

WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN NON-MOTORIZED IMPROVEMENT PLAN

April 17, 2001

**MDOT NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT
PLANNING
SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN WORKSHOPS: SUMMARY REPORT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction: Purpose and Process of Workshops**
- 2. Summary of Participation**
- 3. Existing and Planned Facility Summary**
- 4. Summary of Criteria**
- 5. Summary of Project Ideas and Opportunities**
- 6. Possible Applications**

Attachments:

- A. Workshop Process (Instructions to Facilitators)**
- B. Workshop Participation**
- C. Inventory Maps**
- D. Questionnaire Summary**
- E. Criteria Tally**
- F. Meeting Summary of Non-Motorized Opportunities**

1. Introduction: Purpose and Process of Workshops

The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), Southwest Region is in the process of developing a Non-Motorized Transportation Investment Plan. The plan is intended to integrate non-motorized considerations into Southwest Michigan's planning and programming activities. MDOT wants the non-motorized planning decisions to reflect local needs and priorities. A series of seven workshops held during the week of March 19, 2001 provided an opportunity to gather information about local facilities and to better understand local concerns.

The workshops served two primary goals. The first goal was to gather information for an inventory of existing and proposed non-motorized facilities that is being prepared as part of this project. The workshops served as a venue for review of and additions to the inventory maps. As an adjunct to this review, a questionnaire was distributed to participants asking them about local bicycle, trail and pedestrian planning.

The second goal of the workshops was to gather local input on the criteria for the consideration of non-motorized facilities. As a warm-up exercise, participants were asked to indicate factors that encourage and discourage walking. Attendees then participated in an exercise designed to link various criteria to desired project concepts. Participants were asked to identify hypothetical bicycle and pedestrian project ideas and opportunities on a map and on a list. They were then asked to say why these projects were important. Finally, the participants were asked to review a list of draft criteria and to decide which of these criteria would be consistent with the need for each of the proposed project ideas and to propose additional criteria where the draft criteria were not deemed sufficient. (See Attachment A for a detailed description of the workshop process. Any feedback on the conduct and usefulness of this process would be appreciated to assist in the development of future workshops.)

Following is a summary of the results of the public workshops including a summary of participation; a summary of the methods and results, to date, of the facility and inventory initiative; a summary and discussion of the criteria concepts developed through the workshop process and the project ideas and opportunities identified by participants at the workshops; and, finally, a short discussion on possible applications and next steps.

2. Summary of Participation

Following an extensive outreach effort to identify interested individuals and essential organizations and public agencies, approximately 1,000 participants were invited to one of seven meetings held throughout the nine counties that make-up the MDOT Southwest Region area. One hundred and fifteen people participated in the seven workshops. The largest percentage of participation came from government agencies. There was also substantial participation from advocacy organizations and tourism/business interests. Education and safety interests were also represented at some of the meetings. (An analysis of workshop participation by venue can be found in Attachment B.)

The wide representation of the workshop participants attested to the success of the outreach effort. The scheduling of the workshops during the early morning and late afternoon time periods helped boost the attendance of government and public agency representatives, which was one of the primary goals of the initial outreach process. However, this probably limited the number of bicycle and pedestrian advocates, which was the other primary goal. It is hoped that holding the follow-up June public meetings during evening hours will enable more private citizens to attend and participate.

3. Existing and Planned Facility Summary

The inventory was initiated to identify areas where non-motorized facilities exist or are planned in the southwest region. This information will help MDOT's Southwest Region as it integrates non-motorized considerations into its planning and programming processes.

MDOT will use the non-motorized inventory to:

- Store non-motorized data in a standardized way
- Facilitate shared data among interested agencies
- Facilitate the incorporation of non-motorized consideration in MDOT planning
- Provide context information for non-motorized projects under consideration

The initial non-motorized layer of these maps incorporated existing and proposed trails and bicycle facilities in the southwest region of Michigan based on information received from responsible authorities such as TSCs, MPOs, trail authorities, and other official public entities. This information was inserted onto Geographic Information System (GIS) based maps received from MDOT for each county, using the Maptitude GIS platform. This is the same program MDOT uses. Information in the electronic file is best viewed at a city or county scale.

Participants at the sub-regional workshops reviewed draft county maps and added additional known existing and planned facilities (see Attachment C). Attendees were also asked to complete a supplementary community questionnaire to identify further areas for data acquisition, as well as any local non-motorized planning initiatives (see Attachment D).

4. Summary of Criteria

One of the primary products of the March workshop process was to develop and refine a list of criteria to be used by MDOT in the identification and prioritization of non-motorized transportation investments in the Southwest Michigan Region. This began with the preparation of two preliminary lists of criteria for pedestrian and bicycle projects. These preliminary lists were a product of MDOT's early prioritization efforts and similar criteria developed and in use throughout the rest of the country.

These criteria were then used at the workshops in conjunction with various project ideas and opportunities developed by participants to see how useful they would be in the analysis of specific projects they so identified. Additional criteria were solicited to cover

those instances where the preliminary criteria lists did not adequately describe their proposed projects.

Two tables showing the frequency that these original criteria and the newly developed criteria were checked for both the pedestrian and bicycle projects are provided as a part of this report (see Attachment E). Since there were fewer pedestrian than bicycle projects identified in these workshops, the total number of pedestrian criteria checked is also less. It is the relative frequency of the various criteria that is the most meaningful measure to use in their further development.

