)	NW LYMAN, HILL, RR, LOCAL ELEMENTARY
18	SW URISH, No SIDENALAS TO FUTURE COMMUNITY POOL @ 2155/URISH
(19)	SE 29IH NO SIDEWALKS TO TRAIL ADOUTUD LAKE (OR AT LEAST ON WEST SIDE)
20	No S/W ALONG WEST EDGE
219	NET SARDOU TO DAKLANS COMMUNITY CENTER
22	SW 17.54 No S/W
23	SW 29IN BUS LINE, BREWSTER P. CE S. TOPEKA BUD
(10)	10TH & MACVICAR

Visit us on the web at topeka.org/pedplan



#### Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

**Colored Dot and Number Description or Comment** MEDKAL DISTRICT CASHBURN LANE 17 IL ST. WASHBURN V ERONTACE Cool SIGNIAS SE WASIFINGTON / INDIANA SE ADAMS SE KDIANA HAMAND THE CENTRAL Course Him SO/S PRECRAM REHAS SW IDT FAIRLAND - WANAMAKE DITCHES, ARTERIM, 10208 FARELAWN SPECIAL NEEDS BUNDING 7 195 CROSSOME NEW 14 TH /15 TH TOPERA - PEOPLE Don't Swow Daven 5 CROSSWALK



#### Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

**Colored Dot and Number Description or Comment** HI CREST / ANONDALE EAST No SIDEWALKS 12 DEER CREEK AREA - DITCHES SCOTT MAGNET PED BRIDGE RIPLEY PARK H.P. ELEMENT. SCHOOL 1551E 15 No CURBS - NEED BRAND NEW STREETS GOV. MANSION 2-MILE PERMETER AROUND W.U. MEDFORD 15 BRANNER GTH TO AND 17TH NO SIDEWAY EAST SIDE PARALLEL TO SHUNGA TRAIL





## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
24	6th & OAKLEY
	SCHOOLS
2	WESTRIDGE MAN
3	MEDICAL DISTRICT
2	HUDSON HILL CENT. HICH PARK
	×
2	
10	







Graup 4

## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
	Noto Arts District N.KS Ave
	Events, big sidewalks, First Fridays, can shall
	Laur Shawhee
(2)	Trails all around, recreation
	Gauge Park + 200
(3)	ble family activity, sidewalks, Dool, dog park
(4)	Felker Park
	Trails, sports fields
G	the Capital
	Historical, New
	Davntown
6	strall during the day
-	Ward Meade
	Kits, gardens, Kids activities Historical
(7)	Darwood Park
0	National Bird watching
	West Ridge PMall
( 4 )	
	Washburn University
$\left( \begin{array}{c} 10 \end{array} \right)$	



## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
	College Hill Development
	Burger Stand
(12)	Garfield Park
10-	Pool, School, Trail, rental facilities, good for kids
	Shunga Trail Loop
	Things to see, super connected
	Jandon Trail
14	
	tti Crest
	Safety
	29th b/ Adams + California
2	No sidewalks
Z	25th California - Adams
	Landon Trul
4	No lights
5	Shunga Trail
	No lights or artlets
	11th - 10th - California
6	No lights/ sidewalks





## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
	7th + 12th in N. Topeka
(7)	Old, grain over, broken sidewoulks
8	E 6th + Branner
9	Hope Street
	Around School
10	Seconde
	Wanamaker
	"Bad connectivity but sidewalks + shops
	Shunga Park
12	Surrounding residential cant get to Park
12	23 rd + california
(13)	No sidewalks, ditches
	Deer Creek
(14)	people walk to work no sidewalks, etc.
	Tyler
(15)	No schoolks, ditches
	lake sharned
16	residents can't get to it





## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
	Shunga
	Improve lighting
	Landon
2-	Improve lighting
2	Wanamaker
	Improve connectivity, accessibility - 104
	North Topeka iurb, gutter, widt
$(\mathcal{A})$	Replace sidewalks I build streets to standards
	Front Topellon
(5)	General Infrastructur
(4)	Neighborhood Sidewalks
7	Access to reduction
8	ADA accessibility in Dauntown
	Connections
	Gov. Traits/ Kaw River St. Park
iles	Lake Thannee
484	Connection w/ Landon Trail, option besides 29th





group 4

## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
15	Governers Munsion V Kaw River St Park
1 Souther 1 Souther	2.9th + Fairlawn I wide sidewalks, people, activity Highland Park (25th/California/Indiana) Kids to schools, people to and from work/shopping
2	(Blue circle along Grage) Connectivity to Major Parks North Topeker, General improvements Historic N. Topeaka East, Topeka West South of Side 20 1kg Was to Elest Adams to Element
4	Wittenberg Bridge









## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

	LIBETT.
Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
	Lyman Kol - between Tyler Y Vail
1.	No side walks - narrow 4 dangerous
	No storm drains-ditches
2	Nw Tyler from Lyman to Gordon
Cer	No side walks, very narrow street,
	16th & Clay-Crime-not safe
3	Kids walking to school-Robinson JR
	Elmhurst & Neichborhood - Older
U	Sidewalk-bricks
1.	
	Warda Meade Neighborhood-Older
5.	Gide walks - vegitation
	Highland Park Neighborhood - Ditcher
6.	instead of stormadrains 9 40 side up ltc
	Ditches
	Oakley St. from 8th to 21st - No sideun
7.	at all - Dangerous for pedestrian & cars
	j j j j j j j j j j j j j j j j j j j
	North Highland Park-No sidewalks,
8.	7
	Makland-many side walles need
9.	
	it for it i
2	



## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
	NU Lyman Deed Reachican out of Street Safet, Reasons, Sidewalks.
2	NW Tyler Need Perdicang out of Street Safety Russons Gautters, Sewers,
3	chesney take - not tan to go. while
4	Highland Parte Nohol No sidewalls
5 1	
6	Central Topeller - videwalle continuity
1	

Visit us on the web at topeka.org/pedplan



## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
1	Cape Parts sidewalks wound the perimeter of the park
2	Chusney Park Need streef signs to identify the Mural Mural is these and a good place towalk.
3	NW 25th Street + Tyler More truils pigsy back more trails with Tyler improvements
24	Washburn jata + Washburn a Crosswalk something to ident i by curpting-17th Washburn
5	Continuation of Shinga Trail
(la	Crosswalks
7	Improvements for joggers sothey don't have torin in the street Lower silve Lake Rain Sidewalk at least on one side of the street
	Oakley side walk from 8th street to 21st
9	Sidewalks Storm draws grauts gutters 21st to 29th All & Highland Park Neighbor Atoms to California and eventues on house
10	just north of Highland Park it needs all the same as above

Visit us on the web at topeka.org/pedplan



## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment
	Tom street bentween longe and Fairlawn no side walks now but will be added during street that widening.
12.	Central Topeta for Continuity Since it is Missing sidewalks all over. Dakley to Jefferso I70-21st
	ž
к.	





## Community Workshop No. 1 - March 24, 2015

Getto D			
Colored Dot and Number	Description or Comment		
	WASHIBURN UNIVERSITY		
2	19 TH & WESTERN		
3	TO NUL 25TH TIKE		
(4)	(THIS BACK IS LEAS THAN YOOF AN ACHER) CINEFICLE PLANK IS A BETTER BERK TO WALK MC IT IS A CONSUMMITY PARK IN NERTH TOBE MCKINLEY PARK N. JOPRKA		
(5)	CADGE PARK		
60	LONE DRIVE TO GET THERE NOT CONECTED SHOWNEE (O. LAKE		
(7)	SHUNGA TRAIL		
8	MERDANS ELEM SCHOOL		

Visit us on the web at topeka.org/pedplan

## **Community Pedestrian Workshops**

Summary of Community Workshop No. 2

## Meeting Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 at 6 p.m.

#### **OVERVIEW**

As part of the planning process for the first-ever Topeka Pedestrian Master Plan, a community meeting was held on Wednesday, January 20, 2016 from 6 to 8 p.m. at the Holliday Building (620 SE Madison) in downtown Topeka. Its purpose was to:

- Gather community feedback about the draft pedestrian master plan, specifically its:
  - Vision
  - Goals
  - Action Steps
  - Projects
  - Other comments
- Incorporate the feedback received into the final draft of the master plan.

A total of 15 people attended the meeting, including elected officials, staff from the City of Topeka and its Metropolitan Planning Organization, neighborhood organizations, and others. Notice for the meeting was provided via a combination of press releases, social media posts, and e-blasts. Eleven (11) comment forms were returned.

#### DISCUSSION

The meeting began with a short presentation that provided an overview of the recommendations in the draft Topeka Pedestrian Plan, including its goals, action steps, maps, and priority improvement projects plus associated planning-level (pre-engineering) cost estimates. In response, meeting participants provided the following comments:

- Goal 1 A complete pedestrian network connecting all neighborhoods
  - o Huntoon at 12th Street: No sidewalks, scary Why isn't it included? Part of the ½-cent sales tax as a large complete streets project. Complete streets projects involve lighting and all modes of transportation.
- Goal 2 Maintained sidewalks for safe travel at all times
  - o Going to recommend more funding for the 50/50 cost-share program? Yes and include brick sidewalk eligibility.
    - Will there by a program expansion on a sliding scale by neighborhood and/or income?
  - o How much priority was given to trail connectivity?



- Goal 3 A safe and comfortable walking environment
  - o Priority for projects related to safety and comfort (lighting, etc)?
  - o What about neighborhood/pedestrian-scale lighting?
  - o Elmhurst: Proper tree trimming along sidewalks is an issue Was this discussed?
    - Is shrub encroachment on sidewalks a code compliance issue?
    - Difference between visibility for cars versus that for walkers?
- Goal 4 A culture of walking
  - o Is the Safe Routes to School Study for Quincy Elementary comparable to the county health study?
  - o How would you implement improvements for Action 4c Promote walking in neighborhoods through mixed use development and redevelopment along neighborhood corridors?
  - o What do other cities' coalitions look like and how does Topeka compare to them (re: Action 4B Establish a complete streets advisory committee)?
    - Are resources and sources available? Similar information will be included in the final draft plan.
    - Are there best practices? Similar information will be included in the final draft plan.
  - o What are we doing for areas that don't have sidewalks?

#### **IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

- Curb ramps
  - o How were costs and improvements determined? If one ramp was missing, the sidewalk inventory assigned costs for improving all of the ramps at the intersections. Truncated domes would be added to existing ramps that don't have them. All ramps would be complete by 2017.

#### Crosswalks

- o Costs should be increased to \$25,000 per flashing pedestrian signals.
- o Gage and Fairlawn need flashing pedestrian signals.

#### Improvement Locations

- o Does the heat map include the major street reconstruction projects? No.
- o Why was the Jardine School area given priority? It's an area of high pedestrian demand, noted by the stakeholder advisory committee, and is planning to expand.
- o How were the focus areas selected? By combining the heat map, stakeholder committee comments, discussions with neighborhood groups, etc.
- o Ward Meade
  - Lots of work in the neighborhood to improve walkaibilty. Why not support a neighborhood that's already done work securing planning grants, etc?
     Other neighborhoods should be doing what we're doing. Add previous planning in the neighborhood as a criterion for selection.

