



Wednesday, July 3, 2019 – 5:30 – 6:30 PM
City Commission Conference Room
City Hall, 6 East 6th Street
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Agenda

1. Call Meeting to Order, Welcome and Introductions

2. Public Comment

The public is allowed to speak to any items or issues that are not scheduled on the agenda after first being recognized by the Chair. Each person will be limited to 5 minutes for public comment.

3. Action Item: Approval of minutes from the May 8th meeting (attached)

4. Action Item: Recommend approval of the Draft Lawrence Bikes Plan (attached)

<http://assets.lawrenceks.org/assets/mpo/bicycle/BikePlan-Draft.pdf>

The draft plan was available for public comment May 15 thru June 14. Public comments received and draft responses are attached.

5. Quick Updates

6. Other Business

7. Next Meeting: To Be Determined

***Special Accommodations:** Please notify the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (L-DC MPO) at (785) 832-3150 at least 72 hours in advance if you require special accommodations to attend this meeting (i.e., qualified interpreter, large print, reader, hearing assistance). We will make every effort to meet reasonable requests.*

The L-DC MPO programs do not discriminate against anyone on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or handicap/disability, according to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/title6 or call (785) 832-3150.

Attendance:**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Hamby (Chair)	City of Lawrence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marianne Melling	City of Lawrence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steve Hitchcock	City of Baldwin City
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bill Anderson	City of Leocompton / At Large
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cameron Jacques	Douglas County
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jacki Becker (Vice Chair)	Douglas County
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Scott Keltner	City of Eudora

STAFF PRESENT

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jessica Mortinger, AICP	L-DC MPO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ashley Myers, AICP	L-DC MPO
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ryan Umberger	L-DC MPO

OTHERS PRESENT

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chris Tilden	LiveWell/FLAT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Phil Collison	Self/ELNA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Michael Almon	Sustainability Action Network

1. Call Meeting to Order and Introductions

David Hamby called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm. There was a quorum.

2. Public Comment

Phil Collison, a member of the public, asked how the MPO fits into the policy structure. Jessica Mortinger replied giving information about the MPO and described how the BAC functions as a sub-committee of the policy board.

3. Action Item: Approval of minutes from the February 20th meeting

Motion to approve the amended minutes (correcting the date at the top of the minutes) from the February 28th meeting was proposed by Bill Anderson and seconded by Jacki Becker; the measure passed 6-0.

4. Action Item: Appoint MPO BAC Representative for 23rd Street Corridor Study

<https://lawrenceks.org/mpo/23rd-st-corridor-study>

Jessica Mortinger informed the committee of the 23rd St Corridor Study. The MPO Policy Board created a project advisory committee and steering committee to guide the work of those groups. She described the process including charrettes and an open house with designs originating from that process. Cameron Jacques volunteered that he would be available during the required dates and motioned to be appointed as the representative. Jacki Becker was nominated as an alternate. The motion was seconded by David Hamby; and the vote passed 8-0.

5. Action Item: Finalize Lawrence Bikes Plan Performance Measures

Ashley Myers shared the updated data gathered for the draft performance measures. She noted the BAC needed to determine a benchmark for low-stress bikeway mileage and determine if the goal to increase the percentage of the population within ¼ mile of the bikeway network to 75% is sufficient. Existing data calculates projects under construction at 73%. Bill Anderson and David Hamby had a conversation regarding the use of mode share as a metric to which Jessica Mortinger replied referencing a study which found a positive ratio of lane miles to density as a contributing factor to seasonal ridership. The committee determined the low stress mileage and access metrics would be sufficient since those factors encourage usage of the facilities. Michael Almon, a member of the public, commented he would like to see the committee set ambitious goals because it give citizen advocates more credibility when pushing for extensive and safe facilities. He continued to explain the perception of safety doesn't necessarily align with how safe facilities are and separation of auto and bike traffic drives choice. Therefore the city should aim to build comfortable, separated bikeways. Jacki Becker motioned for a 4% increase in low stress bikeway mileage and a 10% target for the increase of access to the population within ¼ mile of the low-stress bikeway network by 2025. The motion was seconded by Bill Anderson; the measure passed 8-0.