5. Summary of Project Ideas and Opportunities

One of the workshop tools used to develop these evaluation criteria was the compilation of various specific possible pedestrian and bicycle opportunities. This was a very lively and participatory portion of the workshops and many valuable suggestions for possible non-motorized improvements were made (see Attachment F). Although most of the project ideas and opportunities identified in this process have not been reviewed or approved for inclusion in any official plans or construction programs, they could provide a catalyst for future discussions and planning efforts. As such, they have been summarized and are being provided back to the workshop participants with the understanding that they are not currently part of any MDOT official map or transportation plan.

6. Possible Applications

The next step will be to synthesize the criteria into a meaningful format, retaining only those criteria that can actually be used to describe and evaluate the different non-motorized transportation projects. At the present time, we see two ways that these criteria can be used in this process. The first use will be in the development of a scoping checklist that will incorporate non-motorized transportation elements into the standard transportation project scoping process. The second use will be to help provide a prioritization matrix to be used in determining the need and viability of independent stand-alone non-motorized transportation projects.

The next work activity will include preparation of a draft scoping checklist for non-motorized elements that will match and support the present highway scoping checklist. With respect to the independent non-motorized projects, a potential matrix will be drafted with explanatory descriptions of the criteria chosen for this purpose and recommendations on how this matrix might be used. Both of these products will be presented for review and discussion at two hearings to be held in late June 2001.

**MDOT NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT PLANNING
SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN WORKSHOPS
Week of March 19-23, 2001**

Workshop Program Explanation

1. Sign-in and Refreshments

During this time, people will be arriving. They will be greeted at the sign-in table and asked to sign-in; find or fill out their nametag; and, identify themselves by one of the three mode choices. Participants will also be given a number to indicate their table assignment. Every effort will be made to assure variety of perspectives at each table. They will be invited to have refreshments and to have a look at the map to check to see if they can add any existing or planned non-motorized facilities to it.

2. Opening Remarks and Introductions

Fifteen minutes after the official starting time the whole group will be convened. The primary MDOT representative will ask that participants sit at their assigned tables and will welcome everyone, briefly summarize the project and make introductions of the MDOT people and consultants who will serve as small group facilitators.

The primary consultant facilitator will explain the goals of the workshop and the ground rules for participation (Board #1).

3. Working Group Warm-up Exercise

Each table will have one facilitator who will lead the group through the exercise. He/she will request one volunteer to act as scribe. The first activity will serve as a way for participants to get to know each other and to start thinking about non-motorized issues. Facilitators will ask participants in their group to briefly introduce themselves and explain their mode choice(s) as indicated on their nametags. Next, participants will be asked where and how far they walk and what factors encourage and discourage walking for them. The scribe will note the encouragement and discouragement factors.

4. MDOT Transportation Programming Process

The main consultant facilitator will briefly describe the 5-year plan and the highway planning process (Board # 2). He/she will explain that the map (one at each table) shows the known existing and planned non-motorized facilities and the highway improvement projects that are in the current plan.

It will be explained that not all of the non-motorized projects have or will involve MDOT participation but that we are seeking input on the ways in which MDOT can integrate non-motorized considerations into the planning process.

He/she will describe the two types of non-motorized projects: independently initiated bicycle or pedestrian projects and incidental non-motorized improvements that can be integrated into other highway projects.

Next the individual table facilitators will ask the groups to examine the map(s) and think about the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists in the area. The group will then identify potential non-motorized opportunities on the map including non-motorized projects that have been planned and/or programmed, but are not yet shown on the map. The opportunities and project ideas can be noted directly on the map or summarized on post-its.

The group will be asked why these opportunities and project ideas are important. The scribe will be asked to write down the project and the reasons for its importance.

Participants will be made aware of the inventory questionnaires and asked to fill them out after the session or to take them and mail them back.

5. MDOT Early Planning: Criteria for Non-motorized Considerations

The main consultant facilitator will describe the MDOT 5-year Plan Development Process (Board #3) and the need to develop criteria that MDOT can use to evaluate non-motorized needs. Draft criteria for both pedestrian and bicycle considerations will be presented (Boards #4 and 5).

The criteria lists will be available at each table and the small group facilitators will be asked to review the lists and add any criteria that come to mind.

The group will then be asked to go back to their list of identified opportunities and project ideas and indicate which of the criteria would be associated with which opportunity. Do these criteria adequately predict the need for some consideration? Are there additional criteria that must be included in the list?

Groups revise criteria, as needed.

6. Closing

The main consultant facilitator will explain how the results of the groups' contributions will help with the development of the criteria for including bicycle and pedestrian accommodations in the 5-Year Plan and thank participants for coming to the meeting. He/she will remind the participants to fill out or send the questionnaires if they know of planned or programmed trails or non-motorized facilities that are not included on the map.

Also, communication strategies and future opportunities to participate in this project will be mentioned.

