

#### Application

04787 - 2016 Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) 05438 - 46th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements Regional Solicitation - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Status: Submitted Submitted Date: 07/15/2016 2:43 PM

# **Primary Contact**

Name:*	Salutation	Kelley First Name	Middle Name	Yemen Last Name
Title:	Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator			
Department:	SPR			
Email:	kelley.yemen@hennepin.us			
Address:	701 4th Ave S Suite 400			
*	Minneapolis	Minneso	ta	55415
	City	State/Provinc	ce	Postal Code/Zip
Phone:*	612-543-1963			
	Phone		Ext.	
Fax:				
What Grant Programs are you most interested in?	Regional Solicitation - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities			

# **Organization Information**

Name:

HENNEPIN COUNTY

Jurisdictional Agency (if different):

Organization Type:	County Government		
Organization Website:			
Address:	701 FOURTH AVE S #400		
*	MINNEAPOLIS	Minnesota	55401-1362
	City	State/Province	Postal Code/Zip
County:	Hennepin		
Phone:*	612-348-9260		
		Ext.	
Fax:			
PeopleSoft Vendor Number	0000028004A19		

# **Project Information**

**Project Name** 

Primary County where the Project is Located

46th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements

Hennepin

Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

Brief Project Description (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

46th Street is a major east-west pedestrian corridor, connecting to the Chain of Lakes to the west and lakes Hiawatha and Nokomis to the east. The corridor also connects four neighborhood commercial nodes that generate pedestrian traffic. These nodes, particularly Nicollet Avenue, are served by 14 bus routes (5 local, 6 limited stop, and 3 express) which intersect and traverse the corridor. These transit routes provide access to the employment centers of downtown Minneapolis, MSP International Airport and the University of Minnesota. This project will create a safe and accessible route to the Orange Line BRT on Interstate 35W, with a station at 46th Street, providing fast, direct access into downtown Minneapolis.

The 46th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements project will reconstruct curb ramps at intersections along 46th Street (CSAH 46) in South Minneapolis, beginning at Garfield Avenue in the west and continuing to 18th Avenue in the east. All signals identified as part of the project will be retrofitted with accessible pedestrian signals (APS) and pedestrian countdown signal heads where not already existing. Finally, due to needs identified during conversations with members of the Field Regina Northrop Neighborhood Group the project will construct pedestrian crossing enhancements at the Oakland Ave. crossing such as high visibility signage, upgraded pedestrian-activated beacon and a raised concrete median.

The curb ramp improvements that are part of this project will build upon scheduled roadway improvements occurring during summer 2016, these include a mill and overlay, a modern striping configuration which converts the existing four lane road to a three lane road with a center turn lane and the addition of bicycle lanes throughout the corridor. The ADA compliant curb ramps

constructed during the 46th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements project will complete the transformation of the 46th Street corridor, converting an auto oriented street into a multimodal pedestrian, bicycle and transit friendly space that safely accommodates all modes of travel.

The project will improve safety and access to several institutions in the corridor, including four schools, Hope Street for Runaway and Homeless Youth and several places of worship. The overall character of 46th Street is residential with neighborhood based retail and services oriented along major cross streets. The roadway is a class A minor augmenter from Park Avenue west and a class B minor from Park Avenue east.

Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.

<u>TIP Description Guidance</u> (will be used in TIP if the project is selected for funding)

**Project Length (Miles)** 

On CSAH 46 (46th St.) from Garfield Avenue to 18th Avenue in Minneapolis. Pedestrian ADA accessible curb ramp reconstruction, APS and pedestrian countdown signal heads at signalized intersections, pedestrian crossing improvements at Oakland Ave.

2.02

## **Project Funding**

Are you applying for funds from another source(s) to implement this project?	No
If yes, please identify the source(s)	
Federal Amount	\$506,480.00
Match Amount	\$126,620.00
Minimum of 20% of project total	
Project Total	\$633,100.00
Match Percentage	20.0%
Minimum of 20% Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total	

#### **Source of Match Funds**

Hennepin County

A minimum of 20% of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the 20% minimum can come from other federal sources

#### **Preferred Program Year**

#### Select one:

2020

For TDM projects, select 2018 or 2019. For Roadway, Transit, or Trail/Pedestrian projects, select 2020 or 2021.

Additional Program	Years:
--------------------	--------

2018, 2019

Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available.

# **Project Information**

County, City, or Lead Agency	Hennepin County			
Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed	55419			
(Approximate) Begin Construction Date	08/03/2020			
(Approximate) End Construction Date	10/30/2020			
Name of Trail/Ped Facility:	46th Street			
(i.e., CEDAR LAKE TRAIL)				
TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any wo	TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)			
From: (Intersection or Address)	Garfield Avenue			
To: (Intersection or Address)	18th Avenue			
DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION; INCLUDE NAME OF ROADWAY IF MAJORITY OF FACILITY RUNS ADJACENT TO A SINGLE CORRIDOR				
,				
IF MAJORITY OF FACILITY RUNS ADJACENT TO A SINGLE CORRIDOR	Ped Ramps, APS, Countdown Timers			
IF MAJORITY OF FACILITY RUNS ADJACENT TO A SINGLE CORRIDOR Or At:	Ped Ramps, APS, Countdown Timers			
IF MAJORITY OF FACILITY RUNS ADJACENT TO A SINGLE CORRIDOR Or At: Primary Types of Work Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH,	Ped Ramps, APS, Countdown Timers			

Old Bridge/Culvert No.:

New Bridge/Culvert No.:

#### Structure is Over/Under (Bridge or culvert name):

# **Specific Roadway Elements**

CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES	Cost
Mobilization (approx. 5% of total cost)	\$0.00
Removals (approx. 5% of total cost)	\$0.00
Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.)	\$0.00
Roadway (aggregates and paving)	\$0.00
Subgrade Correction (muck)	\$0.00

Storm Sewer	\$0.00
Ponds	\$0.00
Concrete Items (curb & gutter, sidewalks, median barriers)	\$0.00
Traffic Control	\$0.00
Striping	\$0.00
Signing	\$0.00
Lighting	\$0.00
Turf - Erosion & Landscaping	\$0.00
Bridge	\$0.00
Retaining Walls	\$0.00
Noise Wall (do not include in cost effectiveness measure)	\$0.00
Traffic Signals	\$0.00
Wetland Mitigation	\$0.00
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection	\$0.00
RR Crossing	\$0.00
Roadway Contingencies	\$0.00
Other Roadway Elements	\$0.00
Totals	\$0.00

# Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements

CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES	Cost
Path/Trail Construction	\$0.00
Sidewalk Construction	\$0.00
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction	\$0.00
Right-of-Way	\$0.00
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA)	\$414,000.00
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK)	\$72,000.00
Pedestrian-scale Lighting	\$0.00
Streetscaping	\$0.00
Wayfinding	\$0.00
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies	\$146,100.00
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements	\$1,000.00
Totals	\$633,100.00

# **Specific Transit and TDM Elements**

CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES	Cost
Fixed Guideway Elements	\$0.00
Stations, Stops, and Terminals	\$0.00
Support Facilities	\$0.00
Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.)	\$0.00
Vehicles	\$0.00
Contingencies	\$0.00
Right-of-Way	\$0.00
Other Transit and TDM Elements	\$0.00
Totals	\$0.00

# **Transit Operating Costs**

Number of Platform hours	0
Cost Per Platform hour (full loaded Cost)	\$0.00
Substotal	\$0.00
Other Costs - Administration, Overhead,etc.	\$0.00

Totals
--------

Total Cost	\$633,100.00
Construction Cost Total	\$633,100.00
Transit Operating Cost Total	\$0.00

# **Requirements - All Projects**

#### **All Projects**

1. The project must be consistent with the goals and policies in these adopted regional plans: Thrive MSP 2040 (2014), the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2015), and the 2040 Water Resources Policy Plan (2015).