6. Action Item: Release the Draft Lawrence Bikes Plan for 30 day Public Comment (May 15- June 14)

<http://assets.lawrenceks.org/assets/mpo/bicycle/BikePlan-Draft.pdf>

<http://assets.lawrenceks.org/assets/mpo/bicycle/Appendices-Draft.pdf>

Jessica Mortinger summarized the progress made on the draft of the Lawrence Bikes Plan and Bikeway Design Guide. Ms. Mortinger informed the committee how the documents will be used as tools to create a cooperative criteria between the bike design options and development practices outlined in Municipal Services and Operations' Street Design Guidelines. Members reviewed the document and were asked to give feedback. A few committee members recommended alterations to figures in the document. These suggestions were aimed at improving the readability of text and maps to be included in the finalized version of the document. Michael Almon, a member of the public, asked about an action step which would modify the development code to support bike friendly end of trip amenities by applying regulations to retrofit existing developments. Ms. Mortinger said the desired alterations to Article 9 are in support of the City staff's planning processes regarding amended parking requirements. Mr. Almon asked about a segment of the proposed bikeway network which, in previous plans, extends the shared use path on 23rd Street that currently spans Iowa St. and Kasold Dr. and connects it to the East 23rd Street Corridor project to create a contiguous pathway. Members explained their rationale for removal of the pathway from the network due to the high number of conflict points that exist from business' driveways. Kathryn Schartz motioned to release the Draft Lawrence Bikes Plan for public comment. Marianne Melling seconded the motion and the measure passed 8-0.

7. Quick Updates

Jessica Mortinger informed the BAC the City of Lawrence has been recognized as #6 of 510 cities working on bicycling in their most recent assessment. Ashley Myers said the countywide bike plan is still under development. Kathryn Schartz mentioned the Lawrence Bike Club is looking for volunteers.

8. Other Business

No other business was presented.

9. Next Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 7:21pm. The next meeting will be scheduled once the 30-day public comment period is complete and staff have analyzed and processed public input to share with the BAC.

Public comments received and draft responses

Person/ Organization Submitting Comment	Comment	Staff Response	Action
Pattie Johnston	<p>There have been numerous discussions concerning the proposed bike boulevards. Addressing the 21st street ideas, it is obvious that the ones proposing this are not aware of the actuality of the street and the traffic on it. It is an arterial from Iowa to Massachusetts streets with minimum "low traffic" times. It is an older street, in a residential neighborhood, narrow with driveways that require backing out from these driveways. Numerous past construction projects on 19th and 23rd streets have forced drivers to find other routes. They found 21st street and have continued to use it.</p> <p>The answers that have been received expressing these concerns, when an answer has been received, have been in the nature that traffic will diminish after the project is completed. The design of no left turns and street narrowing devices may make it less desirable but also complicates those who live in this neighborhood, especially those of us who live directly on 21st street. Funneling more traffic onto 19th & 20th streets is the most likely result. Even that is not exactly a good practice idea.</p> <p>Though the city has provided meetings and other opportunities to express concerns and issues on this proposal, it is highly unlikely that any of those directly impacted will have any effect on the decision. It can be said that input was asked for from the community but is it really input that is being considered or are these public information opportunities only to show what will be occurring regardless of residents' opinions? It would be nice to be proven wrong but past experience is a good teacher.</p>	<p>This comment is related to a project currently in the design/implementation process and outside the scope of this plan.</p>	<p>Outside Plan Scope: Forwarded to MSO project engineer</p>
John Gascon	<p>With the pending release of the MPO Lawrence Bikes Plan I'm writing to inquire how we might include the concept of the Idaho Stop Rule into the plan and to forward the issue to the Transportation Commission. As a refresher, I included the email thread from last July below. I look forward to your input.</p>	<p>Staff believes a rule of this nature belongs at the state level and is outside the scope of this plan.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
Marlene Merrill	<p>I am thinking that the proposed bike way on 13th and 21st is a waste of city tax resources. Neither bikeway connects with anything. It would be a better use of resources and a better plan to encourage the use of the bike trails that circle the city.</p> <p>I would rather city use funds to take care of traffic and road maintenance in the city. I am not in favor of setting up so called traffic devices in one block of a city street.</p>	<p>This comment is related to a project currently in the design/implementation process and outside the scope of this plan.</p>	<p>Outside Plan Scope: Forwarded to MSO project engineer</p>
	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed "Lawrence Bikes" plan. Bicycling infrastructure benefits individuals and the community in many ways, including improving personal and population health, protecting the environment, enhancing personal mobility, and promoting economic vitality. This plan is a positive step in promoting the continued development of cycling infrastructure and encouraging cycling as an important form of transportation (as well as recreation) in Lawrence. We agree with the premise of this report that, as more "high quality" bicycle facilities are built, more people will choose to use bikes for recreation and transportation to priority destinations.</p> <p>We are particularly interested in a robust network of bicycle and/or shared trails separated as much as possible from the roadway system, since these facilities are generally the safest/most comfortable of all bicycling infrastructure. We recognize that trails are but one piece of the system (that -- by necessity -- will need to link with other segments of the bike network), but we do believe they are essential to the network as a whole. We appreciate the attention provided to the trail network in this plan. In particular, we recognize and support the inclusion of the Lawrence Loop (both existing and proposed sections), and connections to the Loop, in the priority bike network.</p> <p>While supporting the overall proposed plan, we do offer the following comments for consideration:</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Received</p>

