

# Valley Center Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities Master Plan Update

*Valley Center, Kansas*

Approved November 19, 2019





## Acknowledgements

### *Steering Committee Members*

Roger Stewart  
Ben Anderson  
Tina Payne  
Cory Gibson  
Kelsey Parker  
Larry Hoetmer

### *Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WAMPO)*

Tricia Thomas

### *City of Valley Center*

Neal Owings (Director of Parks & Public Buildings)  
Brent Clark (City Administrator)  
Rodney Eggleston (Director of Public Works)  
Barry Smith (Assistant City Administrator for Finance  
and Administration)  
Josh Golka (PEC - City Engineer)  
Ryan Skrack (Community Development Director)  
Matt Vogt (Valley Center Police Captain)

### *Design Team*

Paul Toenjes - SWT Design  
Bonnie Roy - SWT Design  
Liza Farr - SWT Design  
Lisa Koch - Groundswell Consulting  
Timothy Austin - Kaw Valley Engineering  
Brian Coon - Kaw Valley Engineering

*"A well-connected park is more than green space in the midst of a concrete jungle—it makes a city lovable and livable."*

*-Unknown author*

**Table of Contents:**


<i>Introduction</i>	4 - 5
<i>Existing Conditions</i>	6 - 22
<i>Community Engagement</i>	22 - 29
<i>Analysis</i>	30 - 37
<i>Plan</i>	38 - 55
<i>Implementation</i>	56 - 66
<i>Next Steps</i>	67
<i>Appendix</i>	68 - 119

Plan prepared by:



In collaboration with :





## 2013 Pedestrian /Bike Master Plan Priorities





## Site Inventory

The purpose of this study is to provide an assessment of Valley Center's current sidewalks, trails and bike routes providing current conditions of existing sidewalks and trails, identifying gaps in the network, gathering public input on community priorities and developing a final plan that shows sidewalk/ bike path priority improvements. The study area encompasses the city limits of the City of Valley Center, Kansas. This plan is an update to the 2013 Valley Center Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Master Plan.

## Process

A dynamic process was utilized in the development of this plan. This process will be explained in detail over the coming pages. In summary, the process included five key milestones. The process began by examining the existing conditions within the City of Valley Center. Inventory was coupled with a robust public engagement strategy. The data collected in the inventory and public engagement segments was analyzed in depth. With analysis in hand, a plan was developed to accomplish the goals of the document. These findings were then evaluated for impact and prioritized with preliminary cost accompaniment.







# EXISTING CONDITIONS

## Site Inventory

In order to understand the existing conditions in Valley Center, the design team used three tools. First, the data on sidewalk quality collected during the 2013 Master Plan was used as a reference point. Second, the design team used Google Street View to estimate the quality of sidewalk segments. Third, the design team conducted several in-person visits to Valley Center to confirm the data. Several projects have been completed that were assigned a high priority in the 2013 Master Plan. Many more have not due to lack of funding, and the city's connectivity priorities may have shifted with new patterns of development.

During the inventory, the design team identified the older, main part of town as having a large concentration of destinations and also residences. Many of the residential areas have very low volumes and speeds, and people feel more comfortable walking or biking without a dedicated path. The educational core just north of the center includes several schools and some newer sidewalks with notable gaps. The development pattern of the city is expanding east, northwest and west. The newer developments are connected to the central core along large, fast roads that mostly lack safe walking or biking infrastructure. Additionally, through the center of town are a few larger roads that connect between residents and destinations but do not have complete paths for walking or biking.

## Old Town Center

Identified as the area generally bordered by E 5th Street and E Ford Street on the north and south, and the rail road tracks and N Emporia Street on the west and east. This area is the older heart of Valley Center and features a very regular gridded development pattern with intermittent sidewalks of varying condition. Generally this area has many low speed neighborhood streets and some newer sidewalks, notably including recent sidewalk additions along S. Meridian Ave. This area has many of the civic, commercial, and residential destinations, and some notable parks, schools and churches.

## Educational Core


The area north of 5th Street up to Valley Center High School at W. 93rd Street outside of the city limits is the educational core. This area contains Valley Center High School, Middle School, Intermediate School, Wheatland Elementary School, and Abilene Elementary School. There are several new sidewalks connecting to and within school property. However, there are key connections missing between schools and residences. Many sidewalks are also of low quality and present accessibility challenges. Completing these missing connections provides a very high benefit-cost ratio. Accordingly, priority investment Priority investment in this area should focus on creating those connections.

## New and Peripheral Developments

Valley Center has several neighborhoods that have been developed over the last 20 years around the Old Town Center and Educational Core. Many of these neighborhoods do not have complete sidewalk systems. They are also often connected to the Old Town Center and Educational Core along arterial vehicle roads with high speeds and minimal sidewalks. Connecting these neighborhoods to greater Valley Center is critical.

## Existing Conditions Ratings

During this process the existing conditions of most sidewalks in town was inventoried and cataloged. All existing sidewalks were evaluated based on a five point rating scale. The rating scale was developed to apply consistent and measurable evaluations to the sidewalks in Valley Center with a “0” rating representing no sidewalk and a “5” rating representing a newly constructed, fully accessible sidewalk. The existing conditions ratings are explained in depth on the coming pages. Information gathered during the existing conditions inventory was used to create an existing conditions geodatabase. Valley Center will maintain this geodatabase and it is intended to be a “living” platform for the City to continue to document and address bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure within the city of Valley Center.



### Rating - Zero

‘0’ ratings may indicate a need for sidewalks or simply an area that does not have a sidewalk and does not have a specific need for a sidewalk. These areas will be distinguished in the recommendations based on whether priority projects are identified for these areas.



### Rating - One

Inaccessible sidewalks:

Ratings of ‘1’ indicate severe degradation of the sidewalk. These sidewalks are in need of replacement in order to be functional for pedestrian circulation. Sidewalks with a rating of ‘1’ are not accessible and pose a public safety risk. These sidewalks should be prioritized when planning capital improvement projects. ‘1’ ratings are indicative of crumbling pavement, large cracks, overgrown vegetation, vertical heaving.



### Rating - Two


Occasional accessibility challenges:

Sidewalks with a ‘2’ rating are a mix of serviceable pavement and inaccessible pavement. These sidewalks present accessibility issues for children, wheelchairs, and strollers. Moderate public safety risk exists on these sidewalks. ‘2’ rated sidewalks should be considered priority repair projects. Examples of this category include root heaved pavement, lack of accessible ramps, and pavement cracks.




### Rating - Three

'3' ratings are indicative of aging infrastructure that will fall into a '1' or '2' rating in the near future. This infrastructure has met or exceeded its material life cycle and is still performing as an acceptable pavement surface. '3' ratings should be considered for replacement if located within priority project areas. '3' rated pavement outside of priority improvement areas should be monitored and planned for replacement in near term budgeting.



### Rating - Four


'4' ratings are pavements that fall into the designed life cycle of the material and are still fully accessible. Examples of these pavements would be 1-10 year old concrete sidewalks with accessible curb ramps and no accessibility barriers. There is no need for improvement to '4' rated sidewalks. Once these areas fall into a '3' rating they should be identified as improvement projects.



### Rating - Five

'5' Ratings are given to newly installed pavement that meets all current accessibility guidelines.


# Existing Conditions



## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



# Sidewalk Conditions



## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



Sidewalk Conditions




LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

KEY




# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY




# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



# Sidewalk Conditions




## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY



# Sidewalk Conditions



## LEGEND

- 5 Rated Existing Walks
- 4 Rated Existing Walks
- 3 Rated Existing Walks
- 2 Rated Existing Walks
- 1 Rated Existing Walks
- 0 Rated Existing Walks

## KEY





## Value of Engagement

Community engagement is a necessary companion to technical analysis in bicycle and pedestrian planning. While technical analysis is the appropriate means of determining availability and condition of facilities, it is feedback from community engagement that identifies the community's interest in bicycle and pedestrian investment, willingness to pay for those investments, and the prioritization of goals or specific projects.

As this planning process relied heavily on the community to provide feedback and shape the recommendations of the plan, various engagement tools were required to ensure robust input. The planning team engaged with the community through the following means, which will be described in greater depth in the following section:

1. **Community Advisory Committee** - Membership of the committee included City staff, a City Councilmen, the Schools Superintendant, Members of the Outdoor Spaces Board, a member of the Planning Commission, and members of the general public.
2. **City Staff** - Though several members of the city staff led and served as technical advisors during this planning process, the larger city staff committee brought unique insights as both government leaders and, considering that many of them grew up in Valley Center, unique perspectives as residents.
3. **Outreach at community destinations** - City staff and advisory members placed planning materials and questionnaires at various destinations around Valley Center as part of an intercept strategy to solicit input from the community at places where they were likely to visit, rather than in a public meeting setting.
4. **Online survey** - Digital questionnaires were utilized both in the early data collection phase of the project and later in the prioritization phase. Both times, questionnaires were shared with the community through the City's social media platforms.
5. **Community Barbecue** - The planning team participated in the Community Barbecue Fall Sports Showcase in Lions Park, showcased initial routes, and asked for feedback at an event booth.

## Community Engagement

### Community Advisory Committee



A community advisory committee was developed at the beginning of the process to provide guidance throughout the study phase. This group met three times with the planning team. Membership of the committee included City staff, a City Council member, the Schools Superintendent, members of the Outdoor Spaces Board, a member of the Planning Commission, and members of the general public. At the first meeting, members participated in a goal setting process. The main goals for the project were:

- Positively impact all user groups and ability types through connectivity
- Prioritize locations that need safety improvements
- Consider opportunities for regional connectivity



The committee also identified the importance of planning for growth. As the fastest growing school district in the metropolitan area, it was considered vital that this plan consider what we want to be rather than what we are now. This group also provided valuable insights into how community members move around Valley Center, pointing out challenging areas for walking or biking, desired connections, and many other considerations.