- > Heat wasn't high due to neighborhood health Part is at risk
- Heat map is missing some elements Don't let the map discourage good neighborhood work.
- **Group E** Corridors and Complete Streets Linkages
  - o Competitive pool of money for improvements that weren't inventoried. After plan adoption, citizen advocacy could accelerate and increase funding for pedestrian projects. Funding sources are listed in the plan. We can revisit and update the plan, incorporate funding sources, etc.
    - > Funding beyond a sales tax is needed.
    - › Lots of people are working on walkability Need to know more about funding and neighborhood work.
    - > Walkability is trendy now Spin it to get projects funded.

#### **OTHER COMMENTS**

- Are you trying to eliminate brick sidewalks? No. City policy goal is preservation.
  - o Hard for people in wheelchairs.
  - o Repair for brick sidewalks is needed less often.
  - o City has brick streets (95% are to be preserved).
- 42% of survey respondents said they wanted to walk to shops, etc but busy streets were given "low priority" Contradiction? Wanted to avoid double county streets and commercial parcels. Assumed commercial corridors were part of pedestrians' route to destinations.
   o Bus routes are high but there aren't many routes
- Weighting sidewalks within a ½-mile buffer is incorrect and should extend farther as a priority area.

o Downtown's red on the heat map – There are a lot of sidewalks there.

#### **COMMENT FORMS**

Comment forms were given to all meeting participants. After the meeting, a total of 11 were returned. The responses have been tabulated and appear in the table on pages 95-97 of this report.



Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure
Goal 1 – A complete	4	2			
pedestrian network?					
Action 1a: Encourage	8	2			
pedestrian-friendly					
Action 1b: Continue to improve	<b>e</b> 9	1			
complete streets policies?					
Action 1c: Ensure all	7	3	1		
geographic sectors of the					
city are connected with a					
continuous sidewalk?					
Action 1d: Require complete	9	2			
sidewalks in new development	?				
Action 1e: Expand	9	2			
the walkability					
sidewalk network?					
Goal 2 – Maintained sidewalks	6				
for safe travel at all times					
Action 2a: Initiate a	11				
targeted, proactive					
sidewalks repair program?					
Action 2b: Expand the	9	1			1
affordability of the 50/50					
cost-share?					
Action 2c: Conduct	5	4	2		
and awareness					
Goal 3 – A safe and comfortable	<b>e</b> 3	1			2
walking environment?					
Action 3a: Continue to add	7	3			1
and maintain crosswalks?					
Action 3b: Increase pedestrian	- 7	2		1	1
focused lighting?					
Action 3c: Continue to	6	4			1
remove obstructions?					

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Unsure Disagree
Action 3d: Expand buffers between pedestrians and motorists?	5	2	1	3
Action 3e: Continue implementing ADA	7	3	1	
Goal 4 – A culture of walking	5			1
Action 4a: Implement	7	2	2	
programming that encourages children to				
Action 4b: Establish a complet streets advisory committee?	<b>e</b> 9	1	1	
Action 4c: Promote walking in neighborhoods through mixed use development?	9	2		
Do you agree with the recommended 13-year priority list?	1		1	
Do you agree with the recommended new sidewalk construction	6	4		
Do you agree with the recommended sidewalk repair projects?	9	1		
Do you agree with the recommended curb ramp improvement projects	6	2	1	1
Do you agree with the recommended crosswalk projects?	6	.5	1.5	2
Do you agree with street lightin or other amenities NOT include in the cost estimates?	ng 4 ed	2	1	1 1



What other questions do	I think this is the sort of planning needed in Topeka. I also think
you have?	this work can make Topeka more livable and a more attractive
	place to live. Thanks to all who have been involved.
	Why are people walking at night? They probably aren't. No need
	for lighting. Still confused as to why commercial and arterial
	streets were weighted so low. If that is the case, no need for
	crosswalk improvements to busy and mostly commercial streets.
	Previous investments are ignored when designating high priority
	areas – Ward Meade Neighborhood \$99,000 in Empowerment +
	\$5,000 in volunteer field surveys + \$1,500 software grant. Proxy
	for community development when not represented during
	traditional methods. Lack of demographics – older populations
	require better sidewalks. Bus routes – ½-mile buffer = high?
	Farther from bus routes requires more walkability, not closer to
	routes as in plan. Why is downtown red??? Lots of sidewalks there.
	I feel as though longer corridor streets such as 10 <sup>th</sup> would be
	utilized more than neighborhood areas. But since they don't have
	schools they are less of a priority. Would love to see HHN,
	Heartland Visioning, bikeways, way-finding, etc <u>all working</u>
	together! Also to find extra funding. Thank you! This is awesome!
	What can we as citizen do to help encourage and drive the
	continuous implementation of this plan? Beyond just participation
	on the complete streets committee, but continuing to follow up
	on the progress made and looking at new projects as they come
	up.
	Well thought plan. Thank you for your work for our community.
	This is wonderful. Thank you to city employees (planners)
	contractors (mpls) and elected officials for y our professionalism
	and serve to our residents.

Ē



# **APPENDIX B** LISTENING SESSIONS

In the spring of 2015, members of the planning team met with the following groups and individuals to gain their input on the Pedestrian Master Plan. Interviewees in these listening sessions were asked about the challenges for walking in Topeka, as well as what topics they would like to see covered in the forthcoming plan.

#### City of Topeka – Mayor (March 26th)

Larry Wolgast

#### City of Topeka – Neighborhood Relations (March 26th)

Richard Faulkner (Development Services) Monique Glaudé (Division Director, Community Engagement) Sasha Stiles (Department Director, Neighborhood Relations)

#### City of Topeka – Public Works (March 26th)

Jeff Hunt (Assistant City Engineer) Stan Meyers (City Engineer) Kent Pelton (Traffic Engineer)

#### Fast Forward Topeka (March 26th)

Kristen Brunkow (Heartland Visioning) Mikki Burcher (Burcher Consulting) Angela Lowe (Capitol Federal) Jennifer Owen (Fast Forward)

#### Kansas Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired (March 26th)

Nancy Johnson (Board Member)

#### Topeka Metro (April 23rd)

Susan Duffy (General Manager) Denise Ensley (Chief Operations Officer) Al Parrish (Director of Maintenance)

#### **Topeka Public Schools (May 5th)**

Rob Sietz (General Director of Central Services & Facilities Planning)



# **APPENDIX C** Community Pedestrian Survey

The following report on pages 100-114 summarizes the responses the planning team received from people who completed a www.surveygizmo.com survey about walking in Topeka.

Following the Gizmo Survey Summary Report is the Mapping Data Survey Report from pages 115-123. This report summarizes the responses the planning team received from people who completed a www.wikimapping.com mapping survey about walking in Topeka. Responses received from Community Workshop Number One attendees were also entered into the mapping survey by the planning team.



## **Topeka Pedestrian Master Plan: Survey Gizmo Summary Report**









\*Survey respondents in North Topeka and East Topeka are underrepresented in this data, which should be kept in mind as this report is reviewed. Responses are skewed in favor of people who live in West Topeka, where most survey respondents reside.














































































Online WikiMap Survey:

## INSTRUCTIONS

- **1 IDENTIFY** with stars the place(s) you like to walk to or would like to walk to.
- 2 DRAW with lines the route(s) you like to take to get to those places or would like to take.
- **3** MARK with circles the good spots and problem spots for walking.







All the data (598 entries):



To be a final de la constant de la c

The Good Stuff (184 entries):

The Bad Stuff (414 entries):





Good Spots (57 entries):



### What makes this a good spot? Check all that apply:





Place I Like to Walk to (43 entries):



Route I Like to Walk (84 entries):



### Why do you Like to Walk this Route? Check all that Apply:





Problem Spots (221 entries):



Place I Would Like to Walk to (62 entries):







Route I Would Like to Walk (131 entries):

### Why don't you currently walk this route? Check all that apply:



# **APPENDIX D** Pedestrian Plan Stakeholder Committee Notes



### **Stakeholder Committee**

Meeting #1 – March 25, 2015

Holliday Building Conference Room, 1st Floor

620 SE Madison, Topeka

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Members Present	Representing
Craig Barnes	Shawnee County Health Agency
Kevin Beck	Planning Commission
Jim Daniel	Heartland Visioning
Karl Fundenberger	Topeka Metro & Topeka Bikeways Advisory Committee
Trey George	Topeka Housing Authority
Nancy Johnson	Kansas Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired
Jocelyn Lyons	Jayhawk Area Agency on Aging
Teresa Miller	North Topeka West Neighborhood Improvement Association
Jim Ogle	Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization
Kent Pelton	City of Topeka Public Works
LJ Polly	Elmhurst Neighborhood Association
Bill Riphahn	Shawnee County Parks & Recreation
Sasha Stiles	City of Topeka Neighborhood Relations
Others Present	Representing
Bill Fiander	City of Topeka Planning
Shaun Murphy	Toole Design Group
Triveece Penelton	Vireo
Steve Rhoades	Vireo
Ciara Schlichting	Toole Design Group
Carlton Scroggins	Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization



### **Summary of Discussions**

#### Welcome and Introductions

Bill Fiander from the City of Topeka welcomed members of the stakeholder committee. Each person introduced themselves, the organization they represented, and the top thing they would like to accomplish with the Pedestrian Master Plan. Grouped into categories, the top things members want to accomplish are:

#### o Values and quality of life

Improved livability Reflect community values Create a life-long community (cradle to grave) where every can access needed resources Continue making a better, more holistic transportation system

#### o Safety

Do what needs to be done for safety, especially for the kids who travel to and from schools Connectivity from sidewalks to buses, especially from one busy street to the other and on both sides of the street, thereby making it easier for people to get around

#### o Trails

Existing and proposed trail system connections Have an organized, priority plan with more connectivity to the trails system Safety is overarching but there's also a need for access to transit plus quality of life for improved health through recreation

#### o Specific portions of the planning area

Older Neighborhoods: Sidewalks to take care of the people walking along busy streets that have ditches and semi-truck traffic

Older Neighborhoods: Want seniors to be able to have sidewalks that help them reach Wal-Mart and Dillon's, so they can push their carts without going into the street Highland Park area: Needs sidewalks plus curbs and gutters (have ditches now and people walk in the street)

Make it easier for everyone to walk – right now it's not, especially in Highland Park and other areas

#### o **Priorities**

Prioritize with equity in mind See priority list of projects that focuses resources High priority on safety for kids going to school (Safe Routes to School Programs)

#### • Implementation

In 10 years we never have to walk in the street to reach a major destinations (park, school, shopping area, or bus stop)

Have everyone marvel that we actually do what we say that we'll do

#### o Other

Pedestrian plan is nice for community redevelopment Learn more about pedestrian connectivity

#### **Roles & Responsibilities**

Bill Fiander from the City of Topeka explained the team approach. The consultants will do the work, and the stakeholder committee will advise the consultants, sift through public input, and make sure the plan reflects what people say. This plan will be presented to the Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization – Policy Board for approval. Representation which is currently missing from the stakeholder committee include schools, the Chamber of Commerce, and Topeka Independent Living Resource Center.