Workshop Participation

Monday, March 19th

PM Grouping: Three Rivers, Constantine and Sturgis, Coldwater
 Location: Sturgis-Young Performing Arts Center
 Attendance: 8 people
 Category Analysis: 60% governmental
 20% business
 20% no indication

Tuesday, March 20th

AM Grouping: Plainwell, Otsego, Hastings, Wayland, and Middleville north to
 Grand Rapids
 Location: Otsego City Hall
 Attendance: 5 people attended
 Category Analysis 62.5% government
 25% advocacy
 12.5 % tourism and recreation

PM Grouping: Holland, Saugatuck, and Allegan
 Location: Hamilton High School
 Attendance: 9 people attended
 Category Analysis 44% government
 44% advocacy
 11% education

Wednesday, March 21st

AM Grouping: Kalamazoo, Portage, Vicksburg, Schoolcraft, Mattawan,
 Galesburg, and Augusta
 Location: Kalamazoo County Chamber of Commerce Federal Room
 Attendance: 29 people attended
 Category Analysis: 58.6% government
 17.2% Advocacy
 6.9% business
 6.9% education
 3.4% political
 3.4 % safety
 3.4% no indication

PM Grouping: Marshall, Battle Creek, and Albion
 Location: The Kendal Center (Western Michigan University) in Battle Creek
 Attendance: 9 people attended
 Category Analysis 65% government
 22% tourism
 11% business

Thursday, March 22nd Meeting time is changed to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.
Grouping: Watervliet, South Haven, Bangor, Paw Paw, Gobles, Dowagiac
Benton Harbor, St. Joseph, and Niles
Location: St. Julian Winery Banquet Hall-Paw Paw
AM Attendance: 39 people attended
64.1% government
12.8% tourism/recreation
10.3 % business
7.7% advocacy
7.7 no indication

PM Attendance: 16 people
50% government
37.5% advocacy
6.3% education

Following are tabulations of all the existing and proposed non-motorized facilities in the Southwest Michigan Region. This data is still incomplete and any additional or corrected information would be greatly appreciated.

By clicking on one of the County names below you will also be able to open a map depicting this same information in a GIS format. You can blow up these maps to whatever scale you need to view the specific area you are most interested in. If you have any problems opening or manipulating these maps, or would like hard copies of any portion of any of these maps, please contact Ryan Abbotts at rabbotts@tylin.com or call (773) 792-9000.

[Allegan](#)

[Barry](#)

[Berrien](#)

[Branch](#)

[Calhoun](#)

[Cass](#)

[Kalamazoo](#)

[St. Joseph](#)

[Van Buren](#)

MDOT INVESTMENT PLANNING WORKSHOP: MARCH 19-23, 2001
SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN COMMUNITY NON-MOTORIZED INVENTORY TALLY

ATTACHMENT D

Community Agency	Contact	Bikeways			Trails		Pedestrians Plan/Sidewalks*			Sidewalk Policy			Plans, Maps provided	
		System	Plan	Map	Plan	Map	Plan	Downtown	Neighborhoods Commercial Areas	With Development	In-fill	Repair		
City of Allegan	Phone: Victor Rose Fax: (616) 673-5511 (616) 673-2869	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	X	X		NO	NO	YES	
Village of Augusta	Phone: Glen Avis Fax: (616) 731-5517 (616) 731-5255 E-mail: gavis@acm.org	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	X	X	X	YES	YES	YES	
City of Battle Creek, Parks & Rec	Phone: Linn C. Kracht E-mail: (616) 966-3431 ldkracht@cibattle-creek.mi.us	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES				NO		YES	
Battle Creek Unlimited	Phone: Jan Burland Fax: (616) 962-7526 (616) 962-8096 E-mail: burland@bcunlimited.org						YES	X	X	X	YES	NO	YES	
Barrien County Parks & Recreation	Phone: Brian Bailey E-mail: (616) 983-7111 x 8007 bbailey@barriencounty.org				YES	YES								
City of Bridgeman	Phone: Loren W. Berndt Fax: (616) 465-6601 (616) 465-4631 E-mail: laketop@qtm.net						YES	X	X	X	YES	YES	YES	
Calhoun County Community Development	Phone: Annette Chapman Fax: (616) 781-9841 (616) 781-6101 E-mail: achapman@internet1.net	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	X	X	X	NO	NO	NO	Will mail maps.
Cass County Resident	Phone: T. F. Rafferty (616) 445-8411	NO				NO	NO	X	X	X	NO	NO	NO	
Charleston Township	Phone: Fran Bell, Supervisor Fax: (616) 665-7805 (616) 484-8035 E-mail: charleston@voyager.net	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO				NO	NO	NO	

* sidewalk location

MDOT INVESTMENT PLANNING WORKSHOP: MARCH 19-23, 2001
SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN COMMUNITY NON-MOTORIZED INVENTORY TALLY

ATTACHMENT D

Community Agency	Contact	Bikeways			Trails		Pedestrians Plan/Sidewalks*			Sidewalk Policy			Plans, Maps provided	
		System	Plan	Map	Plan	Map	Plan	Downtown	Neighborhoods Commercial Areas	With Development	In-fill	Repair		
Chikaming Township Park Board	Phone: (616) 469-2604 E-mail: pettersen@triton.net	NO			NO	NO	NO	X			NO	NO		
Fillmore Township	Phone: (616) 751-7655 Fax: (616) 751-6065	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES		X		NO	NO	NO	
City of Galesburg	Phone: (616) 665-7000 Fax: (616) 665-4541				YES	YES		X	X	X	YES	NO	YES	Kalamazoo River Trailway Map.
Gun Lake Area, Gun Lake Path	Phone: (616) 664-4792 E-mail: clamoreaux@compuserve.com	NO			YES		NO				NO	NO	NO	
Harbor Country Chamber of Commerce (New Buffalo)	Phone: (616) 469-5409 Fax: (616) 469-2257 E-mail: hccc@triton.net	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO		X		NO	NO	NO	
Kalamazoo County Parks	Phone: (616) 383-8787 Fax: (616) 383-8724 E-mail: bgregersen@kalcounty.com	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES								Kalamazoo River Trailway Map, Additional notes.
Kent County Parks Department	Phone: (616) 336-3223 Fax: (616) 336-2998 E-mail: wseger@kentcountyparks.org	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		X	X	X				
LaGrange Plan Comm.	Phone: (616) 445-8286	NO			NO		NO	X			NO	NO	NO	
Lake County Township	Phone: (616) 465-6601 Fax: (616) 465-4631 E-mail: laketoip@qtm.net	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO				NO	NO	NO	

