

**Minneapolis Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Meeting Agenda**

April 2, 2008
3:00 pm to 4:30 pm
Room 333, City Hall

Meeting Overview – The City is preparing to submit applications for the current round of NTP funding and staff recommendations for the submittals will be presented to the PAC for discussion. A summary of the recent public meeting on the Pedestrian Master Plan will also be presented for discussion.

3:00 pm **Introductions**
 Approval of Meeting Notes
 Announcements

3:10 pm **Non-Motorized Transportation Program Solicitation** – Shaun Murphy will describe recommended projects and evaluation criteria.

4:00 pm **Summary of Public Meeting** – Charleen Zimmer will describe the recent public meeting and the comments received.

4:20 pm **Review of Action Items**

Non-Motorized Transportation Program Solicitation

Shaun Murphy summarized the approach that was used to identify and evaluate projects for the next round of NTP funding applications. The criteria and schedule for the solicitation were received on February 25. City staff sent requests to the Pedestrian Advisory Committee, the Bicycle Advisory Committee, city staff, Council members, Mayor’s office, neighborhood and business organizations, and on the city’s website to request project ideas. 148 project ideas were received. These were narrowed to 18 projects by city staff utilizing the previously approved evaluation criteria and the NTP specifications for projects eligible for funding. These projects represent about \$9 million in cost. Not all of these projects would be funded even if no one else submitted any applications.

The short-list of projects is being presented to the PAC and the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) for discussion and support. After committee discussions and recommendations, a revised short-list will be sent to T&PW and to City Council. Following approval by the City Council, staff will write the applications. Applications are due April 29.

Projects which had the following characteristics generally received better scores:

- Project well defined
- Served bikes and pedestrians
- Destinations along corridor (major destinations, schools, parks, etc.)

- In existing plan
- Filled a gap (bike facility or sidewalk gap)
- Linked with another type of project that has been funded (CIP, stormwater project, etc.)
- High crash area
- Something innovative
- Picked highest scoring projects in each quadrant of the city

Questions and comments included the following:

- How were projects on streets not under city jurisdiction handled? *The City shares a lot of on-street responsibilities related to County roads. This happens to a lesser extent with the Park Board. All County projects were referred to Bob Byers at Hennepin County.*
- Why are there no comments on many in the second group? *The solicitation schedule has a very tight timeline - we didn't have time to list out all comments on all of the projects. Depending on Council action, a project might move forward even if not recommended by staff. Some projects were not recommended because they did not fit the NTP specifications. Others were not recommended due to construction cost or timeline. All remaining projects were evaluated based on the evaluation criteria.*
- Are there other lists for pedestrian projects – are there other funding sources? *Projects were not included if they were fully funded with other sources. Some of the projects may have partial funding or may be eligible for other funds if they are not funded through NTP. The pedestrian master planning process may identify other funding sources.*
- What happened to the projects that were proposed the last round of NTP? *13th Street was funded. 9th Street is on list but didn't score very high – doesn't have a bike element at this time.*
- Can any of these be coordinated with Metro Transit or other city projects that are underway? *Osseo, Pleasant, Hennepin Ave – there are several that could be augmented or coordinated with other projects. Should send this list to Metro Transit regarding coordinate with potential transit stop improvements – would help the applications if could show a link to transit for better mode shift*
- Cedar-Washington (#4) – missing curb ramp at Washington Ave. S. at Holiday Inn. Probably have to move a signal pole to get the ramp in.
- Projects more tactical than model – aren't trying to demonstrate models for new things that make things more pedestrian-friendly
- Need to fund the project and not separate out bike and ped elements for separate funding
- Scoring looks at benefits to both bikes and peds – PAC should be providing push-back to NTP because bikes and peds sometimes compete with each other and by combining you don't get the best projects for either.
- Need to have funding opportunities for pedestrian-only projects.
- NTP looking to fund more pedestrian projects – if there is a strong rationale for pedestrian infrastructure, it would stand out
- Pedestrian innovation is not coming through.
- Would traffic diverters be considered on any of these streets? *Yes, if neighborhood wanted them.*
- Will all sidewalks on these projects be at least 6 feet wide? There are a lot of streets where there are poles and other obstructions that reduce the clear sidewalk width to less than 6 feet.

- More innovative ideas should be included such as activity improvements, wayfinding portals and vendor spaces.
- Don't understand the value of #16. *It connects schools and neighborhoods to the Midtown Greenway.*
- #18 is just a way for the city to fund things that the city should be paying for with normal funding sources.
- City staff should work with Metro Transit and other jurisdictions that might impact what is being proposed.
- Timing was an issue for NTP evaluation. In the future, the PAC would like additional input regarding evaluating and rating the projects. This should be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Motion:

Made by Jennifer Ringold. Seconded by Diane Hansen.

The PAC supports the staff recommendations but encourages greater innovation in the design of the projects. The projects should show a clear benefit to pedestrians.

Motion passed - 12 ayes, 1 no, 2 abstentions.

Motion:

Made by Sarah Harris. Seconded by Karen Nicholai

All projects of the city should be complete projects and pedestrian and bicycle components should be integrated elements with respect to planning, design, funding, construction and maintenance.

Motion passed - 13 ayes, 0 no, 2 abstentions.

Public Meeting Summary

Discussion of this item was tabled until the next meeting.

Action Items

- Any further comments on the NTP solicitation process and proposed projects should be submitted to Shaun Murphy
- Public meeting summary should be added to agenda for next month.

Upcoming Calendar

Next PAC Meeting – Wednesday, April 30, 2008, 3:00-4:30 pm, Room 333 (*NOTE DATE CHANGE*)