

Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
Wednesday, December 5th, 2018 – 3:00 p.m.
Metro COG Conference Room
AGENDA

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Approve minutes from October 17th meeting - **Attachment** Action Item
3. Public input opportunity Public Input
4. Update on dockless bicycle/electric scooter ordinance research Information Item
5. Score/rank Transportation Alternatives applications - **Attachment** Action Item
6. Other business

NOTE: Full Agenda packets can be found on the Metro COG Web Site at <http://www.fmmetrocog.org> – Committees

Metro COG is committed to ensuring all individuals, regardless of race, color, sex, age, national origin, disability/handicap, sexual orientation, and/or income status have access to Metro COG's programs and services. Meeting facilities will be accessible to mobility impaired individuals. Metro COG will make a good faith effort to accommodate requests for translation services for meeting proceedings and related materials. Please contact Savanna Leach, Metro COG Executive Secretary, at 701-532-5100 at least five days in advance of the meeting if any special accommodations are required for any member of the public to be able to participate in the meeting.

103rd Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Meeting
October 17th, 2018 – 3:00pm
Metro COG Conference Room

Members Present

Dan Farnsworth, Chair, Metro COG
Christine Holland, River Keepers
Kim Citrowske, City of Moorhead Planning
Joe Anderson, Fargo Police Department
Jonathan Atkins, City of Moorhead Engineering
Peyton Mastera, City of Dilworth
Maegin Elshaug, City of Fargo Planning
Dylan Ramstad Skoyles, Great Rides
Jason Gates, Citizen representative
Jane Butzer, MnDOT
Patrick Hollister, PartnerSHIP 4 Health
Kim Lipetzky, Fargo Cass Public Health
Bob Walton, NDDOT Fargo District

Others Present:

Luke Champa, Metro COG
Bethany Brandt, KLJ
Jason Carbee, HDR (via phone)

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began at 3:05 pm. Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Approve minutes from July 11th, 2018 meeting

A motion to approve the July 11th minutes was made by K. Lipetzky and seconded by D. Ramstad Skoyles. The minutes were passed unanimously with no edits.

3. Public input opportunity

An opportunity was given for any members of the public to provide any comments or input. No public was represented aside from two individuals representing their consulting firms. No public input was given.

4. 2045 F-M Long Range Transportation Plan

J. Carbee of HDR provided an update and information on Metro COG's 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro COG updates their Long Range Transportation Plan every five years as required.

J. Carbee began by notifying the group of the upcoming public input meetings which will be held:

Wed. Oct 24th 11 am - 1 pm
Moorhead Public Library, Moorhead

and

Thursday Oct 25th 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
Rustad Recreation Center – Dakota Room, West Fargo

J. Carbee also showed the group other public outreach opportunities and encouraged them to pass this information to others and work with their jurisdictions in getting the word out.

Next, J. Carbee showed some results of the public surveys that have already been received (180 public surveys). The results show that the public is interested in more transportation options and is interested in more walkable/bike-able neighborhoods.

There was then a discussion about the local bicycle/pedestrian projects shown in the 2016 F-M Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan. The group provided verbal descriptions of the higher priority projects to J. Carbee. After discussion, it was decided that Metro COG will send J. Carbee: map of bikeway gap analysis gaps, previous TAP applications, Great Rides Expansion Study. D. Farnsworth asked the jurisdictions to send him any priority bicycle/pedestrian projects that they would like J. Carbee to implement into the LRTP.

5. Dockless bicycles & dockless electric scooters

The committee continued with a discussion about dockless bicycle and dockless electric scooters. D. Farnsworth mentioned that over the past year or so dockless bicycles and dockless electric scooters have been popping up in cities across the nation. Both have exploded in popularity with the dockless electric scooters being deployed at a staggering rate. The first city to receive dockless scooters was San Francisco in September 2017. As of October 2018 dockless scooters have been deployed in over 120 cities in the US alone.

P. Hollister mentioned that Fergus Falls has a committee right now advocating for dockless bikes in their community. D. Ramstad Skoyles talked about how Nice Rides in the Twin Cities has switch to dockless bikes. In their case, they have dockless bikes which provide more flexibility in parking capacity and eliminates the need, cost, and maintenance of docks. However there are designated parking spaces for these bikes and it is likely that the transaction cannot be complete until the bike has been parked in a designated spot.

