Improving pedestrian, bicycle and shared ride connections along the METRO Blue Line LRT Extension
1. Introduction

Background
This report summarizes findings from the first round of community engagement conducted as part of the Bottineau Community Works Connectivity Project ("the project"). The goal of the project is to improve pedestrian, bicycle and shared ride connections along the METRO Blue Line LRT Extension.

The purpose of the engagement activities was twofold:

- to identify potential walking and biking projects in the eight METRO Blue Line station areas outside of Minneapolis, and
- to gather community guidance on which criteria are most important when deciding which station connectivity projects should be prioritized for implementation.

Summary of activities
Engagement activities for this first round began in March 2018 and continued until the end of April 2018. Activities in this round include:

- **In-person activities**
  - Pop-Up sessions
  - Community workshops (held in conjunction with station area rezoning activities also led by Bottineau Community Works)

- **Online engagement**
  - Community survey
Overall level of participation

Eight (8) in-person engagement activities were conducted in the first round of engagement.

- **In-person activities**
  - Approximately 220 people attended in person activities
    - 145 attended community workshops
    - 75 participated at Pop-Up events

- **Online activities**
  - A total of 218 people provided responses to the online survey, with 135 of those respondents completing a survey all the way to the end
  - A total of 20 participants engaged in the online Wikimap, providing a total of 22 comments

The following pages of this report include a summary of overall guidance received from all events, as well as individual reports for each of the community workshops and pop-up activities.
2. Overall guidance received

2.1 - Guidance from all Round 1 in-person and online activities

What keeps you from walking or riding a bicycle more often?

- Routes covered in ice and snow during winter
- Destinations are too far apart
- No trails, sidewalks, or bike routes where I want to go
- I feel unsafe around motorized traffic
- I don’t have enough time
- Sidewalks, trails, bike routes are not well lit in dark
- Worried about harassment and crime
- I feel unsafe at intersections
- I have to carry too much stuff
- There aren’t enough benches or trees
- Hard to find my way around
- I don’t have anyone to walk or bike with
- The weather is too unpredictable
- Lack right clothes, shoes, accessories or bike

Pop-Up sessions included several boards and maps to collect guidance from participants. Image: at the Adult Learning Center Pop-Up, in Crystal.

Detail from one of the boards used to collect information on barriers - from the Golden Valley community workshop.
In-person and online results, combined, no weighting
Which criteria are most important to you when selecting among different projects? (total count, not weighted)

- Connects to regional trails
- Solves a safety problem
- Serves a large number of people
- Connects to an LRT station
- Serves people who use transit a lot
- Serves large number of households without cars
- Connects to schools and libraries
- Is near an LRT station
- Is easy and cheap to implement
- Is identified as a priority in another plan

Issues and opportunities collected from participants

Current issues
Participants identified the following as important issues to address for improving connectivity in the station areas they would access:
- Lack of safety around motorized traffic
- Lack of safety at intersections
- Lack of designated walking and biking paths

Ideas for making improvements
Specific ideas for projects along the corridor include:
- Implement designated pedestrian and bicycle paths
- Safer intersections
- Fix needed infrastructure
2.2 - From the online survey (does not include in-person)

Pedestrian-related only, weighted:

Which criteria are most important to you when selecting among different projects? (weighted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project solves a safety problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project serves a relatively large number of people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project connects to regional trails</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project serves people who use transit a lot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project directly connects to an LRT station</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is near a light rail station</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project serves relatively large number of households without cars</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project directly connects to schools and libraries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is easy, relatively cheap to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is already made a priority in another plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Online survey, **bicycle-related only, weighted:**

Which criteria are most important to you when selecting among different projects? (weighted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project creates a bikeway separate from auto traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project connects to other trails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project solves a safety problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project serves a relatively large number of people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project directly connects to an LRT station</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project serves relatively large number of households without cars</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is near a light rail station</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project serves people who use transit a lot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project directly connects to schools and libraries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is easy, relatively cheap to implement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is already made a priority in another plan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Conclusions from comments received

Criteria for selecting PEDESTRIAN-related projects

Given priorities and comments received from in-person and online participants, these are the recommended ranking and weight for the selection criteria that was previously identified by the Infrastructure Connectivity Team.

