

Draft Regional Pedestrian Plan
Public Comments & MPO Staff Responses

Tell Us (online portal)	Pages 2-8
Mike Kelly	Pages 9-14
Pedestrian Coalition	Pages 15-16
Paul Graves, KU	Pages 17

Regional Pedestrian Plan Public Comment Period

Name not shown outside Environmental Justice Zone (on forum)

August 14, 2016, 9:27 AM

Of all of the recommendations made in the regional pedestrian plan, which is most important to you and why?

Connectivity and creating a rational network

Is there an issue that the plan did not cover that you think is important? If so, what is it and why is it important to you?

The priority map for Baldwin lacks connectivity North of 56 and E of 6th street. The proposed upgrades to 56 from Eisenhower to 1st and the existing multi-use path along 1700 N of 56 should both be incorporated into the priority plan. The dead-end path of new sidewalk along Fremont doesn't make sense unless it connects.

MPO Staff agrees that connected loops make sense. In order to create connected loops on both Eisenhower and Fremont, additional streets were identified in the Priority Network.

What other comments, about the report or otherwise, would you like to share with the MPO?

Removal of existing ,poorly maintained sidewalk could be the most cost-effective action, in some cases. Rather than spending money to replace sidewalk that won't be maintained City could cover maintenance of priority network.

Sidewalk maintenance for Baldwin City is addressed on page 89.

Where do you live? (select one)

Baldwin City

Regional Pedestrian Plan Public Comment Period

Name not shown outside Environmental Justice Zone (on forum)

August 13, 2016, 9:51 PM

Of all of the recommendations made in the regional pedestrian plan, which is most important to you and why?

Safe walking areas

Is there an issue that the plan did not cover that you think is important? If so, what is it and why is it important to you?

Would like to address issue of sidewalks. Not enoughconcerned about people having to walk in the street esp in the dark.

The plan recommends a Priority Network of sidewalks on pages 92-93. While this may not include every location where sidewalks are needed, it is a start that will connect people to several areas of town.

What other comments, about the report or otherwise, would you like to share with the MPO?

No response

Where do you live? (select one)

Baldwin City

Regional Pedestrian Plan Public Comment Period

Name not shown outside Environmental Justice Zone (on forum)

August 13, 2016, 3:21 PM

Of all of the recommendations made in the regional pedestrian plan, which is most important to you and why?

Completing incomplete sidewalks with focus on health and safety for pedestrians. Increasing connectivity between isolated pockets of town is also important.

Is there an issue that the plan did not cover that you think is important? If so, what is it and why is it important to you?

I didn't see mention specifically of increasing walkability and safety for pedestrians around the public pool and pool park area (Fremont St.). There are many pedestrians, bicycle riders, and car drivers that use Fremont St. east of Baker University to access the pool and also Baker stadium and baseball fields. There are no sidewalks on either side of Fremont St., so pedestrians walk on the road. With Baker traffic and pool and park users, it seems like an especially important area to install sidewalks.

The recommendation about the Priority Network on pages 92-93 include a route along Fremont St. from Baker to the swimming pool and ball fields.

What other comments, about the report or otherwise, would you like to share with the MPO?

Thank you for your careful look at this issue and for asking for feedback!

Where do you live? (select one)

Baldwin City

Regional Pedestrian Plan Public Comment Period

Name not available (unclaimed)

August 12, 2016, 8:04 PM

Of all of the recommendations made in the regional pedestrian plan, which is most important to you and why?

Creating sidewalks that connect especially along Ames.

Is there an issue that the plan did not cover that you think is important? If so, what is it and why is it important to you?

No response

What other comments, about the report or otherwise, would you like to share with the MPO?

No response

Where do you live? (select one)

Baldwin City

Regional Pedestrian Plan Public Comment Period

Carol Bowen inside Environmental Justice Zone (on forum)

August 10, 2016, 3:28 PM

Of all of the recommendations made in the regional pedestrian plan, which is most important to you and why?

Safety and access. Walking is the most vulnerable form of transportation. Every crash is life threatening. Walking should be considered a basic mode of transportation.

Is there an issue that the plan did not cover that you think is important? If so, what is it and why is it important to you?

More creativity should be encouraged for new developments. Parking lots for, example, should not be prime at the front door. Everyone entering a building is a pedestrian. How does a pedestrian get from a bus stop or the street to the building?