#### **Project Overview & Schedule**

Ciara Schlichting from Toole Design Group gave an overview of what a Pedestrian Master Plan is and what the schedule will be:

- A pedestrian plan is a document that identifies the issues affecting pedestrians.
- Many times it puts a price tag on projects so that funding can be identified.
- Good things for pedestrians will be sought out items like pedestrian scale lighting, green buffers, and smooth sidewalk surfaces.
- Bad things for pedestrians will be minimized items like the absence of sidewalks/ADA ramps, and cracked sidewalk surfaces.
- Different groups will be examined, such as children walking to school, pedestrians with disabilities, senior citizens, and those who would choose to walk instead of drive.
- Priority projects will be identified for 2016 2020, and a process to make decisions regarding new projects will be developed.
- Public input will guide the development of 6 to 8 focus areas.
- Field inventories will take place through July.
- The plan will be written between August and October, with plan adoption scheduled for November.

Discussion which followed included:

- LJ requested a copy of the schedule.
- Teresa inquired about representation from the Seaman School District 345, in addition to Topeka School District 501).
- Bill responded that the plan is to connect with Seaman via a one-on-one listening session because they make up only a portion of the planning area.
- Jim D wonders what public survey participation was like in Wichita.
- Ciara responded that a couple hundred surveys were returned, and believes more participation is possible in Topeka because of social media.

#### Reflections from March 24<sup>th</sup> Community Workshop

Triveece Penelton from Vireo gave an overview of the activities which took place at the March 24<sup>th</sup> community workshop. She described the mapping activities, and summarized that good and bad places to walk came in by geography and by type of place. The resulting maps showed that participants wanted a focus on the central city. There was good representation across the city.

Discussion which followed included:

- Jim O. thought consensus was easy to reach in their small group.
- Bill thought there were more good comments than bad comments. We need to answer the question of what is a bigger priority adding new sidewalks or maintaining existing ones. The responsibility for maintenance of sidewalks also needs to be examined.
- Carl said the meeting was a good start, but he thinks we need a lot more information, and the surveys will help reveal that.
- Carlton said the safety issue (e.g. pedestrians walking in the street) was a big deal over just thinking about sidewalk connectivity.
- Triveece reflected that we didn't hear much about connectivity to bus stops, but we did hear more about connectivity to the trail system.

#### Pedestrian Design

Shaun Murphy from Toole Design Group ran through many photos of physical aspects of streets and sidewalks which affect walkability.

Discussion which followed included:

- Nancy said that medians are difficult for visually impaired pedestrians to traverse because it is sometimes difficult to know when you can continue across the other half of the street.
- Ciara said that medians sometimes have push buttons.
- Nancy said that push buttons on medians would need to be audible.
- Jim Daniel wondered what sidewalk requirements are in subdivisions, and if that applies to 3acre and 20-acre lots.
- Bill responded that sidewalks in subdivisions are required, but that 3-acre and 20-acre lots do not constitute subdivisions.
- Kent asked if sidewalks were required in subdivisions when the streets were built, or if it is when the houses are built.
- Bill responded that sidewalks don't have to be built with the street, but rather when the houses are built. This results in a hodgepodge of sidewalks when only 10 out of 20 houses on a new street are built.
- Jim O. says he lives in a subdivision where empty lots haven't been built on in an 11-year period. He hopes we can address this going forward.
- A discussion took place about sidewalk depth.
- Jim D. asked if the County is involved.
- Carlton responded that Bill Riphahn is the County's representative.

#### **Visioning Exercise**

Ciara Schlichting from Toole Design Group split the stakeholder committee into groups of 3 to talk about their top priorities for what they would like to accomplish:



Afterward, each group reported back on their top 3 priorities. These were recorded on an Excel spreadsheet at the front of the room. Everyone then voted individually on their top 3 priorities for the Pedestrian Master Plan. The results of the voting are recorded in the following chart:

Item	Votes
Develop a good priority tool	6
Connectivity that improves safety and builds on existing streets with pedestrians	5
Improve safety by getting pedestrians out of the street	5
Improve safety of kids going to school, in high infrastructure needs areas	5
Reevaluating who pays for sidewalk improvements and maintenance	
Improve quality of life and health by addressing connectivity to trails and destinations	4
Find a separate funding source for related sewer infrastructure improvements	3
Develop long term goals for creating a connected pedestrian system over several decades	3
Enforce existing ordinance regarding sidewalk maintenance	2
Create a community norm over the first 5 years	2

#### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled by the group for Wednesday, May 27<sup>th</sup>, 4 to 6 p.m.





### **Stakeholder Committee**

Meeting #2 – May 27, 2015

Holliday Building Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor

620 SE Madison, Topeka

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Members Present	Representing
Kevin Beck	Planning Commission
Dale Cushinberry	Highland Acres Neighborhood Improvement Association
Jim Daniel	Heartland Visioning
Karl Fundenberger	Topeka Metro & Topeka Bikeways Advisory Committee
Trey George	Topeka Housing Authority
Jocelyn Lyons	Jayhawk Area Agency on Aging
Teresa Miller	North Topeka West Neighborhood Improvement Association
Jim Ogle	Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization
Kent Pelton	City of Topeka Public Works
LJ Polly	Elmhurst Neighborhood Association
Bill Riphahn	Shawnee County Parks & Recreation
Rob Seitz	Topeka Public Schools
Others Present	Representing
Bill Fiander	City of Topeka Planning
Shaun Murphy (telephone)	Toole Design Group
Triveece Penelton	Vireo
Ciara Schlichting (telephone)	Toole Design Group
Carlton Scroggins	Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization



### **Summary of Discussions**

#### Welcome and Introductions

Bill Fiander from the City of Topeka welcomed members of the stakeholder committee. Each person introduced themselves, the organization they represented, and the last great walk they went on. Walks included:

- Capitol Building
- Governor's Mansion
- Hillsdale Neighborhood
- Kansas Avenue
- Kansas River
- Knollwood Neighborhood
- Lake Shawnee
- Murray Hill Road
- Quincy Street bus station
- Sherwood Lake
- Smokey Mountain National Park
- Washburn University

#### **Review Project Overview and Schedule**

Ciara showed several Power Point slides reviewing the project and schedule.

#### **Public Input Summary**

Shaun reviewed a summary of the input received from the public. Afterward, discussion included the following:

- Bill wondered what was unique about Topeka compared to other cities.
- Ciara answered that nighttime lighting and bumpy sidewalk surfaces (including brick sidewalks) showed up as bigger issues here than in other cities.
- The issue of motorists not respecting pedestrians, and how that experience varies in severity, particularly when crossing the street.
- Bill referenced the 4<sup>th</sup> highest priority for improving the pedestrian environment, "Improved overall walking environment, with more green space, benches, other pedestrians, etc.," and said that he thinks that a buffer zone between pedestrians and cars contributes to this.
- Ciara added that trees, shade, and aesthetic improvements can improve the overall walking environment.



#### Vision, Goals, & Actions

Shaun gave an overview of the draft Vision, Goals, and Actions document. Questions and answers included:

- Bill asked what was meant by "health" in Goal #3, Action #3d.
- Shaun answered that the overall health of individuals (e.g. physical/mental health) was the intention.
- Bill asked Rob if he knew about health measures at schools.
- Rob answered that he wasn't sure, but he imagined there is some type of measurement.
- LJ asked what was meant by "boulevard" in Goal #1, Action #1b.
- Carlton and Bill answered that it refers to the environment of a street having well lit, continuous, safe, and well maintained sidewalks on both sides. These would likely be designated on arterial streets which connect neighborhoods. It does not necessarily mean a big, wide sidewalk.

Shaun then explained that we want to hear people's honest feedback about the document. Which ones excite people, which ones are missing the mark, etc.? Each individual then took 10 minutes to review the document and write down their thoughts. Then 4 groups were formed, and each group discussed their thoughts.



After about 30 minutes, Triveece asked each group for overall impressions.

#### Group 1 (Karl, Dale, Rob, Carlton)

- Had an overall positive impression of the Vision, Goals, & Actions they were thorough.
- Goal #1 was too broad and could be more specific.
- In Goal #2, we should be talking about the overall jurisdiction of sidewalk maintenance rather than about homeowner responsibilities.
- In Goal #3, the focus should be on good infrastructure, rather than focusing on groups of people, particularly if there is no rationale for calling out certain groups.



#### Group 2 (Jocelyn, Trey, LJ)

- The language used wasn't always easy to understand, and this affects project transparency. An example is the use of the phrase "Safe Routes."
- A lot of the actions seem to be impractical and pie in the sky for Topeka.
- In Goal #2, there was a concern that people who have low incomes won't be able to afford the 50% cost share for sidewalk repair.
- It seemed inaccurate to say that property owners should be educated in Action #2c, since they are already educated about their responsibility for snow removal.
- In Goal #3, Action #3d should be moved up to the position of #3a to reflect that it is the highest priority. It should also include bus routes.
- Action #3c regarding ADA accessibility needs to include something about signs, and the need for larger signs for older people who cannot see well, and that trees need to be trimmed around signs to improve visibility.
- Action #4c (lighting between intersections) seemed like a good one.

#### Group 3 (Teresa, Bill R, Jim D)

- The vision is too long. Take away the last sentence otherwise a group will get left out.
- There is never going to be enough money for some people to pay for 50% of sidewalk repair, and some people don't want sidewalks.
- Review the whole city, not just one area. Find the critical, missing links where the sidewalks were never built, in areas that already have sidewalks.
- Not sure that lighting is as important as was reflected in the public survey.
- Some schools do not allow kids to walk.
- Goal #5c regarding green space is a good idea, but who will maintain them?
- Sidewalks should be installed in a development immediately when the project is happening, instead of later.

#### Group 4 (Bill F, Kevin, Kent, Jim O)

- Complete streets help people to think about not only what is between the curbs, but from sidewalk to sidewalk. When the curb-to-curb portion of the street is fixed, that is also when sidewalks and lighting should be fixed.
- The city sales tax which is about to expire should include "sidewalks" in the new ballot measure.
- Where parks are referenced, trails should also be included, because they are synonymous.
- Combine Actions #3b and 5b.
- Merge Goals #4, #5, and possibly #6. Goal #5 is the most important, and safety (Goal #4) is a subset of a good overall pedestrian environment (Goal #5).