Later in the process, this group also reviewed and provided insights and initial routing options, and helped the team refine the overall network. The concept of the multi-use loop trail and connection along Main Street was an idea developed during one of the meetings with this group. At the final meeting, the group ranked and evaluated the various segments of proposed improvements to help identify first and second priority routes.



### City Staff

Like the community advisory group, city staff met with the planning team at regular intervals to offer insights, select routes, and prioritize future improvements. This group met three times with the planning team. This group was able to evaluate the proposed network based on their intimate knowledge of facilities, city funding, policing, and understanding of community-wide strategic planning.

Much like the community advisory group, city staff met with the planning team to provide initial background information, which served as the basis for many of the network planning decisions. Following this, staff reviewed proposed routes and made suggestions for routes and alignments. In the final staff meeting, which was held in conjunction with the community advisory group, the team discussed priorities for implementation. By providing information on planned improvements and funding sources, this group provided unique context for the planning effort, and greatly helped develop a strategy for moving forward.

### Community Engagement #1 -

The City, Advisory Committee, and planning team used two mechanisms for seeking feedback from the public at the beginning of the study process: an online survey and intercept strategies (informational kiosks and questionnaires) at community destinations. The goal of this initial outreach was to understand the challenges and opportunities for walking and biking in Valley Center, as well as to understand where community members wanted to be able to go.

Both the online survey and intercept strategy included the following questions:

1. Generally, where do you live?
2. Select up to 3 primary destinations when walking or biking.
3. Select up to 3 destinations you would like to walk or bike to but currently cannot.
4. Select up to 3 primary conflict points for walking or biking.
5. What makes walking or biking challenging in Valley Center?

### Online Survey

The online survey was distributed via the City's social media. Approximately 60 surveys were completed (due to the format of the questions and partial responses, there was not a clear number of respondents, rather this estimate is based on the number who completed all questions).

### Intercept Strategies

Two boards were placed at various locations in Valley Center in order to get feedback from residents who were less likely to participate in the online survey. On one board, community members were asked to place dots on a map. The second board asked people to write-in responses about biking and walking challenges in Valley Center. City staff and Advisory Board Members set up boards at the following destinations & events:


- Valley Center High School Lunch Program
- Valley Center Public Library
- Valley Center City Hall
- Senior Club
- Breezy's SnoCone Shack
- Pizza Hut

The intercept survey locations that produced the most data points were the Library (101 data points) and Breezy's SnoCone Shack (84 data points). The online survey collected around 385 data points from likely around 60 individual people.


# Community Feedback Results- Poll Everywhere Survey (6/21/19 - 7/7/19)

Below is a compilation of the survey results


## WHERE DO YOU LIVE?



## EXISTING WALKING AND BIKING DESTINATIONS




## PRIMARY CONFLICT POINTS




# Community Feedback Results- Poll Everywhere Survey (6/21/19 - 7/7/19)

Below is a compilation of the survey results

## DESIRED WALKING AND BIKING DESTINATIONS



## WHAT MAKES WALKING AND BIKING CHALLENGING?



## Community Engagement Process



### Community Engagement #2

The planning team set up a booth at the Community Barbecue Fall Sports Showcase on August 24, 2019, in order to show the community the progress that had been made on the plan, as well as ask for feedback to help move the planning process along. At this event, the planning team shared the initial routes that had been developed following the initial engagement and following feedback from the community advisory group and city staff. Routes were presented on large maps and people were asked to mark on the maps if they had ideas for alternative routes or other suggestions. Community members were also asked to rank route types in order to help the City and planning team in the identification of plan priorities.

Though the event was very well attended by the community, the venue was likely not ideal for significant participation at the planning booth, and only 20 community members shared their thoughts with the team. However, the feedback that was received was very helpful and informative. Due to the low participation, the planning team followed this event with a second online survey.

### Online Survey #2

In order to better understand the community's desired priorities for the implementation of pedestrian and bike improvements, a second online survey was developed and placed on the City's social media. In this case, a short digital presentation introduced respondents to the overall plan and the various route typologies in the plan. The short questionnaire that followed asked respondents to rank project types and then to consider how money should be allocated to each type. The goal was not to understand how respondents would rank individual segments of sidewalk or trail, to understand if a certain category of improvement would be most important to them, like a recreational trail or a sidewalk network, for example. This would then inform how the community advisory group and city staff would evaluate prioritization of individual segments of the proposed network.

Survey Responses	How Would You Prioritize the Plan Elements		If You Had \$100 to Spend on Projects		Citywide BBQ	Overall Ranking
	Raw Score	Ranking	Raw Score	Ranking	Ranking	
<i>Build out priority sidewalk network</i>	4.36	5	\$ 20.37	6	1	High
<i>Safe-streets connecting major north-south and east-west corridors</i>	4.43	6	\$ 19.75	5	N/A	High
<i>Shared sidewalks</i>	3.35	3	\$ 13.58	2	N/A	Low
<i>City-wide connectors via a city loop trail.</i>	3.82	4	\$ 18.52	4	3	Medium
<i>Bike routes</i>	2.7	2	\$ 14.20	3	4	Low
<i>Regional Trail</i>	2.35	1	\$ 13.58	2	2	Low

### City Council

On November 5, 2019, the planning team led the Valley Center City Council in a planning workshop. Prior to this meeting, council members received a draft plan to review.

During the workshop, the planning team presented the overall planning process and the recommendations for feedback. In general council members were in agreement with the recommendations of the study. There was considerable focus given to addressing additional sidewalk connectivity in the Tradewinds neighborhood on the northwestern edge of Valley Center. Sidewalks were recently implemented in this neighborhood, primarily along Goff Street, but other sidewalks were highly desired, particularly to help students to more safely walk along Meridian to the high school. Based on this discussion, an additional priority sidewalk was added on the northern edge of the neighborhood and a sidewalk was added to the west side of Meridian Ave up to 93rd Street.

Council members received a final report on November 14, and will vote to adopt the report at the November 19, 2019 council meeting.





## Analysis

The analysis undertaken for the Valley Center Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities Master Plan Update was aimed at determining the relative importance of given routes with Valley Center. This would eventually serve in identifying the routes that would make up the proposed pedestrian and bike network.

This analysis takes into account several elements in order to understand the relative community demand for facilities along given corridors in the city. The focus was analyzing the intersection of the following factors in order to provide a score for each segment of sidewalk (both existing and non-existing sidewalks as described in the Existing Conditions section of this report.

These items were used to evaluate demand for pedestrian and bike facilities:

**Community Engagement feedback** - Community survey responses were compiled and overlaid in GIS mapping software to understand the relative density of responses. This showed where the highest concentration of community interest was in potential facilities.


**Community Impact** - Though the community may be very interested in a particular area or facility, this does not always take into account the relative community impact of a proposed facility. By studying walking buffers around the concentrations of neighborhoods and community destinations, we can understand where a facility might have the greatest impact on the most people.

**2013 Plan Priority** - In order to ensure that previous community desires were accounted for in this effort, the 2013 Plan priorities were also added to the analysis model.

**Existing Sidewalk Scores** - Existing sidewalk scores were incorporated into the analysis. This helped to identify concentrations of missing or highly degraded sidewalks that fell in areas of high demand.

# Analysis

## Desired Routes, Conflicts and Desired Destinations




### LEGEND

- Desired Destination
- Conflict/Challenge Location
- Desired Route for a bike or pedestrian improvement

### Description

This map shows conflict points and desired destinations as identified by community members during engagement. The routes in yellow were identified as high priorities.

### Community Engagement Heat Map



#### LEGEND



Fewer  
Community  
Responses

More  
Community  
Responses



#### Description

This map shows the relative frequency of community responses. Most of the community's comments were in the heart of Valley Center.

# Analysis

## Community Impact

Community impact was determined based on proximity to seven destination types: parks, civic destinations, schools, churches, business districts, medical facilities, and the residential core. Proximity was determined using 1/4 mile walking buffers.




### Churches

- Pathway Church Valley Center
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
- First United Methodist Church Valley Center
- Faith Church
- Grace Connections Church
- Pathway Church VC Office & Community Center
- New Hope Community Church
- LifePoint Church
- Calvary Baptist Church
- Church of Christ
- Valley Center Christian Church


### Parks

- McKay Petrie Sports Complex
- Lions Park and Valley Center Swimming Pool
- McLaughlin Park and Splash Park
- Arrowhead Park
- Veterans Park
- Wetland Park




### Business Districts

- 5th Street and N Meridian Street Intersection
- Main Street
- N Meridian Street, south of Main Street




### Medical Destinations

- Valley Center Medical Plaza




### Residential Core

- Old center
- Newer neighborhood north of 5th Street



### Schools

- Valley Center High School
- Valley Center Middle School
- Valley Center Intermediate School
- Wheatland Elementary School
- Abilene Elementary School
- West Elementary School



### Civic Destinations

- Community Center & Public Library
- City Hall
- Post Office
- Public Safety Office

# Analysis

## Community Demand

### Process



Community Impact, 2013 Prioritization, and Community Demand. Each of these categories are described below. Each of these evaluation categories were rated on a scale of 1 to 3, giving each improvement a maximum possible score of 9.

Community Impact was calculated by overlaying the buffers described on the previous pages, and a score of 1 to 3 was assigned depending on how many buffers intersected. Thus a facility in an area with many intersecting buffers would connect to many people to many destinations.

The 2013 Valley Center Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities Master Plan included a map of prioritized sidewalk facilities, ranked from 1 to 3. Several of the priority 1 facilities have been completed since the 2013. Scores for segments still awaiting implementation were added to the model.


Community demand was directly influenced by data gathered during our community engagement exercises. In keeping with the three point rating system, community demand was classified based on number and type of input received.

These data layers were combined numerically and overlaid on the existing (and non-existing) sidewalk network. This created the demand map on the opposite page. A small portion of the numerical results are below, (for full table see Appendix).