* sidewalk location

MDOT INVESTMENT PLANNING WORKSHOP: MARCH 19-23, 2001
SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN COMMUNITY NON-MOTORIZED INVENTORY TALLY

ATTACHMENT D

Community Agency	Contact	Bikeways			Trails		Pedestrians Plan/Sidewalks*			Sidewalk Policy			Plans, Maps provided		
		System	Plan	Map	Plan	Map	Plan	Downtown	Neighborhoods Commercial Areas	With Development	In-fill	Repair			
Village of Michiana	Phone: (616) 469-4815 E-mail: 1johnbarb@home.com		YES	NO	NO	NO	NO				X	NO	NO	NO	
New Buffalo Township Park Community	Joyce & Len Zboril (616) 469-1354	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	X			X	NO	NO	NO	Nancy Kagan will supply.
Oshtemo Township	Debbie Everett, Clerk Phone: (616) 375-4260 Fax: (616) 375-7180 E-mail: oshtemo@oshtemo.org	NO					NO					NO	NO	NO	
Village of Richland	Phone: Jeff Heppler (616) 629-5124	YES	YES	YES			YES	X	X			NO	YES	YES	
Richland Township	Dean Blanchard, Supervisor Phone: (616) 629-4921 Fax: (616) 629-5993	NO			NO	NO	NO					NO	NO	NO	
Village of Schoolcraft	Mary Ver Hage Phone: (616) 679-4304 Fax: (616) 679-4761 E-mail: villsch@net-link.net	NO			NO		NO			X	X	YES	YES	YES	
City of St. Joseph	Roy Dost Phone: (616) 983-6341 Fax: (616) 985-0347 E-mail: dost@parrett.net	YES	YES	YES			YES			X	X	YES	YES	YES	Provided map. Inventory gaps; priorities/sidewalk infill.
City of Sturgis	Thomas R. Seymour, PE. Phone: (616) 659-7226 Fax: (616) 659-7295 E-mail: tseymour@ci.sturgis.mi.us	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO			X	X	YES	YES	YES	

* sidewalk location

	Paw Paw (AM), Table One	Paw Paw (AM), Table Two	Paw Paw (AM), Table Four	Paw Paw (AM), Table Three	Hamilton (PM) Suzan's Table	Hamilton (PM) John's Table	Sturgis Meeting #1	Kalamazoo (AM) Table One	Kalamazoo (AM) Table Two	Kalamazoo (AM) Table Three	Kalamazoo (AM) Table Four	Battle Creek, John's Table	Battle Creek, Suzan's Table	St. Julian's PM, Suzan's Table	St. Julian's PM, John's Table	Oshtemo, AM, Meeting #2	TOTAL
Suggested Criteria for Bicycle Projects																	
crash record		4	3	2	1	5	2	8		1	1			1	1	3	32
difficult street crossing	2	4	2	2	3		1	7	1	2	1	2	1			1	29
bike crossing volumes	1	4		2	1			3		2				1			14
bike volumes along road	2	5		2	3	3	3	4	2	2					2	3	31
existing bike lane or route		3						8						2		4	17
no paved shoulder	3	5	2	1	2	3	1	6	3	1	1	1		2	4		35
capacity, road-sharing issues	3	4	2	2	3	3	2	8	3	2	1	1	1	1	4	1	41
part of local or regional bicycle plan or trail plan	2	4	4		5			1	1	2		2	4	2	5		32
land-use type and density	1	2	2	1	4	5	3	1	3	1	2			2	1		28
school access route		3	2	2	5		3	3		1	2		1	2	1	2	27
nearby college	2	1	1				1	2						1	2	4	14
natural/man-made barriers	1	3	3	2	1	1		4	3	2	2	1	1	1	2		27
road serves as multi-use trail connection	3	4	4	2	4	5		7	4	1		3	4	1	5	5	52
facility needed to serve future gaps	3	3	4	2	5	5		3	2	1	1	3	3	1	3	1	40
personal security issues		2								1		1	1	1		5	11
need improved warnings for drivers	2	3	3	2	2	3	1	8	3	2	1	1	2	1	4	5	43
dangerous conditions	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	5	3	2	2	1	4	1	4	5	48
intersection improvement is planned				1				2	1					1		1	6
bridge improvement is planned	2													1		1	4
cost effective: small investment required	1		1	1	2	3	1		2	1			2	1		2	17
NEW CRITERIA SUGGESTED AT WORKSHOPS																	
access recreational areas							1										1
access to jobs													1				1
access to parks													1				1
addresses heavy traffic issues																6	6
assist with congestion							1										1
commercial destinations (serves destinations)					4	5		4									13
commuter route						5											5
connects communities	3					5		4			1	1			5		19
connects destination area																4	4
connects to adjacent jurisdictions							1										1
county connector		3															3
creates circular route		1															1
dangerous mailboxes								4									4
destination			4														4
economic development/ impact		1	4											2			7
educational resource					5												5
encourages alternative transportation														1	4		5
extension of known market (popularity)					3												3
fills in gaps in trail system					1												1
future development plans						5											5
historical significance						4		4				2		1	2		13
improved ambience	1													1			2
improves quality of life																1	1
intermodalism														1			1
landscaping improvement planned													1				1
linkages to business														1			1
matching funds	1																1
opportunity for private partnership																4	4
opportunity to work with other agencies																6	6
park/camping access														1			1
potential connector trail system		3															3
promote cycling							1										1
publicly owned right-of-way				1													1
rail-to-trail									1								1
recreation access					3										5		8
recreation/health		5		1	5	5		8	4				4			2	34
roadway improvement				1													1
right-of-way availability	1					4						2			2		9
scenic		5			5							2	3	1	5		21
serves all user-types																4	4
stimulate economic development					5												5
stimulate non-motorized traffic					1												1
stimulates local bicycle planning							1										1
stimulates residential development							1										1
tourism	2		4	1		4	1	1				3	1	2	5	6	30
trunk-line improvements	1														2		3