#### **Prioritization Activity**

Ciara explained the prioritization activity, and Triveece asked everyone to take 12 dots and place them in the categories of destinations, populations, and multi-modal transportation connections. People could place all 12 dots in one location, place 1 dot in 12 locations, or anything in between. The results of the activity were:

Destinations	Votes
Parks	12
Schools (elementary)	9
Major Cultural & Gov't Destinations (e.g. zoo, library)	6
Schools (middle)	6
Senior Centers	5
Community Centers	4
Washburn University	4
Business Districts	3
Downtown Topeka	3
Residential (high density)	3
Office	1
Schools (high)	1
Cemeteries	0
Industrial	0
Residential (low density)	0

Specific Populations	Votes
Children	10
People with Disabilities	9
Low Income Households	7
Seniors	7
Zero Car Households	5
People with Health Disparities	4
Visitors	1
College Students	0

Multimodal Transportation Connections	Votes
Streets with No Sidewalks	14
Streets with Existing Sidewalks in Poor Repair	13
Bus Routes	10
Heavier Traffic Streets (arterials)	8
Trails	4
Lighter Traffic Streets (neighborhood)	3
Streets with Bicycle Routes	3

#### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, July 29<sup>th</sup>, 4 to 6 p.m.





### **Stakeholder Committee**

Meeting #3 – July 29, 2015

Holliday Building Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor

620 SE Madison, Topeka

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Members Present	Representing
Craig Barnes	Shawnee County Health Agency
Kevin Beck	Planning Commission
Kristen Brunkow	Heartland Visioning
Dale Cushinberry	Highland Acres Neighborhood Improvement Association
Jim Daniel	Heartland Visioning
Karl Fundenberger	Topeka Metro & Topeka Bikeways Advisory Committee
Larry Hinton	Heartland Healthy Neighborhoods
Nancy Johnson	Kansas Association for the Blind & Visually Impaired
Teresa Miller	North Topeka West Neighborhood Improvement Association
Jim Ogle	Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization
LJ Polly	Elmhurst Neighborhood Association
Bill Riphahn	Shawnee County Parks & Recreation
Rob Seitz	Topeka Public Schools
Sasha Stiles	City of Topeka Neighborhood Relations
Emma Starkey	Community Resources Council & Heartland Healthy Neighborhoods
Others Present	Representing
Bill Fiander	City of Topeka Planning
Shaun Murphy (telephone)	Toole Design Group
Triveece Penelton	Vireo
Taylor Ricketts	Topeka Metro
Ciara Schlichting (telephone)	Toole Design Group
Carlton Scroggins	Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization



### **Summary of Discussions**

#### Welcome and Introductions

Bill Fiander from the City of Topeka welcomed members of the stakeholder committee. Each person introduced themselves and the organization they represented.

#### **Review Project Overview and Schedule**

Shaun showed a few Power Point slides reviewing the project overview and schedule, including the following changes:

- 1) Neighborhood engagement regarding field inventory work has been inserted in August and September.
- 2) Field inventory work has been pushed back from August to the September/October time frame.
- 3) The 4<sup>th</sup> steering committee meeting and Round 2 of public input have been pushed back 2 months to November.
- 4) Plan adoption is anticipated to occur in early 2016.

LJ asked what was meant by neighborhood engagement. Bill replied that face-to-face meetings would take place with those neighborhoods which are in priority areas. They will be asked what their pedestrian priorities are.

#### Update on Vision, Goals, & Actions

Shaun gave an update on Vision, Goals, & Actions document, which is the outline of the plan which will be drafted over the coming months. The feedback received at the May stakeholder committee meeting was used as a guide for making changes. After running through a few examples of how committee feedback was utilized, Shaun highlighted the following overall changes:

- 1) The goals and actions were consolidated and shrunk from 6 goals and 20 actions into 4 goals and 16 actions.
- 2) The use of insider jargon was removed for several less well-known phrases.
- 3) Internal departments at the City of Topeka conducted a review, and many of their suggestions were included in the updated version.

Shaun welcomed stakeholder committee members to contact the project team about any ideas, questions, or concerns in the next 7 days before work begins on drafting the plan.

Jim D. asked what departments reviewed the document, and how the discussion went. Bill answered that Public Works and Neighborhood Relations were involved, and that there were 4 main areas of discussion:

- Could staff manage the 50/50 cost-share projects?
- Language corrections related to pedestrian signals and crosswalks.
- Maintenance practices for sidewalks (proactive vs. non-proactive strategies in relationship to high priority areas).
- Sidewalk snow removal (relationship to high priority/demand areas) and the political issues associated with ticketing for lack of snow removal.

A short discussion ensued on snow removal, including public awareness, neighborhood involvement, and the use of volunteerism.



#### **High Priority Pedestrian Areas**

Ciara reviewed the voting activity that took place at the end of the May meeting, and illustrated how the results were used to create a series of 10 heat maps, including parks and schools. The 10 maps were combined into one composite map, which has a color scale (red = high priority, blue = low priority) to show priority areas for pedestrians.

Ciara asked committee members to draw up to 4 to 6 shapes and/or lines on the map, in addition to the 4 red areas in North Topeka, East Topeka, Highcrest, and Downtown. She explained that the committee's input will help inform the locations for field inventory in September and October.

Committee members then split into 4 groups and discussed their ideas.



After about 30 minutes, Triveece asked each group to present their ideas:

#### Group 1 (presented by Emma)

- Jardine school expansion area near 29<sup>th</sup> & Randolph
- Gage Park
- Highland Park

#### Group 2 (presented by Bill R.)

- North Topeka streets including NW Vail Ave, NW Lower Silver Lake Road, NW Lyman Road, and NW Gordon Ave
- Planned trails including the Oregon Trail, KAW Trail, Deer Creek Trail, and connections from Lake Shawnee to Deer Creek Trail and SE 45<sup>th</sup> Street
- Perimeter walks around Gage Park and Washburn University
- SW 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue near MacVicar
- East Topeka streets including SE California Ave, SE 25<sup>th</sup> Street, SE 29<sup>th</sup> Street, and SE 45<sup>th</sup> Street

#### Group 3 (presented by Jim O.)

- The Highland Park neighborhood and SE California Ave
- The cross town corridor of SW 29<sup>th</sup> Street and SE 29<sup>th</sup> Street
- West Topeka streets including Gage Boulevard, SW 17<sup>th</sup> Street, and SW 21<sup>st</sup> Street between the VA and Downtown

#### Group 4 (presented by Karl)

- Oakland neighborhood
- West Topeka streets including SW Gage Blvd, SW MacVicar Ave, SW Topeka Blvd, SW 8<sup>th</sup> Ave, SW 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW Huntoon Street, and SW 37<sup>th</sup> Street

#### Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 4 to 6 p.m.; followed by a public meeting scheduled for Wednesday, November 18<sup>th</sup>, 4 to 6 p.m.



## **Stakeholder Committee**

Meeting #4 – January 6, 2016

Holliday Building Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor

620 SE Madison, Topeka

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Members Present	Representing
Kevin Beck	Planning Commission
Terry Coder	City of Topeka Public Works – Traffic Engineering
Jim Daniel	Heartland Visioning
Mariah Debacker	Community Resources Council
Karl Fundenberger	Topeka Metro & Topeka Bikeways Advisory Committee
Trey George	Topeka Housing Authority
Sasha Haehn	City of Topeka Neighborhood Relations
Larry Hinton	Heartland Healthy Neighborhoods
John Hunter	Heartland Visioning
Nancy Johnson	Kansas Association for the Blind & Visually Impaired
Jocelyn Lyons	Jayhawk Area Agency on Aging
Teresa Miller	North Topeka West Neighborhood Improvement Association
Kent Pelton	City of Topeka Public Works – Traffic Engineering
Maren Peterson	Community Resources Council
LJ Polly	Elmhurst Neighborhood Association
Bill Riphahn	Shawnee County Parks & Recreation
Rob Seitz	Topeka Public Schools
Emma Starkey	Community Resources Council & Heartland Healthy Neighborhoods
Others Present	Representing
Bill Fiander	City of Topeka Planning
Susan Hanzlik	City of Topeka Planning
Shaun Lopez-Murphy (telephone)	Toole Design Group
Triveece Penelton	Vireo
Taylor Ricketts	City of Topeka Planning
Ciara Schlichting (telephone)	Toole Design Group
Carlton Scroggins	Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization
Dan Warner	City of Topeka Planning



### **Summary of Discussions**

#### Welcome and Introductions

Bill Fiander from the City of Topeka welcomed members of the stakeholder committee. Each person introduced themselves and the organization they represented.

#### Project Update

Ciara showed Power Point slides reviewing the project schedule. She then updated the committee on what the project team has accomplished since the July meeting:

- Neighborhood meetings
- Field inventory
- Project priority list

Questions from committee members, and follow-up answers (provided by Bill F.) included the following:

*Q: What was learned at the neighborhood meetings?* A: The neighborhoods helped narrow the field inventory areas down to reasonable size.

*Q: Did you consider all of the schools? There are a couple missing in North Topeka*. A: Yes, but we missed putting Heritage Christian School and Logan School on the map. Those will be added.

#### Draft Master Plan

Shaun showed PowerPoint slides giving an overview of the draft master plan, including:

- Executive Summary
- Chapter 1 Public Input
- Chapter 2 A Complete Pedestrian Network (Goal 1)
- Chapter 3 Maintained Sidewalks (Goal 2)
- Chapter 4 Safety & Comfort (Goal 3)
- Chapter 5 A Culture of Walking (Goal 4)

Questions/comments from committee members, and answers (provided by Bill F. unless otherwise noted) included the following:

Q/C: Income-based requirements can lower participation in cost share programs due to the associated stigma. A: The point of the sidewalk cost share program is to be used, so the City will monitor it to see if participation increases or decreases after the sliding scale income adjustments are made.

Q/C: Topeka Public Works staff will be providing more comments on Actions 3a and 3b.

Q/C: What can be done to help people who get stuck in the center of US-24 when crossing the street? A (provided by Terry): The signal timing may need to be changed if there is a high frequency of slow pedestrians crossing at particular stoplights.

Q/C: Are we going to put lighting on trails? A (provided by Bill R.): No, some areas are isolated and we don't want to encourage the idea that such areas are safe.

Q/C: There will be logistical elements to discuss at Heartland Healthy Neighborhoods, regarding the proposed Complete Streets Advisory Committee. A: The plan suggests that representation on the proposed committee should be similar to this Pedestrian Plan Stakeholder Committee.


Q/C: Does Action 4a include kids walking to catch school buses? Kids are standing in a muddy area while waiting for a bus (St. John at Taylor). A: Yes.

Q/C: More weight should be given to Jardine Middle School, since it is undergoing an expansion and will have more kids walking. A. We will build flexibility into the priority project list so that the City can respond to unforeseen changes such as this one.

#### **Field Inventory & Priority Projects**

Triveece reviewed the results of the field inventory, which captured over 2,000 points covering the following project types:

- New Sidewalks
- Repair of Existing Sidewalks
- Curb Ramp Improvements
- Crosswalk Improvements

She also showed the proposed order for carrying out these priority projects. Intervening discussion about funding these projects occurred throughout this portion of the meeting.