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

2. The project must be consistent with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Reference the 2040 Transportation Plan objectives and strategies that relate to the project.

	Goal: Safety and Security
	Objective: A. Reduce crashes and improve safety and security for all modes of passenger travel and freight transport.
	Strategies: B1, B4, B6
	Pg. 60 and 162
	Goal: Access to Destinations
	Objective: A
List the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages:	Increase the availability of multimodal travel options, especially in congested highway corridors.
	Objective: D
	Increase transit ridership and the share of trips taken using transit, bicycling and walking.
	Objective: E
	Improve multimodal travel options for people of all ages and abilities to connect to jobs and other opportunities, particularly for historically under- represented populations.
	Strategies: C1, C2, C16, C17
	Pg. 62 and 163-166

Goal: Healthy Environment

Objective: A

Reduce transportation-related air emissions.

Objective: C

Increase the availability and attractiveness of transit, bicycling, and walking to encourage healthy communities and active car-free lifestyles.

Objective: D

Provide a transportation system that promotes community cohesion and connectivity for people of all ages and abilities, particularly for historically under-represented populations.

Strategies: E3, E6

Pg. 66 and 167, 168

(Limit 2500 characters; approximately 750 words)

3. The project or the transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document. Reference the name of the appropriate comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study document [studies on trunk highway must be approved by the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Council], or other official plan or program of the applicant agency [includes Safe Routes to School Plans] that the project is included in and/or a transportation problem/need that the project addresses.

Hennepin County Pedestrian Plan pg. 22, 33, 38, 47, 48, 50, 51

List the applicable documents and pages:

Americans with Disabilities Act Americans with Disabilities Act Hennepin County Program Access and Transition Plan for County Highway Rights of Way

(Limit 2500 characters; approximately 750 words)

4. The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of bicycle/pedestrian projects, transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project, which is otherwise eligible.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

5.Applicants that are not cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

6.Applicants must not submit an application for the same project in more than one funding sub-category.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

7. The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Funding amounts by application category are listed below.

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities: \$250,000 to \$5,500,000

Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA): \$250,000 to \$1,000,000

Safe Routes to School: \$150,000 to \$1,000,000

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

8. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

9. The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

10. The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project for the useful life of the improvement.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

11. The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term independent utility means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match. Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

12. The project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

13. The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected state and local units of government prior to submitting the application.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

#### **Requirements - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Projects**

1.All projects must relate to surface transportation. As an example, for multiuse trail and bicycle facilities, surface transportation is defined as primarily serving a commuting purpose and/or that connect two destination points. A facility may serve both a transportation purpose and a recreational purpose; a facility that connects people to recreational destinations may be considered to have a transportation purpose.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

#### Multiuse Trails on Active Railroad Right-of-Way:

2.All multiuse trail projects that are located within right-of-way occupied by an active railroad must attach an agreement with the railroad that this right-of-way will be used for trail purposes.

#### Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

#### Safe Routes to School projects only:

3.All projects must be located within a two-mile radius of the associated primary, middle, or high school site.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

4.All schools benefitting from the SRTS program must conduct after-implementation surveys. These include the student travel tally form and the parent survey available on the National Center for SRTS website. The school(s) must submit the after-evaluation data to the National Center for SRTS within a year of the project completion date. Additional guidance regarding evaluation can be found at the MnDOT SRTS website.

Check the box to indicate that the applicant understands this requirement and will submit data to the National Center for SRTS Yes within one year of project completion.

#### **Requirements - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Projects**

#### Measure A: Project Location Relative to Jobs and Post-Secondary Education

Existing Employment:	9677
Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment:	0
Upload Map	1468608829062_Regional Economy.pdf

#### Measure A: Usage

Existing Population Within One-Half Mile	31459
Upload Map	1468608857937_Population Summary.pdf

Yes

#### Measure A: Project Location and Impact to Disadvantaged Populations

Select one:

Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):

**Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:** 

Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:

Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

The 46th St. project corridor is within an area that is above the regional average concentration for populations in poverty or populations of color. Safe and easily accessible sidewalks, pedestrian ramps and crossing signals will connect residents and neighborhoods across the major barrier of 46th St. Due to the many transit routes, commercial nodes, schools and churches, pedestrians frequently walk along or across the corridor. The project improvements; ADA curb ramps, APS signals and pedestrian countdown signals will facilitate safer and more informed street crossings, especially for children and seniors, two groups who need more time to cross streets. These improvements will build upon prior work scheduled for summer of 2016. 46th St. will undergo a four to three lane conversion, eliminating the existing multiple threat crossings, which are particularly difficult for children and seniors. Considering that many low income communities have lower rates of car ownership and rely on public transportation and walking at higher rates than individuals of higher income, the ability to safely access transit, stores and parks on foot is critically important.

The corridor has a population of 70,102 people and there are 9,677 jobs located within one mile. Providing access to major employment centers including downtown Minneapolis, the U of M, the I-494 employment corridor and the airport.

Many of the corridor's retail establishments are neighborhood oriented, making walking to access goods and services an easy and practical choice. Additionally, the recreational amenities of Lake Harriet and Lake Hiawatha/ Nokomis bookend the corridor to the west and east and are frequently accessed by foot or bike. Children and teenagers frequently cross the corridor due to the presence of four schools and Hope Street for Runaway and

Homeless Youth located on or near 46th Street. The many transit stops along the corridor generate high levels of pedestrians as well, improved curb ramps will greatly benefit these individuals by streamlining access transit stops and safely providing access to a wide range of places including neighborhood parks and schools, jobs, and businesses once riders alight.

Pedestrian crossing enhancements at Oakland Ave. (such as high visibility signage, upgraded pedestrian crossing beacon and raised concrete median) will directly connect children, seniors and low income individuals across a challenging segment of 46th St. Additionally, the proposed Southside Minneapolis Greenway is expected to cross at Oakland Ave. making the safe and highly visible crossing important for regional north/ south bicycle and pedestrian travel as well.

The response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations affected by the project.

Upload Map

1468608907812\_Socio-Economic Conditions.pdf

City/Township	Segment Length in Miles (Population)	
Minneapolis	2.02	
	2	
Total Project Length		

2.02

#### Measure B: Affordable Housing

**Total Project Length (Total Population)** 

## Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

City/Township	Segment Length (Miles)	Total Length (Miles)	Score		Segment Length/Total Length	Housing Score Multiplied by Segment percent	
		0		0	0	0	

# Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

Total Project Length (Miles)	2.02
Total Housing Score	0

Measure A: Gaps, Barriers and Continuity/Connections

The 46th Street corridor forms a pedestrian barrier, physically and psychologically dividing the South Minneapolis neighborhoods it bisects the street is difficult to cross due to high volumes (13,100 AADT at I-35W) of fast moving traffic, poorly oriented curb ramps that are not up to current ADA standards and inadequate pedestrian signal equipment.