Page 7 includes connections to front doors of commercial businesses within the Economy focus area. Page 15 includes discussion about considering pedestrian needs in the development review process. Also, the plan includes a recommendation for block length standards for new subdivision developments on page 62. The current City of Lawrence Development Code Article 9 20-913 requires "There shall be defined pedestrian ways connecting all public entrances of Buildings to all modules of the Parking Area, to the required Bicycle Parking Area, to any adjacent bus stop and to the nearest public sidewalks¹."

What other comments, about the report or otherwise, would you like to share with the MPO?

I have reviewed all the city's documents regarding transportation. As a life-long walker, my overall impression is that while there are good solutions to known problems, there really is no understanding of the needs of pedestrians. It's almost like the solutions are readied by folks who walk occasionally or have a specific notion of who, how, where, when and why a pedestrian chooses to walk.

Somewhere in the city's transportation documents, there should be some discussion of a pedestrian's behaviors and walking needs. Pedestrians are all ages and abilities. Some pedestrians walk fast. Others walk very slow. Some are unpredictable. They walk, stroll, run, and meander (yes). Sometimes, there's a specific destination in mind. Sometimes, not. A pedestrian's path is not necessarily a straight line. They need to cross streets safely. Such a description can influence new design and retrofitting.

Language has been added to page 16 at the beginning of the Pedestrian Infrastructure Design section of the Pedestrian Progress Toolbox. The added language aims to explain the diversity of pedestrian user types that should be considered in design. The Pedestrian Infrastructure Design section includes a range of ideas that cities could use to improve the pedestrian environment, and some ideas specifically address certain user types. For example, the Visual Interest section provides ideas for pedestrians that walk more for enjoyment than transportation. The Street Crossings section speaks about the difference in crossing times between older adults, children, and mobility impaired pedestrians. The new language attempts to provide a better introduction that explains more about the pedestrian user types that can benefit from certain infrastructure changes.

Where do you live? (select one)

Lawrence

¹ City of Lawrence Development Code Article 9 20-913 <http://lawrenceks.org/assets/pds/planning/documents/DevCode.pdf>

Regional Pedestrian Plan Public Comment Period

Name not shown outside Environmental Justice Zone (on forum)

August 4, 2016, 9:31 PM

Of all of the recommendations made in the regional pedestrian plan, which is most important to you and why?

The safe routes to schools for Lawrence. This is a great way for my children to get exercise and gain some independence. Children are less able to navigate complex pedestrian-vehicle intersections and so would benefit the most from safe pedestrian routes. I also think these routes will end up helping the general pedestrian infrastructure.

Is there an issue that the plan did not cover that you think is important? If so, what is it and why is it important to you?

The most important issue for me is the implementation of linear parks, especially along creeks in flood zones, for shared use paths. These paths have been very successful in our town and other towns. They are not only the safest pedestrian paths (no chance of wondering off into the street), but are usually the most enjoyable to be on (around nature and away from the noise of cars and exhaust). Implementation along creeks means that useful land for development is not used and it keeps topographic slopes to a minimum.

Through the public participation process, MPO Staff did not hear enough feedback on linear parks to make a direct recommendation regarding them. However, page 17 discusses the value of visual interest and amenities while walking, and the traffic calming recommendation on page 60 attempts to address the safety and enjoyment of walking on calmer streets and pathways.

What other comments, about the report or otherwise, would you like to share with the MPO?

No response

Where do you live? (select one)

Lawrence

Regional Pedestrian Plan Public Comment Period

Name not available (unclaimed)

August 2, 2016, 4:46 PM

Of all of the recommendations made in the regional pedestrian plan, which is most important to you and why?

"Implement the Safe Routes to School Program and as a part of it

"Use Traffic Calming Devices to Improve Pedestrian Safety and Comfort at Locations with Real and Perceived Risks"

Why? Self-explanatory!

Is there an issue that the plan did not cover that you think is important? If so, what is it and why is it important to you?

Better street lighting especially during the late fall and winter months - pedestrians need to use flashlights in East Lawrence after 4 PM (except at the intersections)

Through the public participation process, MPO Staff did not hear enough about the need for lighting to include in a direct recommendation. However, pages 18 and 19 explain the benefits of improved street lighting.

What other comments, about the report or otherwise, would you like to share with the MPO?

No response

Where do you live? (select one)

Lawrence

MPO response to comments received on Regional Pedestrian Plan – Similar comments were reorganized for MPO response

Page 5:

Place the title “City-Specific Recommendations” at the top of the page.

MPO Staff made this change.