Questions/comments from committee members, and answers (provided by Bill F. unless otherwise noted) included the following:

Q/C: Public Works uses many factors to determine the location of crosswalks. A: Public Works will need to rule if a crosswalk is needed or not – this is only intended to be a planning level estimate of what would be needed to fund crosswalks in these areas.

Q/C: Neighborhood Improvement Associations need to communicate the importance of patience and remind residents that projects are coming.

Q/C: Fundraising and getting people involved will improve buy-in for carrying out this project list.

Q/C: This looks like a logical way to order the projects, but elected officials will want to order this list in ways that fit into their own priority system, on a year-to-year basis.

*Q/C:* Satisfied with focusing on the Quincy Elementary area in East North Topeka, as opposed to West North Topeka – the school area is low income and they need the help.

Q/C: There is a donut of missing sidewalks because of the lack of regulation requiring sidewalks after World War II. This is now coming back to bite us. A: The challenge we have is with redevelopment in these areas.

#### **Next Steps**

Bill reviewed next steps:

- The public meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup> from 6pm to 8pm. Committee members were encouraged to attend.
- Comments on the draft plan are due by February 3<sup>rd</sup>, and should be sent to Bill F. or Carlton.
- The plan will have one more round of edits, and then it will go to the Metropolitan Topeka Policy Board for adoption on Thursday, February 25<sup>th</sup>.



# **APPENDIX E** Neighborhood Meetings

In the late summer and fall of 2015, members of the planning team attended the following neighborhood meetings to gain their input on the Pedestrian Master Plan. Meeting attendees were given background on the planning process, and then were asked to point to priority areas for the forthcoming field inventory in their neighborhoods.

Central Highland Park (September 14th) **Central Park** (September 17th) Chesney Park (September 10th) Crestview (September 8th) East Topeka North (September 3rd) East Topeka South (September 28th) **Elmhurst** (August 12th) **Hi-Crest** (August 27th) Historic Holliday Park (November 17th) Historic Old Town (October 4th) North Topeka East (September 14th) North Topeka West (September 14th) **Oakland** (August 17th) Tennessee Town (September 14th) Ward Meade (September 24th)



# **APPENDIX F** Complete Streets Checklist

### **COMPLETE STREETS POLICY** And RECOMMENDED ACTION PLAN Metropolitan Topeka Planning Organization

Heading	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Design Considerations	2
Policy Statement	3
Implementation Strategies	3
Project Checklist	4
Staff Committee	7
Health Assessment Criteria	7
Resolution	

Adopted by the MTPO July 1, 2011

## MTPO COMPLETE STREETS POLICY and RECOMMENDED ACTION PLAN

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Elected officials, planning commissions, health organizations, transportation related entities and other decision makers, as well as the general public, are increasingly recognizing that designs for our community's streets must achieve an appropriate balance in service to all modes of transportation and the role transportation plays in increasing the livability of a community. An effective complete street design accommodates modes of all types, including passenger vehicles, trucks, pedestrians, bicycles, motorcycles/scooters, public transit, as well as users of all ages and abilities. Facilities for each mode and user must be provided in a comprehensive, yet safe manner. Additionally, adequate space must be provided for all the requirements of utilities and the other traditional uses of our street rights-of-way. Any street design that successfully meets all of these needs is typically referred to as a *complete street*.

It is recognized that achieving a complete streets retrofit for existing urban streets at times presents a challenge. To this end, the concept of complete "corridors" must be considered in the development of a complete streets policy for the region. This is not only a matter of necessity, but an innovative way to address the challenges of a city built for cars first and non-motorized modes second. In other words, a "travel shed" should be considered whereby parallel streets may need to accommodate specific modes of transportation, rather than converting every street into a complete street.

There is no uniform design for a complete street. The features of compete streets vary based on context, topography, road functions, the speed of traffic, pedestrian and bicycle demand, and another factors. Based on road specific context, common features of complete streets include:

- Sidewalks
- Paved Shoulders
- Bike Lanes
- Safe Crossing Points
- Accessible Curb Ramps
- Pedestrian Refuge Medians
- Bus Stop Access
- Sidewalk "bump-outs" at intersections
- Access to adjacent trails in a "Corridor"

This report is a result of collaboration among the Policy Board, TAC, and the planning partners. It is meant as a guide for each governmental agency to consider when developing its own complete streets policy and action steps.



#### **DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS**

A complete streets policy is not a design manual. Rather, it is a policy stating that all modes of transportation should be considered in the construction and improvement of our street network. No one design fits all streets. Every complete street evolves from a process of evaluating a number of factors that influence its ultimate design. Specific design standards are found in various ordinances, policies, standards, and plans adopted by the governing bodies and transportation providers. Many of these are referenced below. Design standards and specifications vary among jurisdictions; and, they can even vary within a particular jurisdiction depending upon the particular need, limitations or opportunities of the existing street.

In any urban county across America, there are potentially thousands of miles of local streets, hundreds of miles of principal arterials, minor arterials, and collectors. It is, therefore, necessary to choose from a broad selection of available guidelines and criteria when implementing a Complete Streets policy. The following is a list of various documents and guidelines presently available for consideration for all elements of Complete Streets projects.

Primary Types of Mobility	<u>Design Guidelines</u>
Pedestrian	<ul> <li>City of Topeka Design Criteria &amp; Drafting Standards</li> <li>Publications and Design Standards from the Institute of Traffic Engineers</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Topeka-Shawnee County Regional Trails and Greenways Plan</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities</li> <li>Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Accessibility for the Disabled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities</li> <li>Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</li> <li>City of Topeka Design Criteria &amp; Drafting Standards</li> </ul>
• Bicycle	<ul> <li>Topeka-Shawnee County Regional Trails and Greenways Plan</li> <li>Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</li> <li>City of Topeka Design Criteria &amp; Drafting Standards</li> <li>Publications and Design Standards from the Institute of Traffic Engineers</li> </ul>
• Mass Transit	<ul> <li>City of Topeka Design Criteria &amp; Drafting Standards</li> <li>Publications and Design Standards from the Institute of Traffic Engineers</li> <li>Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities</li> <li>KDOT Standard Specifications</li> <li>American Association of State Highway and</li> </ul>



Transportation Officials, A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets (AASHTO)

- Automobile City of Topeka Design Criteria & Drafting Standards
  - Publications and Design Standards from the Institute of Traffic Engineers
  - Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
  - KDOT Standard Specifications
  - American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets (AASHTO)

#### POLICY STATEMENT

The MTPO's complete streets policy has been adopted by the Policy Board and is attached to this report as a reference. The TAC will work with the Policy Board and the planning partners to work out a detailed process and possible standards for inclusion of projects in the TIP. Each governmental agency is encouraged to adopt its own policy statement.

#### **RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES**

The following strategies are provided as possible ideas for implementation of a complete streets policy by the region's governing bodies and transportation providers. These strategies are suggested as a guide only. Each entity should develop its own standards, as appropriate.

- 1. Develop a model complete streets project checklist for use by the consultants and staff when designing street projects.
- 2. Create a staff committee to review each major street project for compliance with the complete streets policy using a set of "health assessment criteria".
- 3. Incorporate recommendations into future TIP projects.
- 4. Consider amendments to applicable traffic regulations specific to bicycles, and pedestrians based on fulfillment of the Complete Streets policy.
- 5. Consider amendments to all applicable subdivision regulations that would implement the complete streets policy, such as:
  - a. Developing a "connectivity index" to ensure new subdivisions provide adequate connectivity to adjacent existing and future developments; and
  - b. Revising the subdivision application form to require new developments to indicate how conformance to the complete streets policy is being achieved.
- 6. Annually budget funds in the Capital Improvement Plan for implementation of complete streets, especially in support of existing or planned projects.
- 7. Apply for federal and state grants to help implement the complete streets policy, such as federal Transportation Enhancement Grant administered by KDOT.



#### PROJECT CHECKLIST

- 5. What accommodations for transit, bicycles and pedestrians are now incorporated along the current facility and along the facilities it intersects or crosses?

5a. Please provide specifics for any items listed above.

- 6. If there are no existing pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel walkways and bikeways, or transit stops?
- 7. Please indicate any particular non-motorized transit uses or needs along the project corridor that you have observed or of which have been informed.
- 8. What existing challenges could the proposed project improve for transit, bicycle, or pedestrian travel in the vicinity of the proposed project?
- 9. What trip generators (existing and future) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract transit, walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others?
- 10. In the project design, have you considered collisions, including those involving bicyclists and pedestrians, along the route of the facility?

10a. If so, what resources have you consulted?

10b. If so, what are your conclusions?

11. Does the adopted bicycle plan, or other neighborhood or transportation plans call for the development of transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities on, crossing, or adjacent to the proposed facility/project?

11a. Is the proposed project consistent with these plans?

12. Do any local, state, or federal policies call for incorporating transit, bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities into this project?



12a. If so, have the policies been followed?

- 13. If this project includes a transit, bicycle or pedestrian facility, have all applicable design standards or guidelines been followed?
- 14. Has the proposed project received any comments or suggestions from the public? If so, please specify.
- 15. What accommodations, if any, are included for transit patrons, bicycles and pedestrians in the proposed project design?
- 16. Will the proposed project remove an existing transit, bicycle or pedestrian facility, or block or hinder bicycle or pedestrian movement?

16a. If yes, please describe the situation in detail.

- 17. Will the proposed project temporarily block or reroute any existing modes of transportation during the duration of its construction?
  - 17a. If yes, please describe the corrective accommodation to preserve the function of these facilities.
- 18. If the proposed project does not incorporate transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or if the proposed project would hinder or these types of mobility options, list reasons why the project cannot be re-designed to accommodate these facilities.

18a. What would be the cost of incorporating each of these types of facilities?

18b. What is each facility's proportion of the total project cost?

- 19. What agency will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the each type of facility?
- 20. How will ongoing maintenance be budgeted?



#### **STAFF COMMITTEE**

A Complete Streets Committee, if a governing body or planning partner decided to create one, could consist of staff members responsible for providing transportation services or with responsibilities for designing, planning, or reviewing transportation or neighborhood development related issues. An example of a standing staff committee would include staff similar to the following:

- Economic development staff
- Planner
- Architect
- Engineer
- Traffic Engineer
- Parks and Recreation Director
- Transit Planner (TMTA)

Duties of the Committee should be defined by the particular jurisdiction or governing body. Duties could include:

- 1. Define "major street project".
- 2. Review major street projects for compliance with the complete streets policy. Other individuals and groups, such as neighborhood organizations should be consulted when appropriate.
- 3. Make recommendations to the City Manager for changes to city codes, policies and regulations in support of the complete streets policy.
- 4. Identify potential street corridors for priority complete streets treatment.