Please note that while it was possible to separate responses and criteria rankings related to pedestrian projects vs. bicycle projects in the online survey, it was not possible to do so during in-person engagement. The criteria and weights presented here are a best approximation summarizing all guidance received from the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Recommended weight (%) according to guidance received from the public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solves a safety problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to regional trails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves a large number of people</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves people who use transit a lot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to an LRT station</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is near an LRT station</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves large number of households without cars</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to schools and libraries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is easy and cheap to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is identified as a priority in another plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria for selecting BICYCLE-related projects

Given priorities and comments received from in-person and online participants, these are the recommended ranking and weighing for the selection criteria that was previously identified by the Infrastructure Connectivity Team.

Please note that while it was possible to separate responses and criteria rankings related to pedestrian projects vs. bicycle projects in the online survey, it was not possible to do so during in-person engagement. The criteria and weighings presented here are a best approximation summarizing all guidance received from the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Recommended weighing (%) according to guidance received from the public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creates protected bikeway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to regional trails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves a safety problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves a large number of people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to an LRT station</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves large number of households without cars</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is near an LRT station</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves people who use transit a lot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to schools and libraries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is easy and cheap to implement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is identified as a priority in another plan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Reports for individual sessions

Summaries for in-person events completed thus far

Eight in-person engagement events have been completed through April 6, 2018. A report from each of those events is included in this section.

It should be noted that although effort was made to facilitate a uniform set of activities at all events of a similar type, it was sometimes necessary to adapt content and activities depending on the time that the hosts were able to make available. A summary of which activities were completed at each engagement event is provided below. An “X” means the activity did take place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Place / Institution</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robbinsdale Community Workshop</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hennepin County BAC Meeting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brooklyn Park Community Workshop #1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Golden Valley Community Workshop</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brooklyn Park Community Workshop #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pop-Up: Adult Education Center, Crystal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pop-Up: Brooklyn Park Library</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pop-Up: 610 West Apts., Brooklyn Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Workshop #1

Robbinsdale Community Workshop

Thursday, March 15, 7 to 9pm
Robbinsdale City Hall

Background

This event was a public community workshop held at Robbinsdale City Hall, and was organized jointly by the team working on the Bottineau Community Works station area rezoning policy updates and the team leading community engagement for the Connectivity Project.

The workshop was attended by approximately twenty-five people. Of the 21 individuals who signed in, 19 had addresses within Robbinsdale, 1 had a Crystal address and 1 had a Plymouth address.

The purpose of the workshop was to identify potential walking and biking projects in the Robbinsdale station area and gather community guidance on which criteria are most important when deciding which station connectivity projects should be prioritized for implementation.

Summary of guidance received

Current assets

Generally, participants recognized the following as assets existing in the area:

- Walking and biking to the station area from the south and east is relatively safe
- There is good sidewalk infrastructure in the adjacent neighborhoods/side roads
- Bike path along county road 9
Current issues
Participants identified the following as important issues to address for improving connectivity in the area:

- Lack of safety near motorized traffic
- Lack of designated walking and biking paths
- Unsafe intersections

Ideas for making improvements
Among the ideas participants provided for improving conditions in and near the station area are:

- Improve safety at intersections
- Implementing designated walking and biking paths
- Improved street-level lighting

Criteria for selecting projects
Participants at this workshop ranked the criteria for selecting which projects to prioritize for implementation. Their feedback was processed. Top priorities include:

1) Project solves a safety problem
2) Project serves a large number of people
3) Project connects to regional trails
Community Workshop #2

Hennepin County BAC Meeting

Monday, March 19, 4 to 6pm
701 4th Ave S, Minneapolis

Background

The project team engaged the Hennepin County Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) at their monthly meeting, providing information on the project and requesting comments regarding walk, bike, and shared mobility opportunities along the Bottineau LRT corridor. Approximately 20 people participated in the BAC workshop.