Public comments received and draft responses

Person/ Organization Submitting Comment	Comment	Staff Response	Action
Chris Tilden, on behalf of Friends of Lawrence Area Trails	1. Add an additional grade-separated crossing for the Lawrence Loop across K-10 in the 27th Street/Wakarusa Drive area to the priority bike network. This plan proposes three “high priority” grade-separated crossings for the future bikeway network. We believe these are very important projects, but a grade-separated crossing for the Lawrence Loop in the area of the Wakarusa/27th intersection with K-10 highway is equally (or more) so. A grade-separated crossing at that location (being considered as part of K-10 future reconstruction) should be included in the plan.	This grade separated crossing is included in the current planning process for the K-10 Widening and K-10 Interchange improvements. Originally the only grade separated crossings on the map were ones that would need to be considered for standalone funding.	Incorporated
	2. Enhance connections to the Lawrence Loop in east Lawrence. Given the high latent demand for cycling in the eastern part of Lawrence identified in the plan, we believe there should be: o A segment included in the priority bike network between Massachusetts Street and the Burroughs Creek section of the Lawrence Loop between 13th and 23rd Streets. Currently the only identified cycling connections between Massachusetts and the eastern Lawrence Loop are 15th and 19th Streets. These streets have discontinuous bike lanes that do not represent the type of continuous “high comfort” facilities we believe should link the Loop to our city center. There is also a proposed “secondary” connection near 23rd Street. This very large gap needs a priority bikeway segment to enhance access to the Burroughs Creek Trail and Haskell Rail Trails, some of the most heavily used sections of the Loop.	While we understand the desire to add additional mileage to the secondary or primary network doing so inflates the list of potential projects diluting the likelihood a complete network will be reasonably funded. The MPO BAC discussed the merits of prioritizing segments of the bikeway plan to the primary and secondary network.	No Change
	o A bikeway segment going east from the Loop (towards Venture Park and East Hills Business Park) somewhere between 15th and 31st Streets. This segment should be included on the priority network – or at least the secondary network -- to create access to employment opportunities in the eastern part of Lawrence. There are existing plans to develop bike infrastructure along both 19th and 23rd Street east of the Burroughs Creek Trail, so one or both could be included in the secondary or priority network.	The reconstruction of 19th Street will consider a bikeway connection to Venture Park. However 19th Street was not added to the Priority/Secondary network, because it is currently planned in the City of Lawrence's Capital Improvement Program and the Priority/Secondary network is intended to represent the network that should be prioritized for standalone funding.	No Change
	3. Add the proposed trail along the western bank of Kansas River to the secondary and/or priority network. The bikeway system map has a proposed bikeway (we assume a paved trail) running north from Burcham Park and ultimately connecting to Lakeview Road. We propose this bikeway be included in the secondary, if not the primary, bike network. We envision this trail would be highly utilized as a transportation corridor as well as a recreational amenity. There are several large business concentrated north of town that currently are connected to the bikeway network only by the bike lanes on Michigan Avenue, Riverridge Road, and N. Iowa Street. These are high-speed roadways that that are not comfortable for many cyclists. This trail would be a present a great opportunity for people who work in that area north of town to commute by bike on a “high comfort” bike facility, and would draw even more residents and tourists to the Kansas River for recreational purposes.	While we understand the desire to add additional mileage to the secondary or primary network doing so inflates the list of potential projects diluting the likelihood a complete network will be reasonably funded. The MPO BAC discussed the merits of prioritizing segments of the bikeway plan to the primary and secondary network. In this instance, there is less bikeway demand on the northern alignment.	No Change
4. Include “protected” bike infrastructure on Naismith Drive from 23rd to 19th Street. The Naismith Trail is an extremely important connector to the Loop. In order for that trail to be part of a “high comfort” corridor all the way to the University of Kansas, it is important that there is a protected bike lane, shared use path, or other bike infrastructure on the 23rd to 19th Street segment that is separated from the roadway.	Naismith Dr from 23rd to 19th Street is part of planned priority network. The current bike route/shared lane markings and current Level of Comfort does not meet 3 or below goal of plan. When Naismith Drive is reconstructed, the plan would indicate that a more comfortable facility should be constructed.	Existing	
Thank you once again for the opportunity to provide comment. Should you want any clarification regarding our			