STREET_NAME	FINAL_Count	FINAL_Count_1	FINAL_Count_2	FINAL_Count_3	Count_Route	TotalCount	Total_FINAL	Count_1	TotalCount2	Schools_Count	Comm_Count	ResCounts_Count
Meridian Ave	0	7	1	0	4	12	17	1	5	2	0	1
Meridian Ave	0	2	1	0	5	8	14	2	6	2	0	1
Meridian Ave	0	2	0	0	5	7	12	2	5	1	0	1
Meridian Ave	0	1	0	0	6	7	14	3	7	2	0	1
Southwind Drive	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4	1	0	1
Arrowhead Park Sidewalk Southwind Dr Access	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	0	0	1
Arrowhead Park Loop Sidewalk	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	1
Arrowhead Park Loop Sidewalk	0	0	3	0	0	3	5	1	2	0	0	1
Arrowhead Park Loop Sidewalk	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	1
Arrowhead Park Sidewalk Meadow Dr Access	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	0	0	1
N Meadow Road	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	1
N Meadow Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	1	0	1
Sidewalk to Wheatland Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	1	0	1
Meadow Road	0	1	1	0	0	2	4	1	4	1	0	1

# Map of Highest Demand for Facilities



## Description

The densest red coloration on the map represents locations and corridors with the highest need and the highest community demand in Valley Center. This map served as the basis for the development of the proposed network of facilities.

## LEGEND

Engagement + Walkability Analysis Score



Low Demand/  
Low Need

High Demand/  
High Need





## Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities Master Plan Update

The team developed proposed routes following the initial community engagement phase. The resultant maps from the community's feedback shown in the analysis section informed the selection of initial routes for a variety of pedestrian and bike facilities. These facilities provide connections to schools, parks, downtown, and the network that developed serves nearly all of the neighborhoods in the central part of Valley Center. As the community further develops, routes will extend to connect newer areas of town. The goal of developing routes was not necessarily to provide a sidewalk or trail in front of every house, but to provide a facility within a short walk of each home. This creates a more focused and cost-effective approach to developing a network of connected sidewalks and trails. The primary goal of this plan is to create safe and accessible connections between population centers and destinations for pedestrians and cyclists within the City of Valley Center.

Based on the results of the existing conditions and analysis phases of this study, the design team has developed a comprehensive pedestrian & bicycle master plan for the City of Valley Center. This plan represents five key types of improvement, which are described in the following pages:

- City Loop Trail
- Safe-Streets
- Bike Routes
- Regional Trail
- Connected Priority Sidewalks

It is important to note that opportunities for additional improvements exist outside of the designated alignments shown on the overall plan. It is also important to note that this plan is not intended to be static. While general time lines for the designated improvements are spelled out in terms of priority, as new development occurs within Valley Center and necessities fluctuate, it is important to reevaluate and address these improvements over time. The following pages describe the pedestrian and bicycle improvements recommended by the Valley Center Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities Master Plan Update.



### CITY LOOP TRAIL

10' WIDE CONCRETE OR ASPHALT TRAIL  
PEDESTRIANS AND BIKES

**PROS:**

- OFF-STREET & LOW-STRESS
- COMMUNITY GATHERING PLACE
- LARGE VOLUMES OF USERS

**CONS:**

- HIGH-COST AND SPACE NEEDS
- MAINTENANCE BEYOND ROADWAY
- CURFEW CONCERNS



### SAFE-STREETS


STREET SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS, TRAFFIC CALMING, CURB-EXTENSIONS,  
SIGNAGE AND OTHER ELEMENTS

**PROS:**

- SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS BENEFIT ALL USERS
- SLOWS THRU-TRAFFIC, CREATING A GATEWAY TO TOWN
- INSTALLED WITH PLANNED ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

**CONS:**

- HIGH-COST OF PERMANENT INFRASTRUCTURE
- SLOWER VEHICULAR SPEEDS = MORE DELAYS



### BIKE ROUTES

ROUTE SIGNAGE AND DRIVER AWARENESS SIGNAGE

**PROS:**

- CREATES GREATER DRIVER AWARENESS
- SAFETY IN NUMBERS, MORE CYCLISTS CONCENTRATED IN CERTAIN AREAS
- LOW COST
- WAYFINDING TO TOWN AMENITIES

**CONS:**

- LIMITED EFFECTIVENESS
- PROMOTES 'VEHICULAR CYCLING'



### REGIONAL TRAIL

10'-12' WIDE HARD SURFACE TRAIL

**PROS:**

- POTENTIAL FOR REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY
- SHOWCASES SCENIC AMENITIES
- LOW-STRESS, DEDICATED RIGHT OF WAY

**CONS:**

- PERMISSION FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES
- HIGH-COSTS
- RESTRICTIONS ON TRAIL AMENITIES LIKE BENCHES AND SHADE (DUE TO REGULATIONS AGAINST THE PLACEMENT OF STRUCTURES ON LEVEE )



### CONNECTED PRIORITY SIDEWALKS

5'-6' WIDE CONCRETE SIDEWALK

**PROS:**

- SAFE WALKING ENVIRONMENT
- CONNECTIONS TO COMMUNITY DESTINATIONS
- PROMOTES HEALTHY LIFESTYLES

**CONS:**

- RIGHT OF WAY AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP CHALLENGES
- PRIVATE/PUBLIC MAINTENANCE SHARE
- EXPENSIVE TO IMPLEMENT EVERYWHERE



## City Loop Trail

The multi-use trail loop builds upon the success of the recently completed trail along the median on Emporia Avenue on the east side of the town core. During the engagement phase, residents and city staff spoke highly of the completed segment and were impressed by the frequency of use. This plan proposes extending this trail north, through McLaughlin Park and across Meridian Avenue. From there, the trail will link Valley Center Middle School, Intermediate School and Wheatland Elementary before tying into Interurban Avenue. Further south, the trail will follow Sheridan Avenue and connect to West Elementary School. At Main Street, the trail will turn east and follow the north side of Main Street. The rail crossing at Main and the Union Pacific line will need to be improved significantly to provide a safe crossing.

Along Main Street, care must be taken to ensure that trail use, particularly on bikes, does not create safety conflicts with those entering and exiting the storefronts. The trail should be placed outward of a sidewalk that is immediately adjacent to the storefronts. Fortunately, Main Street is significantly wide to accommodate this without sacrificing parking. From there, the trail will continue to across Meridian and connect back to the existing trail at Emporia Avenue.

Connecting the multi-use loop trail to Main Street has the benefit of drawing more residents downtown. The popularity of the trail along Emporia is evidence that residents are looking for opportunities to get out, walk, run or bike, and see their neighbors. The loop will serve to both connect other neighborhoods to the trail and, by providing a nearly 3 mile loop, will invite users to loop around town. As more and more residents use the trail, they will help to activate the stretch along Main Street and will hopefully stop at restaurants and shops, helping to bolster the business there.

## Safe-Streets

Complete streets are streets where all modes of transportation are welcome. Comfortable sidewalks, facilities for bikes, and improvements to traffic movements make the street more equitable for everybody. It's a safer environment where everyone can get to where they need to go no matter how they're trying to get there. A key component to complete streets is properly sizing the roadway lanes for traffic capacity and for the desired speed limits. At the same time, safety enhancements like curb extensions and high visibility crosswalks make crossings safer for bikes and pedestrians. With the right road configuration, everyone can feel comfortable whether in a car, on foot or on a bike.

Elements of complete streets:

Curb extensions at intersections to shorten crosswalk lengths.

High-visibility crosswalk striping

Wide sidewalks (5-6') with a lawn or landscape buffer between sidewalk and curb

Minimum vehicular lane widths, where widths reflect signed speed limits (10-11' wide for 25-35 mph).

Minimum corner radii on roadways, wherever possible.

Traffic calming measures, where needed, like speed humps, signalization

## Bike Routes

Bike routes create better connectivity to some of the surrounding areas and for people on bikes that might be coming through Valley Center. While many of the internal streets in Valley Center are quiet and comfortable for most riders, the numbered streets that connect to the greater region are not. Bike routes are designated routes with wayfinding signage and share the road signage. They also create a safer environment, where drivers are more aware of cyclists. Plus, as cyclists become more frequent users of a given route, there is a 'safety in numbers' effect, which further heightens driver awareness.

The signage that is used to designate the routes can become a larger strategy of wayfinding and directing visitors to the many amenities in Valley Center. A significant number of cyclists from the Wichita region pass through Valley Center, while more pass through the area on the Trans-America Trail. Directing some of these travelers to the businesses in Valley Center can provide economic impacts.

Bike routes are more oriented towards distance cycling and towards more confident riders. Though their efficacy is not always particularly high unless a route becomes very popular, bike routes help promote larger regional connectivity and are a low-cost technique.

## Regional Trail

The regional trail follows the agricultural channel east of downtown, commonly known as 'the ditch'. The existing levees along this corridor already have gravel service roads on top, and with minimal improvement to the gravel surface, could incorporate a trail relatively easily. Over the years, there have been several attempts to develop similar trails in the region, which have met unfavorable responses from regulators at the Tulsa District of the United States Army Corps of Engineers. However, there is some cause to be more optimistic in Valley Center as the Army Corps has recently de-certified the levees along this particular drainageway, and it is possible that these levees are no longer under Corps jurisdiction. Under Sedgewick County regulators, the trail development may be possible.

The regional trail will require additional consideration at a few key locations, primarily at intersections with east-west roadways and where waterway crossings may be needed. Roadway crossings would be most successful with the least circuitous route to connect to the other side and continue along the trail, so intersections will need to be thoughtfully designed for safety, and may require stop signs for on-coming vehicular traffic.


The regional trail will serve as a major recreational amenity for Valley Center, creating a unique experience and enhancing the community's quality of life. It has the potential to connect to the communities in the south, thereby also becoming an important connector trail. For example, students in Park City who attend Valley Center schools might be more likely to bike to school, while Valley Center residents may want to bike to Park City to do their shopping.

## Connected Priority Sidewalks

Connected sidewalks are very vital part of the proposed plan. Sidewalks that connect to schools, parks and other destinations are important, and many existing streets lack sidewalk altogether. While it's certainly desirable for the community to have sidewalks on both sides of every street, this would be quite costly to implement everywhere. So, specific high-priority routes have been identified to focus sidewalk improvements. The goal of this network is for all residents to be within a short distance of a connected sidewalk network even if there may not be sidewalks immediately in front of their residence.