It was asked if Great Rides is concerned about dockless bikes potentially coming to Fargo/Moorhead from an outside company. D. Ramstad Skoyles said that he believes the popularity of Great Rides will continue even if an outside company comes to town with dockless bikes. With NDSU students able to ride Great Rides bikes for free, this has an advantage over other systems. He did however have some concerns Great Rides bikes

being mistaken for dockless bikes. His concerns would be that people might accidentally park the Great Rides bikes at random locations, thinking they were dockless.

There was then discussion about how the Fargo/Moorhead area should prepare for dockless bikes and scooters in the future. It was discussed that perhaps the best option would be to research ordinances being used in cities currently with dockless bikes and scooters and provide those to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee. B. Brandt noted that NACTO has a regulations guide for this exact thing. Metro COG will research ordinances and provide them to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee.

6. Transportation Alternatives grant opportunity

D. Farnsworth reminded the group about the annual Transportation Alternatives grant opportunity. Applications on the ND side will be due to Metro COG 12/4/18. Applications on the MN side will be due to Wayne Hurley 1/4/19. Letters of intent for MN projects will need to be submitted 10/31/18.

7. Other business

No other business was provided.

Meeting adjourned 4:30pm.

Agenda Item 5

To: Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
From: Dan Farnsworth, Metro COG
Date: November 29, 2018
Subject: **Score/rank Transportation Alternatives applications**

The Transportation Alternatives (TA) program, is a federally-funded grant opportunity for projects that provide enhancements to alternative means of transportation such as bicycle/walking trails, safe routes to school projects, crosswalk improvements, and more.

All North Dakota applicants within Metro COG's planning area are required to submit their applications to Metro COG by December 4th. All Minnesota applicants within Metro COG's planning area were required to submit letters of intent by October 31st with the final applications due January 4th, 2019.

As is standard practice, Metro COG, in cooperation with the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee will rank these projects. Prior to ranking at this meeting, Metro COG would like to have the discussion with the Committee on the ranking method. Below are the three methods of ranking Metro COG would like to discuss with the Committee:

- Method 1 – using the same ranking criteria as last year (**attachment 1**)
- Method 2 – using similar ranking criteria as last year with modifications to the Goal 4 criteria (**attachment 2**)
- Method 3 – consider using no ranking criteria. Rather, discuss the projects that and rank them according to the judgement of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee as a whole.

Agenda Item 5 - Attachment 1

Current TA Project Evaluation

Metro 2040 Goal	Proposed TA Evaluation				Project	
	Question	Weight	Points or %	Weighted Pts	Example 1	Example 2
Goal 1: Maintain the Existing Transportation System	Of the entire project length, what percentage of the length has existing trail or sidewalk that is in <u>poor</u> condition which will be replaced as part of the project? (give points in percentage)	20	___%	20	0	3
Goal 2: Improve the Efficiency, Performance and Connectivity of a Balanced Transportation System	Does the project demonstrate connectivity to other bike/ped facilities, parks, or other public facilities?	19	100%	19	1.9	1.9
Goal 3: Maximize the Cost Effectiveness of Transportation	Does the project implement a specific recommendation of a corridor, comprehensive, or other planning study? Or does the project fill a critical gap or identified short- or long-range project in the bike-ped network as identified in the 2016 Metro Bicycle-Pedestrian Plan? (see Figures 6.1 & 6.2)	14	100%	14	1.4	0
Goal 4: Promote Consistency between Land Use and Transportation Plan to Enhance Mobility and Accessibility	The project will provide new bicycle or pedestrian connections to or from projected (year 2020) trip density areas of 25 to 50 trip ends/acre. (see 2020 trip density figure (M:/TIP/Miscellaneous/Evaluation Forms/TAP Evaluation supporting material)), OR	16	30%	4.8	4.8	0
	The project will provide new bicycle or pedestrian connections to or from projected (year 2020) trip density areas of 50 to 100 trip ends/acre. (see 2020 trip density figure (M:/TIP/Miscellaneous/Evaluation Forms/TAP Evaluation supporting material)), OR	16	60%	9.6		
	The project will provide new bicycle or pedestrian connections to or from projected (year 2020) trip density areas of 100 or more trip ends/acre. (see 2020 trip density figure (M:/TIP/Miscellaneous/Evaluation Forms/TAP Evaluation supporting material))	16	100%	16		
Goal 5: Provide Safe and Secure Transportation	Is the project designed to address safety issues at a location where crashes involving a motor vehicle and a bicyclist or pedestrian are occurring? (see: Figures 2.12 & 2.13 of the 2016 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan OR use more recent available data)	11	30%	3.3	0	0
	Does the project improve the ability for students to safely cycle or walk to school?	11	30%	3.3	0	3.3
	Does the project improve safety or mobility for non-automotive users with disabilities?	11	30%	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Does the project include way finding and/or other signage that will help users find their destination OR enhanced signage for safety?	11	10%	1.1	1.1	0
Goal 6: Support Economic Vitality	Does the project increase bicycle and/or pedestrian connections from residential areas to industrial or commercial centers?	13	50%	6.5	0	6.5
	Does the project construct or enhance any major recreational trails (i.e. River Corridor, Milwaukee Trail, Heartland Trail, etc.)?	13	50%	6.5	6.5	6.5
Goal 7: Protect the Environment and Conserve Resources	Does the project meet the intent of the Complete Streets Policy Statement? (see www.fmmetrocog.org, Home -> Resources -> Policies > Complete Streets Policy)	7	50%	3.5	3.5	3.5
	Does the project include any landscaping to improve aesthetics, water quality or animal habitats?	7	50%	3.5	0	0
Total Points					22.5	28