Public comments received and draft responses

Person/ Organization Submitting Comment	Comment	Staff Response	Action
Clark Coan	<p>Please accept these comments on the Bikeway Plan Update:</p> <p>Please add the following:</p> <p>1. Extend the Heatherwood Trail north to Bob Billings Parkway. Currently, the trail is just too short at only .5 mi. and extending it north would increase usage and connectivity.</p>	The Heatherwood Trail is already a planned connection to Bob Billings Parkway.	Existing
	<p>2. Create a protected bikeway along old US 56 by utilizing an existing shoulder and building additional shoulders. This appears the best way to link Lawrence with the Ottawa to Baldwin trail which is going to be built.</p>	Outside of Lawrence Plan scope. This alignment can be considered as part of the Countywide plan.	Outside Plan Scope
	<p>3. Indicate a proposed tunnel or other grade-separated crossing for the Lawrence Loop across the South Lawrence Trafficway near 27th Street/Wakarusa Drive to improve rider safety).</p>	This grade separated crossing is included in the current planning process for the K-10 Widening and K-10 Interchange improvements. Originally the only grade separated crossings on the map were ones that would need to be considered for standalone funding.	Incorporated
	<p>4. Include the proposed trail along the western bank of the Kansas River, running north from Burcham Park to connect to Lakeview Road, in the priority or secondary funding network.</p>	While we understand the desire to add additional mileage to the secondary or primary network doing so inflates the list of potential projects diluting the likelihood a complete network will be reasonably funded. The MPO BAC discussed the merits of prioritizing segments of the bikeway plan to the primary and secondary network. In this instance, there is less bikeway demand on the northern alignment.	No Change
	<p>5. Include a protected bikeway on Naismith Drive from 19th to 23rd Street to provide a safe connection between the KU campus and the Naismith Valley Trail (an important connection to the Loop).</p> <p>Thank you for paying attention to my comments.</p>	Naismith Dr from 23rd to 19th Street is part of planned priority network. The current bike route/shared lane markings and current Level of Comfort does not meet 3 or below goal of plan. When Naismith Drive is reconstructed, the plan would indicate that a more comfortable facility should be constructed.	Existing