The street has four schools that front or are near 46th Street and many neighborhood oriented businesses reliant on a local customer base. Reconnecting disparate sections of neighborhoods can encourage more walking, enticing residents to choose non-motorized travel to run errands, travel to school and visit parks. The improvements proposed as a part of this project will knit neighborhoods back together, facilitating greater access and mobility between neighborhoods to the north and south of 46th Street.

Hennepin County's AADT measurements throughout the corridor vary with a high of 13,100 (2015) near the I-35W freeway ramps and a low of 5,800 (2014) near Lyndale Ave. intersection (attachment 1). Posted speed limit is 30 mph and to cross the roadway pedestrians must navigate across four travel lanes. The 46th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements project, in conjunction with the restriping and four to three lane reconfiguration to occur in 2016, will reconnect communities to the north and south of 46th Street by slowing traffic, improving crosswalk visibility and improving access and mobility for pedestrians traveling across and throughout the corridor by upgrading and standardizing all curb ramps to be in compliance with current ADA requirements.

Improved curb ramps will allow all pedestrians including vulnerable populations such as the disabled, the elderly and children to navigate this

#### Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

barrier with greater ease, speed and confidence. Additionally, accessible pedestrian signals (APS) and pedestrian countdown signal heads will provide more information for pedestrians crossing at signalized intersections, allowing them to make more informed decisions about their ability to safety cross the street.

At Oakland Ave. the pedestrian crossing enhancements will reconnect the Regina and Field neighborhoods along a frequently used north/ south pedestrian route. The Oakland Ave. crossing is also part of the proposed Southside Minneapolis Greenway, providing an enhanced pedestrian crossing for regional north/south commuter and recreational bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

**Measure B: Project Improvements** 

Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

The 46th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements project addresses a deficiency related to sidewalk curb ramps, street crossings and pedestrian signals (attachment 2 and 3). The current non-compliant curb ramps result in challenging and unsafe intersection crossings. MN DOT crash data shows that four bicycle/ vehicle and six pedestrian/ vehicle crashes occurred during the 2011 to 2015 period, with eight of the ten crashes occurring at a signalized intersection (attachment 4). No crashes resulted in a fatality but three crashes resulted in incapacitating injury or injury and the remaining crashes resulted in possible injury. By applying a crash modification factor of 0.3, derived from the study, Evaluation Pedestrian Safety Improvements, Van Houten et al., 2012, the installation of pedestrian countdown timers will reduce pedestrian/ vehicle crashes by 70% at those intersections that are currently without countdown timers (attachment 5).

The Regina Field Northrop Neighborhood Group has been actively working with the Hennepin County to address these deficiencies. The outdated signal equipment at Oakland Ave warrants replacement based on its condition and functionality. As part of the 2016 striping reconfiguration along 46th Street, the neighborhood designed their own crossing concept to address pedestrian safety concerns, which included several pedestrian crossing enhancements such as high visibility signage, upgraded pedestrian crossing beacon and a raised concrete median. The county has adopted and refined this concept and has incorporated it as part of this project. At signals elsewhere along the corridor installing Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) and pedestrian countdown timers will provide pedestrians and the visually impaired with more information for making decisions about crossing the street. Correcting these deficiencies in the pedestrian environment

will have a significant impact on pedestrian travel throughout the corridor, intersection crossings will become more predictable and the risk of falls or crashes will be reduced.

# **Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Connections**

Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

The project to update 46th Street pedestrian ramps to ADA compliance will connect the corridor to the METRO Orange Line bus rapid transit while also increasing pedestrian safety in the corridor. The 46th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements project will build upon improvements scheduled for summer 2016 including a four to three lane conversion, reducing crossing time and distance, and bike lanes which will create separation from moving vehicles for pedestrians walking on the sidewalk or in crosswalks. In conjunction with these roadway improvements, the 46th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements project will reconstruct curb ramps on 46th Street, fostering a more welcoming and safe multimodal transportation environment where pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users will be able to travel safely and comfortably. Fully ADA compliant curb ramps, pedestrian countdown signal heads and APS allow pedestrians and people in wheelchairs to take advantage of the many transit options available and do so in a safe and comfortable way, navigating curb ramps and crossing intersections safely.

In addition to coming street geometry and bicycle facility improvements, 46th Street is served by 14 bus routes (5 local, 6 limited stop, and 3 express) intersecting or running the length of the corridor. These buses carry residents to major employment destinations including downtown Minneapolis, the airport and the University of Minnesota. The planned Metro Transit Orange Line BRT project will use the existing bus stop at 46th Street and I-35W. The addition of bus rapid transit will provide new levels of access to downtown Minneapolis for residents living near the 46th Street corridor, serving the neighborhood with regular fast and convenient bus service. If the applicant is completing a transit or TDM application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment. Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.

Check Here if Your Transit Project Does Not Require Construction

# Measure A: Risk Assessment

1)Project Scope (5 Percent of Points)		
Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred	Yes	
100%		
Stakeholders have been identified		
40%		
Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted		
0%		
2)Layout or Preliminary Plan (5 Percent of Points)		
Layout or Preliminary Plan completed		
100%		
Layout or Preliminary Plan started	Yes	
50%		
Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started		
0%		
Anticipated date or date of completion	08/08/2019	
3)Environmental Documentation (5 Percent of Points)		
EIS		
EA		
PM	Yes	
Document Status:		
Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)	100%	
Document submitted to State Aid for review	75%	date submitted
Document in progress; environmental impacts identified; review request letters sent		
50%		
Document not started	Yes	
0%		
Anticipated date or date of completion/approval	01/31/2020	

#### 4) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (10 Percent of Points)

No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and Yes project is not located on an identified historic bridge

100%

Historic/archeological review under way; determination of no historic properties affected or no adverse effect anticipated

80%

Historic/archaeological review under way; determination of adverse effect anticipated

40%

Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological resources in the project area

0%

Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review:

Project is located on an identified historic bridge

#### 5)Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (10 Percent of Points)

4(f) Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or public private historic properties?6(f) Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?

Yes

No Section 4f/6f resources located in the project area

100%

No impact to 4f property. The project is an independent bikeway/walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement; letter of support received

100%

Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no known adverse effects

80%

Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely coordination/documentation has begun

50%

Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely coordination/documentation has not begun

30%

Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area

0%

6)Right-of-Way (15 Percent of Points)

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements not required Yes

#### 100%

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired	
100%	
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made	
75%	
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made	
50%	
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified	
25%	
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not identified	
0%	
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed	
0%	
Anticipated date or date of acquisition	
7)Railroad Involvement (25 Percent of Points)	
No railroad involvement on project	Yes
100%	
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature page)	100%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated	
60%	
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun	
40%	
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations not begun	
0%	
Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement	
8)Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)*	
*Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mr to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Counc Interchange Request Committee.	
Project does not involve construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps	Yes
100%	

100%

Interchange project has been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee	
100%	
Interchange project has not been approved by the Metropolitar Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee	1
0%	
9)Construction Documents/Plan (10 Percent of Points)	
Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)	
100%	
Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review	
75%	
Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion	
50%	
Construction plans have not been started	Yes
0%	
Anticipated date or date of completion	01/31/2020
10)Letting	
Anticipated Letting Date	07/13/2020

# Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form):	\$633,100.00
Enter Amount of the Noise Walls:	\$0.00
Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls:	\$633,100.00
Points Awarded in Previous Criteria	
Cost Effectiveness	\$0.00