#### POSSIBLE "HEALTH" ASSESSMENT CRITERIA WHEN CONSIDERING PROJECTS

#### **Primary Types of Mobility**

- Pedestrian
- Accessibility for the Disabled
- Bicycle
- Mass Transit
- Complete System

#### Criteria – Pedestrian

Sidewalks

#### Crosswalks

Lighting

#### Criteria – Disabled

- Ramped curb cuts
- Texture differentiations for blind
- Mass Transit Accommodations
- Crossing signals

#### Criteria – Bicycle

- Direct routes to destinations
- Clearly marked bicycle lanes
- Separation from sidewalks
- Destination specific routes
- Crossing signals

#### Criteria – Mass Transit

- Designated transit stops
- Shelter from rain and sun
- Accessibility to shelter from sidewalk
- Posted schedules of service

#### **Goal: % Policy Compliance**

- 100% 100% 100%
- 100%
- 100%

#### Measurement

- Percentage of provision
- Width
- Shade and shelter
- Separation from adjacent street
- Separation from bicycle traffic
- Provision of shade and structures
- Connectivity in all directions
- Percentage of provision
- Location and frequency of provision
- Functional for motorized traffic
- Percent of coverage
- Lighting at crosswalks
- Perception of adequate safety
- Intensity specific for surrounding uses

#### Measurement

- Percentage of provision
- Percentage of provision
- Frequency of accommodations
- Hand or camera activated

#### Measurement

- Mileage required to reach destination
- Mileage of arterial and collector streets
- Mileage of bicycle unique provisions
- Least distance to reach destination
- Hand or camera activated

#### Measurement

- Specific to origin and destination
- Percentage of provision
- Percentage of provision
- Percentage of provision

# **APPENDIX G** Planned Street Reconstruction Project



Planned street reconstruction projects are shown in purple lines above, and listed in the chart below. These projects typically include construction of new sidewalks or reconstruction of existing sidewalks.

Project	Limits	Planned Year of Reconstruction
SW 10th Avenue	Gage Blvd to Fairlawn Rd	2015
SW 6th Avenue	Wanamaker Rd to I-70 Bridge	2015
SW 37th Street	Gage Blvd to Burlingame Rd	2015/2016
SE California Avenue	33rd St to 37th St	2016
SE California Avenue	29th St to 33rd St	2017
SW 10th Avenue	Wanamaker Rd to Fairlawn Rd	2017-2020
SW 6th Avenue	Fairlawn rd to Gae Blvd	2019
SW 12th Street (2 lanes)	Gage Blvd to Kansas Ave	2020
SE California Avenue	37th St to 45th St	2021
SW 17th Street	I-470 to MacVicar Ave	2024
SW Huntoon Street (2 lanes)	Gage Blvd to SW Harrison St	2025
SW Topeka Boulevard (5 lanes)	15th St to 21st St	2026
SW 29th Street	Wanamaker St to Fairlawn Rd	2026
SW 37th Street	Burlingame to Scapa Pl	2028
SW 17th Street	Washburn Ave to Adams St	2028
NE Seward Avenue	Sumner St to Forest Ave	2029
SE 37th Street	Kansas Ave to Adams St	2029



# **APPENDIX H** School Walking Routes

The following 14 maps are Topeka's 2008, USD 501 Safe Routes to School Maps for the following elementary schools:

- Highland Park Central Pp. 151
  - Lowman Hill **Pp. 152** 
    - McCarter Pp. 153
      - McClure Pp. 154
    - McEachron Pp. 155
      - Meadows Pp. 156
        - Quincy **Pp.157**
      - Randolph Pp.158
        - Ross Pp. 159
- Scott Dual Language Magnet Pp. 160
  - State Street Pp. 161
    - Stout **Pp. 162**
    - Whitson Pp. 163
- William Science/Fine Arts Magnet Pp. 164



#### **USD 501 - Highland Park Central Attendance Boundary**



151

#### **USD 501 - Lowman Hill Attendance Boundary**



## USD 501 - Mc Carter Attendance Boundary



## **USD 501 - Mc Clure Attendance Boundary**



154

### **USD 501 - Mc Eachron Attendance Boundary**





#### **USD 501 - Meadows Attendance Boundary**





### USD 501 - Quincy Attendance Boundary





#### USD 501 - Randolph Attendance Boundary



158

## USD 501 - Ross Attendance Boundary





### USD 501 - Scott Magnet Attendance Boundary





#### **USD 501 - State Street Attendance Boundary**





### **USD 501 - Stout Attendance Boundary**





### **USD 501 - Whitson Attendance Boundary**





#### USD 501 - William Magnet Attendance Boundary





# **APPENDIX I-A** Field Inventory Report

# **Inventory Assumptions and Variables**

#### **Sidewalk Improvements**

- Less than100ft; calculations based on maximum length of 100 LF.
- 100-300ft; calculations based on a median value of 200 LF.
- 301-500ft; calculations based on a median value of 400 LF.
- More than 500ft; calculations based on minimum length of 500 LF.
- Repair calculations based on an average block length of 400 LF.
- Non-brick sidewalks; MTPO policy to determine final material
- Focus improvement activities on areas with moderate and severe needs

#### **Curb Ramp Improvements**

• Calculations based on repairing curb ramps for an entire intersection (4 corners).

#### **Crosswalk Improvements**

- Reviewed only streets with 5 or more lanes.
- Reviewed locations near schools.
- Reviewed existing crosswalks that lacked and/or needed painting.

New Sidewalk - \$72/LF Repair Sidewalk - \$72/LF Curb Ramp add Domes - \$500 EA New Curb Ramp - \$2,000 EA Painted Crosswalk - \$500 EA Refuge Island - \$16,000 EA School Crossing - \$1,000 EA Flashing Pedestrian Sign - \$25,000 EA



## Area #1 – North Topeka West

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	19	5,200	0.98	\$374,400		
Norepairsneeded	9	3,600	0.68	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	3	700	0.13	\$50,400		
Severedisrepair	11	3,400	0.64	\$244,800		
Total	51	14,200	2.69	\$ <b>699,600</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	9	1,300	0.25	\$93,600		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Ramps	Cost		
Noimprovementneeded	3	12	\$0		
Goodrepair, buttruncated	3	12	\$6,000		
domesareneeded					
Disrepair	6	24	\$48,000		
Noramp	15	60	\$120,000		
Total	27	108	\$174,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	8	16	\$8,000		
PedestrianRefugeIsland	2	4	\$16,000		
SchoolCrosswalk	0	0	\$0		
FlashingWarningSigns	0	0	\$0		
Total	10	20	\$24,000		

North Topeka West Total Improvement Cost = \$867,600





## Area #2 – North Topeka East

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost	
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	56	18,100	3.43	\$1,303,200	
Norepairsneeded	12	4,800	0.91	\$0	
Moderatedisrepair	8	1,900	0.36	\$136,800	
Severedisrepair	33	11,100	2.10	\$799,200	
Total	127	37,800	7.16	\$ <b>2,239,200</b>	
Savings (Minordisrepair)	18	1,900	0.36	\$136,800	

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Number of Ramps	Cost		
Noimprovementneeded	0	0	\$0		
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	14	56	\$28,000		
Disrepair	13	52	\$104,000		
Noramp	9	36	\$72,000		
Total	36	144	\$204,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
PaintedCrosswalk	9	18	\$9,000		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	4	8	\$32,000		
SchoolCrosswalk	0	0			
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0		
Total	13	26	\$41,000		

North Topeka East Total Improvement Cost = \$2,484,200





## Area #3 – Oakland

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost	
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	31	9,700	1.84	\$698,400	
Norepairsneeded	7	2,800	0.53	\$0	
Moderatedisrepair	37	8,000	1.52	\$576,000	
Severedisrepair	6	2,100	0.40	\$151,200	
Total	113	27,900	5.28	\$1, <b>425,600</b>	
Savings (Minordisrepair)	32	5,300	1.00	\$381,600	

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements						
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost			
Noimprovement needed	7	28	\$0			
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	1	4	\$2,000			
Disrepair	27	108	\$216,000			
Noramp	7	28	\$56,000			
Total	42	168	\$274,000			

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	9	18	\$9,000		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0		
SchoolCrosswalk	6	6	\$6,000		
Flashing Warning Signs	2	2	\$50,000		
Total	17	26	\$ <b>65,000</b>		

OaklandTotalImprovementCost=\$1,764,600





## Area #4 – East Topeka North

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost	
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	38	11,900	2.25	\$856,800	
Norepairsneeded	38	15,200	2.88	\$0	
Moderatedisrepair	5	1,200	0.23	\$86,400	
Severedisrepair	6	2,100	0.40	\$151,200	
Total	105	32,700	6.20	\$ <b>1,094,400</b>	
Savings (Minordisrepair)	18	2,300	0.44	\$165,600	

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements				
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost	
No improvement needed	4	16	\$0	
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	б	24	\$12,000	
Disrepair	1	4	\$8,000	
Noramp	14	56	\$112,000	
Total	25	100	\$132,000	

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements				
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost	
Painted Crosswalk	10	20	\$10,000	
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0	
SchoolCrosswalk	4	4	\$4,000	
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0	
Total	14	24	\$14,000	

EastTopekaNorthTotalImprovementCost=\$1,240,400





## Area #5 – East Topeka South

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost	
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	22	6,300	1.19	\$453,600	
Norepairsneeded	13	5,200	0.98	\$0	
Moderatedisrepair	18	4,100	0.78	\$295,200	
Severedisrepair	22	7,500	1.42	\$540,000	
Total	96	25,200	4.77	\$1, <b>288,800</b>	
Savings (Minordisrepair)	21	2,100	0.40	\$151,200	

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements				
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost	
Noimprovementneeded	6	24	\$0	
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	6	24	\$12,000	
Disrepair	15	60	\$120,000	
Noramp	23	92	\$184,000	
Total	50	200	\$316,000	

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements				
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost	
Painted Crosswalk	25	50	\$25,000	
Pedestrian Refuge Island	6	12	\$48,000	
SchoolCrosswalk	0	0	\$0	
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0	
Total	31	62	\$73,000	

East Topeka South Total Improvement Cost = \$1,677,800




# Area #6 – Central Highland Park

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	93	31,700	6.00	\$2,282,400		
Norepairsneeded	3	1,200	0.23	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	8	2,000	0.38	\$144,000		
Severedisrepair	8	2,000	0.40	\$151,200		
Total	123	38,600	7.31	\$ <b>2,577,600</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	11	1,600	0.30	\$115,200		

Table2: CurbRamp Improvements					
ProjectType	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Ramps	Cost		
Noimprovement needed	1	4	\$0		
Needs repair, buttruncate domesareneeded	ed 8	32	\$16,000		
Disrepair	1	4	\$8,000		
Noramp	36	144	\$288,000		
Total	46	184	\$312,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements						
ProjectType	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost			
Painted Crosswalks	2	4	\$2,000			
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0			
School Crosswalk	0	0	\$0			
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0			
Total	2	4	\$2,000			