Public comments received and draft responses

Person/ Organization Submitting Comment	Comment	Staff Response	Action
<p>Gary Webber, Healthy Built Environment Work Group, LiveWell Douglas County</p>	<p>Dear Friends at MPO;</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed "Lawrence Bikes Plan." Improving our community's infrastructure for people who ride – or would like to ride – bicycles benefits our communities in many ways. It will improve the health of Lawrence residents and the environment, and create opportunities for many people to get to priority destinations such as schools, employment, recreation, culture amenities, places of worship and many more through means other than a private automobile.</p> <p>We believe this plan lays out a compelling vision for the bicycling network in Lawrence, and we are optimistic that it will help promote the ongoing development of a connected system of bicycling infrastructure that will encourage cycling as a safe and efficient local form of transportation and recreation. We appreciate the development of a "Priority and Secondary Funding Network" to highlight those segments of the proposed bike network that are the highest priority for future funding. We are particularly interested in seeing robust development of a "high comfort" bike network that provides connections that separate bikes from automobiles to the greatest extent possible. While we recognize the entire network cannot be "protected," the goal to increase ridership in our community is likely to happen only when people have access to a network they see as safe. For many riders this means using facilities that are largely separated from cars: shared use paths, multi-use trails, protected bike lanes (lanes with physical barriers separating them from the roadway), etc.</p> <p>Our thanks to the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the MPO's Bicycle Advisory Committee, and the advocates and community members whose participation and input formed the basis for this plan. We look forward to supporting the implementation of this important plan!</p> <p>Sincerely, Gary Webber, on behalf of Healthy Built Environment Work Group LiveWell Douglas County</p>	<p>Thanks</p>	<p>Received</p>
	<p>We have been following the development of the County-Wide Bikeway Plan and the Lawrence Bikeway Plan (LBP) since early 2018. We generally like how the plan has progressed. We do have a few requests that I hope you will incorporate into the plan.</p> <p>Shared Use Path on 23rd St., Iowa to Haskell Ave.</p> <p>The most recent bikeway plan which is currently in effect calls for a shared use path (SUP) along 23rd St. from Iowa St. to Haskell Ave. There now exist two SUPs west of Iowa along Clinton Parkway. And the upcoming East 23rd St. multi-modal corridor plan will include a SUP (or equivalent) east of the Haskell viaduct.</p> <p>Unwisely, the draft LBP has eliminated the Iowa-Haskell SUP along 23rd St. Please reinstate it. I understand that you have reasons to think otherwise, but please consider the importance of a SUP on this section of 23rd St.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is at the heart of the MPO identified Bikeway Demand Map (see attached) • It would complete a bikeway corridor spanning the entire width of Lawrence, on flat terrain (other than the very west and very east ends). • It would provide a convenient and safe way for cyclists to get to restaurants and stores along 23rd St. • Bicycling on 23rd St. itself is dangerous, and bicycling on the sub-standard sidewalks is dangerous for pedestrians, and a disincentive for cyclists. • There are fewer driveways on the south side of 23rd St. than the north side to pose conflicts, and they can be addressed by design (such as green pavement paint, and/or automobile turning radii). • It's a false assumption that either 21st St. or 25th St. will provide access to 23rd St. stores, because once on 23rd, cyclists still must travel along the street. • It's a false assumption that the 21st St. bicycle boulevard will be the through route, because coming from the west, very few will bike north 1/2 mile to 19th St., then 1/4 mile back south to get on 21st St.; and coming from the east, 21st 	<p>The MPO BAC discussed the merits of including 23rd Street as a planned segment in the bikeway network and decided to not include it as a route on the bikeway plan.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