# **Other Attachments**

Description	File Size
Attachment 1 - Hennepin-County-traffic- flow-map-2015	2.7 MB
Attachment 10 - CSAH 46 (46th St) Ped & ADA Improvements_MnDOT letter of support	109 KB
Attachment 11 - Pedestrian Advisory Committee resolution of support	198 KB
Attachment 2 - 46th_Existing Conditions	5.7 MB
Attachment 3 - 46th_Planned	5.7 MB
Attachment 4 - MN DOT pedestrian and bicycle crash data CSAH 46 2011 - 2015	231 KB
Attachment 5 - crash modification factor for countdown timer	127 KB
Attachment 6 -Hennepin County Pedestrian Plan	149 KB
Attachment 7 - Project to RBTN Orientation	226 KB
Attachment 8 - City of Minneapolis 46th St. Support Letter	283 KB
Attachment 9 - Field Regina Northrop Neighborhood Group 46th St. Support Letter	2.9 MB
	Attachment 1 - Hennepin-County-traffic- flow-map-2015 Attachment 10 - CSAH 46 (46th St) Ped & ADA Improvements_MnDOT letter of support Attachment 11 - Pedestrian Advisory Committee resolution of support Attachment 2 - 46th_Existing Conditions Attachment 3 - 46th_Planned Attachment 3 - 46th_Planned Attachment 4 - MN DOT pedestrian and bicycle crash data CSAH 46 2011 - 2015 Attachment 5 - crash modification factor for countdown timer Attachment 6 -Hennepin County Pedestrian Plan Attachment 7 - Project to RBTN Orientation Attachment 8 - City of Minneapolis 46th St. Support Letter Attachment 9 - Field Regina Northrop Neighborhood Group 46th St. Support



# **Population Summary**

Results

Within HALF Mile of project: Total Population: 31459 Total Employment: 3397

Project

0.5

n

2010 TAZ

1





# Hennepin County 2015 Flow Map



b) Majors and ATRs are all 2015 counts unless otherwise indicated.

Minneapolis Department of Public Works. Minneapolis follows the same alternating year schedule as Hennepin County. If a count is not current, the prior count is indicated by <u>red underlined italics</u>. For further information or updates, call the City at (612) 673-5750

All are 2014 counts. Call MN/DOT at (651) 366-3856 for further information. Note: MnDOT counts are shown in *bold italics*.

4. Except as noted above, for further information about traffic County Transportation Department at (612) 596-0240





Minnesota Department of Transportation Metro District 1500 West County Road B-2 Roseville, MN 5511

July 8, 2016

James N. Grube, P.E. Director of Transportation and County Engineer Transportation Department 1600 Prairie Drive Medina, Minnesota 55340

RE: Letter of Support for Regional Solicitation Application CSAH 46 (46th Street) Pedestrian and ADA Improvements from CSAH 22 (Lyndale Ave) to 18th Ave S.

Dear Mr. Grube:

Thank you for requesting a letter of support from MnDOT for the Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) 2016 Regional Solicitation. Your application for the CSAH 46 (46<sup>th</sup> St) project impacts MnDOT right of way on I-35W. MnDOT, as the agency with jurisdiction over I-35W, supports this County project to improve pedestrian accessibility and experience along CSAH 46 (46th Street), which includes ADA compliant pedestrian ramps, addition of a pedestrian median and replacement of the pedestrian crossing beacon at Oakland Avenue, and intersection improvements that include Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) and pedestrian countdown timers at signalized intersections not programmed for replacement in the near future.

Details of any future maintenance agreement with the County will be determined during project development to define how the project will be maintained; however, ped/bike amenities that impact MnDOT right of way are normally owned and maintained by the local agency.

This project has no funding from MnDOT. In addition, the Metro District currently has no discretionary funding in year 2020 of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) or year 2021 of the Capital Highway Investment Plan (CHIP) to assist with construction or assist with MnDOT services such as the design or construction engineering of the project. Please continue to work with MnDOT Area staff to assist in identifying additional project funding.

Sincerely,

Scott McBride, P.E. Metro District Engineer

Cc: Elaine Koustsoukos, Metropolitan Council John Griffith, MnDOT Metro District – West Area Manager Gina Mitteco, MnDOT Metro District – Multimodal Planning Director

An Equal Opportunity Employer



# City of Minneapolis Pedestrian Advisory Committee Infrastructure & Engineering Subcommittee Thursday, June 16, 2016

In attendance: Julias Tabbut and Curran, Scott Engel, Matthew Dyrdahl, and presenters Kelley Yemen, Steve Hay, and Nathan Koster

## Hennepin County Regional Solicitation Projects (Kelley Yemen, Hennepin County)

Process: Application deadline is in mid-July; it takes about six months to learn whether applications are successful; applications don't include details like lane widths; three project categories: roadway, bikeway, sidewalk

Marshall St NE, 10<sup>th</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> (roadway project): two-way curb-protected bike lane, parking on the other side, two drive lanes

44<sup>th</sup> / Webber Pkwy / Lyndale North (roadway project): different cross-section designs for each section; adding bike lanes (along existing Webber Park trails for middle section, on each side of road in others); current sidewalks in terrible condition (along Webber Park); road diet for that wee bit of Lyndale – in 2018 resurfacing, adjacent City section might be dieted also

CSAH 81 bridges, W Broadway over Hwy 100 (roadway project): replacing bridge structures only for now – adding wider multiuse facility for bikes and peds in anticipation of future connectivity. Engel suggests getting rid of bridges and rebuilding at grade

Portland Ave S, 60<sup>th</sup>-66<sup>th</sup> over crosstown (bikeway project): converting 4 to 3 lanes; adding buffered or protected bike lanes; widening sidewalks on bridge to allow for multiuse; filling in sidewalk gap from Park Avenue to the highway; looked at making bridge wider for separate facilities or adding a bike/ped bridge but both were impractical (because of truck clearance and extra ped crossings, respectively)

W Lake & Excelsior intersection (sidewalk project): adding island in the middle of intersection and crosswalks connecting everything; \$1mil total cost; will clarify things for car traffic too; Engel would like to see sidewalks widened too, but that's not in scope of project (would have to reconstruct Lake St to get room); most appropriate solution out of West Lake Study for this funding source

46<sup>th</sup> St S, Lyndale to just short of Cedar (sidewalk project): ADA-compliant ramps; pedestrian median and crossing beacon at Oakland; intersection improvements including APS and countdown timers

Endorsements from PAC will help the application, so resolution: "The PAC supports Hennepin County's regional solicitation application. We're especially excited about the West Lake & Excelsior and 46<sup>th</sup> Street projects, and filling the sidewalk gap along Portland Avenue." Unanimously approved.