Change “Form or Assign Responsibilities ...” to “City Commission charter a Pedestrian Interests Advisory Committee similar to the Bicycle Advisory Committee.” One way to accomplish this result is to merge all transportation advisory activities supporting the City Commission into a single transportation advisory body as recommended by the Ordinance 7106 Pedestrian-Bicycle Issues Task Force.

City of Lawrence staff are currently working to form a Transportation Commission, so it could be confusing to recommend the establishment of a Pedestrian Interests Advisory Committee. Within the recommendation itself on page 62, it identifies that no current committee for pedestrian issues exists and recommends the establishment of a Transportation Commission as a single body to inform the Lawrence City Commission on transportation issues. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Reword the next-to-last Lawrence Item as: “Target resources in the pedestrian network to construct ADA compliant pedestrian facilities where no such facilities (or ADA non-compliant facilities) now exist.

The additional detail provided in this proposed change is also provided in the recommendation itself on page 68. For the purposes of this list in the executive summary, a shorter, simpler description is easier for the reader. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Page 5/Page 65:

Change “University Staff” to “University Staffs” to accurately reflect the presence of two such institutions in Lawrence.

MPO Staff made this change.

Page 9:

The second bullet addresses the controversial topic of anthropogenic global warming. The cited item uses the “nearly 97%” ratio to add emphasis. Because transportation greenhouse gas emissions are but one of many sources of those emissions, a more balanced statistic would use the total greenhouse gas emissions in the denominator. According to USEPA, in 2014, transportation represented approximately 26% of total US GHG emissions.¹ This is the definitive data provided to the United Nations Framework Conference on Climate Change. Therefore I propose the second bullet be rewritten: “According to the Environmental Protection Agency, transportation contributes 26% of total greenhouse gas emissions in the United States.” Footnote source per your style manual to the information in footnote 1 below.

¹ “Share of U.S. GHG Emissions by Sector, Fast Facts—U.S. Transportation Sector Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990-2014, page 1 Chart and text, United States Environmental Protection Agency, url: <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=P1000NBL.pdf>, accessed August 21, 2016

MPO Staff made this change.

Page 13:

After text referring to the formation of a consolidated transportation commission, add the following: "This recommendation has not yet been placed on the Lawrence City Commission Agenda for consideration."

Page 16:

Add after the first sentence: The Lawrence City Commission has heard a Task Force report calling for a consolidated transportation advisory commission. To date, the Commission has not placed consideration of this recommendation on its formal agenda.

Page 62:

Add that the Lawrence City Commission has not yet placed this item on their meeting agenda despite being fully aware of the recommendation from their appointed Pedestrian-Bicycle Issues Task Force.

The process of establishing a Transportation Commission is well-underway by City of Lawrence Staff. If this text were included, the recommended qualification would likely result in our document being quickly outdated. The City of Lawrence is also working on implementing some of the other recommendations in the plan, and there is no plan to continually note each work task as the plan is being considered for approval. MPO staff recommends no changes.

Page 13: The impact of the ADA germane to this document's plans is compliance of pedestrian facilities with the revised federal regulations known as the "2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design." This document should refer to the 2010 ADA Standards established in 28 CFR 35.151 and 36 CFR 1191. This document should provide an assessment of the adequacy of the 1992 Self-Evaluation Transition Plan to the 2010 ADA Standards.

Page 68:

This portion of the document should refer to the 2010 ADA Standards established in 28 CFR 35.151 and 36 CFR 1191. This document should provide an assessment of the adequacy of the 1992 Self-Evaluation Transition Plan to the much more recent 2010 ADA Standards. The following question should be answered here: Does the 1992 Transition Plan need revision in light of more detailed federal regulations or other factors? If the 1992 Transition Plan remains good as written then this plan should make such an affirmative statement.

The purpose of this section of the plan is to identify previous legislation that will help to inform the context of pedestrian planning. Conducting an assessment/evaluation of the 1992 Transition Plan is outside the scope of this plan. This comment will be shared with Tammy Bennet, City of Lawrence ADA Coordinator & Assistant Director of Public Works. MPO staff recommends no changes.

Page 14:

Many major cities including, New York, Boston, Los Angeles, Seattle, and Austin² have embraced Vision Zero for the foundation of their traffic safety campaign. Vision Zero is based on four principles³:

- Ethics: Human life and health are paramount and take priority over mobility and other objectives of the road traffic system
- Responsibility: providers and regulators of the road traffic system share responsibility with users;
- Safety: road traffic systems should take account of human fallibility and minimize both the opportunities for errors and the harm done when they occur; and
- Mechanisms for change: providers and regulators must do their utmost to guarantee the safety of all citizens; they must cooperate with road users; and all three must be ready to change to achieve safety.

