

Design and Placemaking Committee

Date: June 20, 2017

Time: 8am to 9:30am

Location: 211 N Broadway
Bi-State Development, 7th Floor, Missouri Room

Action Items:

1. Committee members asked to push out [survey](#) again and for ideas about ways to improve our outreach efforts.
2. Trailnet will explore ideas on how to connect to a place/physical landscape
 - a. Not necessarily a specific route, but in the context of designs/destinations
3. Trailnet will review notes on intentional vs. non-intentional users and determine concept design opportunities for next meetings based on information received from D&R Committee
4. Trailnet will research history of Cultural Trail to learn more about the pros and cons of the project
5. Trailnet will research St. Louis specific projects and other national examples that have a similar concept/project (e.g. Loop Trolley) to learn more about the pros and cons of the projects

Attendees:

	Name	Affiliation
Amanda	Colon-Smith	Dutchtown South Community Corporation
Connie	Tomasula	City of St. Louis Planning and Urban Design Agency
David	Allen	Metro Arts in Transit/Bi-State Development
Lisa	Cagle	Citizens for Modern Transit
Mary Ann	Lazarus	Trailnet Board
Matt	Bernstine	Washington University in St. Louis - Sam Fox School of Design and Visual Arts
Rodrigo	Reis	Washington University in St. Louis - Prevention Research Center
Steve	Patterson	Urban Review
Grace	Kyung	Trailnet
Cindy	Mense	Trailnet

Taylor	March	Trailnet
Eileen	Gillespie	Trailnet (intern)

1. Introductions

- a. Please review attendee list.

2. Approve Committee minutes

- a. There was a question about whether the committee requires a quorum. The committee decided not to require a quorum today, but to require one (at least 50% of members approve) going forward.
- b. The committee approved the minutes from last meeting.

3. Chair Selection

- a. Matt Bernstine and Rodrigo Reis will co-chair the committee. The committee approved the chairs.

4. Ground Rules

- a. Review of ground rules and committee procedures. There were no questions or comments about the ground rules.
- b. There was a question about confidentiality -- the fact that the meetings are taking place is not confidential.
- c. The committee approved the ground rules.

5. Indianapolis Site Visit Option

- a. Trailnet is exploring options to visit the Cultural Trail. This committee and the Destinations & Routes committee are invited to visit the Cultural Trail in Indianapolis.
- b. Thurs. 7/20 - Sat. 7/22
- c. Debating whether it would be a 1 day (leave at 5am, come back around 11pm or midnight) or 1.5 day trip (leave in the afternoon, stay overnight, come back the next evening)
- d. The committee agreed that 1.5 days is a better option and that Thursday-Friday are the best days (because they don't cut into people's weekend). The 1.5 day option allows for enough time to see everything that we want/need to see and talk to people we want/need to talk to
- e. It was agreed that the most cost-effective option is ideal.
- f. Question from the committee: are there any criticisms of the Cultural Trail or similar projects?
 - i. Look at critical analyses of this project
 - ii. Also look at criticisms of the Loop Trolley (STL-specific project)
 - iii. Share these in the committee's shared Google folder

- iv. Check out Transportation for America (may be doing case studies on design and placemaking projects right now)

6. City Bike Tour

- a. Sunday, July 16
- b. Meet at Morgan Street Brewery
- c. Time: 7:30am; ride starts at 8am
- d. Length: 15-20 miles
- e. Led by John Kohler
- f. Will make some stops to talk about different projects happening in the city and how Trailnet projects can and do build into those
- g. Intended audience is committee members, but interested friends are welcome!
- h. Same day at Trailnet's City Ride

7. Summary of Data

- a. Committee reviewed responses from last meeting's impromptu networking session. Summary of information below captures data from all four committee meetings. Below is a combined summary of the most common responses.
 - i. **What motivated you to accept Trailnet's invitation?**
 - 1. Bicycle and pedestrian advocacy, partnerships, community input and development, safety, advocacy for the disabled, land use, equity, and health.
 - ii. **What's the region's best asset contributing to our region becoming a top destination for walking and biking?**
 - 1. Infrastructure and streets (wide, under-capacity streets; gridded network of streets), parks and green spaces, STL agencies, STL citizens, STL attractions, development, and partnerships.
 - iii. **What's the major barrier keeping us from becoming a top destination for walking and biking?**
 - 1. Infrastructure (physical fragmentation, spread out nature of the city and neighborhoods), car-centric culture, safety, funding, STL citizens, organizational issues, politics, and lack of collaboration.
- b. Survey data
 - i. Demographics
 - 1. Low participation from younger age groups (under 18 and 18-29), low and moderate income communities, and people of color. Input is needed from these groups.
 - ii. Trailnet survey captures questions and responses to help guide discussions for each of the committees. Below are the draft analysis of related questions from the survey for the Design & Placemaking Committee, so far ($n = 1200$).