Sidewalks will be six feet wide, wherever possible, with ample room for residents on foot or on a bike. They will be constructed in continuous sections, filling in gaps where sidewalk may currently be lacking and linking destinations together.

## Proposed Network



### LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

### Description

The overall plan for pedestrian and bike improvements in Valley Center is based on creating a network of a variety of trail and sidewalk types. Though some features may be best suited for a specific purpose, when part of a larger network they can meet the needs of many different users. For example, a recreational trail may also serve as an important regional commuter route.

# Proposed Network



## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY



# Proposed Network



## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY



# Proposed Network




## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY



# Proposed Network




## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY




# Proposed Network



## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY



# Proposed Network




## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY



# Proposed Network




## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY



# Proposed Network




## LEGEND

- — — Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY



# Proposed Network



## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY






LEGEND

-  Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
-  Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
-  Regional Trail
-  City Loop Trail (Proposed)
-  City Loop Trail (Existing)
-  Safe-Street
-  Bike Route

KEY



# Proposed Network




## LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

## KEY






LEGEND

- Connected Priority Sidewalk (Proposed)
- - - Connected Priority Sidewalk (Existing)
- Regional Trail
- City Loop Trail (Proposed)
- - - City Loop Trail (Existing)
- Safe-Street
- Bike Route

KEY







## Master Plan Implementation


Implementation is the most rewarding next step for the city and its residents once the Valley Center Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities Master Plan Update is adopted. Implementation of the planned improvements will happen in multiple forms. First, integration of proposed improvements into annual capital improvement budgets will allow short-term implementation of priority projects. While this is the most rapid and tangible implementation process, it is limited by available funding.

The second implementation strategy to be explored is grant funding. Grants are available for a myriad of different project types and scales. However, in the context of the Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan, it would be recommended that grant funding be pursued for the greenway trails. Grants for recreational trails are available at the state and national level through KDWP and the Land and Water Conservation Fund as well as others. In addition to grant funding the use of donor recognition is a compelling option for the funding of recreational trail elements. Donor engagement is a good way to instill community pride in the improvements and a sense of individual involvement. For improvements that are important to the community but beyond the abilities of current funding streams, the evaluation of additional community infrastructure taxes should be considered.

## Survey Results

The second online community survey asked respondents to rank proposed plan elements based on a series of questions. Survey responses in the table below have been added to the proposed route map. This map served as a tool during the final city staff and community advisory meeting, and as a point of reference as individual segments were rated following that meeting. In general, respondents and stakeholders were more focused on street safety improvements, sidewalks and the city loop trail.

Survey Responses	How Would You Prioritize the Plan Elements		If You Had \$100 to Spend on Projects		Citywide BBQ Ranking	Overall Ranking
	Raw Score	Ranking	Raw Score	Ranking		
<i>Build out priority sidewalk network</i>	4.36	5	\$ 20.37	6	1	High
<i>Safe-streets connecting major north-south and east-west corridors</i>	4.43	6	\$ 19.75	5	N/A	High
<i>Shared sidewalks</i>	3.35	3	\$ 13.58	2	N/A	Low
<i>City-wide connectors via a city loop trail.</i>	3.82	4	\$ 18.52	4	3	Medium
<i>Bike routes</i>	2.7	2	\$ 14.20	3	4	Low
<i>Regional Trail</i>	2.35	1	\$ 13.58	2	2	Low



## Prioritization Workshop

City staff and community advisory group were asked to evaluate each proposed facility in order to identify the highest priority projects to implement in the future. Prior to that meeting, the team had broken each facility type into logical project-sized segments. This segmentation was based on three considerations:

### Constructability

Oftentimes, there are logical beginning and end points for a given construction project. These might be major intersections or other geographic features. However, there are also times where it makes sense to group projects or address a larger area since the cost or associated disruption caused by construction may be proportionately less than if areas were to be built separately.

### Funding

Segments that connect to destinations or offer continuous linkages between already existing bike or pedestrian facilities should be developed as complete packages wherever possible. This makes funding easier to justify, particularly for potential grant funding, and easier to justify for the connectivity itself.

### Connections


While a one block segment of sidewalk may make the most fiscal sense, there are instances where construction of three blocks of continuous sidewalk might create a direct connection between two community destinations. Segments have been selected to create the most connectivity following the completion of a given project.

## Selection of Priority Segments


At the workshop, the planning team presented the opportunities and challenges associated with each segment in the proposed network. City staff and community members were given the information and asked to score each segment on a scoring rubric (see below). Following this meeting, scores were tabulated and segments were assigned a composite score.

Segments	Project Type	Feasibility	Community Feedback	Connections to Key Destinations	Timing and/or Availability of Funding	Average Score
Dexter Street Sidewalk - Clay Street to Ford Street	Sidewalk	3	3	3	2.5	2.875
Meridian Sidewalk Gap Connectivity - Ford Street to 5th Street	Sidewalk	2.4	3	3	3	2.85
Clay Street Sidewalk (North Side) - Colby Street to Dexter Street	Sidewalk	2.6	3	3	2.5	2.775
Meridian Safe Street 15-1 - 7th Street to 5th Street	Safe Street	2.5	3	3	2.5	2.75
Meridian Safe Street 15-2 - 5th Street to Main Street	Safe Street	2.5	3	3	2.5	2.75
Meridian Safe Street 15-3 - Main Street to Ford Street	Safe Street	2.5	3	3	2.5	2.75
5th Street Safe Street 16-1 - Interburan Drive to Meridian Avenue	Safe Street	2.5	3	3	2.5	2.75
5th Street Safe Street 16-2 - Meridian Avenue to east of Emporia	Safe Street	2.5	3	3	2.5	2.75
5th Street Safe Street 16-3 - East of Emporia Avenue to Seneca Street	Safe Street	2.5	3	3	2.5	2.75
Main Street Sidewalk - Main Street to Abilene Avenue	Sidewalk	2.4	3	2.666666667	2	2.516666667
Clay Street Sidewalk (South Side) - LifePoint Church to Dexter Street	Sidewalk	2.4	3	2.666666667	2	2.516666667
3rd Street Sidewalk - Meridian Avenue to Emporia Avenue	Sidewalk	2.4	3	2.333333333	2	2.433333333
5th Street Sidewalk - Interurban Street to Birch Avenue	Sidewalk	2.6	3	2.333333333	1.5	2.358333333
5th Street Sidewalk - Park Avenue to Meridian Avenue	Sidewalk	2.6	3	2.333333333	1.5	2.358333333
Colby Street Sidewalk - 5th Street to Clay Street	Sidewalk	2.2	3	2.666666667	1.5	2.341666667
Main Sidewalk - Meridian Avenue to Abilene Avenue	Sidewalk	2.333333	3	2.333333333	1.5	2.291666667
5th Street Sidewalk - Birch Avenue to Park Avenue	Sidewalk	2.6	3	2	1	2.15
Ford Street Sidewalk - Dexter Street to Gatewood Street	Sidewalk	2	3	2	1.5	2.125
Ford Street Sidewalk - Ramsey Street to Dexter Street	Sidewalk	2.25	3	1.666666667	1.5	2.104166667
Ramsey Sidewalk - Meridian Avenue to Ford Street	Sidewalk	2	3	2	1	2
Loop Trail 5 - 5th Street (North) to Clay (South)	Loop Trail	2	2	1.5	1.5	1.75
Loop Trail 9 - 85th Street/5th Street (North) to 81st Street/Main Street (South)	Loop Trail	2	2	1.5	1.5	1.75
Loop Trail 19 - Interburan Drive to Meridian Avenue	Loop Trail	2.25	2	1.5	1	1.6875
5th Street Sidewalk - Valley Oaks Court to Seneca Street	Sidewalk	1.5	3	1.5	0	1.5
Main Street Shared Sidewalk - Sheridan Street to Emporia Avenue	Shared Street	1.75	1	1.5	1.5	1.4375
Loop Trail 1-1 - 93rd Street (North) to 5th Street (South)	Loop Trail	1.5	2	1	1	1.375
Loop Trail 1-2 - 85th Street (North) to Main Street (South)	Loop Trail	1.5	2	1	1	1.375
Regional Trail 1-3 - Main Street (North) to 77th Street/Ford (South)	Regional Trail	1.5	1	1	1	1.125
Regional Trail 1-4 - 77th Street (North) to 69th Street (South)	Regional Trail	1.5	1	1	1	1.125
Regional Trail 1-5 - 69th Street (North) to 61st Street (South)	Regional Trail	1.5	1	1	1	1.125
Regional Trail 8 - Main Street Connection	Regional Trail	1	1	1	1	1
Recreational Trail 14 - South of Ford Street	Recreational Trail	1	1	1	1	1