Central Highland ParkTotal Improvement Cost = \$2,891,600





# Area #7 – Highland Crest

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	22	9,800	1.86	\$705,600		
Norepairsneeded	3	1,200	0.23	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	2	400	0.08	\$28,800		
Severedisrepair	0	0	0	\$0		
Total	59	15,200	2.88	\$ <b>734,400</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	32	3,800	0.72	\$273,600		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements						
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost			
Noimprovement needed	1	4	\$0			
Good repair, but truncated	20	80	\$40,000			
domesareneeded						
Disrepair	0	0	\$0			
Noramp	11	44	\$88,000			
Total	32	128	\$128,000			

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	3	6	\$3,000		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0		
SchoolCrosswalk	2	2	\$2,000		
Flashing Warning Signs	2	2	\$50,000		
Total	7	10	\$55,000		

Highland Crest Total Improvement Cost = \$917,400





#### Area #8 – Downtown Topeka

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	9	2,800	0.53	\$201,600		
Norepairsneeded	33	13,200	2.50	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	5	900	0.17	\$64,800		
Severedisrepair	0	0	0	\$0		
Total	69	19,700	3.73	\$ <b>266,400</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	22	2,800	0.53	\$201,600		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements						
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost			
Noimprovement needed	2	8	\$0			
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	10	40	\$20,000			
Disrepair	6	24	\$48,000			
Noramp	5	20	\$40,000			
Total	23	92	\$108,000			

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements						
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost			
PaintedCrosswalk	13	26	\$13,000			
Pedestrian Refuge Island	4	8	\$32,000			
School Crosswalk	0	0	\$0			
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0			
Total	17	34	\$45,000			

DowntownTopekaTotalImprovementCost=\$419,400





#### Area #9 – Central Park

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	23	5,600	1.06	\$403,200		
Norepairsneeded	28	11,200	2.12	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	22	5,400	1.02	\$388,800		
Severedisrepair	20	6,300	1.19	\$453,600		
Total	122	32,000	6.05	\$1 <b>,245,600</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	29	3,500	0.66	\$252,000		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost		
Noimprovement needed	16	64	\$0		
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	2	8	\$4,000		
Disrepair	10	40	\$80,000		
Noramp	20	80	\$160,000		
Total	48	192	\$244,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements						
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost			
Painted Crosswalk	5	10	\$5,000			
Pedestrian Refuge Island	1	2	\$8,000			
SchoolCrosswalk	1	1	\$1,000			
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0			
Total	7	13	\$14,000			

Central ParkTotal ImprovementCost=\$1,503,600





#### Area #10 – Tennessee Town

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	2	400	0.08	\$28,800		
Norepairsneeded	32	12,800	2.42	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	7	1,300	0.25	\$93,600		
Severedisrepair	7	2,500	0.47	\$180,000		
Total	113	27,900	3.47	\$ <b>302,400</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	9	1,300	0.25	\$93,600		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost		
Noimprovement needed	1	4	\$0		
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	6	24	\$12,000		
Disrepair	4	16	\$32,000		
Noramp	2	8	\$16,000		
Total	13	52	\$60,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0		
School Crosswalk	0	0	\$0		
FlashingWarningSigns	0	0	\$0		
Total	0	0	\$0		

TennesseeTownTotalImprovementCost=\$362,400





# Area #11 – Historic Holliday Park

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost	
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	0	0	0	\$0	
Norepairsneeded	3	1,200	0.23	\$0	
Moderatedisrepair	17	5,000	0.95	\$360,000	
Severedisrepair	7	2,200	1.71	\$151,200	
Total	113	27,900	5.28	\$ <b>518,400</b>	
Savings (Minordisrepair)	6	600	0.11	\$43,200	

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements						
ProjectType	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost			
No improvement needed	3	12	\$0			
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	7	28	\$14,000			
Disrepair	1	4	\$8,000			
Noramp	2	8	\$16,000			
Total	13	52	\$38,000			

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0		
School Crosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0		
Total	0	0	\$0		

HistoricHollidayParkTotalImprovementCost=\$556,400





#### Area #12 – Elmhurst

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	3	1,000	0.19	\$72,000		
Norepairsneeded	14	5,600	1.06	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	13	2,500	0.47	\$180,000		
Severedisrepair	4	1,000	0.19	\$72,000		
Total	49	11,800	2.23	\$ <b>324,000</b>		
Savings (Minor disrepair)	15	1,700	0.32	\$122,400		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost		
No improvement needed	0	0	\$0		
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	13	52	\$26,000		
Disrepair	2	8	\$16,000		
Noramp	1	4	\$8,000		
Total	16	64	\$50,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
ProjectType	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	10	20	\$10,000		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0		
SchoolCrosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0		
Total	10	20	\$10,000		

ElmhurstTotalImprovementCost=\$384,000





# Area #13 – Old Town

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost	
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	1	200	0.04	\$14,400	
Norepairsneeded	19	7,600	1.44	\$0	
Moderatedisrepair	19	3,800	0.72	\$273,600	
Severedisrepair	11	2,900	0.55	\$208,800	
Total	60	15,700	2.98	\$ <b>498,800</b>	
Savings (Minordisrepair)	10	1,200	0.23	\$86,4000	

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost		
Noimprovement needed	6	24	\$0		
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	0	0	\$0		
Disrepair	3	12	\$24,000		
Noramp	11	44	\$88,000		
Total	20	80	\$112,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	11	22	\$11,000		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	4	8	\$32,000		
SchoolCrosswalk	5	5	\$5,000		
Flashing Warning Signs	3	3	\$75,000		
Total	23	38	\$123,000		

OldTownTotalImprovementCost=\$731,800





#### Area #14 – Topeka Boulevard

1st Street to 37th Street

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	22	4,800	0.91	\$345,600		
Norepairsneeded	22	8,800	1.67	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	6	1,100	0.21	\$79,200		
Severedisrepair	0	0	0	\$0		
Total	71	17,100	3.24	\$ <b>424,800</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	21	2,400	0.45	\$172,800		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost		
Noimprovement needed	1	4	\$0		
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	19	76	\$38,000		
Disrepair	8	32	\$64,000		
Noramp	8	32	\$64,000		
Total	36	144	\$166,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	21	42	\$21,000		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	3	б	\$24,000		
School Crosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0		
Total	24	24	\$45,000		

Topeka Boulevard Total Improvement Cost=\$635,800



# Area #15 – Gage Boulevard

1st Street to 29th Street

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	7	1,900	0.36	\$136,800		
Norepairsneeded	36	14,400	2.73	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	5	700	0.13	\$50,400		
Severedisrepair	0	0	0	\$0		
Total	76	20,700	3.92	\$1 <b>87,200</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	28	3,700	0.70	\$266,400		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost		
Noimprovement needed	8	32	\$0		
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	25	100	\$50,000		
Disrepair	0	0	\$0		
Noramp	3	12	\$24,000		
Total	36	144	\$74,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	1	2	\$1,000		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0		
School Crosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0		
Total	1	2	\$1,000		

Gage Boulevard Total Improvement Cost = \$262,200



#### Area #16 – SW 10th Street

Gage Blvd to Topeka Blvd

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	13	2,300	0.44	\$165,600		
Norepairsneeded	32	12,800	2.42	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	2	400	0.08	\$28,800		
Severedisrepair	0	0	0	\$0		
Total	67	18,500	3.51	\$1 <b>94,400</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	20	3,000	0.57	\$216,000		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost		
Noimprovementneeded	18	72	\$0		
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	14	56	\$28,000		
Disrepair	1	4	\$8,000		
Noramp	5	20	\$40,000		
Total	38	152	\$76,000		

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0		
SchoolCrosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0		
Total	0	0	\$0		

SW10<sup>th</sup>StreetTotalImprovementCost=\$**270,400** 



#### Area #17 – SW 17th Street

Gage Blvd to MacVicar Ave

Table 1: Sidewalk Improvements						
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost		
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	12	2,700	0.51	\$194,400		
Norepairsneeded	4	1,600	0.30	\$0		
Moderatedisrepair	5	1,000	0.19	\$72,000		
Severedisrepair	0	0	0	\$0		
Total	25	6,200	1.17	\$ <b>266,400</b>		
Savings (Minordisrepair)	4	900	0.17	\$64,800		

Table 2: Curb Ramp Improvements						
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	NumberofRamps	Cost			
Noimprovementneeded	0	0	\$0			
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	2	8	\$4,000			
Disrepair	0	0	\$0			
Noramp	10	40	\$80,000			
Total	12	48	\$84,000			

Table 3: Crosswalk Improvements					
Project Type	Total Points	Number of Crosswalks	Cost		
Painted Crosswalk	1	2	\$1,000		
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0		
SchoolCrosswalk	0	0	\$0		
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0		
Total	1	2	\$1,000		

SW17<sup>th</sup>StreetTotalImprovementCost=\$**351,400** 



### Area #18 – 29th Street

Gage Blvd to Adams Street

	Table 1: S	Sidewalk Improv	vements	
Project Type	Total Points	Linear Feet	Miles	Cost
New Sidewalk (No Existing Sidewalk)	13	3,300	0.63	\$237,600
Norepairsneeded	7	2,800	0.53	\$0
Moderatedisrepair	7	1,100	0.21	\$79,200
Severedisrepair	2	400	0.08	\$28,800
Total	67	12,800	2.43	\$ <b>345,600</b>
Savings (Minordisrepair)	38	5,200	0.98	\$374,400

Tak	ole 2: Curb Ram	p Improvements	
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Ramps	Cost
Noimprovement needed	3	12	\$0
Good repair, but truncated domes are needed	14	56	\$28,000
Disrepair	1	4	\$8,000
Noramp	7	28	\$56,000
Total	25	100	\$92,000

	Table 3: Crosswa	lk Improvements	
Project Type	<b>Total Points</b>	Number of Crosswalks	Cost
Painted Crosswalk	10	20	\$10,000
Pedestrian Refuge Island	0	0	\$0
School Crosswalk	0	0	\$0
Flashing Warning Signs	0	0	\$0
Total	10	20	\$10,000

29<sup>th</sup>StreetTotalImprovementCost=\$**447,600** 



# **APPENDIX I-B** Inventory Questions

The following SiteCapture questions were answered as part of the inventory:

**Introduction:** What type of pedestrian improvements are needed at the location where you are standing (choose all that apply):

- o Crosswalk
- Curb ramp
- New Sidewalk (answer only once per block face, if applicable)
- Repaired sidewalks

New Sidewalk: Approximately how long is the needed sidewalks on this side of the block

- o N/A
- o Less than 100 feet
- o 101 300 feet
- **301 500 feet**
- o More than 500 feet

New Sidewalk: What obstructions are in the path of the new sidewalk along this side of the block

- o Buildings
- o Curb, storm drains, and roadway surface
- o Driveway
- o Fences
- Guardrails
- o Landscaping
- Mailboxes
- o N/A
- o Other
- Retaining walls
- o Trees

New Sidewalk: If you chose "Other" for sidewalk obstructions, please specify.