Public comments received and draft responses

Person/ Organization Submitting Comment	Comment	Staff Response	Action
Michael Almon, Sustainability Action Network	<p>Shared Use Path on Naismith Dr., 23rd St. to 19th St. This 1/2 mile section of Naismith Dr. is a conspicuous gap in a very important spoke of the Lawrence Loop. Except for the Naismith Dr. gap, there now exists a 2 mile SUP corridor connecting K.U. at Sunnyside Dr. with south Lawrence apartment complexes, with the Loop, and with regional shopping. As part of the Priority Network, the 23rd – 19th section of Naismith Dr. should be designated a separated SUP. The Public Works idea for on-street bicycle lanes is problematic for several reasons.</p>	<p>Naismith Dr from 23rd to 19th Street is part of planned priority network. The current bike route/shared lane markings to and current Level of Comfort does not meet 3 or below goal of plan. When Naismith Drive is reconstructed, the plan would indicate that a more comfortable facility should be constructed.</p>	No change
	<p>Engineering as the most important of the five E's The five E's toward achieving greater ridership are Engineering, Education, Enforcement, Encouragement, and Evaluation. The Lawrence Bikeway Plan should strongly emphasize that engineering gains the greatest return on investment and subsequently the greatest increase in ridership. The Plan soundly sets the goal of creating a network of bikeways comfortable for all ages and abilities of cyclists. Comfortable equates to safe and convenient. Engineering accomplishes this best. A focus on educating motorists in responsible and respectful driving is desirable, but it has slow and partial reach to the public. There will always be a large proportion of uneducated and oblivious drivers who will pose a threat. Enforcement of traffic laws for those dangerous drivers is at best a scatter shot approach. Money spent on enforcement has very little lasting effect, so must be continually replenished. As for effectiveness, patrol officers cannot be present on all streets 24/7/365 without breaking the budget, so the vast majority of dangerous traffic violations goes unseen. Safe bikeways by means of engineering achieves the function of education in place, on the ground, every day. By creating physically safe bikeways, engineering also allows enforcement to be more targeted and effective. And of course, well engineered and safe bikeways will attract and encourage a wider range of cyclists of all ages and abilities. Thank you for developing a good Lawrence Bikeway Plan, and we hope our requests will enhance its effectiveness.</p>	<p>The reality is the City is unable to engineer our way to better ridership alone. This plan will take decades to complete with constant dedication to funding bikeways. National Transportation Planning best practices note the cost effectiveness of a holistic approach that includes all Es.</p>	No Change
	<p>It would be nice to be able to zoom into the maps. Some of them are hard to read.</p>	<p>The final plan will include interactive maps</p>	Included in Final Plan
	<p>Lurved it! I'm on board! Your goals set out for the bike boulevards in Lawrence focus only on the bike riders, of which there are very few, and not on the effect on the car riders, of which there are many. If you wish to improve bike paths, build bike paths. But don't mess up the streets so that the cars are restricted. That will only make things difficult for both bike riders and car drivers. Who came up with this nutty idea anyway ?</p>	<p>Thanks Our main goal is to create a bikeway network which supports safe and comfortable riding for all by creating a low-stress bikeway network. To create a low-stress, comfortable network many bicycle types need to be utilized. Bike paths are one of many types of bikeways we plan to design in our network.</p>	Received No change
	<p>I see very few bicyclists regardless of what time of day I'm out or where I'm driving. Spending vast sums of tax dollars on bicycle-centric street improvements is not a good use of our money considering the few people this benefits.</p>	<p>Our community has recognized goals for improving facilities for non-motorized users (which include bicycle riders and pedestrians) in Transportation 2040. This planning process supports the transportation goals for the City of Lawrence. This plan is not only for the many citizens who currently bicycle, but also those who wish to, but currently feel unsafe.</p>	No change