The numbers in the above table represent the frequency that each criteria was mentioned at all of the tables at all workshops combined. They are primarily valuable as a relative measurement to use in further criteria development.

	Paw Paw (AM), Table One	Paw Paw (AM), Table Two	Paw Paw (AM), Table Four	Paw Paw (AM), Table Three	Hamilton (PM) Suzan's Table	Hamilton (PM) John's Table	Sturgis Meeting #1 Kalamazoo (AM) Table One	Kalamazoo (AM) Table Two	Kalamazoo (AM) Table Three	Kalamazoo (AM) Table Four	Battle Creek, John's Table	Battle Creek, Suzan's Table	St. Julian's PM, Suzan's Table	St. Julian's PM, John's Table	Osego, AM, Meeting #2	TOTAL
Suggested Criteria for Pedestrian Projects																
crash record	1	1		1		2	2	2	1		2	1				13
difficult street crossing		1		3		2	2	2	4		2	1	1	1		21
ped crossing volumes	2	1				2	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	1		18
ped volumes along road	2	1		1		1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1		18
no existing sidewalk	1	1		2		2	2	2	3	1		1	1	1		19
no paved shoulder	2	1		2		2		2	1	2	1		1	1	1	16
visible worn path	1	1	1	1			2	2	1	2		1	1	1		14
sidewalk: poor condition or design		1					1		1	2	1					6
sidewalk on one side		1						2	2	1	1	2		1		10
existing gaps in sidewalk network	2	1		2			1	2	2	3		2		1		16
future development plans require or warrant sidewalks	3	1		1		2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1		18
part of local or regional pedestrian plan or trail plan	3	1	1	3			1		2	2		1		1		15
land-use type and density	3	1		1		2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1		20
school access route	1			2		1			1	4	1		1	1		12
nearby college								1	1	2		1				5
natural/man-made barriers	2		1	2			1		2	2		1	1	1	1	14
personal security issues							1	1		2		1				5
need improved ambiance	2			1			1	1	1	2		1				9
intersection improvement is planned				1		1			2	1		1				6
bridge improvement is planned				1				1	1	1						4
cost effective: small investment required		1	1	1				1	1	1		2	1			9
NEW CRITERIA SUGGESTED AT WORKSHOPS																
ability to obtain easements						1										1
access facilities	3											1				4
capacity road sharing		1														1
children independence												1				1
dangerous conditions	1															1
dangerous conditions		1														1
destination access								1			1					2
economic development		1														1
encourage non-motorized/ promote ped traffic	3						1	1	3			1				9
handicap accessible			1													1
historical significance			1										1			2
improved safety												1				1
intense traffic									3							3
linkage to business node													1			1
matching funds	1															1
multi-use (snowshoe, X country)			1													1
needed improved warning for drivers		1									1					2
perception of being injured		1														1
poor visibility									1							1
provides universal access				3												3
public support (demand)												1				1
quality of life												1				1
recreation/health	3	1	1	2				2				1	1			11
reduce congestion	3															3
road project may generate development						1										1
scenic area/corridor, natural, beauty, ambiance	3			2		1		2								8
sidewalk 'switches' sides											1					1
special event area/access						1		1								2
tourism	1	1		2				2								6
trunk-line improvement planned	1													1		2

The numbers in the above table represent the frequency that each criteria was mentioned at all of the tables at all workshops combined. They are primarily valuable as a relative measurement to use in further criteria development.

Meeting Summary of Non-Motorized Opportunities

The following is representative of the “opportunities” for non-motorized development in the Southwest Region as identified by participants of the workshops.

Name: Graatschap, Saugatuck, & Hamilton	Location: Allegan
Type: BIKE On road signed route with spur to state park	
Rationale: Provides an alternate transportation mode to the state park while linking other areas within the community. Creates a safe opportunity for cyclists already using the roadway and has multiple school destinations. This is a popular route, is part of local/region bicycle/trail plan and will complete a loop in northwest Allegan County.	

Name: Plainwell to Hamilton	Location: Allegan
Type: BIKE Abandoned rail corridor connecting small communities in Allegan county	
Rationale: Provides a safe and direct commuter route from communities in the county. Provides an alternative to an on-road route along M-40. Also provides access to local schools and opens up outdoor education potential. Is part of a local/regional bicycle/trail plan and would stimulate non-motorized travel in the area.	

