Destinations and Routes Committee Minutes - June 14, 2017

Destinations and Routes Committee

Date:       June 14, 2017
Time:       8:30am to 10am
Location:   1520 Market
            Department of Human Services Conference Room, 4th floor, east end

Action Items:
1. Committee members asked to push out survey again and for ideas about ways to improve our outreach efforts.
2. Trailnet will review the questions raised during the committee meeting and begin to research best practices
3. Trailnet will meet with John and Andrew to discuss next steps for D&R Committee
4. Trailnet will begin to create the criteria prioritization selection to choose best opportunity streets
5. Trailnet will begin to evaluate potential opportunity streets for the network

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Campbell, Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Carney, St. Louis County Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Lackey, City of St. Louis Office on the Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kohler, City of St. Louis Board of Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Ogilvie, City of St. Louis Board of Aldermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael</td>
<td>Pawlak, East West Gateway Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Newcomer, Community Builders Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Coates, Community Builders Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Voegele, Missouri Dept. of Transportation - St. Louis City Area Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Theiss, East West Gateway Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Gershman, Bi-State Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Wojciechowski, Alta Planning + Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Kyung, Trailnet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Introductions**
   a. Please review attendee list.

2. **Approve Committee minutes**
   a. The committee approved the minutes from last meeting.

3. **Chair Selection**
   a. John Kohler volunteered to chair the committee. Andrew Lackey volunteered to co-chair with John. The committee approved John and Andrew to co-chair the D&R committee.

4. **Ground Rules**
   a. Review of ground rules and committee procedures. There were no questions or comments about the ground rules.
   b. The committee approved and agreed to abide by the ground rules.

5. **Assets/Barriers Overview**
   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. There was a discussion of the safety and comfort of cyclists in St. Louis. There is a need to push forward with this project to get the “interested but concerned” riders out.

c. There was a discussion on why tourists love St. Louis
   i. They say it is an organized and orderly city
   ii. They give compliments on the bike lanes (esp. green painted lanes)
   iii. Out-of-towners love our parking meter system

6. Committee Recommendation Framework
   a. Review decisions to be made and work tasks moving forward
      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.
         1. June: criteria selection, opportunity streets, non-opportunity streets
         2. July: identify and select destinations and opportunity streets/projects, determine streets that are not an option, identify potential streets for routes
         3. Aug: present route options to other committees, connecting destinations, opportunity streets/projects, bike share opportunities
         4. Sept: assemble cohesive network (trails, transit, calm streets, gateway bike plan, great streets, meeting criteria guidelines and planning lens)
         5. Oct: pre-draft route → get feedback from other committees
         6. Nov: announce draft plan at Gala
   ii. The committee was asked to complete the survey and push out the survey again.
         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.

Action Item:
1. Complete Trailnet survey
2. Share Trailnet survey with friends and organizations

b. 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 Destinations & Routes Committee, so far ($n = 1200$).
   i. More people think that destinations that serve residents and local business (i.e. transit stations, job centers, and retail districts) are highest
priority, compared with destinations that attract visitors and tourists (i.e. places for leisure and recreation, museums, parks, and stadiums).

ii. People are leaning toward prioritizing places that are not well-connected and not well-developed (as adding more transportation can attract new businesses and residents) over places that are already well connected and well developed (as adding more businesses and transportation options could help attract new businesses and residents).

iii. Maps reviewed → median household income, median home value, who bikes to work, who takes transit to work, households with no vehicle, income density per acre, households with children, older adults population, population density change over time, population change over time (loss of population from the city to the county), ratio of income to poverty level, change over time for racial demographics, change over time percent owner occupied, where people live vs. work

iv. Overview of existing master plans
   1. Are we missing any plans?
      a. 39 North (Monsanto area) -- plan has a nice focus on bike paths
      b. Would be nice to put together a map of employment and retail density so we can see potential for trips

v. Trailnet GIS map -- [http://arcg.is/2rtnol3](http://arcg.is/2rtnol3)

7. Small group discussion
   a. The committee self-selected into one of two groups. Group 1 discussed opportunity streets. Group 2 discussed criteria for selecting destinations and routes.