Lawrence should adopt a traffic safety campaign embracing Vision Zero principles. If some non-zero level of pedestrian fatalities is acceptable then the document should fully explain the rationale.

Page 61:

Refer to my previous comments on page 14 concerning Vision Zero. Those comments are germane here as well.

Language has been added in the Pedestrian Progress Toolbox section on pages 14-19 to identify Vision Zero and Toward Zero Deaths as a tool that communities can use. The purpose of this section of the plan is to lay out all available tools that Douglas County municipalities could use to improve the pedestrian environment. While the traffic safety campaign recommendation for Lawrence on page 61 does not list Vision Zero as a goal to be achieved out of the campaign, progress on pedestrian safety can still be made before achieving zero fatalities or injuries. Vision Zero was discussed thoroughly by the Pedestrian-Bicycle Issues Task Force and was not identified as a recommendation in their final report, thus it was not prioritized for implementation in Lawrence and wasn't included as a specific recommendation in the plan.

Page 39:

Revise the first sentence as follows: This Pedestrian Plan cannot be effective without the support of elected officials and the use of public revenue sources to fund pedestrian infrastructure engineering, pedestrian education and encouragement, enforcement of

² For a list of such cities see url: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vision_Zero#United_States

³ Sweden's Vision Zero, [pdf], in "World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention", pages 19-20, World Health Organization, url:

http://who.int/violence_injury_prevention/publications/road_traffic/world_report/Chapter1.pdf, accessed August 21, 2016

pedestrian-related public safety laws, and evaluation of all of these measures to equitably create a safe environment for all pedestrians.

Add: The relevant elected officials include the County Commissioners, City Commissioners, School Board members and County Sheriff.

While the success of this plan depends on the support of a variety of people, it is not necessary to specifically list those groups within the document. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Page 41:

Not all USD 497 elementary schools are neighborhood schools. Langston Hughes, Deerfield, and Quail Run attendance boundaries extend beyond the immediate neighborhoods of their locations. Therefore, not all elementary age children in USD 497 have the opportunity to walk to school. Revise the text accordingly for the sake of accuracy.

MPO Staff made this change.

Page 42:

Revise the second sentence for the sake of accuracy and completeness as follows: The sidewalk network built before 2014 was inventoried under the supervision of the City Auditor using Global Positioning System (GPS) technology for location reference purposes. The previous sentence in the plan mentions that the audit was conducted in 2014, and it was conducted by Public Works. The City Auditor did not supervise this project, but audited the work after it was complete. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Page 60:

Replace the second sentence as follows: City Commissioners and the USD 497 School Board members should review the current list of routes and consult with school-based experts to confirm the accuracy of the existing list of routes. School-based experts shall include the formal input of parents of students. City Commissioners and USD 497 School Board will jointly define and approve a process to periodically review the SRTS priority routes for each school building. This process will be documented in a city ordinance. City commissioners will consult with private school administrators for their requests for SRTS priority route designation for those school locations and devise a similar periodic review process to address necessary changes impacting private school locations. This process will be documented in a city ordinance. Related traffic safety matters including the need for additional crossing guards or traffic calming due to changing conditions from the original SRTS survey will be considered in these formal periodic reviews processes. While the Health Department has a key health promotion role in SRTS, the Lawrence-Douglas County Health Department shall have no further role in the formal decisions to establish or revise the extent of SRTS priority routes or associated traffic safety upgrades. Such decisions properly belong to elected officials of the City and School Board.

The final sentence in this section is truncated and needs to be completed.

Language has been added to reflect that USD 497 should be involved in defining the process for approving and amending routes. Further details suggested here will not be included because it is not essential to the recommendation.

Page 62:

Add after the footnote: “In some past Planning Commission actions developers have been able to obtain approval for block lengths greater than 800 feet for subdivision designs (e.g. Langston Commons and Langston Heights plats) abutting USD 497 school property. Such geometric design limits must be scrupulously followed in the future to permit a high level of directly connected pedestrian service to public school properties.”

This recommendation aims to set a standard for citywide block lengths. Limiting the focus to block lengths only near public school properties limits the potential for this recommendation to have an impact on the entire pedestrian network. Also, this plan aims to make recommendations for future actions rather than remark on past Planning Commission actions. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Page 63:

The rationale for this recommendation needs to show more specific benefits than “illumination of issues.” This document and other cited references are adequate to illuminate the issues. The hazard here is that the make work of application for the status displaces needed staff effort in other more valuable tasks already identified. The staff hours cost and any application fees need to be fully assessed for a cost-benefit before further work is expended on mere status seeking.