# Sidewalk Priorities



# Multi-Use Priorities




# Safe-Streets Priorities




**LEGEND**

- First Priority Safe-Streets
- Second Priority Safe-Streets
- All Other

# Regional Trail Priorities



# Bike Route Priorities



## Proposed Project Tables - Priority Projects and Costs by Type - Continued


Segment Name	Segment Start	Segment End	Type	Cost	Cost Per LF	Priority Rating
S Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	E Clay Street	S Ramsey Drive	Proposed Sidewalk	\$18,268	\$45	2nd Priority
S Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 2	E Butler Street	E Clay Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$2,685	\$45	2nd Priority
S Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 3	E Butler Street	E Clay Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$15,474	\$45	2nd Priority
S Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 4	E Allen Street	E Butler Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$15,652	\$45	2nd Priority
S Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 5	E Main Street	E Allen Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$21,793	\$45	2nd Priority
Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	3rd Lot north of E 1st Street	E 1st Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$11,195	\$45	2nd Priority
Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 2	E 4th Street	2nd Lot North of E 3rd Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$14,406	\$45	2nd Priority
Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 3	E 5th Street	2nd Lot North of E 4th Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$24,556	\$45	2nd Priority
W 5th Street Sidewalk: Segment 1	Interurban Street	N Birch Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$44,096	\$45	1st Priority
W 5th Street Sidewalk: Segment 1	N Birch Ave	N Park Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$32,417	\$45	1st Priority
W 5th Street Sidewalk: Segment 1	N Park Ave	N 24th Street W	Proposed Sidewalk	\$14,806	\$45	1st Priority
W Main Street Sidewalk	N 24th Street W	N Abilene Road	Proposed Sidewalk	\$13,504	\$45	1st Priority
E Main Street Sidewalk	N Abilene Road	S Colby Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$29,729	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	Son Ct	Southwind Dr	Proposed Sidewalk	\$23,173	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	Southwind Dr	Goff Road	Proposed Sidewalk	\$40,516	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	Goff Road	Valley Center Intermediate Parking Lot - North	Proposed Sidewalk	\$17,469	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	Northwind Drive	Son Ct	Proposed Sidewalk	\$13,049	\$45	2nd Priority
W 77th Street N Sidewalk	S Meridian Ave	S Ramsey Drive	Proposed Sidewalk	\$17,055	\$45	1st Priority
E 2nd Street Sidewalk	N 24th Street W	N Abilene Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$4,348	\$45	1st Priority
N Ash Ave Sidewalk	2nd Lot North of W 4th Street	W 4th Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$8,098	\$45	1st Priority
S Dexter Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	E Clay Street	Dover Drive	Proposed Sidewalk	\$12,031	\$45	2nd Priority
S Dexter Ave Sidewalk: Segment 2	Dover Drive	Valley Park Drive	Proposed Sidewalk	\$14,107	\$45	2nd Priority
S Dexter Ave Sidewalk: Segment 3	Valley Park Drive	W 77th Street N	Proposed Sidewalk	\$27,246	\$45	2nd Priority
E Clay Street Sidewalk: Segment 1	S Colby Ave	S Dexter Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$11,886	\$45	2nd Priority
N Colby Ave Sidewalk	E Main Street	E Allen Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$21,043	\$45	2nd Priority
E 2nd Street Sidewalk: Segment 1	N Dexter Ave	N Emporia Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$14,613	\$45	1st Priority
E 2nd Street Sidewalk: Segment 2	N Colby Ave	N Dexter Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$12,600	\$45	1st Priority
E 2nd Street Sidewalk: Segment 3	N Burns Ave	N Colby Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$14,426	\$45	1st Priority
E 2nd Street Sidewalk: Segment 4	N Abilene Ave	N Burns Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$14,341	\$45	1st Priority
N Colby Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	E 3rd Street	E 2nd Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$16,405	\$45	1st Priority
N Colby Ave Sidewalk: Segment 2	E 2nd Street	E 1st Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$17,028	\$45	1st Priority
N Colby Ave Sidewalk: Segment 3	E 1st Street	E Main Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$20,756	\$45	1st Priority
N Colby Ave Sidewalk: Segment 4	E 5th Street	5th Lot North of E 4th Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$11,277	\$45	1st Priority
N Colby Ave Sidewalk: Segment 5	E 4th Street	7th Lot North of E 3rd Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$9,413	\$45	1st Priority
3rd Street Sidewalk Extension	Corner N Miles Ave & 3rd Street	Trail from 5th Street to 77th Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$16,047	\$45	
Valley Center School Connection	5th Street	Valley Center Intermediate School	Proposed Sidewalk	\$38,861	\$45	1st Priority
S Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	Industrial Street	Leeker's Family Foods Parking Lot Access	Proposed Sidewalk	\$27,583	\$45	2nd Priority
S Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 2	Leeker's Family Foods Parking Lot Access	W Ness Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$137,911	\$45	2nd Priority
S Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 3	W Ness Ave	W 69th Street N	Proposed Sidewalk	\$80,031	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 1	7th Street	E 6th Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$27,706	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 2	E 6th Street	E 5th Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$26,873	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 3	2nd Lot North of E 4th Street	E 4th Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$5,491	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 4	E 3rd Street	E 2nd Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$15,853	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 5	E 2nd Street	2nd Lot North of E 1st Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$4,590	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 6	Valley Center Intermediate Parking Lot - South	W 5th Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$29,984	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 7	Valley Center Intermediate Parking Lot - North	Valley Center Intermediate School Sidewalk	Proposed Sidewalk	\$5,344	\$45	2nd Priority
N Meridian Ave Sidewalk: Segment 8	Northwind Drive	93rd Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$70,200	\$45	1st Priority
E Clay Street Sidewalk: Segment 2	S Dexter Ave	Butler Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$40,686	\$45	1st Priority
W 2nd Street Sidewalk: Segment 1	Planned Railroad Path	N Birch Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$12,484	\$45	1st Priority
W 2nd Street Sidewalk: Segment 2	N Sheridan Ave	Planned Railroad Path	Proposed Sidewalk	\$53,269	\$45	1st Priority
W 3rd Street Sidewalk	N Park Ave	N 24th Street W	Proposed Sidewalk	\$13,516	\$45	1st Priority
E Clay Street Sidewalk: Segment 3	S Meridian Ave	S Abilene Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$17,437	\$45	2nd Priority
W 85th Street N Sidewalk	N Emporia Street	N Seneca Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$29,531	\$45	1st Priority
E Clay Street Sidewalk: Segment 4	LifePoint Church Parking Lot Access	S Dexter Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$29,385	\$45	2nd Priority
4th Street Sidewalk	N Abilene Ave	N Burns Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$19,466	\$45	1st Priority
5th Street Sidewalk	Redbud Street	Interurban Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$32,801	\$45	1st Priority
2nd Street Sidewalk	Meridian Street	Abilene Street	Proposed Sidewalk	\$9,469	\$45	1st Priority
Tradewinds Sidewalk	Longview Street	Meridian Ave	Proposed Sidewalk	\$106,000	\$45	2nd Priority

*Priority Projects. Costs include general estimations for engineering and minimal allowances for utility work.*

## Proposed Project Tables - Priority Projects and Costs by Type - Continued

Segment Name	Segment Start	Segment End	Type	Length	Priority	Cost
Trail from 77th Street to 69th Street	77th Street	69th Street	Recreation	6,218	2nd Priority	\$100,812.00
E Ford Street Trail	Ford	Ford	Recreation	5,434	2nd Priority	\$16,500.00
Trail from 93rd Street to 5th Street	93 Street	5th Street	Recreation	5,811	1st Priority	\$125,260.00
Trail from 5th Street to Northridge Street	5th Street	Northridge	Recreation	2,662	1st Priority	\$33,750.00
Trail from Northridge to 77th Street	Northridge	77th Street	Recreation	2,591	1st Priority	\$113,125.00
Trail from 69th Street to 61st Street	69th Street	61st Street	Recreation	6,038	2nd Priority	\$172,810.00
E 5th Street Trail	Valley Oak Ct	N Seneca Street	Recreation	1,758	1st Priority	\$21,080.00
Sidewalk Extension	Planned Sidewalk Extension of E Clay Street	Planned Sidewalk West of S Stoneridge Street	Recreation	2,642	1st Priority	\$37,350.00
81st Street Bike Route	55th Street	Sheridan Street	Bike Route	7,914	2nd Priority	\$17,964.00
Seneca Street Bike Route: Segment 1	93rd Street	Tanner	Bike Route	6,940	2nd Priority	\$15,753.00
Seneca Street Bike Route: Segment 2	Tanner	77th Street	Bike Route	3,357	2nd Priority	\$7,620.00
E 5th Street Bike Route: Segment 1	Seneca Street	Broadway	Bike Route	7,728	2nd Priority	\$17,542.00
E 5th Street Bike Route: Segment 2	Valley Oak Ct	N Seneca Street	Bike Route	7,728	2nd Priority	\$17,542.00
S Meridian Ave Bike Route	W Ness Ave	W 69th Street N	Bike Route	5,441	2nd Priority	\$12,365.00
Ford Bike Route	Meridian	Seneca Street	Bike Route	5,288	2nd Priority	\$12,003.00
S Meridian Ave Bike Route	Industrial Street	69th Street	Bike Route	5,259	2nd Priority	\$11,937.00
Ford Bike Route	Meridian	Seneca Street	Bike Route	5,288	2nd Priority	\$12,003.00
S Meridian Ave Bike Route	Industrial Street	69th Street	Bike Route	5,259	2nd Priority	\$11,937.00
Meridian Ave Complete Street: Segment 1	Northwind	7th Street	Complete Street	2,387	1st Priority	\$358,500.00
Meridian Ave Complete Street: Segment 2	93rd Street	Northwind	Complete Street	1,559	1st Priority	
Meridian Ave Complete Street	Main Street	Ford Ave	Complete Street	2,676	1st Priority	\$93,660.00
Meridian Ave Complete Street: Segment 1	7th Street	5th Street	Complete Street	1,353	1st Priority	\$202,950.00
Meridian Ave Complete Street: Segment 2	5th Street	Main Street	Complete Street	2,614	1st Priority	\$91,490.00
Sheridan/Interurban Multi-Use Trail	Main Street	Fieldstone Street	Multi-Use	4,047	2nd Priority	\$382,000.00
Main Street Multi-Use Trail	Sheridan Ave	Meridian Ave	Multi-Use	4,419	2nd Priority	\$396,000.00
N 24th Street W Bike Route	Valley Center Intermediate Parking Lot - North	Valley Center Intermediate School Sidewalk	Multi-Use	5,097	Existing	
School Path	Interurban	Meridian Ave	Multi-Use	3,479	2nd Priority	\$315,000.00
Main Street Bike Route	Meridian Ave	Emporia Ave	Multi-Use	4,419	1st Priority	\$396,000.00

*Priority Projects. Costs include general estimations for engineering and minimal allowances for utility work.*



# NEXT STEPS

## GIS

A component of the Valley Center Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan Update effort was to develop a digital GIS database for the city to build on moving forward. It is important to understand this database and add to it/update it moving forward. GIS is a powerful tool and can help the city make informed decisions moving forward. However, it is important to understand that GIS can only be as useful as the quality of the information being put into the system. Continuing the inventory of existing and future infrastructure in the Geodatabase is important in making the software as informative as possible.