Public comments received and draft responses

Person/ Organization Submitting Comment	Comment	Staff Response	Action
	<p>The intersection of 13th and Connecticut seems to be not well thought out. That intersection is dicey even for east-west automobile traffic trying to see if cars are coming from north-south. Add bicycles and pedestrians trying to get across and it's a miracle that there haven't been more accidents there. Why not add the flashing signal there? The proposed fixes for that intersection don't seem to take the north-south traffic volume and visibility into account.</p>	<p>This comment is related to a project currently in the design/implementation process and outside the scope of this plan.</p>	<p>Outside Plan Scope: Forwarded to MSO project engineer</p>
<p>TellUs Comments</p>	<p>I will start by quoting the draft plan's own conclusion: "Reviewing the bicycle crash data indicates a majority of crashes occurred in either crosswalks/an intersection or roadway without a crosswalk/bikeway and the roadway speed is equal to or greater than 30 mph. They occur during the daylight, on clear weather days with dry surface conditions. This indicates speed concerns should be addressed and education about safe driving and bicycling behaviors is necessary." How will Lawrence move from a bronze designation to silver if, as indicated in the conclusion, residents cannot accommodate intermodal transportation even under the most optimal of road conditions?!? The recent upheaval and vandalism caused by both auto drivers and neighborhood residents to changes made at the intersection of 13th and Connecticut Streets demonstrates broad public hostility to limiting vehicular access in order to provide equally safe intermodal passageways for *anything* not cars. Unless the city is prepared to reconstruct the proposed neighborhood streets (13th east of Massachusetts and 21st West of Massachusetts) with cemented barrier access similar to the ongoing 9th Street project, complete with meridians and speed bumps to impair automobile speeding, bicyclists and pedestrians will not be able to make use of these two streets with any sense of *more safety* than they have now.</p>	<p>Bike Boulevards are one type of bikeway facility and may not be appropriate in all contexts. Streets utilize traffic calming and an engineering approach to slow the street to 25 mph or less and need to have 3,000 or fewer cars a day. The Level of Comfort map provides a way to assess streets based on speed and volume and provides an opportunity to construct facilities that provide additional comfort for all types of people who bicycle.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>The goals are fine, although goals mean little without concrete empiricism and action plans designed to measure/enact said goals. As a regular bike rider in Lawrence, these goals don't directly address the ongoing issues. Riding in town is pretty simple. Riders should stay off of heavily trafficked roads (bike lanes here are an insane idea), and the City should strongly enforce traffic violations for drivers who block intersections/crosswalks/do not fully stop at lights/signs, do not yield properly/use excessive speed in roundabouts. All I need is for drivers to be safe (both while bike riding and driving myself), the roads to be relatively free of potholes and drainage issues (they aren't which is dangerous for biking), and roads to be free of ridiculous pavement markings and/or bike "projects" that only serve to confuse drivers and riders. The roads are primarily for cars and should be treated as such with biking a secondary consideration. Trying to increase ridership when anyone who lives here and bikes knows what roads to avoid due to congestion/speeds/dangers is a lofty goal. Let's support and enforce what we already do, rather than complicating the issue with more money that doesn't need to be spent for "improvements" that will be used by a very small minority of citizens but will inconvenience the majority (as seen in the most recent bike project off of Connecticut & 13th). Also, keep those "professional riders" off of heavily trafficked roads and highways. They don't own those roads but certainly act as though they do.</p>	<p>According to Kansas State Law (8-1587), every person riding a bicycle upon a roadway shall be granted all of the rights and shall be subject to all of the duties applicable to the driver of a vehicle. Riding on street is actually safer than sidewalk driving due to the unsafe nature of driveways and drivers not expecting bicycle speeds on sidewalks.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Plan Changes

Item	Change
Table 2 - Dedicated Bicycle and Pedestrian	Updated to reflect 2020-2024 CIP
All network maps	Updated highway labels
% of transportation budget spent on bicycling	Updated
Design Guide	Update with NACTO Don't Give up at the Intersection - protected intersection new image and setback measures, little additions. Pedestrian Crossing Treatments from Alta pg 42 and 43, RRFB and HAWK added to traffic control and signs with bullet on LBI pg 45
Design Guide	Changed footer to match the bike plan and other appendices
Pictures	Added labels to pictures
Appendices	Inserted the text from Word into InDesign
Action Plan	Header missing engagement, removed duplicate "establish data driven process..." text
Page C.6	Updated the text to reflect the design guide rather than the placeholder in the plan
Page 46 - percentage of people who have access performance measure	Updated the numbers to reflect a modeled way to do the math so it is consist each year. Will update once network is finalized.
Grade Separated Crossing	Added a grade separated crossing at 6th and Massachusetts
Future bikeways	Cleaned up the lines to remove duplicates and have the priority network follow existing paths
Maps	Changed the symbology for the marked shared lanes
Pie charts	Removed the white borders to match the other graphics