## **<u>City of Minneapolis Regional Solicitation Projects</u> (Steve Hay, City of Minneapolis)**

Process: Timeline same as County's, above; City is submitting six applications (fewer than in past – trying to increase chances for most important / winnable projects), three roadway and three bike/ped projects

Hennepin Avenue, Washington to 12<sup>th</sup> (roadway project): full reconstruction; approved concept (not layout yet); \$16mil total – applying for \$7mil here; protected bike lanes

37<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, Central to Stinson, northern border of Mpls (roadway project): partnership with Columbia Heights; adding bike facility (on master plan – no details yet); filling two-block sidewalk gap on Minneapolis side and adding sidewalks along Columbia Heights side (currently none); in CIP already

Nicollet Ave bridge over Minnehaha Creek (bridge subcategory): \$25mil total; structure and substructure improvements; bike and ped trails underneath get concrete crumble pelted

Prospect Park Trail, Franklin SE to 27<sup>th</sup> over I-94 (bike/ped project): making multiuse trail from railway property; "project of opportunity" since railway wants to give it up

Queen Ave bike boulevard, 44<sup>th</sup> to Basset Creek (bike/ped project): adding a bike boulevard along a residential street roughly parallel to Penn Ave, crossing Olson Memorial at Penn

36<sup>th</sup> St W, Lake Calhoun to DuPont (bike/ped project): pedestrian enhancements; protected bikeway (currently with bollards); building new curb and gutter and putting bike and ped facilities behind curb; along cemetery; highly used by peds; chance to "explore feasibility of . . . adding sidewalk space" and raised protected bikeway; not a full reconstruct, so not sure how it will affect drainage, etc.; maybe a little mill and overlay needed

Resolution: "The PAC supports the City's regional solicitation application. We're very especially excited about the 36<sup>th</sup> Street improvements." Unanimously approved.

## 8th Street South (Steve Hay, City of Minneapolis)

Reconstruction from Hennepin to Chicago Avenue in 2019-20; got funding in 2014 through regional solicitation; just beginning project development and design; aiming to have an approved layout in January; prioritizing peds and transit -- no bike facilities; widening sidewalks (esp at 3 BRT stops on south side); bumpouts at all intersections; evaluating curbside uses (parking, drop-off, valet, etc. – the biggest challenge / question mark); taking out a lane of traffic or parking to widen sidewalks; peak hour restrictions a likely possibility; streetscape improvements (trees etc); current conditions of 7<sup>th</sup> better, but will probably also be reconstructed in early '20s

## 42nd Avenue North (Nathan Koster, City of Minneapolis)

Reconstruction from Xerxes to Lyndale in 2018-19; proposing 84 curb extensions along 1.5 miles (drainage might dictate a bigger one across from none in some cases, but crossing distances would be narrowed the same); keeping parking at Thomas Ave business node because it's fully used – sharrows there; narrowing from Sheridan to Penn and adding boulevards; C line BRT coming along Penn; filling sidewalk gap from Penn to Girard along cemetery to south (no longer along pond path); keeping sidewalk along curb in order to maintain mature trees behind them; at Humboldt: redoing pavement and sidewalks at ess curve – basically keeping as is but lots of curb extensions, squared up crossings, etc.; Fremont business node – removing North side parking to add bike lanes, D Line BRT; east of Emerson, planted boulevards, reduced traffic widths (similar to beginning section)

Long stretch without crossing near school and cemetery – add light or sign or beacon to prevent speeders and enable crossings?; temporary bollard bumpouts at business nodes?; will be trying to reduce driveway widths

Resolution: "The PAC enthusiastically supports this project, especially the bumpouts, narrowed traffic lanes and crossings, protection from car traffic provided by boulevard and/or bike lanes, and the sidewalk gap infill." Unanimously approved.

# **Existing Pedestrian Amenities**

Figure 1



Regional Solicitation Map version date: 07/11/2016

Data source: Hennepin County

This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.



# **Existing Pedestrian Amenities**

Figure 2



Regional Solicitation Map version date: 07/11/2016

Data source: Hennepin County

This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.



# **Existing Pedestrian Amenities**

Figure 3



This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.



Regional Solicitation Map version date: 07/11/2016

Data source: Hennepin County

# **Planned Pedestrian Amenities**

Figure 1



Regional Solicitation Map version date: 07/11/2016

Data source: Hennepin County

This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.



# **Planned Pedestrian Amenities**

Figure 2



Regional Solicitation Map version date: 07/11/2016

Data source: Hennepin County

This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.


# 46th Street (CSAH 46) from Garfield Avenue South to 18th Avenue South

# **Planned Pedestrian Amenities**

Figure 3



This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.



Regional Solicitation Map version date: 07/11/2016

Data source: Hennepin County

# Hennepin County Public Works

# CSAH 46 from Lyndale Ave to Cedar Ave (2011 - 2015) - created on 06-24-2016 by rile1che Crash data is managed by the Mn/DOT Office of Traffic, Safety, and Operations.

SYS	NUM	REF_POINT	GIS_ROUTE	GIS_TM	RD_DIR	ELEM	RELY	INV	R_U
04	27000046	000+00.506	0427000046	0.506	W		1	3	U
04	27000046	000+00.506	0427000046	0.506	S		1	3	U
04	27000046	000+00.506	0427000046	0.506	W		1	3	U
04	27000046	000+00.665	0427000046	0.665	Z	J51	1	3	U
04	27000046	000+00.665	0427000046	0.665	Z	J51	1	3	U
04	27000046	000+00.665	0427000046	0.665	Z	J52	1	3	U
04	27000046	001+00.106	0427000046	1.106	E		1	3	U
04	27000046	001+00.175	0427000046	1.175	Z		1	3	U
04	27000046	001+00.716	0427000046	1.716	Z		1	3	U
04	27000046	001+00.716	0427000046	1.716	Z		1	3	U

ATP	CO
UNIT 1 WAS BEGINNING FORWARD FROM A STOPPED POSITION IN THE WEST BOUND LANE OF TRAFFIC ON 46TH ST A	27
DRIVER OF UNIT 1 SAID THAT HE WAS TRAVELING NB ON NICOLLET AVE. S WITH A GREEN LIGHT WHEN HE WAS ST	27
DRIVER OF UNIT 1 WAS TRAVELING NB ON NICOLLET AV S AND PROCEEDING TO MAKE A LEFT TURN ONTO 46TH ST.	27
VEH1 WAS WB ON 46ST. BICYCLE WAS EB 46ST TURNING LEFT TO NB 2 AV S. WIT. THOUGHT VEH1 WAS A BLUE P	27
THE PEDESTRIAN WAS AN OCCUPANT IN A VEHICLE STOPPED AT THE REDLIGHT ON 46TH AT 2 AV S. SHE EXITED W	27
DRIVER OF UNIT 1 STATED SHE WAS MAKING A LEFT TURN FROM SOUTHBOUND STEVENS AVE S ONTO 46TH ST E., W	27
UNIT 1 WAS FACING WB ON 46 ST E AND GOING TO MAKE A NB TURN ONTO PARK AVE S. THE PEDESTRIAN, UNIT	27
VEH 1 WAS EB 46 ST E APPROACHING CHICAGO AV S. PEDESTRIAN WAS CROSSING SW ACROSS 46 ST E NEAR CO	27
THE PEDACYCLE WAS TRAVELING EAST ON 46TH ST E APPROACHING BLOOMINGTON AV S.VEHICLE 2 WAS NORTH ON B	27
VEH 1 NB ON BLOOMINGTON AVE S. PED CROSSING 46TH ST SB. ON THE GREEN LIGHT VEH 1 MADE A LEFT TURN	27

CITY	DOW	MONTH	DAY	YEAR	TIME	SEV	NUM_KILLED	NUM_VEH	JUNC	SL
2585	4-Wed	4	18	2012	1745	С	0	1	4	30
2585	4-Wed	10	30	2013	2051	В	0	1	4	30
2585	1-Sun	12	20	2015	1826	С	0	1	4	30
2585	7-Sat	4	2	2011	1330	С	0	1	7	30
2585	1-Sun	12	23	2012	0729	С	0	1	4	30
2585	5-Thu	3	5	2015	0810	С	0	1	4	30
2585	3-Tue	12	13	2011	1811	С	0	1	4	30
2585	5-Thu	10	22	2015	1830	А	0	1	1	30
2585	1-Sun	10	13	2013	1615	А	0	1	4	30
2585	1-Sun	10	26	2014	0845	С	0	1	4	30