Walk Friendly Community is a free evaluation tool that is objective and nationally recognized. While City staff and citizens may be able to raise similar concerns to elected officials, feedback from a national program such as Walk Friendly Community provides a greater argument for future recommendations and is a measuring stick for progress. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Page 66:

The judgment of the Ordinance 7106 Pedestrian-Bicycle Issues Task Force was to include the “Lawrence Loop” Shared Use Path as a key priority. No mention is made of the Lawrence Loop here. I would argue it should be included as part of the Priority Network. If, despite my advocacy, the MPO believes the Lawrence Loop is not a priority, the MPO should provide a detailed rationale in this section of the plan.

While the Loop may be used for transportation purposes by bicyclists, it is used primarily for recreation for pedestrians. The purpose of the Priority Network is to establish routes that lead pedestrians to key destinations such as schools, and to reduce barriers to walking along arterials and collectors. While the Loop is certainly an important amenity for pedestrians, land use patterns do not suggest that it will be an important facility for connecting pedestrian origins and destinations. Additionally, with the already high estimated cost of connecting and maintaining the proposed Priority Network, the Loop would add significant cost while providing limited benefit for those who walk for transportation. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Page 70:

With the impending opening of the K-10 South Lawrence Traffic Way, much 23rd Street corridor traffic will proceed on K-10 rather than on 23rd Street. The recommendation needs to be revalidated in light of the upcoming changes to the traffic demand on the 23rd Street corridor. If the recommendation stands even after considering the K-10/SLT connection opening, then the text should reflect that this impact was already factored in. **The corridors identified in this recommendation were chosen through the public process during the Multimodal Planning Studies in 2013. The public engagement conducted as part of the Regional Pedestrian Plan planning process did not result in feedback that suggests altering of any of these corridors. Based on the MPO travel demand model, projected traffic volumes on 23rd Street are not expected to drop significantly. The change is less than 5%. The recommendations from the Multimodal Planning Studies identified projects that help connect pedestrians to transit, independent of the automobile traffic on the street. In many cases, sidewalk may still be needed to connect a pedestrian to a bus stop, regardless of the traffic volume; this is particularly true on arterial streets where the speeds and crossing distances are greater. The Multimodal recommendations still stand and were considered after the SLT had committed funding for construction. MPO Staff recommends no changes.**

I wish to thank all MPO staff for their contributions to the production of this draft document. Despite my many comments, I think this is a high quality effort reflecting the high quality of our planning experts. My kudos go out to them.

Michael K. Kelly

Re: PedCo Comments on the Regional Pedestrian Plan draft

The draft document is very technical. It does not reflect an understanding of pedestrians and their needs. In fact, we would be hard pressed to find any city document that explains pedestrian activity. Without this understanding, planning and design are limited.

The content and language used throughout the document attempts to balance the expectations and needs of technical staff members who will consult the plan as a tool, elected officials, and general citizens. While the document certainly needs to be approachable and readable by anyone, its primary goal is to encourage policy and infrastructure changes that better support pedestrian activity. For that reason, technical information is necessary to present rational arguments for change, with clear guidelines for elected officials, developers, engineers, etc. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Walking happens at a human pace. There is time to enjoy the scenery, wave to neighbors or stop and chat, take a diversion if there is something of interest. It is not like biking or driving where the driver/cyclist must attend to controlling the vehicle, making the proper turns, and avoiding other vehicles or pedestrians.

Pedestrians walk to destinations, walk for pleasure, walk for health, or walk/run for recreation. Pedestrians walk in all weather, not necessarily in straight lines, not at steady speeds, and not at the same speed. Walkers choose from a variety of routes.

When walking is a major activity in one's daily life, one is much healthier. As the walking population increases, the environment becomes cleaner, quieter, safer, and calmer.

Pedestrians face challenges. Incomplete sidewalks and sidewalks very close to busy streets are hazardous, as are damaged sidewalks. The funding and maintenance/repair references need to be more developed.

In response to the comments that sidewalks adjacent to busy streets are hazardous, this plan addresses those particular sidewalk segments on pages 66-67. Funding is recommended to be prioritized to improve routes along busy arterial and collector streets in these Priority Routes. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Do we want a comment on urban sprawl?

