Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee  
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019 - 3:00 p.m.  
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AGENDA
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108th Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Meeting  
October 16th, 2019 – 3:00pm  
Metro COG Conference Room

Members Present  
Dan Farnsworth, Chair, Metro COG  
Ryan Kota, Great Rides  
Patrick Hollister, PartnerSHIP 4 Health  
Christine Holland, River Keepers  
Maegin Elshaug, City of Fargo Planning  
Kim Citrowske, City of Moorhead Planning  
Peyton Mastera, City of Dilworth  
Malachi Peterson, City of West Fargo Planning (proxy for Tim Solberg)  
Bob Walton, NDDOT  
Jonathan Atkins, City of Moorhead Engineering  
Jane Butzer, MnDOT  
Kim Lipetzky, Fargo Cass Public Health  
Barrett Voigt, Cass County

Others Present:  
Katie Kitowski, MN Green Corps  
Luke Champa, Metro COG  
Luke Morman, City of Fargo Planning  
Linda Nelson, Citizen

1. Welcome and Introductions  
The meeting began at 3:05 pm. Attendees introduced themselves.  
D. Farnsworth noted that the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee’s member Stan Thurlow passed away in September. It’s believed that Stan had been a member of the Committee since its inception, representing the City of Dilworth. Stan provided the Committee with a wealth of knowledge and experience which will be greatly missed.

2. Approve minutes from July 24th, 2019 meeting  
The minutes were reviewed by the Committee. A motion to approve the July 24th minutes was made by M. Peterson and seconded by P. Mastera. The minutes were passed unanimously.

3. Public input opportunity  
L. Nelson attended the meeting as a citizen and inquired about how the Fargo-Moorhead area uses and plans to use technology in our bicycle / pedestrian efforts. One specific inquiry was regarding any mobile apps that are used or could be used.
D. Farnsworth noted that Metro COG recently created a bike map app for mobile devices that is free for the public. The app was created in response to public demand and replaces the paper maps that were printed for the public over the past years. Information was provided to L. Nelson about the app and D. Farnsworth encouraged her to reach out to Metro COG should she have any further questions about this app or other items pertaining to the F-M Area’s bicycle/pedestrian efforts.

4. **Metro COG bike/ped project updates**

An update was provided to the Committee on the bicycle / pedestrian related projects that Metro COG is currently working on. All projects are consultant-led studies. The projects are as follows:
- FM Diversion Recreation Plan
- FM Metro Bikeways Gap Analysis
- Fargo Safe Routes to School Plan

A request was made by C. Holland (Riverkeepers) regarding a future pedestrian bridge at 40th Ave S/Bluestem as part of the FM Metro Bikeways Gap Analysis. She requested that the bridge be high enough to allow kayak and canoe traffic to easily be able to pass underneath. It was noted that the style of bridge that is being considered at this location will actually be much higher than the current pedestrian lift bridges. The future bridge for consideration would be high enough where it wouldn’t need to be lifted during a flood event.

5. **Update on next Bike/Ped Committee Citizen Rep**

With the current citizen rep’s term expiring December 31st, Metro COG is in the process of selecting a new citizen to serve the next two-year term. In early September, Metro COG solicited application for a citizen member to the committee. Applications were due September 30th. Metro COG received a total of five applications. A review committee consisting of four members of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee is currently reviewing the applications. The review committee will provide their rankings of candidates by October 31st and a candidate will be recommended shortly thereafter.

6. **Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) scoring**

With the TAP applications due in the next few months, there was discussion as to how to best score and rank the projects prior to sending the rankings to NDDOT and MnDOT. It was stated that often times Metro COG’s rankings (which are done with the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee) don’t end up being the same ranking as NDDOT or MnDOT, who ultimately select the projects.

Three options were provided to the Committee for future scoring and ranking:
- Option A – Keep the current scoring criteria
- Option B – Revise the scoring criteria for consistency with the 2045 Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Transportation Plan (to be adopted in November)
- Option C – Omit the scoring criteria and ranking altogether

Two other options were posed to the Committee from Committee members:
- Review applications and perhaps have applicants present their projects to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee and the Committee could provide pros and cons to NDDOT and MnDOT and leave out the ranking.
- After scoring and ranking, just submit the top ranked applications to NDDOT and MnDOT

After discussion, the group did not prefer Option A. Some liked the idea of Option C since it wouldn’t require the time-extensive process of scoring & ranking applications for which the rankings may not be taken into consideration. However, the consensus of the Committee was to move forward with Option B. They felt this would be the best since it is good practice to rank the projects and formally submit the rankings to NDDOT and MnDOT. Also, Option B would adopt the soon-to-be approved 2045 MTP goals and objectives.