ΤΥΡΕ	DIAG	LOC1	TCD	LIT	WTHR1	WTHR2	SURF	CHAR	DESGN	ACC_NUM
6	90	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	5	121090132
6	3	1	1	4	6	0	2	1	90	133030192
7	3	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	5	153540145
6	5	1	1	1	2	0	1	2	5	110920059
7	2	1	1	4	1	0	1	2	5	123580024
7	3	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	5	150640024
7	90	1	1	4	1	0	1	1	5	113470132
7	90	1	98	4	1	0	1	1	8	152950172
6	9	1	3	1	2	0	1	1	8	132870006
7	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	142990047

PERSON1											PERSON2
VTYPE	DIR	ACT	FAC1	FAC2	POSN	INJ	EQP	PHYS	AGE	SEX	VTYPE
1	W	1	1	0	1	Ν	99	1	22	F	53
1	Е	6	1	0	1	Ν	99	1	30	F	53
1	W	6	2	2	1	Ν	99	1	25	М	51
1	W	1	15	0	1	Ν	0	99	899	Z	53
1	Е	1	1	0	1	Ν	4	1	35	F	51
4	Е	6	32	0	1	Ν	99	1	33	F	51
3	W	5	2	0	1	Ν	99	1	72	М	51
1	Е	1	1	1	1	Ν	4	1	24	М	51
3	Ν	1	1	0	1	Ν	4	0	36	F	53
51	S	31	1	1	21	С	98	1	66	М	1

										PERSON3	
DIR	ACT	FAC1	FAC2	POSN	INJ	EQP	PHYS	AGE	SEX	VTYPE	DIR
9NW	1	5	17	21	С	98	1	8	F		
Ν	1	19	0	35	В	98	1	16	Μ		
9NW	31	1	1	35	С	98	1	61	F		
9NW	6	2	0	25	С	98	1	52	Μ		
9NW	33	90	0	25	С	98	1	16	F		
9NW	31	1	0	21	С	98	98	41	F		
9NW	35	1	0	21	С	98	1	57	F		
9NW	33	17	2	25	А	98	99	51	Μ		
Е	1	99	0	25	А	11	98	51	Μ		
Ν	6	1	1	1	Ν	4	1	25	F		

									PERSON4		
ACT	FAC1	FAC2	POSN	INJ	EQP	PHYS	AGE	SEX	VTYPE	DIR	ACT

FAC1	FAC2	POSN	INJ	EQP	PHYS	AGE	SEX



# **CMF / CRF Details**

CMF ID: 5272

Install pedestrian countdown timer

**Description: Install pedestrian countdown timer** 

**Prior Condition: Unknown** 

**Category: Intersection traffic control** 

Study: *Evaluating pedestrian safety improvements*, Van Houten et al., 2012

**Star Quality Rating:** 

★★★★★★ [View score details]

Crash Modification Factor (CMF)						
Value:	0.3					
Adjusted Standard Error:						
Unadjusted Standard Error:						

Crash Reduction Factor (CRF)						
Value:	70 (This value indicates a <b>decrease</b> in crashes)					

Adjusted Standard Error:	
Unadjusted Standard Error:	

	Applicability						
Crash Type:	Vehicle/pedestrian						
Crash Severity:	All						
Roadway Types:	Not specified						
Number of Lanes:							
Road Division Type:							
Speed Limit:							
Area Type:	Not specified						
Traffic Volume:							
Time of Day:							
If countermeasure is intersection-based							
Intersection Type:	Roadway/roadway (not interchange related)						
Intersection Geometry:	Not specified						

Geometry:	
Traffic Control:	Signalized
Major Road Traffic Volume:	

Development Details		
Date Range of Data Used:		
Municipality:	Detroit	
State:	MI	
Country:		
Type of Methodology Used:	Time series	
Sample Size Used:	449 Sites	

Other Details			
Included in Highway Safety Manual?	No		
Date Added to Clearinghouse:	Dec-02-2013		
Comments:	The study did not adjust the reduction in crashes at the treatment location based on the change in the comparison sites.		

This site is funded by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and maintained by the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center

The information contained in the Crash Modification Factors (CMF) Clearinghouse is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the

interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse. The information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation, nor is it a substitute for sound engineering judgment.

.....

# Recommendations

The recommendations of this plan are guided by the county's goals outlined in this plan:

	GOAL 1 Improve the safety of walking
INTRODUCTION	GOAL 2 Increase walking for transportation
INTRODUCTION	GOAL 3 Improve the health of county residents through walking
GOALS	
CONTEXT	Recommendations fall into three categories:
CONTEXT	1. Strategies to implement
EXISTING CONDITIONS	<ol> <li>Continuation of current practices</li> <li>Partnerships with agencies, municipalities, and organizations</li> </ol>
	5. Partnerships with agencies, municipanties, and organizations
KEY FINDINGS	For a full summary of recommendations, implementation timeframes, and costs:
RECOMMENDATIONS	Appendix D: Summary of Recommendations
GOAL 1	Appendix E: Estimated Cost Information for Implementing Recommendations
GOAL 2	Note: The costs associated with the recommendations are planning estimates. Actual capital costs or
GOAL 3	staff time may vary. Right of way or easement costs, impacts on utilities, drainage, retaining walls, and other location-specific issues may increase the construction cost of pedestrian infrastructure.
PERFORMANCE	
MEASURES GO	AL 1 6.1 IMPROVE THE SAFETY OF WALKING
PRIORITIES	6.1.1. CURB EXTENSIONS, REFUGE MEDIANS, AND CROSSWALKS
FUNDING	STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION	1.1A. Install Curb Extensions and Pedestrian Refuge Medians as Part of Stand-Alone Pedestrian Safety Projects.
i	Street reconstruction projects provide an opportunity to improve pedestrian crossings, however, county roads are typically reconstructed every 50-60 years. Where feasible and conditions allow, stand-alone pedestrian safety projects should be implemented in order to improve pedestrian safety on streets that are not yet candidates for reconstruction. Stand-alone pedestrian safety

projects should be constructed as part of the County Road Safety Plan implementation and as part of the Pavement Preservation Plus Program.

The **Pavement Preservation Plus Program** is a new county program that provides funding for improvements to the pedestrian environment such as curb extensions, pedestrian refuge medians, signage, and curb ramps.

**Curb extensions:** Curb extensions extend the sidewalk space into the street and provide benefits to pedestrians by shortening the crossing distance and improving visibility for both pedestrians and vehicles. Curb extensions are also commonly referred to as bump outs.

**Pedestrian refuge median:** Median designed with space for pedestrians to wait if unable to cross the entire roadway at once.

## STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENT

<u>STRATEGY</u>	<u>TIMEFRAME</u>	PRIORITY			
	Year to begin Implementation	Ongoing	Low	Medium	High
1.4. Sidewalks and trails					
1.4A. Work with cities to encourage applications for CIP Sidewalk Participation funds to construct and improve high priority sidewalks.	2013	х			х
1.4B. Work with cities, school districts, and park districts to encourage the construction of pedestrian facilities along county roads within 1/2 mile of schools, parks and senior centers.	2013-2014	х			х
1.4C. Evaluate the effectiveness of the Hennepin County CIP Sidewalk Participation Program and propose changes as appropriate.	2014			x	

## PRACTICES TO CONTINUE

	Plan and construct multi-use trails along county roads to provide combined pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
Sidewalks and trails	Work with cities and property owners to fill sidewalk gaps and/or improve sidewalk conditions in coordination with new development and redevelopment projects.
	Work with cities to fill sidewalk gaps in conjunction with county road reconstruction projects and transitway projects.