## Future Study

A critical component of any planning study is the refreshment of the ideas proposed once the realities of a community evolve. This is no different for the Valley Center Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan Update. While the recommendations in the document span the coming decade, it is important to know that these proposals have a shelf life. Each plan is different and it is hard to accurately predict the lifespan of a planning document. It is recommended that this plan be reviewed annually and revised as needed to address any future developments that may impact the plan.

## Maintenance

An essential component to any bicycle and pedestrian network is the ongoing maintenance of the infrastructure in place. Included in the appendix of this document is a rating table that will allow the city to continually review and evaluate built infrastructure. It is recommended that an annual or biannual infrastructure review be conducted and inventoried in the new GIS database. This inventory allows the city to document and inventory the existence and condition of built infrastructure allowing for strategic planning for maintenance and replacement as needed.





# APPENDIX

## Community Engagement

*Online Survey*

*Community Engagement Boards*

*Summary Maps*

## Cost/Feasibility

*Sidewalks*

*All Other Bike/Pedestrian Facilities*


# Community Survey

Valley Center Pedestrian Bike Master Plan Survey

5 questions


## 1. Generally, where do you live?

You have not responded



**2. Click up to 3 primary destinations when walking or biking.**


You have not responded



# Community Survey


## 3. Click up to 3 destinations you would like to walk or bike to but currently cannot.

You have not responded



**4. Click up to 3 primary conflict points for walking or biking.**

You have not responded



**5. Walking and biking in Valley Center is challenging because...**

You have not responded

Enter a response

# Community Engagements Results - Survey

## What makes walking or biking challenging in Valley Center?


	Tags	Date
My concern is the partially finished sidewalks in the older neighborhoods. This would increase safe travel to and from schools. It is pretty easy to get around.	Incomplete paths	7/3/2019 22:09 6/30/2019 18:19
We really need a mountain bike area similar to Air Capitol. It will bring in riders, thus income to the city. Could be constructed behind West Elementary. There are not enough single track facilities in this part of the stage. I'm sure you could reach out to KS SINGLE TRACK and their volunteers would help with design and maintenance. They do it all the time at Air Cap, Horizon, Santa Fe, etc.	Recreation Incomplete paths Paths along busy roads Repeat	6/29/2019 17:00 6/29/2019 7:33 6/26/2019 13:30 6/26/2019 13:30
Need more paths and sidewalks There aren't sidewalk along busy roads There aren't sidewalk along busy roads City lacks regional connective routes to Park City. Why not use the levy for building trails on? Increase connective routes within the city...ie: Dexter out to Ford. Fix broken links of sidewalks. Add lighting on 5th, Ford Street and within the parks along walks. Sidewalks stop in the middle of blocks forcing you to cross where crosswalks are not available or walk/bike through someone's yard. Especially on meridian for students going to school on the east side of street. Map is to small to pinpoint but main focus should be around meridian from 1st street to middle school and intermediate.	Regional connectivity  Incomplete paths	6/25/2019 17:01  6/25/2019 13:49
We don't have a lot of good bike paths other than the nice new one on 85th street. 77th is not safe due to the narrow road and no shoulder. Not all areas have sidewalks. A poorly designed survey. Maps are ridiculously difficult to read. Where are existing bike trails? Why not put up traffic lights first on Broadway intersections. I have a disabled daughter. She has a special needs tricycle and has tipped it 3 times while riding in Valley. The sidewalks are far to narrow and some have drop offs on the side (especially north of West Elementary). She has visual deficits that make it hard for her to stay perfectly centered on the skinny sidewalks. I'm always with her, but that isn't always enough. We love to be active, but this definitely limits our ability to do so. The new sidewalks by dollar general are exactly what we need more of. Traffic time	Bike paths Incomplete paths  Narrow sidewalks Traffic	6/24/2019 18:47 6/24/2019 16:57  6/23/2019 19:15  6/22/2019 23:34 6/22/2019 17:47
In regards to walking/biking and using the crosswalks it appears that the newer crosswalks that were put in in front of VCIS and on 5th by the railroad tracks people do not see them well enough. These crosswalks have the lights on the poles on the side, not directly in eyesight like older style crosswalks. I notice this a lot when taking and picking my kids up from school that sometimes the button has been pushed and people still drive through when kids are trying to cross. They don't see the lights since they are to the side. Other times the people may have crossed and the light still flashes for a few seconds but they drive before the light is done flashing even if another kid is coming up to the crosswalk. I know they were put in recently but people do not see them as well as the traditional crosswalk on 5th street in front of Abilene. Also it would be nice if on the survey we could zoom in on the map not sure if my answer were at all accurate because it's hard to see and when I click a spot the pinpoint goes not directly in that spot but on the other side of a street. Zooming would seem to allow more accurate responses for the survey. Some roads have no shoulder to ride or walk on. Primarily Seneca and 93rd. Faster traffic on these roads make it dangerous. The new 5th street path is wonderful! This is not a well done survey. I cannot zoom in on the maps to give clear, correct answers. Walking/Biking from Valley Creek Estates, and the subdivision out of town off 85th and Main, is not safe for children to get to school, the pool or downtown. That area is where I would like to see connection to the walking/bike paths. Poor sidewalks on meridian	Crosswalk Design Bike paths  Incomplete paths Path quality	6/22/2019 14:56 6/22/2019 11:09  6/22/2019 8:43 6/22/2019 7:26
1) Some places that already have sidewalks are tough to get through because the sidewalks are not in good shape! 2) Anytime there has been even a little bit of rain, the sidewalk area south of Dollar General is so muddy and messy, my kids and I have to go through the parking lot instead. When it hasn't been raining, that same area always has a mess of dirt. The sidewalk and what should-be grass areas really need some help! 3) I typically walk 2 or 3 miles every day around town with my dog.. and most of the time my two boys are with us on their bikes. We love being able to get out and around town! Sidewalks everywhere would be amazing! :) Sidewalks are not continuous or are in poor condition A large continuous loop is missing, so far. Thank you so much for the progress we have made in the last several years. Biking is difficult for children. It's not always safe on the roads, but sidewalks aren't wide enough for bikes and walkers. 5th street needs a safer way to bike. Some places do not have sidewalks Some sidewalks are uneven or broken. Trees in town hang over the sidewalks too low to ride under. In town you have to ride or walk on streets to get to Lions park. Would be nice to have one big path from the high school to 77th on the east side of town! School bus traffic. And school traffic in general.	Path quality Incomplete paths Incomplete paths Bike paths Incomplete paths Path quality Traffic	6/21/2019 23:52 6/21/2019 22:00 6/21/2019 20:24 6/21/2019 20:11 6/21/2019 19:32 6/21/2019 19:09 6/21/2019 18:52
I don't know of any designated bike paths. I try to stay off meridian. The sidewalk south of national color plastics is treacherous on a bike! Not everywhere housing is, there are sidewalks. For example, along Main St out to 81st and West St.	Bike paths Incomplete paths	6/21/2019 18:35 6/21/2019 18:23

## Community Engagements Results - Survey

We have gotten better but still not enough sidewalks.	Incomplete paths	6/21/2019 17:55
There are designated walking/sidewalks but no designated bike paths. I can't really tell on the map, I'm not familiar enough. But I do ride my bike & would feelsafer if it was on a bike path. There have been a lot of improvements in recent years and it's really nice. This would be one more that would benefit so many people, and make it safer for all bike riders (including the kids). Thank you!	Bike paths	6/21/2019 17:41
Biking and walking (and running) are rarely destinations for most. Rather they are part of an exercise activity. You can get to where you want to go, but it on roads with the rest of the traffic.	Recreation	6/21/2019 17:33
It isn't except on 77th street due to no sidewalk to Seneca.	Incomplete paths	6/21/2019 17:33
This survey is not good. Too hard to see the map in order t select responses.	Incomplete paths	6/21/2019 17:31
No walking or biking bridge across Meridian or 5th street.	Incomplete paths	6/21/2019 17:25
Many areas in older sections of town do not have sidewalks.	Incomplete paths	6/21/2019 17:21
No good bike.path on main street west of town	Bike path	6/21/2019 17:17
There are no bike paths, no destinations and no rules protecting pedestrians. In Goddard it is clearly stated that all bikes get the ENTIRE lane. We are not allowed to ride on sidewalks yet golf carts can. I see people speed through even then the new lighted crosswalk warning lights. It is too dangerous to be active in this town!!! Used to bike to Leekers and it is no longer here so really no destinations to go to anymore. Would love to see and would support bike paths in VC. The town has done a good job of connecting the schools. However, kids shouldn't have to cross the street to get from sidewalk to sidewalk (north meridian as an example)	Bike path	6/21/2019 17:17
The map is not very user friendly on a phone because you can't zoom in, but it would be WONDERFUL to be able to use Meridian all the way from one side of town to the next. My kids often ride their bikes down Meridian and the sidewalk completely cuts off in places. Those sidewalks are in poor, poor shape.	Path quality	6/21/2019 17:13
I have small children and we have to ride on the sidewalk in order to keep them safe. There are only sidewalks sparaticly throughout town.	Bike paths	6/21/2019 17:11
Lack of sidewalks, and horrible existing sidewalks.	Path quality	6/21/2019 17:07
Not enough sidewalks or bike paths.	Bike paths	6/21/2019 17:05
Either no sidewalks or have to be on road or in street. Too dangerous	Incomplete paths	6/21/2019 17:04
Sidewalks aren't wide enough for both bicycles and pedestrians. Theres also the problem of uneven sidewalks in front of older homes.	Narrow sidewalks	6/21/2019 17:01
Few sidewalks on side streets.	Incomplete paths	6/21/2019 16:58


# Generally, where do you live?

 When poll is active, respond at **PollEv.com/swtdesign900**




**Click up to 3 primary destinations when walking or biking.**

 When poll is active, respond at **PollEv.com/swtdesign900**




**Click up to 3 destinations you would like to walk or bike to but currently cannot.**

 When poll is active, respond at [PollEv.com/swtdesign900](https://PollEv.com/swtdesign900)



**Click up to 3 primary conflict points for walking or biking.**

 When poll is active, respond at **[PollEv.com/swtdesign900](https://www.pollevo.com/swtdesign900)**



## Community Engagement Boards

The Advisory Committee for this project partnered with the design team to execute community engagement in the most effective way. Committee members took the boards designed and printed by the design team to key locations and events in their community to gather feedback. They were also given a guidance sheet with instructions for the activity.