**New Sidewalk:** Looking at either end of this new sidewalk, how many ends connect with the existing sidewalk?

- o N/A
- o 2
- o 1
- o 0

**Repair Sidewalk:** What percentage of the sidewalks along this side of the block need repair?

- o N/A
- Less than 25%
- o **25-50%**
- o **51 75%**
- More than 75%

Repair Sidewalk: In general, for those sidewalks needing repair, what is their condition?

- o N/A
- Server repair
- o Moderate repair
- o Minor repair

Repair Sidewalk: How many trees are uprooting the sidewalks which need repair?

- o N/A
- o 1 or 2
- o 3 or 4
- $\circ$  5 or more

Curb Ramp: What type of curb ramp improvement is needed?

- o N/A
- o There is no curb ramp, so there needs to be one installed
- The existing curb ramp is in disrepair
- The existing curb ramp is in good repair but needs a truncated dome
- o Other

Curb Ramp: If you chose "Other" for cur ramp improvement, please specify.

Crosswalk: What crossing features are needed?

- Alternate surface crosswalk
- o Bump out
- Flashing pedestrian sign
- o N/A
- Other (fill in the blank)
- o Painted crosswalk
- o Refuge island
- o Stoplight

**Crosswalk:** If you chose "Other" for crossing feature, please specify.



**APPENDIX J** Pedestrian Funding Sources

199

Name	General Overview	Federal	Foundation	Innovative V	Vebsite	Agency
Section 405 National Priority Safety Programs	Section 405 grants provide funding on a competitive basis to states to improve highway safety in a number of areas including impaired driving, occupant protection, distracted driving and more. States are legible to apply they have met certain qualifications that pertain to each subgrant. Under this section, Nonmotorized Safety grants are eligible to states where pedestrian and brycolitis ficabilities exceed 15 percent of the state's total annual crash fatalities. The funds may be used for law enforcement training, enforcement campaigns, and public education to improve pedestrian safety.	×				National Highway Traffic Safety
Safe Routes to Schools	This program provides funding for education, enforcement, evaluations and infrastructure improvements near elementary and middle schools that promote students walking and cycling to school. This was a federally funded program between 2005 and 2012. Funds provided to States during that time do not expire and may still be available. It has since been combined with other programs. Under the FAST Act, funding to States can still be provided via the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Set-State.	×			www.saferoutesinfo.org	Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	HSIP funds are available for safety projects aimed at reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries. Bike lanes, roadway shoulders, crosswalks, intersection improvements, underpasses and signs are examples of eligible projects. Projects in high-crash locations are most likely to receive funding. States that have identified bioyde safety and pedestrian safety as Emphasis Areas are more likely to fund bicycle and pedestrian safety projects.	×			ttp://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip	Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Grant	TIGER grants fund a broad array of road, rail, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The program focuses on capital projects that generate economic development and improve access to reliable, safe, and affordable transportation especially for disadvantaged communities. The grant funds projects that have gone through preliminary design stages and prioritizes projects with broad stakeholder support. Applicants are required to demonstrate that project benefits outweigh the costs. Projects in urban areas must request at least \$10 million (with a 20% match) and projects in rural areas must request at least \$1 million (with no required match).	×			www.transportation.gov/tiger	Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Opportunities: US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit, and Federal Highway Funds	The Federal Highway Administration created a data-table to assist communities in understanding which Federal funding programs could be used for bicycle and pedestrian projects. The table provides an overview, specific program requirements must be met and eligibility must be determined on a case-by-case basis. For example: transit fundis must provide access to transit and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds must benefit ar quality in eligible areas.	×			www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/fund ng/funding_opportunities.cfm	Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
Section 402 State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program	The Section 402 program provides grants to states to improve driver behavior and reduce deaths and injuries from motor vehicle-related cashes. The program is jointly administrated by the National Highway Taffic Safet Yi Administration NHTSA) and the federal Highway Administration (FHVA) at the federal level and by State Highway Safety Offices at the state level. Funds may be used to reduce impaired driving, reduce speeding, improve pedestrian and bicycle safety, and reduce school bus deaths and injuries, among other activities. Child and adult bicycle safety deducation is eligible for funding.	×		-	www.ghsa.org/html/stateinfo/programs/402.html	Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
National Scenic Byways Program	The federal National Scenic Byways Program was established as a grass-roots collaborative effort to help recognize, preserve and enhance selected roads throughout the United States. Funds may be used for "construction along a scenic byway of a facility for pedestrians and bicyclists."	×			www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/scenic_byways/grants	Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)	The FLAP program provides funding to improve transportation facilities that provide access to, are adjacent to, or are located within Federal lands. The Access Program supplements State and local resources for public roads, transit systems, and other transportation facilities, with an emphasis on high-use recreation sites and economic generators.	×			atp://fh.fhwa.dot.gov/programs/flap	Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Set Aside	This set-aside, established in the 2015 transporation bill, Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), replaces the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Activities which were eligible under the Transportation Alternatives Program, TAP). Activities which were eligible under the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Activities which were eligible under the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Activities which were eligible under the Transportation Alternatives Program, which itself included the formet Transportation Endines Program, the Safe Routes to Alternatives Program Are now eligible under this set-aside. Larger Metropolitan Planning Organizations control a share of the funds to distribute locally through a competitive process.	×				Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
Surface Transportation Block Grant	Under the FAST Act, the Surface Transportation Program (STP) was renamed the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. Bicycle and pedestrian activities are broadly eligible under this large and flexible program.	×				Federal Highway Administration (FWHA)
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program	The CMAQ program supports surface transportation projects and other related efforts that contribute air quality improvements and provide congestion relief. Non-motorized projects can be funded through this program because of their link to air quality improvements. Projects must be located in areas that do not meet, or have recently not met, minimum air quality standards.	×		-	ww.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Community Services Block Grant Program (CSBG)	The Community Services Block Grant provides funds to alleviate the causes and conditions of poverty in communities and includes transportation projects. Administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, funding is allocated to states who then make it available to local communities. Funded projects have included: commercial district streetscape improvements; sidewalk improvements; safe routes to school; and neighborhood-based bio;cling and walking facilities that immove local transportation potitions or helo revitalize neighborhoods.	×			www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/programs/csbg/about	Department of Housing and Urban Development

Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grants and the Partnership for Sustainable Communities	This grant program supports locally-led collaborative efforts that bring together diverse interests to determine how best to target housing, economic and workforce development, and infrastructure investments to create more jobs and regional economic activity. The Program places a priority on investing in partnerships, including nontraditional partnerships (eg., arts and outline, recreation, public health, lood systems, regional planning agencies and public education entities). The program is a key initiative of the Partnership for Sustainable Communities. In which HUD <b>x</b>		http://portal.h es/economic_r al_planning_gi https://www.si resources	ud gov/hud portal/HUD?src=/program offic seitences/sustainable_communities_region ants stainablecommunities.gov/partnership:	Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
	works with the budget interval interval interval (2011) and the budget of the interval interval interval works of the 2010 condinate and leverage programs and investments.				
Partnerships to Improve Community Health (PICH)	The PICH program supports programs tailored to individual community needs, across various settings (community institutions) organizations, health, care facilities, schools, and worksites), to create greater access to healthier environments with the goal of reducing the prevalence of chronic diseases. Funding priorities include addressing physical inactivity and lack of access to places such as parks and schools.		www.cdc.gov/ ovecommunity	nccdphp/dch/programs/partnershipstoimpr /health/index.html	Centers for Disease Control (CDC)
National Implementation and Dissemination for Chronic Disease Prevention	This initiative supports national organizations and their local chapters/affiliates in building and strengthening community infrastructure to implement population-based strategres to improve community health. <b>x</b>		www.cdc.gov/ ationanddisser	nccdphp/dch/programs/nationalimplement nination/index.ittml	Centers for Disease Control (CDC)
Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health	REACH is a national program administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to reduce racial and ethnic health disparities. Through REACH, awardee partners plan and carry out local, culturally appropriate programs cadress awarde ange of health issues among African Americans, American Indians, Hispanics/Latinos, Asian Americans, Alaska Natives, and Pacific Islanders. REACH gives funds to state and local health departments, tribes, universities, and community-based organizations. Awardees use these funds to build strong partnerships to guide and support the program's work. Along with funding, CDC provides expert support to REACH awardees.		www.cdc.gov/	nc cdphp/dch/programs/reach/index.htm	Centers for Disease Control (CDC)
REI Outdoor Store	REI provides grants to select nonprofits that care for the outdoors. The process begins with a relationship between a store and a project. Initial support can come in the form of promoting or partnering for events and service projects and offering product donations. Ultimately, the store will invite the project to apply for grant funding.	×	www.rei.com/s	tewardship/community.html	
National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA)	NRPA routinely partners with foundations to provide grants for projects in parks, such as the Walk With Ease Grant, which is a partnership between the NRPA and the Centers for Disease Control, or the NRL Play 60 After-School KGc Off Grant, a partnership with the NFL Network to fund fields, equipment and staff. Additional fundraising resources and strategies are also provided.	×	www.nrpa.org	Grant-Fundraising-Resources	
Walmart Foundation	Walmart Foundation provides significant funding for projects that align with their key focus areas. Opportunity, Sustainability and Community. In addition, staff are encouraged to participate in volunteer projects and can provide smaller levels of financial support.	×	http://giving.w	almart.com/apply-for-grants	
Home Owners Associations	As more and more communities recognize the benefits of bliking and walking, they are willing to support extensions of existing systems or connections to their neighborhood. Home Owners Associations and other neighborhood groups are often willing to fund all or part of a project to hasten its completion.		×		
Boy Scouts of America	The Boy Scouts of America is one of the nation's largest youth development organizations. The BSA provides a program for young people that builds character, trains them in the responsibilities of participating citizenship, and develops personal fitness. Many Scout troops embrace the opportunity to build or clear trails and small bridges, add benches, and address other transportation barriers.		× ×	<u>013</u>	
Specialty License Plates	States, such as North Carolina, have offered special license plates with proceeds funding specialized projects such as trail development and construction.		×		
Workplace Giving	Workplace giving programs let employees donate to the charities they care about, primarily through payroll deductions, often contributing a few dollars per paycheck. Once a year the donor decides which issues and organizations are most important to them and contributes accordingly. Donations through workplace giving enables organizations to spend less time and money fundiasing and more time working toward their goals. EarthShare is an example non-profit which coordinates campaign focused on the environment. The Combined Federal Campaign (CFC) is another example program, which focuses on federal and military donors.		× ×	teotg	
Crowdfunding	Growdfunding focuses on raising money for projects through many small donations, typically via the internet. Websites, such as gofundme.com, loby.com and indiegogo.com, allow fundraising campaigns to be easily established. In 2014, Memphis raised 570,000 in this way to build a separated bicycle lane. In 2015, Denver launched a crowfunding campaign focused on corporate donors for the planning and design of bicycle facilities.		×		