PedCo is requesting that the plan devote more discussion to:

A description of the pedestrian – who, why, what, where, when, and how.

Language has been added to page 16, at the beginning of the Pedestrian Infrastructure Design section of the Pedestrian Progress Toolbox to better describe different pedestrian user types. The infrastructure design ideas that follow provide ideas that sometimes are targeted at specific user types, including children, those who are mobility impaired, and those who walk for pleasure vs. transportation.

Elaborate on a maintenance/repair plan and funding sources

The funding section on pages 50-51 aligns with recommendations that emerged from the Pedestrian-Bicycle Issues Task Force. This plan recommends consideration of a dedicated program, of which the Task Force investigated 5. If this is not feasible, then the plan recommends enforcement of property owner repairs. The second recommendation on page 64 again aligns with the work done by the Task Force, recommending the same level of funding for yearly pedestrian improvements. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Specific edit requests:

On page 7 under Focus, replace "Improve safety by reducing the number and severity of crashes through infrastructure design along and across roadways, and by promoting safe driving, walking, and bicycling behaviors through education and enforcement." with "Improve safety by reducing the number and severity of crashes through such infrastructure design as lane reduction, design along and across roadways, and by promoting safe driving, walking, and bicycling behaviors through education and enforcement."

Lane reduction is one of many design options to improve safety through infrastructure design, and it may not always be the appropriate choice. Traffic calming devices of various types can also help to improve safety in certain circumstances. This level of specificity is not needed in the context of the Focus Areas. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

On page 8 under Health and Wellness, include something about health being improved by living in a cleaner, quieter, safer, and calmer environment with more walkers and fewer cars.

The third fact under Improved Air Quality on page 9 addresses pollution. Page 17, under Visual Interest, Amenities, and Personal Comfort speaks to noise levels and comfort. Safety is a theme throughout the document. MPO Staff recommends no changes.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the regional pedestrian plan. On behalf of The University of Kansas, we respectfully submit the following comments on the document titled *Regional Pedestrian Plan Draft (7-27-16), Part II – Lawrence*:

1. Figures 2.1 & 2.3 (missing sidewalks): Should “Residential” (as in “Residential Streets”) in the title of Figure 2.1 and in the legends for Figures 2.1 & 2.3 be replaced with “Local” (as in “Local Streets”)? For example, a number of streets on KU’s campus are currently depicted with shading corresponding to “Missing Sidewalk along Residential on Both Sides of Street” or “Missing Sidewalk along Residential along One Side of Street” whereas most of these streets on campus are not “Residential” in nature. In addition, “Residential” is not listed as a roadway functional classification type on the Functional Classification Map, whereas “Local” is.

MPO made these changes.

2. Figures 2.2 & 2.11 (missing or non-compliant curb ramps): Last month, staff in KU Design & Construction Management visually inspected curb ramps at intersections denoted on these figures and bordering the campus. They found that about half of these intersections have curb ramps that visually appear to be compliant. A spreadsheet of our findings is attached. Please note that our observations did not include measuring or surveying to verify ADA compliance.

MPO Staff is working to make these changes. A revised table will be included in the plan to clarify these changes.

3. Table 2.4 (2009-2015 projects): We did not find the following capital improvements listed on Table 2.4:

- a. In 2012, KU funded construction of a new shared-use path on the south side of Bob Billings Parkway from Crestline Drive to Iowa Street as part of the City’s project to reconstruct the intersection of Iowa & Bob Billings.
- b. In 2012, KU constructed a new sidewalk along the west side of Constant Avenue from Irving Hill Road to Becker Drive, and along the south side of 19th Street from Iowa Street to Constant Avenue.
- c. From 2012-2015, KU reconstructed sidewalks along both sides of Jayhawk Boulevard from West Campus Road to 14th Street.
- d. In 2013, KU constructed a new sidewalk along the west side of Stewart Drive from Irving Hill Road to the Lied Center.
- e. In 2014, KU installed a new crosswalk across Naismith Drive at 18th Street.
- f. In 2015, KU widened sidewalks on both sides of Irving Hill Road Bridge over Iowa Street; the project also included concrete traffic barriers, improved railings, and improved lighting.
- g. In 2015, KU reconstructed sidewalks along both sides of 15th Street from Burdick Drive to Naismith Drive.

MPO Staff will include these capital improvements in the plan after identifying cost estimates for each improvement.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Paul Graves, P.E., Deputy Director

The University of Kansas | Office of Design & Construction Management

785-864-3875 | pgraves@ku.edu | www.dcm.ku.edu