# GOAL 2 6.2 INCREASE WALKING FOR TRANSPORTATION

## 6.2.1. PEDESTRIAN-RELATED POLICY AND PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

## STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENT

2.1A. Establish an Internal Procedure for Pedestrian-Oriented Review of County Projects Such as Roadway Reconstruction Projects, Transitway Projects, Construction of Libraries and Other County Facilities, and Others as Determined.

An internal procedure for pedestrian-oriented review of projects will ensure that projects are considered for pedestrian impacts and improvements during the early stages of project development. County staff should develop and document the procedure for pedestrian-oriented review of projects. Elements of the Pedestrian Level of Service measure should be incorporated into the pedestrian-oriented review of projects. Staff should also consider opportunities to incorporate walkability assessments and pedestrian-oriented tasks into the scope of work of roadway and transitway projects. RECOMMENDATIONS

**KEY FINDINGS** 

INTRODUCTION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS** 

GOALS

CONTEXT

GOAL 1

GOAL 2

GOAL 3

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRIORITIES

FUNDING

.....

GOAL 3

PERFORMANCE

**MEASURES** 

**FUNDING** 

IMPLEMENTATION

## STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENT

	<u>STRATEGY</u>	<u>TIMEFRAME</u>		PRIORITY		
		Year to begin Implementation	Ongoing	Low	Medium	High
	2.2 Transitways					
INTRODUCTION	2.2A. In station area planning, consider and analyze how the walkshed can be expanded by adding pedestrian facility connections.	2013	х			Х
GOALS	2.2B. Identify and prioritize pedestrian improvements to					
CONTEXT	enhance the pedestrian environment at Transit stops	2014	Х			Х
EXISTING CONDITIONS	and along common routes to LRT and BRT stations.					
KEY FINDINGS	2.2C. Prioritize adding and enhancing pedestrian					
RECOMMENDATIONS	connections between transit stations, high density housing,	2013-2014	Х			Х
GOAL 1	and major employers near station areas.					
GOAL 2						

## GOAL 3 6.3 IMPROVE THE HEALTH OF COUNTY RESIDENTS THROUGH WALKING

PRIORITIES 6.3.1. PRIORITIZE PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS IN AREAS WITH GREATEST HEALTH NEEDS

#### STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENT

# 3.1A. Emphasize the Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan Strategies in Geographic Areas with Populations Experiencing Health Disparities.

The locations of populations experiencing health disparities are incorporated into the pedestrian facility priority locations. The implementation of strategies in this plan, particularly pedestrian safety strategies, should be targeted towards geographic areas with populations experiencing health disparities. County staff should also work with other agencies to encourage consideration of health disparities and access to healthy destinations in local capital programs.

**Health disparities:** Health disparities are defined as differences in the rates of disease among different population groups. In Hennepin County, low income populations have higher rates of chronic disease than the county as a whole.

## PRACTICES TO CONTINUE

# Include Access to Healthy Destinations in the Prioritization Criteria for the CIP Sidewalk Participation Program.

The county should continue to consider access to parks as part of the evaluation process for CIP Sidewalk Participation funding.

# Hennepin County Pedestrian Plan

# 7.1 INCREASE THE SAFETY OF WALKING

# NUMBER OF PEDESTRIAN-VEHICLE CRASHES

Hennepin County staff compile crash data and verify every crash on the county road system. Crash information is verified from the Minnesota Department of Public Safety and local police records in order to provide a high level of accuracy and reliability in crash data. The purpose of tracking the number of pedestrian-vehicle crashes is to understand whether we are meeting our goal of reducing crashes by 50% by 2030. Hennepin County will align with the MnDOT Towards Zero Deaths initiative to ensure coordination with statewide work to reduce roadway fatalities.

# NUMBER OF PEDESTRIAN-VEHICLE CRASHES

Hennepin County's crash reporting system includes information about the severity of pedestrian injuries resulting from crashes on the county road system. Fatal and severe injury (A - level) crashes are tracked to understand trends in the severity of pedestrian-vehicle crashes.

# 7.2 INCREASE WALKING FOR TRANSPORTATION

# MILES/PERCENT OF COUNTY ROADS WITH PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ON BOTH SIDES OF THE ROADWAY

Hennepin County staff track the mileage of pedestrian facilities (sidewalks and trails) on the county road system as part of the county's Complete Streets Inventory. Hennepin County prefers to have pedestrian facilities on both sides of county roads in order to provide pedestrians with convenient access to their destinations. This measure tracks the county's progress towards providing pedestrian facilities on both sides of county roadways.

# MILES/PERCENT OF COUNTY ROADS WITH PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ON ONE SIDE OF THE ROADWAY

Data for this measure is provided through the Complete Streets Inventory. In some cases, environmental constraints do not allow the space for pedestrian facilities on both sides of a roadway. At a minimum, Hennepin County prefers to provide pedestrian facilities on at least one side of county roadways, in order to provide pedestrians with a safe and comfortable alternative to walking on the roadway. This measure is included in the 2012 Public Works Strategic Plan.

# MILES OF SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTED ALONG COUNTY ROADWAYS (ANNUAL)

Data for this measure is provided through the Complete Streets Inventory. This measure provides information on the annual progress of the expansion of the Hennepin County pedestrian system.

# PERCENT OF RESIDENTS WHO WALK TO WORK

This measure allows the county to understand the trends in walking for one type of transportation trip. The US Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) tracks information on the journey to work on an annual basis. The Pedestrian Plan Performance Measures tracks the ACS 3 year estimate. The ACS surveys a sample of US residents throughout the year. The 3 year estimate provides greater reliability and a smaller margin of error.

INTRODUCTION

GOALS

CONTEXT

**EXISTING CONDITIONS** 

**KEY FINDINGS** 

RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL 1

GOAL 2

GOAL 3

#### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRIORITIES

FUNDING

There are several limitations to this data source. Fluctuations in the data are often within the margin of error. The survey is conducted year round and does not capture summertime walkers if surveyed during the winter. The greatest limitations of this data are that it does not capture information about walk trips other than the journey to work and it does not capture information about walking trips to transit. The great majority of pedestrian trips are not captured by the ACS, as the Metropolitan Council 2000 Travel Behavior Inventory showed that only 12% of pedestrian trips in the Twin Cities region are for the purpose of going to work.

## PERCENT OF HENNEPIN COUNTY RESIDENTS WHO WALK TO A DESTINATION AT LEAST ONCE PER WEEK

Data for this measure is collected through Hennepin County's Survey of the Health of All the Population and the Environment (SHAPE). SHAPE collects a broad set of information about health and health behaviors from a sample of Hennepin County residents. SHAPE is conducted every 4 years. This measure has been included in the SHAPE survey since 2010. This measure allows the county to understand broadly the role of walking for transportation among county residents.

### ANNUAL PEDESTRIAN COUNTS ON COUNTY PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

Data for this measure is collected through several sources. The City of Minneapolis and Transit for Livable Communities have been conducting pedestrian counts since 2007. Many of these counts are along county roadways. Three Rivers Parks District also conducts counts on trails within Hennepin County. County staff are working to develop a pedestrian and bicycle count program in 2013 and 2014. This data will provide information on pedestrian use of specific county pedestrian facilities. This measure will be tracked through a separate annual count report.