Name: Old Penn Central Line	Location: Allegan & Kent
Type: BIKE/PED Rail-to-trail conversion from Allegan to Dorr and possibly into Kent County	
Rationale: Would serve a growing popularity in rail-to-trails and exhibits historical potential with abandoned rail facilities. However, a preliminary study would need to occur to determine if the right-of-way is still available in some areas.	

Name: Old Interurban paralleling U.S. 131	Location: Allegan
Type: BIKE/PED Rail-to-trail from Plainwell up into Kent County	
Rationale: Would serve a growing popularity in rail-to-trail conversions and exhibits historical potential with abandoned rail facilities. However, a preliminary study would need to occur to determine if the right-of-way is still available in some areas. Also has potential to serve as a school access route.	

Name: Gunn Lake People Path	Location: Allegan & Barry
Type: PED Sidepath and trail around Gunn Lake	
Rationale: Provides a scenic path around Gunn Lake and will reduce the numbers of pedestrians currently walking in the roadway.	

Name: Hutchins Lake Trail	Location: Allegan
Type: BIKE On-street signed bike route around Hutchins Lake	
Rationale: Route is already heavily used by cyclists. There is little or no paved shoulders Would serve to link communities and future gaps in trails systems. Improved warnings for drivers are required. Right-of-way is available. Would assist in tourism. This would be a cost-effective project.	

Name: Lake Shore Trail	Location: Allegan
Type: BIKE On-street signed bike route along the Lake Michigan shore of Allegan County	
Rationale: Route has potential to connect to other communities as well as counties and is part of a local/regional bike/trail plan. This route would provide excellent recreation and tourism opportunities as well as historical significance. A new connection will be needed at the Douglas washout.	

Name: Lake Allegan Trail	Location: Allegan
Type: BIKE Combined on-street signed and dirt road	
Rationale: Route is already heavily used, very scenic, and favored by locals for future development. This opportunity would serve to link communities and provide a safe alignment for the increasing number of cyclists using this route.	

Name: U.S. 131 Bike Route	Location: Allegan
Type: BIKE Paved shoulders along U.S. 131 in conjunction with MDOT work	
Rationale: Highway improvement is already scheduled and adding a paved shoulder would be a cost-effective solution, if there is available right-of-way. Would hopefully construct safe crossings so that those living west of U.S. 131 may cross safely to use the trails east of U.S. 131.	

Name: Paul Henry Thornapple Trail	Location: Barry
Type: BIKE/PED Fill in gaps in existing trail	
Rationale: Provides a national link and scenic experiences.	

Name: Bridgeman/ New Buffalo Beach Access	Location: Berrien
Type: PED Access route to local facilities, primarily for pedestrians to access the beach	
Rationale: Provides a safe route to access the beach and creates a pedestrian friendly atmosphere to encourage non-motorized travel. Part of the local pedestrian/trail plan and will connect to the Great Lakes trail. Can increase tourism and reduce area congestion.	

Name: Great Lakes Trail	Location: Berrien & Van Buren
Type: BIKE Primarily an on-road signed bike route along Red Arrow Highway	
Rationale: Part of local/regional/national bicycle/trail plan that will serve to connect communities, colleges, two existing trails, and a national loop along the Red Arrow Highway right-of-way. Improved warnings for drivers are needed, as cyclists are already on roadways without paved shoulders, creating difficult street crossings and road-sharing issues. Encourages additional tourism development possibilities. Is a cost-effective solution.	

Name: U.S. 31 from Niles to Grand Haven	Location: Berrien
Type: BIKE On-road signed bike lane following new U.S. 31 route	
Rationale: Serves as a scenic trail connection between communities and other trails where right-of-way is available. Is located in an area where trunk-line improvements are planned. Will serve nearby colleges and mitigate natural/man-made barriers.	

Name: U.S. 12 continuous	Location: Berrien & Cass
Type: BIKE On-road signed bike route with paved shoulders	
Rationale: Serves as a Regional/National trail connector (Cass County, Great Lake Trail, and eastern counties). Route is already in use by cyclists. Portions of this route can also provide access to schools and colleges. Is a proposed historic Heritage Route.	

Name: Lakeside to New Buffalo walkway	Location: Berrien
Type: PED Pedestrian walkway connecting lakes to New Buffalo	
Rationale: Mitigates dangerous conditions for pedestrians due to high ped volumes both crossing and along a road in an area where there are no paved shoulders. This area is part of a local/regional pedestrian/trail plan and there is a high perception of getting injured while walking in this area.	

Name: Galien River Hiking Trail	Location: Berrien
Type: PED Maintained hiking trail along the Galien River	
Rationale: Overcomes natural/man-made barriers while providing safe access to a scenic corridor that is already a heavily used area.	

Name: Benton Harbor to Niles	Location: Berrien
Type: BIKE Off-road gravel abandoned rail-to-trail	
Rationale: Provides an alternative to proposed route for U.S. 31. Connects more small communities, creating a greater tourist potential. Would act as a 'spine' between the northern and southern ends of the county and connect to existing bike/pedestrian networks (Niles).	

Name: Coldwater Lakes Bicycle Route	Location: Branch
Type: BIKE On-street, signed with paved shoulders (need shoulders)	
Rationale: To promote non-motorized traffic and to provide a safe cycling routes for recreational purposes for both tourists and local users. Helps alleviate conflicts between all user groups (ped/bike/car/horse-and-buggy). Would link downtown Coldwater with the surrounding camping and lake areas by bridging natural/man-made barriers and difficult street crossings. Will stimulate local bicycle/pedestrian planning.	