It was suggested that a subgroup could help guide these new scoring criteria. The following members offered to be on the subgroup: Jonathan Atkins, Peyton Mastera, Malachi Peterson, and a member of Fargo Planning.

Metro COG will develop draft criteria and will then work with the subgroup (either via email and/or meetings) to refine the criteria. After the subgroup is good with the criteria, Metro COG will forward to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee for comments prior to scoring the TAP projects.

7. Request for updated bikeway information

As Metro COG keeps the bike map app up-to-date, Metro COG is requesting that local jurisdictions provide Metro COG with any updates to their bicycle network. A. Pierce (Metro COG) will coordinate with local jurisdictions’ GIS, Planning, and/or engineering departments.

8. Update on latest BIKE FM efforts

An update was given on the latest BIKE FM efforts. In August BIKE FM had a booth along the Streets Alive route and provided the public with educational materials, free water bottles, and promotional materials for the new Fargo-Moorhead Area bike map app.

BIKE FM plans to have a booth at a Halloween event for kids and families in downtown West Fargo. At this event, BIKE FM will hand out healthy snacks and will provide postcards to parents which will have bicycle safety tips as well as BIKE FM information.
It was also noted that West Fargo Events hopes to host a bike rodeo in June 2020 as part of a series of events at the soon-to-open Lights on Sheyenne – a mixed use development complex with a community gathering plaza. BIKE FM is working with West Fargo Events in providing assistance with this bike rodeo.

9. **Update on Clay County Heartland Trail**

An update was provided on the status of the Clay County Heartland Trail. It was noted that, due to lack of funding, not much progress has been made on the planning of this trail in the past year. Members of the group have been working with Minnesota legislators in a bonding bill that could provide funding for design of the Clay County Heartland Trail as well as construction of the trail near Detroit Lakes. There is a good chance a bonding bill will be passed with the upcoming legislative session. Whether or not funding will be provided for the Heartland Trail as requested is yet to be determined.

10. **Excessive roadway widths – barriers to pedestrians**

Committee member Jason Gates, who was unable to attend this meeting, provided a presentation for the Committee that he wished to share. D. Farnsworth presented the slide show on Gates’s behalf.

The topic of this presentation was about overly-wide roads in our area. The particular case study in this presentation was 42nd St in Fargo near Kennedy Elementary School. This discussion stemmed from an individual that was nearly hit by a vehicle at a marked crosswalk which included flashing beacons. The individual was crossing this crosswalk near Kennedy Elementary School, when the vehicle in the outside lane stopped for the pedestrian but the vehicle on the inside lane did not stop (likely didn’t see the pedestrian). This raised the question of why the roadway needed to be a 5-lane roadway when the traffic volumes don’t warrant it.

It was suggested that these styles of roadways only encourage high vehicle speeds, encourage more car travel, bisect neighborhoods, and discourage pedestrian connectivity. This was compared to Broadway in north Fargo which is a 2-lane roadway and creates a much safer and comfortable environment for pedestrians.

Upon presentation of this to the Committee, discussion followed. Members of the Committee agreed that this is an issue and that roadways shouldn’t be built in such a manner where they become barriers to pedestrians. Committee members expressed concerns about crossing other excessively-wide roadways such as 32nd Ave S and 45th Street in Fargo. It was noted that the City of Fargo is changing how they plan and design roadways to better accommodate pedestrians. Some examples can be seen with the re-design of Main Ave in downtown Fargo from a 5-lane roadway to a 3-lane roadway. Another example was the design of 25th St south of 52nd Ave S.
As a follow-up to this presentation, Metro COG will forward this presentation to Jeremy Gorden (Fargo Engineering) as he was unable to attend the meeting. It was encouraged for jurisdictions to consider make future major roadways more pedestrian-friendly and not overbuilt roadways as this is a hindrance to pedestrian movement, reduces neighborhood livability, and increases roadway construction & maintenance costs.

11. Other business

P. Hollister notified the Committee about Metro COG’s open house on October 17th from 4:00 pm – 6:00 pm which will showcase Metro COG’s newly-remodeled space.

P. Hollister also notified the Committee about an open house for All Aboard Minnesota, a group looking to get reliable passenger rail service between Chicago and Fargo. The open house will be held at the Hjemkomst Center in Moorhead on October 30th from 6:30 pm – 7:30 pm.