Agenda Item 5 - Attachment 2

Proposed TA Project Evaluation

Metro 2040 Goal	Proposed TA Evaluation				Project	
	Question	Weight	Max %	Max Points	Example 1	Example 2
Goal 1: Maintain the Existing Transportation System	Of the entire project length, what percentage of the length has existing trail or sidewalk that is in <u>poor</u> condition which will be replaced as part of the project? (give points in percentage)	20	___%	20	0	3
Goal 2: Improve the Efficiency, Performance and Connectivity of a Balanced Transportation System	Does the project demonstrate connectivity to other bike/ped facilities, <u>fixed-route transit</u> , parks, or other public facilities?	19	100%	19	1.9	1.9
Goal 3: Maximize the Cost Effectiveness of Transportation	Does the project implement a specific recommendation of a <u>corridor</u> , comprehensive, or other planning study? Or does the project fill a critical gap or identified short- or long-range project in the bike-ped network as identified in the 2016 Metro Bicycle-Pedestrian Plan? (see Figures 6.1 & 6.2)	14	100%	14	1.4	0
Goal 4: Promote Consistency between Land Use and Transportation Plan to Enhance Mobility and Accessibility	<u>The majority of the project is greater than 0.25 miles from a fixed bus route.</u>	16	50%	8	16	16
	<u>Any part of the project is within 0.25 miles of a low income area as identified in Metro COG's latest Title VI Report.</u> OR	16	25%	4		
	<u>Any part of the project is within a low income area as identified in Metro COG's latest Title VI Report.</u>	16	50%	8		
Goal 5: Provide Safe and Secure Transportation	Is the project designed to address safety issues at a location where crashes involving a motor vehicle and a bicyclist or pedestrian are occurring? (see: Figures 2.12 & 2.13 of the 2016 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan <u>OR use more recent available data</u>)	11	30%	3.3	0	0
	Does the project improve the ability for students to safely cycle or walk to school?	11	30%	3.3	0	3.3
	Does the project improve safety or mobility for non-automotive users with disabilities?	11	30%	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Does the project include way finding and/or other signage that will help users find their destination OR enhanced signage for safety?	11	10%	1.1	1.1	0
Goal 6: Support Economic Vitality	Does the project increase bicycle and/or pedestrian connections from residential areas to industrial or commercial centers?	13	50%	6.5	0	6.5
	Does the project construct or enhance any major recreational trails (i.e. River Corridor, Milwaukee Trail, Heartland Trail, etc.)?	13	50%	6.5	6.5	6.5
Goal 7: Protect the Environment and Conserve Resources	Does the project meet the intent of the Complete Streets Policy Statement? (see www.fmmetrocog.org , Home -> Resources -> Policies > Complete Streets Policy)	7	50%	3.5	3.5	3.5
	Does the project include any landscaping to improve aesthetics, water quality or animal habitats?	7	50%	3.5	0	0
Total Points					33.7	44