Name: Coldwater Bridge over US 12	Location: Branch
Type: BIKE/PED Multi-use bridge over U.S. 12 to access Coldwater Linear Park	
Rationale: This opportunity would mitigate a difficult street crossing at U.S. 12 and eliminate a gap in the planned/existing system. The future local/regional pedestrian plan and development plans require/warrant this connection.	

Name: I-194 Bike Side Path	Location: Calhoun
Type: BIKE Side path along I-94 to downtown	
Rationale: Provides a link with the southern part of Battle Creek. Would encourage business access by non-motorized uses and stimulate recreation. Would also assist in mitigating non-motorized volumes along route, as well as dangerous crossings. Will link existing/proposed Battle Creek cycling/pedestrian trails/routes.	

Name: M-96 Bike Path & M-66	Location: Calhoun
Type: BIKE Bike route linking Battle Creek to Marshall (sidepath preferred)	
Rationale: Provide a connector between communities and to economic development areas (downtown and new casino). Can also create tourism and provide a link between communities. Is an alternative to the proposed rail-to-trail connection between Battle Creek and Marshall.	

Name: Battle Creek Southern Extension	Location: Calhoun
Type: BIKE On-street Bike Route extension of Battle Creek to the South	
Rationale: Provide a longer access corridor into the countryside and communities surrounding Battle Creek for recreational and commuter potential (accommodate urban sprawl). Would serve to act as a connector between rural communities and schools, and not just Battle Creek.	

Name: Hill Brady and Dickman (M-96)	Location: Calhoun
Type: PED/BIKE Intersection improvement (pedestrian signal)	
Rationale: Provide a safe connection between existing and proposed trails in an area with dense landuse and commercial and residential areas. Will help to mitigate existing conflict between pedestrians and cyclists using this intersection.	

Name: Homeward to Union City	Location: Calhoun
Type: BIKE/PED Rail-to-trail from Homeward to Union City	
Rationale: Provides a connection between outlying communities and existing/proposed pedestrian/bicycle trails/paths. Right-of-way is available for this opportunity.	

Name: Diamond Lake Side Path	Location: Cass
Type: BIKE Side path around Diamond Lake with on-road and off-road accommodations	
Rationale: Provide a safe route around Diamond Lake for recreational purposes. This area experiences a high volume of non-motorized traffic. Serves as a connection to future gaps, will provide access to local schools, and is cost effective.	

Name: Russ Forest Trails	Location: Cass
Type: PED Wilderness hiking trails with some potential for shared use facilities (MTBs and horses)	
Rationale: Opportunity would be a nature trail located within a historic forest with educational potential. Project would be cost effective, as the trail requires little maintenance.	

Name: M 60, Niles to Cassopolis	Location: Cass
Type: BIKE Combined on-road, signed with paved shoulders and rail-to-trail	
Rationale: Provides a link between communities and other planning regions in Michigan and is part of existing/future bike/trail plans. Opportunity also allows for a greater separation between vehicular and bicycle/pedestrian traffic.	

Name: Gull Lake Loop	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE Multi-use trail around Gull Lake, on-road and off-road	
Rationale: Provides a scenic trail that would extend the existing Kalamazoo plan past Richland and connect to Fort Custer and the North Country Trail.	

Name: Augusta Linear Park	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE/PED Multi-use facility for pedestrians and cyclists in Augusta	
Rationale: Provide a safe route for the high volumes of pedestrians and cyclists currently using this route and connects to local amenities (lookout point). Provides a sidewalk/trail to alleviate difficult street crossings by filling in existing gaps. Reduce collisions with cyclists/pedestrians.	

Name: Kalamazoo Bike System extensions	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE Extension of on-road facilities out of Kalamazoo	
Rationale: Provide a longer access corridor to the countryside and communities surrounding Kalamazoo for recreational and commuter potential. Opportunity would serve to act as a connector between rural communities and not just Kalamazoo.	

Name: Business Loop U.S. 131 Connector	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: Bridge or roadway improvement to connect the north and south sides of BL U.S. 131	
Rationale: BIKE/PED Provides a safe connection between tourists attractions and may be apart of the DTW revitalization project.	

Name: West Avenue Bike Route	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE Cross county bike route	
Rationale: Provides safe public access on an already heavily traveled road. Is the only road that traverses the county with a paved shoulder for most of its length. Would be fairly cost effective considering its length, as it only requires signing and minimal improvements.	

Name: M-43 & M-99 Bike Route	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE On-road signed bike route with paved shoulders	
Rationale: Provides a connection to population centers, downtown retail areas, and existing/proposed bike/trail/pedestrian plans. Route is currently unsafe for the number of cyclists already using it. Would potentially draw more tourism.	

Name: Stadium Drive	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE On-road signed bike route with paved shoulders	
Rationale: Provides a connection to population centers, downtown retail areas, and existing/proposed bike/trail/pedestrian facilities. Route is currently unsafe for the number of cyclists already using it and would potentially draw more tourism.	

Name: Westnedge, Milham to Romence	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: PED Pedestrian Crossing upgrade	
Rationale: Provide a safe corridor for pedestrians to cross the road for access to the business areas to the north. Will encourage walking, as people will feel safer walking to work.	

Name: Vicksburg Rail-to-Trail	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE/PED Vicksburg to Kalamazoo abandoned railway (Rail-to-Trail)	
Rationale: Provides a connection to communities/facilities and recreational opportunities in the area. Also, makes good use of land that is sitting vacant or unused.	