Meeting adjourned 4:25 pm.
As discussed at the last Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee meeting, Metro COG was in the process of selecting a new citizen representative to the Committee. A selection committee was set up to review and rank the applications. The selection committee was comprised of four members, one representing the jurisdictions of Dilworth, Fargo, Moorhead, and West Fargo.

A total of five applications were received by the September 30th deadline. Upon review by the selection committee, Chris Garty of Fargo was the top ranked candidate. The Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee can expect to receive a copy of Mr. Garty’s application at or before the meeting.

Upon approval in December by Metro COG’s Policy Board, Mr. Garty’s appointment with the Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee will be effective January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2021.
At the last Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee meeting it was the decision of the Committee to create new scoring criteria for the Transportation Alternatives (TA) applications. With Metro COG recently completing their Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), it was decided to create new criteria that would reflect the goals and objectives of the MTP.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee also suggested that a subgroup be set up to help develop the new criteria. The subgroup, consisting of a representative from Barnesville, Dilworth, Fargo, Moorhead, and West Fargo, met twice with additional correspondence via email.

Attached is the new scoring criteria for review by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee prior to scoring of the TA applications. Included in the attachment are the following:

- Previous TA project evaluation sheet
- Proposed TA project evaluation sheet – urban
- Proposed TA project evaluation sheet – rural
### Previous TA Project Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Maintain the Existing Transportation System</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weighted Pts</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the entire project length, what percentage of the length has existing trail or sidewalk that is in poor condition which will be replaced as part of the project? (give points in percentage)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>__%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project demonstrate connectivity to other bike/ped facilities, parks, or other public facilities?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Improve the Efficiency, Performance and Connectivity of a Balanced Transportation System</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weighted Pts</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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/Evaluation Forms/TAP Evaluation supporting material]), OR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3: Maximize the Cost Effectiveness of Transportation</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weighted Pts</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 &amp; 6.2)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4: Promote Consistency between Land Use and Transportation Plan to Enhance Mobility and Accessibility</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weighted Pts</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project demonstrate connectivity to other bike/ped facilities, parks, or other public facilities?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 5: Provide Safe and Secure Transportation</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weighted Pts</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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/Evaluation Forms/TAP Evaluation supporting material]), OR</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 6: Support Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weighted Pts</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase bicycle and/or pedestrian connections from residential areas to industrial or commercial centers?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 7: Protect the Environment and Conserve Resources</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weighted Pts</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project meet the intent of the Complete Streets Policy Statement? (see <a href="http://www.fmmetroco.org">www.fmmetroco.org</a>, Home -&gt; Resources -&gt; Policies -&gt; Complete Streets Policy)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total Points | 49.8 | 43.7 | 42.8 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2045 MTP Goal</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>TA Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Source of criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Safety</td>
<td>Is the project located where a crash involving a motor vehicle and a bicyclist or pedestrian have occurred within the past 5 years?</td>
<td>Refer to most recent bicycle/pedestrian crash maps. Saved in TA folder.</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project located within 1/2 mile radius of a K-8 public school?</td>
<td>Measure from outermost perimeter of school building.</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Efficiency and Reliability</td>
<td>Is the project located within 1/4 mile of existing commercial AND multi-dwelling residential (3-plexes or greater) land uses?</td>
<td>Per jurisdiction’s zoning maps</td>
<td>(2045 MTP)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project part of a multi-jurisdictional planning effort/initiative?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Bicycling</td>
<td>Is the project located in a zone which currently has low or moderate levels of walkability on the 2045 MTP’s walkability index?</td>
<td>Refer to Figure 4.24 in the 2045 MTP Plan. Low and moderate shown in blue and yellow. If project is in two zones, chose the zone in which the majority of the project is located.</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project consistent with recommendations of a corridor, comprehensive, or other planning study?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project located in an area with high or medium levels of vehicle trip density?</td>
<td>High trip density = 50+ trips/acre, Medium trip density 25 to 50 trips/acre, Refer to maps developed for F-M area. Saved in TA folder.</td>
<td>2045 MTP High trip density: 10 points, Med trip density: 5 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and Transportation Decisions</td>
<td>Is the project located within 1/4 mile of a MATBUS route corridor?</td>
<td>This is measured from any portion of the project.</td>
<td>(2045 MTP)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are considering criteria related to environmental sustainability. Below is potential criteria we could use that’s in-line with our MTP or Bike/Ped Plan:
- Is the project located with one of Metro COG’s environmental justice areas? 5 pt
- Does the project include the addition of vegetation? 3 pt
- Does the project include the addition of vegetation, landscape furniture, or bicycle parking? 3 pt
- Does the project make a systematic effort to conserve natural resources? 3 pt
## Proposed TA Project Evaluation - Rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2045 MTP Goal</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Evaluation instructions</th>
<th>Source of criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Safety</strong></td>
<td>Is the project located where crashes involving a motor vehicle and a</td>
<td>Refer to most recent bicycle/pedestrian crash maps. Saved in TA folder.</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bicyclist or pedestrian have occurred within the past 8 years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project located within 1/2 mile radius of a K-8 public school?</td>
<td>Measure from outermost perimeter of school building.</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Efficiency and Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Does the project directly connect two existing bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities with a similar facility?</td>
<td>Examples of similar facilities: shared use path connecting directly to shared use path(s), sidewalk connecting directly to sidewalk(s), bike lane connecting directly to bike lane(s)</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project directly connect to an existing bicycle and/or pedestrian facility with a similar facility?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project within a 1/4 mile of existing commercial AND multi-dwelling residential (3-plexes or greater) zoning districts?</td>
<td>Per jurisdiction's zoning maps</td>
<td>(2045 MTP)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking and Bicycling</strong></td>
<td>Is the project consistent with recommendations of a corridor, comprehensive, or other planning study?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development and Transportation Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Does the project connect residential area(s) to commercial or industrial area(s)?</td>
<td>Defer to Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Committee's judgement at time of scoring.</td>
<td>2045 MTP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project provide a direct connection to a park or other recreation facility (i.e. swimming pool, skating rink, etc.)</td>
<td>Direct connection refers to project adjoining property of park or recreation facility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points
Based on recommended approval by the Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee of the new Transportation Alternatives (TA) scoring criteria, the Committee will then score and rank the TA projects that Metro COG received.