The following pages include the guidance sheet and board that were shown at the public engagement events listed below.

- Public Library

- High School Lunch Program

- Breezy's SnoCone Shack

- Senior Club

- City Hall

- Pizza Hut



### CITY OF VALLEY CENTER PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE MASTER PLAN UPDATE

#### PROJECT OVERVIEW

The City of Valley Center has hired a team of consultants led by SWT Design to update the City's Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan. The purpose of this study is to provide an assessment of Valley Center's current sidewalks, trails and bike routes providing current conditions of existing sidewalks and trails, identifying gaps in the network, gathering public input on community priorities and developing a final plan that shows sidewalk/trail priority improvements. The study area is the City of Valley Center, KS – city limits.

#### OUTREACH/MESSAGING

We want the community's input during this project to help inform priorities, resolve concerns, and address desires. Our team of consultants will be located at multiple locations throughout the City to gather your insight during their existing conditions analysis. Please consider visiting one of these locations to participate in an interactive activity, or participate by completing an online survey. There will be future opportunities to provide input on this planning effort.

Movie on Main: Saturday, June 22, 8:00-9:30pm

Library Reading/Valley Center Library: Thursday, June 27, 10:30am

Senior Center Summer Lunch / Valley Center Community Building: Thursday, June 27, noon

Valley Center High School Summer Lunch: Wednesday, June 26 11a-12:30p

Valley Center McKay-Petrie Sports Complex Concessions: Wednesday, June 26 5:30-7p

Valley Center City Hall: June 24 - June 28, 8-5p

#### INSTRUCTIONS TO FACILITATORS

Thank you for assisting with this public engagement exercise. Public engagement is used as input into the planning process. We will use this information to help prioritize bicycle and pedestrian investments, along with information about technical needs, safety and demand.

This exercise includes two large maps with dots. Participants should be asked to place dots that coincide with the following locations:


- Blue: Where you live
- Green: Where you currently walk/bike
- Yellow: Where you would walk/bike if you could
- Red: Hot spots where walking or biking are challenging.

Additionally, another comment board will enable participants to complete the sentence, "walking and biking in Valley Center is challenging because \_\_\_\_\_."



**MAPPING EXERCISE (PLACE DOTS ON THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS):**

- 1. WHERE DO YOU LIVE? (Blue Dot)
- 2. PRIMARY DESTINATION WHEN WALKING OR BIKING? (Green Dot)
- 3. DESTINATION YOU WOULD LIKE TO WALK TO BUT CURRENTLY CANNOT? (Yellow Dot)
- 4. PRIMARY CONFLICT POINTS FOR WALKING OR BIKING? (Red Dot)




# Community Engagements Results - Intercept Survey Boards

## MAPPING EXERCISE (PLACE DOTS ON THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS):

- 1. WHERE DO YOU LIVE? (Blue Dot)
- 2. PRIMARY DESTINATION WHEN WALKING OR BIKING? (Green Dot)
- 3. DESTINATION YOU WOULD LIKE TO WALK TO BUT CURRENTLY CANNOT? (Yellow Dot)
- 4. PRIMARY CONFLICT POINTS FOR WALKING OR BIKING? (Red Dot)

*Breezy's Sno Cone Shack*




# Community Engagements Results - Intercept Survey Boards

## MAPPING EXERCISE (PLACE DOTS ON THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS):

1. WHERE DO YOU LIVE? (Blue Dot)
2. PRIMARY DESTINATION WHEN WALKING OR BIKING? (Green Dot)
3. DESTINATION YOU WOULD LIKE TO WALK TO BUT CURRENTLY CANNOT? (Yellow Dot)
4. PRIMARY CONFLICT POINTS FOR WALKING OR BIKING? (Red Dot)

*City Hall*




# Community Engagements Results - Intercept Survey Boards

## MAPPING EXERCISE (PLACE DOTS ON THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS):

- 1. WHERE DO YOU LIVE? (Blue Dot)
- 2. PRIMARY DESTINATION WHEN WALKING OR BIKING? (Green Dot)
- 3. DESTINATION YOU WOULD LIKE TO WALK TO BUT CURRENTLY CANNOT? (Yellow Dot)
- 4. PRIMARY CONFLICT POINTS FOR WALKING OR BIKING? (Red Dot)

*H.S. School Lunch Program*



# Community Engagements Results - Intercept Survey Boards

## COMMENT BOARD (FILL IN YOUR THOUGHTS):

WALKING AND BIKING IN VALLEY CENTER IS CHALLENGING BECAUSE...

- No sidewalks on main West of <sup>H.S. School Lunch Program</sup> Sheridan (West)
- Gaps in sidewalks on Meridian
- Connection between USD262 schools
- Connect Park City and VALLEY CENTER






# Community Engagements Results - Intercept Survey Boards

## MAPPING EXERCISE (PLACE DOTS ON THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS):

1. WHERE DO YOU LIVE? (Blue Dot)
2. PRIMARY DESTINATION WHEN WALKING OR BIKING? (Green Dot)
3. DESTINATION YOU WOULD LIKE TO WALK TO BUT CURRENTLY CANNOT? (Yellow Dot)
4. PRIMARY CONFLICT POINTS FOR WALKING OR BIKING? (Red Dot)

*Seniors Club*



# Community Engagements Results - Intercept Survey Boards

## COMMENT BOARD (FILL IN YOUR THOUGHTS):

### WALKING AND BIKING IN VALLEY CENTER IS CHALLENGING BECAUSE...

*Seniors Club*


- *NA - Northwest corner of Lions Park (short distance to sidewalk) people + young bikers have to go into the street.*
- *Bas. Buchanan - Main street nearby Meridian*
- *MW - COMPLETE THE SIDEWALK ON THE EAST SIDE OF MERIDIAN BETWEEN MAIN AND 75TH STREET*

# Community Engagements Results - Intercept Survey Boards


## MAPPING EXERCISE (PLACE DOTS ON THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS):

- 1. WHERE DO YOU LIVE? (Blue Dot)
- 2. PRIMARY DESTINATION WHEN WALKING OR BIKING? (Green Dot)
- 3. DESTINATION YOU WOULD LIKE TO WALK TO BUT CURRENTLY CANNOT? (Yellow Dot)
- 4. PRIMARY CONFLICT POINTS FOR WALKING OR BIKING? (Red Dot)

*Pizza Hut*



# Community Destinations and Engagement Identified Points




## LEGEND

- 15 to 28 Destinations
- 10 to 15 Destinations
- 6 to 10 Destinations
- 3 to 6 Destinations

Fewer  
Community  
Engagement  
Data Points

More  
Community  
Engagement  
Data Points


# Community Engagement Heat Map & Sidewalk Quality



## LEGEND

- █ 5 Rated Walk
- █ 4 Rated Walk
- █ 3 Rated Walk
- █ 2 Rated Walk
- █ 1 Rated Walk
- █ No Walk






## Community Engagement Heat Map & Suggested Routes

### LEGEND



### LEGEND





# APPENDIX

## Pedestrian Facilities

*Community Engagement Boards*

*Historic Pricing*

*3rd Street Path*

*Colby and Main Street Paths*

*Clay & Dexter Street Paths*

*Meridian Paths*

*5th Street Path*

# Historic Pricing

Material costs are based on bid results from the City of Wichita, Kansas. The formal bid (FB) from which the prices were taken are shown, below. Bids were examined for 2017, 2018, and 2019. The resultant bid prices used are:

<b>Concrete Sidewalk Removed and Replaced:</b> Unit Cost per Square Feet for the removal of existing path, along with labor and materials to construct new path consisting of 5" thick, fiber-reinforced concrete. Unit Cost to include seeding and restoration.	<b>\$9.00/ ft<sup>2</sup> (FB740127, FB840199)</b>
<b>New 5" concrete path</b> Placing 5" flush with existing grades.	<b>\$6.00/ft<sup>2</sup> (FB740226, FB840128, FB740049)</b>
<b>Wheelchair Ramp</b> New. Removal is approximately \$200/ea.	<b>\$500/ea (FB840199)</b>
<b>Tree Removal, small</b>	<b>\$325/ea (FB740226)</b>
<b>Tree Removal, large</b>	<b>\$550/ea (FB740226)</b>

**Disclaimer:** The above prices are representative of real prices obtained during competitive bidding at the City of Wichita. These values, although intended to estimate costs of construction, may vary significantly.

# Valley Center Pedestrian Facilities




## 3rd Street Path



The 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Path connects Meridian with Emporia on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. Along the south side, there are multiple gas meters, trees, utility poles, and other obstructions. Along the north side, multiple driveways would have to be completely replaced to adjust for the new slopes required for accessibility under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Specifically, the ADA requires the cross-slope of a sidewalk (the slope perpendicular to travel direction) may not exceed 2%.

Both the north and south sides have very limited right of way. In order to clear obstructions and obtain the requisite right of way, it is anticipated that a 4' wide, 1,532' long path between Abilene and Emporia on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street is can be constructed, but at approximately \$9–\$12/ft<sup>2</sup> (\$13,788–\$18,384), including reconstructing some driveways. Nine wheelchair ramps (\$5,400) would be required.

## Colby and Main Street Paths




The Colby Street Path connects Lion's Park, the Pool, the Library, LifePoint Church, and Abilene Elementary School. Along the east side of Colby, this avoids several obstacles, including backing cars and wing walls at Valleyview Apartments (Southwest corner of Colby and Main).