## 7.3 IMPROVE THE HEALTH OF COUNTY RESIDENTS THROUGH WALKING

## PERCENT OF HENNEPIN COUNTY RESIDENTS WHO ARE OVERWEIGHT OR OBESE

This data is collected through the Hennepin County SHAPE survey. Weight status is computed from self-reported height and weight. Pedestrian planning is one of many strategies to improve public health. Though a direct link between plan implementation and weight status cannot be established, the purpose of this measure is to understand trends in the weight status of county residents in order to inform the implementation of this plan.

INTRODUCTION

GOALS

CONTEXT

**EXISTING CONDITIONS** 

**KEY FINDINGS** 

RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL 1

GOAL 2

GOAL 3

#### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRIORITIES

FUNDING

# 8.1 **PRIORITIES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Priorities for the implementation of the plan's strategies were developed through feedback from the Pedestrian Plan Steering Committee, analysis of the results from the community engagement process, and an internal review process. The chart below shows the priority level for broad categories of the strategies included in this plan. Priority levels and timeframes for completion were assigned to specific strategies based on this chart.

MPROVE THE SAFETY OF WALKING	LOW PRIORITY	MEDIUM PRIORITY	HIGH PRIORITY
Crossing improvements			
• Curb extensions and medians			
• Crosswalks			
Signals			
• Signal timing			
Countdown timers			
Sidewalks			
Constructing new sidewalk/trail			
• Improving pedestrian conditions on existing sidewalks			
Accessibility/Support of ADA transition plan			
Enforcement and education for safety			

## **INCREASE WALKING**

Policy and process improvement		
• Design guidelines and review of projects		
Data collection		
Coordination with transitway projects for pedestrian improvements		
Winter Maintenance		

## **IMPROVE HEALTH**

Prioritize pedestrian improvements in areas with greatest health needs		
Safe Routes to School Programs		
Education and encouragement for walking		

INTRODUCTION

••••••

GOALS

CONTEXT

**EXISTING CONDITIONS** 

**KEY FINDINGS** 

RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL 1

GOAL 2

GOAL 3

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRIORITIES

FUNDING

:

# 8.2 **PRIORITIES FOR THE LOCATION OF PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

Priorities for the location of implementation of the plan were also developed through feedback from the Pedestrian Plan Steering Committee, analysis of the results from the community engagement process, and an internal review process. The chart on page 47 shows the priority level for various demographic and geographic characteristics.

	LOW PRIORITY	MEDIUM PRIORITY	HIGH PRIORITY	•
Locations with high pedestrian activity currently				INTRODUCTION
Transit stops and stations				
High frequency transit				GOALS
Retail centers				CONTEXT
Job centers				
Schools				EXISTING CONDITIONS
Libraries				KEY FINDINGS
Health care – Hospitals and clinics				
Parks				RECOMMENDATIONS
Grocery stores and farmers markets				GOAL 1
Population density				GOAL 2
				- GOAL 3

## 8.2.1. IDENTIFYING HIGH PRIORITY LOCATIONS

The priorities outlined in the table above were used to create a map showing the locational priorities for implementing this plan. This map is a tool to determine where the provision or enhancement of pedestrian infrastructure will have the greatest impact on pedestrian safety and have the greatest potential to increase rates for walking. This map will primarily be used as a guide for implementing the recommendations under Goal 1: Increase the safety of walking.

The highest priority locations for plan implementation are in Minneapolis and its inner ring suburbs. Many high priority locations currently have pedestrian facilities on both sides of the street. These locations should be considered for pedestrian safety improvements such as pedestrian crossing improvements and sidewalk reconstruction. In second ring suburban communities and western Hennepin County, high priority locations are identified around commercial and town centers, with most other areas identified as medium to low priority. There are fewer pedestrian facilities along county roads in second ring suburbs and western Hennepin County should focus on the addition of sidewalks and trails to increase opportunities for walking.

This map is meant as a guide for the implementation of this plan and is not meant to substitute for field visits, community engagement, or other information gathering. There may be some locations with high scores that may have little to no demand for pedestrian facilities, while a location with a low score may actually benefit greatly from a pedestrian safety improvement.

## For information on methodology of identifying high priority locations:

- Appendix F: Methodology for Identifying High Priority Locations
- Appendix G: Priority Level of Pedestrian Facility Gaps

# PRIORITIES

#### FUNDING

PERFORMANCE

MFASURES





Public Works 350 S. Fifth St. - Room 203 Minneapolis, MN 55415 TEL 612.673.2352

www.minneapolismn.gov

June 20, 2016

James N. Grube, P.E. Director of Transportation and County Engineer Transportation Department 1600 Prairie Drive Medina, Minnesota 55340

Re: Letter of Support for Regional Solicitation Application and Project CSAH 46 (46th Street) Pedestrian and ADA Improvements From CSAH 22 (Lyndale Avenue) to 18th Avenue South

Dear Mr. Grube:

The City of Minneapolis supports Hennepin County's federal funding application through the Regional Solicitation for the proposed pedestrian and ADA improvements to CSAH 46 (46th Street) improvements from CSAH 22 (Lyndale Avenue) to 18th Avenue South.

The City of Minneapolis supports this Hennepin County project to improve pedestrian accessibility and experience along CSAH 46 (46th Street). Proposed improvements include ADA compliant pedestrian ramps, addition of a pedestrian median and replacement of the pedestrian crossing beacon at Oakland Avenue, and intersection improvements that include Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) and pedestrian countdown timers at signalized intersections not programmed for replacement in the near future. These proposed safety improvements will enhance the livability and quality of life for Minneapolis and Hennepin County residents.

Thank you for making us aware of this application effort and the opportunity to provide support. The city looks forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

Sisak Cerny

Lisa Cerney Director of Public Works

# FIELD REGINA NORTHROP Neighborhood Group

1620 E 46th Street Minneapolis, MN 55407 (612) 721-5424 frnng@frnng.org

July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016

James N. Grube, P.E. Director of Transportation and County Engineer **Transportation Department** 1600 Prairie Drive Medina, Minnesota. 55340

Re: Letter of Support for Regional Solicitation Application Project CSAH 46 (46<sup>th</sup> Street) Pedestrian and ADA Improvements From CSAH 22 (Lyndale Ave) to 18th Ave South

Dear Mr. Grube,

The Field Regina Northrop Neighborhood Group (FRNNG) supports Hennepin County's federal funding application through the Regional Solicitation for the proposed pedestrian and ADA improvements to CSAH 46 (46th Street) improvements from CSAH 22 (Lyndale Ave) to 18th Ave South.

FRNNG has been working with Hennepin County staff since the spring of 2015 to help facilitate engagement in our community and develop feedback for possible improvements of 46<sup>th</sup> Street. Through out the outreach process, poor pedestrian experience and inability to safely cross 46th Street were top priorities for our residents. Hennepin County has been working to address these concerns within the limited scope of the scheduled resurfacing project. The proposed safety improvements of ADA-compliant pedestrian ramps, pedestrian countdown timers, the addition of the pedestrian median, and replacement of the pedestrian crossing beacon at Oakland would further support the Field Regina Northrop Neighborhood's goals.

Thank you for looking into this opportunity to support our neighborhood.

Sincerely, Willie Bridges