Name: WMU Multi-use Trail	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE/PED Multi-Use trail connecting Parkview/Drake to WMU	
Rationale: Mitigates hazardous conditions (crossings, no shoulders/sidewalks). Provides access to business and residential areas, other campuses, and special university events (football Saturdays). Could be extended like ‘spokes of a wheel’, with WMU acting as the hub. Possibly provide overpasses in really dangerous areas.	

Name: Kilgore Pathway	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE/PED Off-road extension of Kilgore Bike/Ped Proposed Route	
Rationale: Provide a safe multi-use trail along an area with high pedestrian volumes as evidenced by a well worn path. and. Would provide safe access under I-94 (man-made barrier).	

Name: I-94 Underpasses	Location: Kalamazoo
Type: BIKE/PED Lover’s Lane/Oakland/Westnedge & others, safe underpasses	
Rationale: An opportunity to rebuild areas that have poor to inadequate facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to pass underneath I-94. Area has high traffic (vehicular/bike/ped) volumes, a record of crash, and poor site lines.	

Name: Centerville to Collin	Location: St. Joseph
Type: Rail-to-trail conversion	
Rationale: BIKE/PED Provide a safe multi-use trail opportunity that will promote local and tourist non-motorized traffic and stimulate future trail planning. This opportunity will hopefully alleviate a high crash record, provide access to schools, and serve recreational and commercial destinations. Also, the trail will help to alleviate traffic congestion during local special events, such as the County Fair.	

Name: Sturgis to Centerville	Location: St. Joseph
Type: Rail-to-trail conversion	
Rationale: BIKE/PED Similar to the Centerville to Collin opportunity, this suggestion will additionally serve a college and provide the link to future/existing in-town projects and non-motorized systems in Sturgis and Centerville.	

Name: Sturgis Sidewalk	Location: St. Joseph
Type: PED Improve sidewalks on west side of town in Sturgis along U.S. 12	
Rationale: Provide a safe route for residents on the west side of town to access the commercial areas and the downtown. Currently there are difficult street crossings, visibly worn paths and no paved shoulder or sidewalks.	

Name: Paw Paw High School (PPHS) Spur	Location: Van Buren
Type: PED Extension of a rail-to-trail from downtown Paw Paw to the east side high school located out of town	
Rationale: Provides a safe off-road route for students from downtown Paw Paw to the eastside high school. Connects the community to a new recreational complex on the eastern edge of town. Encourages non-motorized traffic. The spur serves as part of the local pedestrian/trail plan and will fill in existing gaps in the sidewalk network. Matching funds may be available for construction.	

Name: Paw Paw Maple Lake Sidewalk	Location: Van Buren
Type: PED Sidewalk connection around Paw Paw Lake	
Rationale: Provides safe connection to local parks and scenic areas. Visible worn paths are present in absence of sidewalks and paved shoulders. Part of a planned road project and local pedestrian/trail plan. May connect to the Kal-Haven Trail.	

Name: Hartford to Paw Paw Trail	Location: Van Buren
Type: BIKE Potentially abandoned Rail-to-Trail with preserved right-of-way	
Rationale: Mitigates difficult street crossings while connecting communities and other multi-use trails. Right-of-way is potentially available. Part of a local/regional bicycle/trail plan and will serve future gaps. Area requires improved warnings for drivers.	

Name: Van Buren Trail Bridge	Location: Van Buren
Type: BIKE Bridge accommodation for a shared use facility	
Rationale: 200 foot bridge that will span the Paw Paw River connecting the Van Buren Trail through all three counties Is necessary for future trail development.	

Name: Hartford to Paw-Paw Trail	Location: Van Buren
Type: BIKE Side Path, modification to proposed alignment connecting Hartford to Paw-Paw	
Rationale: The original rail-to-trail proposed route may no longer be available. This new opportunity will serve as a sidepath along Black River Road providing a safe facility that will link to other multi-use trails.	

Name: Paw Paw to Decatur via Lawton	Location: Van Buren
Type: BIKE Signed on-road with paved shoulders and rail-to-trail conversion	
Rationale: Provides a safe route for users to mitigate difficult crossings and provide for high ped volumes along roadways. The construction of paved shoulders will serve to fill in future gaps while completing loops for planned local/regional bicycle/trail plans with the extension from Lawton to Decatur via a rail-to-trail project. Establishes a safe route for local schools.	

Name: Paw Paw Rural Connectors	Location: Van Buren
Type: On-road bike route extensions to the rural communities surrounding Paw Paw	
Rationale: Provides access to tourism, downtown, camping areas, and serve as a link to the other communities. Provides safe commuter and travel routes for non-motorized needs to the outlying areas.	

Name: Trail Maps	Location: Southwest Region
Type: BIKE/PED Trail Maps and Roadway Suitability Reports	
Rationale: Opportunity to make existing and suitable routes available to the public. (MDOT is already working on this project.)	

Name: Sidepath reconstruction	Location: Southwest Region
Type: PED Soft sidepaths on all paved trails	
Rationale: Easier on the shins of runners.	

Name: New Policy	Location: Southwest Region
Type: To provide non-motorized access in relationship to population density	
Rationale: Encourage alternative transportation and allow for access and movement outside of neighborhoods. This policy would also include sections regarding bridge reconstruction to ensure a consideration for non-motorized methods of travel.	