At approximately 3,900' (\$140,400), this path provides a significant amount of connectivity to high-use attractions. Fifteen wheelchair ramps (\$9,000) would be required.

Main Street, from Abilene to Colby, (750', \$27,000), on the north side would require four wheelchair ramps (\$2,400). On the south side, two would be required (\$1,200). However, the property on the south has an island that would have to be rebuilt such that the north side is far more constructable.

## Clay & Dexter Street Paths



Clay, from Colby to Dexter (300', \$10,800), and Clay, from the LifePoint Church to Dexter (700', \$25,200) complete paths and complete missing portions of walk. Colby to Dexter would require three wheelchair ramps (\$1,800).

Dexter, from Clay to Ford (1,300', \$46,800) completes the connection to Ford Street. On the west side of the street, eight wheelchair ramps would be required (\$4,800). On the east side, five wheelchair ramps would be required (\$3,000).

Ford, from Ramsey to Dexter (925', \$33,300), Dexter to Stoneridge (1,400', \$50,400), and Stoneridge to Gatewood (275', \$9,900) provide connectivity along Ford.

## Meridian Path



Meridian, Ford to 5<sup>th</sup> St, has a combination of missing and degraded sidewalk. At approximately one mile, approximately 2,750' (~\$100,000) will complete the missing portions.

Ramsey, Meridian to Ford, 955' (\$34,380).

Main, Meridian to Abilene, 300' (\$10,800).

## 5th Street Path



Valley Oaks Ct	Seneca Street	625'
Interurban Street	Birch Ave	1,000'
Birch Ave	Park Ave	725'
Park Ave	Meridian	350'
	TOTAL:	2,700'

Missing lengths of walk along 5<sup>th</sup> Street: \$97,200



## Valley Center Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Master Plan 2019

*Route 1-1*

*Routes 1-2, 1-3, and 8*

*Route 1-4*

*Route 5*

*Route 9*

*Route 10*

*Route 14*

*Route 15-1*

*Route 15-2*

*Route 15-3*


*Route 16-1*

*Route 16-2*

*Route 16-3*

*Route 19*

# Valley Center Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Master Plan 2019




## Historic Pricing

Material costs are based on bid results from the City of Wichita, Kansas. The formal bid (FB) from which the prices were taken are shown, below. Bids were examined for 2017, 2018, and 2019. The resultant bid prices used are:

<b>Concrete Sidewalk Removed and Replaced:</b> Unit Cost per Square Feet for the removal of existing path, along with labor and materials to construct new path consisting of 5" thick, fiber-reinforced concrete. Unit Cost to include seeding and restoration.	<b>\$9.00/ ft<sup>2</sup> (FB740127, FB840199)</b>
<b>New 5" concrete path</b> Placing 5" flush with existing grades.	<b>\$6.00/ft<sup>2</sup> (FB740226, FB840128, FB740049)</b>
<b>Wheelchair Ramp</b> New. Removal is approximately \$200/ea.	<b>\$500/ea (FB840199)</b>
<b>On-Street Signage</b> Typical.	<b>\$500/sign (FB740163, FB840105)</b>
<b>Pavement Marking (multicomponent) (sharrows)</b>	<b>\$300/each (FB740097)</b>
<b>Low-Water Crossing / flume (8" thickened)</b>	<b>\$15.00/ft<sup>2</sup> (FB740226)</b>
<b>Tree Removal, small</b>	<b>\$325/ea (FB740226)</b>
<b>Tree Removal, large</b>	<b>\$550/ea (FB740226)</b>
<b>Pavement marking machine, airless, self-propelled</b> Due to the cost of contractor installation of striping, using City forces to stripe becomes cost-competitive.	<b>\$22,395/each (FQ840029)</b>
<b>Crushed Concrete Path (4")</b>	<b>\$1.25/ft<sup>2</sup> (FB840142)</b>

**Disclaimer:** The above prices are representative of real prices obtained during competitive bidding at the City of Wichita. These values, although intended to estimate costs of construction, may vary significantly.



Route 1-1 is a recreational trail. Placing the path along the west side of drainage canal eliminates need for a bridge and for a culvert. Additionally, this allows the path not to cross the narrow bridge on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.

The additional path on the south side of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street allows trail users to connect to the school. With a total length of 5,350 feet + 1,700 feet along 93<sup>rd</sup> = 7,050 feet of effective path to the school, but only 5,350 (\$66,875) of hard-packed gravel would need to be placed between 93<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets. Locating the path on the east side, improvements would require a pedestrian bridge approximately 100 feet at \$800/ft (\$80,000). A drainage analysis may allow the bridge to be shortened if headwalls are used to reduce the distance.

## Routes 1-2, 1-3, and 8




Routes 1-2, 1-3, and 8 are recreational trails. This bridge will serve as a connection to Route 1-3 and the homes to the south. Route 1-2 and Route 8 can be built together, providing a complete path and access to the homes to the east. This allows the pedestrian bridge to be built at a point in the future. Route 1-2 and 8 are a total of 5,400 feet (\$67,500); Route 1-3 is 2650 feet (\$33,125). The pedestrian bridge needs to be approximately 100 feet at \$800/ft (\$80,000). A drainage analysis may allow the bridge to be shortened if headwalls are used to reduce the distance.




Route 1-4 is a recreational trail. The three low water crossings could be used to avoid costly bridges and culverts. With a total length of 6,865 feet (\$85,812) plus each of the low-water crossings (3 x \$5,000 = \$15,000), for a total of approximately \$100,812.

## Route 1-5




Route 1-5 is a recreational trail. The two low water crossings could be used to avoid costly bridges and culverts. With a total length of 5,950 feet (\$85,812) plus each of the low-water crossings (2 x \$5,000 = \$10,000), for a total of approximately \$95,812. The pedestrian bridge needs to be approximately 100 feet at \$800/ft (\$80,000). A drainage analysis may allow the bridge to be shortened if headwalls are used to reduce the distance.




Route 5 is a recreational path. Constructability would indicate the path should be on the east side of tracks to avoid west railroad spur and ditch. With a total length of 2,750 feet (\$34,375), the path would cross meridian at a 90° angle outside of the railroad crossing.

## Route 9




Route 9 is a multi-use path. Along the west side of the path is West Elementary School, with parking stalls abutting the existing sidewalk. As one alternative, the path could change from the west to the east side by the existing crosswalk adjacent to the school.

The railroad grade crossing has the sidewalk outside the protection of the gates, which is not preferred. For constructability, the path should extend north on the west side of Interurban Street, avoiding drainage structures and other obstacles. With a length of 4,250 feet (\$38,250), this would provide a connection between the schools and future expansion to the north.




Route 10 is a multi-use path along Main Street, which has a right-of-way width of approximately seventy-five feet. The current sidewalk-railroad crossing is outside of the gates and should either be redirected onto the street or the crossing widened to allow protection of both the motoring public and pedestrians. Significant drainage issues will drive the cost on this 4,400' section (\$396,000+).

## Route 14




Route 14 is a recreational trail. At 5,500' (\$8,250–\$16,500), there are no major obstacles to construction other than assuring that the gravel trail is sufficiently compacted.



Route 15-1 is a complete street. Generally, this costs about \$1 to \$2 per foot. However, annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. This does not include any bulge-outs or other street improvements to slow traffic.


Sharrows should be provided every approximately 150'; annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. With a length of 1,350', this would require approximately sixteen sharrows at \$300/each (\$4,800) and eight “share the road” signs (\$2,400), not including any geometric improvements.

## Route 15-2



Route 15-2 is a complete street. Generally, this costs about \$1 to \$2 per foot. However, annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. This does not include any bulge-outs or other street improvements to slow traffic.


Sharrows should be provided every approximately 150'; annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. With a length of 2,550, this would require approximately sixteen sharrows at \$300/each (\$4,800) and eight “share the road” signs (\$2,400), not including any geometric improvements.



Route 15-3 is a complete street. Generally, this costs about \$1 to \$2 per foot. However, annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. This does not include any bulge-outs or other street improvements to slow traffic.

Sharrows should be provided every approximately 150'; annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. With a length of 1,350, this would require approximately nine sharrows at \$300/each (\$2,700) and five “share the road” signs (\$1,500), not including any geometric improvements.


## Route 16-1



Route 16-1 is a complete street. Generally, this costs about \$1 to \$2 per foot. However, annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. This does not include any bulge-outs or other street improvements to slow traffic.

Sharrows should be provided every approximately 150'; annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. With a length of 2,250, this would require approximately fifteen sharrows at \$300/each (\$4,500) and eight “share the road” signs (\$2,400), not including any geometric improvements.

This could also be a location for a shared sidewalk, a 6' sidewalk on both sides of 5<sup>th</sup> Street.




Route 16-2 is a complete street. Generally, this costs about \$1 to \$2 per foot. However, annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. This does not include any bulge-outs or other street improvements to slow traffic.

Sharrows should be provided every approximately 150'; annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. With a length of 2,500, this would require approximately seventeen sharrows at \$300/each (\$5,100) and eight “share the road” signs (\$2,400), not including any geometric improvements.

Most of this section has mature trees on the south side with utility poles on the north side. On-street bicycle lanes would require the removal of the two-way left turn lane, likely decreasing overall safety.

## Route 16-3



Route 16-3 is a complete street, generally costing about \$1 to \$2 per foot. Annual maintenance runs about 25% of the initial costs for repainting sharrows. This does not include any bulge-outs or other street improvements to slow traffic.

With a length of 2,250' and no improved shoulders, there is insufficient room to place path on either side of the road easily, and a speed limit of 45 mph, no changes are recommended. Even if the speed limit were lowered, it is unlikely that median and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds will decrease significantly.



Route 19 is a multi-use path. The stretch along Interurban Street is along an open bar ditch with several drainage structures and a utility pole. Crossing between Meadow and Deerfield avoids these conflicts. Additionally, completing this portion allows a connection with the existing sidewalk on the east side of Interurban Dr. The total 3,500' (\$22,750) path would then run from Interurban to Meridian & 7<sup>th</sup>.