8. Large group discussion
   a. Group 1: Opportunity Streets
      i. Identified streets that currently have excess capacity and should be looked at further
         1. Major arterials that currently don’t have too much traffic
      ii. Identified streets to eliminate as possibilities
         1. Eliminated Hampton, Kingshighway, and Grand due to amount of traffic and recent highway interchange reconfigurations
         2. Eliminated streets where proposed MetroLink will go due to timeline, these may still be options for a phase 2, but we would not want to install something only to have it re-studied and reconfigured almost immediately
      iii. Discussion of shape of proposed vision (loop, spokes, cross)
   iv. Discussed the importance of connecting to existing trails
   v. Discussed upcoming and ongoing efforts that support and complement the different opportunity streets, and what elements/infrastructure types
these efforts are recommending (e.g. Great Streets Projects, Project Connect, Downtown Circulation Study, Great Rivers Greenway's Chouteau Greenway, Hodiamont Greenway, and Trestle / 14th Street Improvements)

b. Group 2: Criteria for selecting destinations and routes
   i. Establishing criteria will help us choose between different streets (use criteria to evaluate the proposed routes)
   ii. Connect densely populated areas without access to multimodal transportation & places those residents want to go (quality of life destinations)
   iii. Make sure the phases are equitable
       1. Do the criteria change with each phase of the project?
   iv. Identify overlapping opportunities and gaps in infrastructure
   v. Develop radially and north-south/east-west to work towards creating a connected network
       1. Essence in the middle (where we begin in the first phase)
   vi. Need to work with land use to ensure equity when determining destinations and routes
   vii. Comments:
       1. Middle market neighborhoods
           a. On the verge of decline but haven’t declined yet
           b. St. Louis city neighborhoods are more in danger of being middle market neighborhoods than of gentrifying
       2. Attaching a racial equity lens to all aspects of our plan
           a. Barriers to taking the protected bikeways into underserved neighborhoods → culture around biking; bike education
           b. “Chicken and egg” kind of thing going on -- infrastructure attracts people to bike, but there’s not a lot of incentive to build infrastructure if no one bikes (interest does not equal use → people may want to bike, but they aren’t biking because the infrastructure is not there)
               i. Needs for infrastructure are where people are living -- explore routes where the infrastructure doesn’t already exist (this is important)
           c. Needs to be a priority → this project can’t just go down the central corridor
       3. Are we phasing this or building all at once?
       4. Should the pathways be a loop, or spokes, or a grid???
           a. Indianapolis is a loop in the middle, with spokes extending outside the loop (kind of like the El system in Chicago)
           b. Or it could be north-south & east-west major spines, with additional spokes in different directions (or a cross with a loop around the outside, and the cross continues to be
extended w/new loops --with supportive facilities such as traffic calming and calm streets-- added)

5. Phasing is equitable
   a. 1st phase should really connect popular destinations to get people riding and using the routes, while still focus on being equitable
   b. Additional phases should extend farther into neighborhoods (less about destinations) and focus on improving networks and access/opportunity for all of St. Louis region.

6. Infrastructure asset map
   a. County has one; City is in the process of creating this

7. What are the essential things we want to focus on in the 1st phase of planning?
   a. What do we want to connect in the 1st phase?
      i. Densely populated areas without access to multimodal transportation & places people want to go
   b. Do the criteria change as we move into additional phases and move into neighborhoods? (where people live vs. where people want to go)
   c. Do we begin with the best opportunity and recognize that criteria may change as we expand or for different typology

8. Trip type
   a. Frequent/daily trips vs. occasional trips

9. Reaching densely populated areas that don’t have access to multimodal transportation options
10. Connecting to transit and existing trails (MetroLink stations and trailheads)

9. Next steps
   a. Committee members asked to push out survey again and for ideas about ways to improve our outreach efforts.
   b. Trailnet will review the questions raised during the committee meeting and begin to research best practices
   c. Trailnet will meet with John and Andrew to discuss next steps for D&R Committee
   d. Trailnet will begin to create the criteria prioritization selection to choose best opportunity streets
   e. Trailnet will begin to evaluate potential opportunity streets for the network