Any jurisdictions within Metro COG’s planning area are required to submit their TA applications to Metro COG. Metro COG has received a total of three applications from jurisdictions within ND and one letter of intent from jurisdictions in MN. Below is a description of each application (ND) or letter of intent (MN) submitted.

**North Dakota Rural TA**

**City of Horace (Sponsor: Cass Co.) – County Road 17 Shared-Use Path Phase II**
The City of Horace is seeking funding to extend their shared-use path along County Road 17 from 81st Avenue to 76th Avenue (2,000 feet in length). The City recently received Recreational Trails Grant funding to complete a shared-use path from the Horace Elementary School to 81st Avenue. This proposed project would ultimately connect 76th Avenue and the soon-to-be constructed Middle & High Schools with nearby residences, Horace Elementary School, and downtown Horace.

**Cost:** $235,150 construction total; $184,120 requested from TA

**North Dakota Urban TA**

**City of Fargo – Deer Creek/Drain 27 Shared Use Path**
The City of Fargo is seeking funding to construct a shared use path that would connect the Deer Creek neighborhood (south of 52nd Ave S east of Sheyenne St/CR 17) with the existing path network located along and north of 52nd Ave S. The path would be constructed alongside Drain 27 from 52nd Ave S to city-owned property at 59th Ave S and tie into the existing path network. The proposed project would consist of approximately 7,300 feet of path.

**Cost:** $500,000 construction total; $290,000 requested from TA

**City of West Fargo – Drain 45 Multiuse Path – Phase II**
The City of West Fargo is seeking funding to construct a shared-use path on the enclosed portion of Drain 45 (just east of 4th St E) between 7th Ave E and Main Ave. The path would be 0.5 miles in length. This would be phase II of this two-phase project. West Fargo recently received funding for the Phase I portion – 7th Ave E to 13th Ave E.

**Cost:** $407,000 construction total; $290,000 requested from TA
City of Moorhead – CR 12/60th Ave S Bicycle & Pedestrian Bridge Crossing
The City of Moorhead is seeking funding for a proposed bicycle/pedestrian crossing over the Red River on CR 12/60th Ave S. The proposed crossing would use shoulder space on the existing bridge to provide a safe crossing protected from vehicular traffic. This crossing is a key component of the planned Harvest Trail that would connect Bluestem Center for the Arts in Moorhead with bicycle/pedestrian facilities in Fargo near 52nd Ave S.
Cost: $320,000 construction total; $256,000 requested from TA