1. When designing streets, people prioritize major streets as places to be, where residents can enjoy walking to school, local businesses, and parks.
 2. When it comes to speed, people prioritize major streets as designed for everyone to travel safely, even if that means slowing down traffic.
- iii. Call to the committee to complete the survey

Action Item:

1. [Complete Trailnet survey](#)
2. [Share Trailnet survey](#) with friends and organizations

8. Committee Recommendation Framework

- a. Draft plan: for the Design & Placemaking committee: infrastructure/design plan/recommendations
 - i. Timeline review (this is subject to change -- do not want to rush anything or release a plan before it is fully ready). Timeline can be found in [powerpoint slides](#).
- b. Timeline
 - i. June
 1. Intentional user experience vs. non-intentional user experience
 - ii. July
 1. Prioritize intentional user experience vs. non-intentional user experience
 2. Discuss intentional user/non-intentional user experience vs. design relationship
 3. Indy Trip/City Tour
 - iii. August (Blender)
 1. Synthesize committee recommendations
 2. Identify priority elements to support intentional user/non-intentional user experience
 - iv. September
 1. Secure designer for renderings (this committee will determine what we will ask of a designer...consultation through the process, just the renderings, etc.)
 2. Determine draft design guideline principles
 - v. October (Blender)
 1. Pre-draft typography cross sections elements
 2. Pre-draft design principles/guidelines elements
 3. Pre-draft renderings of latest concept designs
 - vi. November

1. Nov. 2 - announce draft plan at Gala
- c. Transportation Design Guidelines from the City of Vancouver
 - i. We would like to create something similar to this. What are our design guidelines for the network of protected bike paths and sidewalks?
 - ii. Atlanta Beltline report card -- great example for benchmark metric goals
 1. We would like to create something similar -- will probably focus more on this after the draft plan is released in November

9. Small group discussion

- a. Intentional User vs. Non-Intentional User Experience
 - i. Who are we designing this vision for? (Who are the intentional users and non-intentional users?)
 1. Intentional User: someone who is using the trail for a purpose
 2. Non-Intentional user: someone who encounters the trail
 3. Who are we missing?
 4. **Who do we not feel confident in designing for?**
 - ii. What do they need?
 1. What does inclusive mean for the users we are talking about?
 2. What makes a good experience for them?
 3. Why does this matter to the users?
 - iii. First, the committee split into pairs to come up with a list of intentional users and non-intentional users.
 - iv. Then, the pairs combined into groups of 4. They discussed what they came up with in pairs and removed duplicates. They posted what they had thought of on the wall along a intentional user/non-intentional user spectrum.

10. Large group discussion

- a. Discussion of terms “user” and “non-user”
 - i. Instead of using the terms “user” and “non-user”, one group decided that “active” vs. “passive” (when thinking about intention) is better terminology.
 - ii. Anyone who is on the trail is technically a user. “Non-user” is a very exclusive term.
 - iii. The committee decided on using “**intentional**” and “**non-intentional**”
 1. Trailnet changed the powerpoint slides and committee minutes to reflect the new language decided on for the user groups
- b. Examples of Intentional Users and Non-Intentional Users -- click [here](#) for full list
 - i. Some shared highlights from the small group discussions
 1. Examples of users (intentional and non-intentional)
 - a. Maintenance workers, MSD, Laclede Gas, etc.
 - b. Food delivery by bike
 - c. Artists

- d. People with other disabilities, such as people who are blind or deaf
- 2. What is the intention in design regarding homeless people?
- 3. People need wayfinding, legibility in knowing where they are
- 4. This should be a place to be active
- 5. This should be a place to interact with others
- 6. What is the role of artists and art that fits in with the context of the space?
 - a. This could also be a space for arts education (esp. to children)
- c. User profiles
 - i. After the whole committee discussed the intentional vs. non-intentional users, everyone individually picked a user and developed a profile for that user (intentional or non-intentional)
 - ii. Click [here](#) to see these profiles

11. Next steps

- a. Committee members asked to push out [survey](#) again and for ideas about ways to improve our outreach efforts.
- b. Trailnet will explore ideas on how to connect to a place/physical landscape
 - i. Not necessarily a specific route, but in the context of designs/destinations
- c. Trailnet will review notes on intentional vs. non-intentional users and determine concept design opportunities for next meetings based on information received from D&R Committee
- d. Trailnet will research history of Cultural Trail to learn more about the pros and cons of the project
- e. Trailnet will research St. Louis specific projects and other national examples that have a similar concept/project (e.g. Loop Trolley) to learn more about the pros and cons of the projects

12. Other notes

- a. The committee decided not to use the word "trail"
 - i. Trail suggests recreation and off-road
 - ii. Alternate suggestions:
 - 1. Network
 - 2. Path → still too similar to trail
 - 3. Living space
 - 4. Street network
 - 5. Connector