Summary of guidance received

Current assets

Generally, participants recognized the following as assets for existing LRT station areas:

- Good existing walking and biking infrastructure
- An interconnected system
- Safety as a priority for all modes: crossings with crossing signals, safe access for bikes to get on and off trains, secure bike parking access

Current issues

Participants identified the following as important issues to address for improving connectivity in the area of future LRT stations:

- Lack of connectivity between transportation systems
- Lack of bicycle parking/storage
- Unsafe intersections, lack of safe designated space for walking and biking

Ideas for making improvements

Among the ideas participants provided for improving conditions in and near the station area are:

- Interconnected pedestrian, bicycle, transit system
- Improved wayfinding and marked routes
- Safe intersections

Criteria for selecting projects

Participants at this workshop ranked the criteria for selecting which projects to prioritize for implementation in this way:

1) Project connects to regional trails
2) Project connects to an LRT station
3) Project serves a large number of people
Community Workshop #3

Brooklyn Park Community Workshop

Tuesday, March 20, 6 to 8pm
Brooklyn Park City Hall
A part of the Think Again Brooklyns event series

Background

This event was held as part of “Think Again Brooklyns,” a monthly community workshop held at Brooklyn Park City Hall. The project team presented information on the project and requested participant comments and ideas regarding walk, bike, and shared mobility opportunities for Brooklyn Park station areas.

Approximately 55 people attended the event, with 41 people signing in.

Summary of guidance received

Current assets

Generally, participants recognized the following as assets in the Brooklyn Park station areas:

- Existing walking and biking infrastructure in the adjacent neighborhoods and roads.
- Safe walking and biking environment
- System interconnects walking and biking paths to transit hubs

Current issues

Participants identified the following as important issues to address for improving connectivity in the station areas:
• Lack of safety near motorized traffic. Participants expressed that high levels of traffic and erratic drivers create dangerous conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists.

• Lack of designated walking and biking paths. Despite existing infrastructure, there are areas that provide little to no designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists.

• Lack of access to destinations. Participants mentioned that it is difficult to access destinations due to distance or physical barriers.

**Ideas for making improvements**

Among the ideas participants provided for improving conditions in and near the station area are:

• Implement designated pedestrian and bicycle paths. Consistent sidewalks and bikeways will improve connectivity and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

• Maintain and fix dilapidated infrastructure. Participants mentioned sidewalks should be wide enough and maintained to walk comfortably at all times.

• Create safer intersections. Marked crosswalks and traffic signals will make crossing streets easier and safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Criteria for selecting projects**

Participants at this workshop ranked the criteria for selecting which projects to prioritize for implementation in this way:

1) Project serves people who use transit a lot
2) Project serves a large number of households without cars
3) Project connects to schools and libraries
Community Workshop #4
Golden Valley Community Workshop

Wednesday, March 28, 6 to 8pm  
Unity Minneapolis

Background

This community workshop was held at Unity Minneapolis in Golden Valley. It was organized jointly by the team working on the Bottineau Community Works station area rezoning policy updates and the team leading community engagement for the Connectivity Project.

The workshop was attended by about 45 people, with 42 people signing in.

The purpose of the workshop was to identify potential walking and biking projects in the Golden Valley station area and gather community guidance on which criteria are most important when deciding which station connectivity projects should be prioritized for implementation.

Summary of guidance received

Current assets

Generally, participants recognized the following as assets in the Golden Valley station area:

- Good existing infrastructure
- Relatively safe access to points of interest
Current issues
Participants identified the following as important issues to address for improving connectivity in the station areas:

- Poorly maintained infrastructure
- Lack of designated walking and biking paths
- Lack of safety around motorized traffic

Ideas for making improvements
Among the ideas participants provided for improving conditions in and near the station area are:

- Implement designated pedestrian and bicycle paths
- Fix infrastructure in need of updates
- Clear trails, sidewalks, and bike routes of ice and snow during winter months

Criteria for selecting projects
Participants at this workshop ranked the criteria for selecting which projects to prioritize for implementation in this way:

1) Serves a large number of people
2) Connects to regional trails
3) Serves a large number of households without cars
Golden Valley Community Workshop
Routes and issues near Golden Valley Road Station

Legend
- LRT Station
- Biking Routes
- Walking Routes
- Dangerous for walking and biking
- Parks
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Community Workshop #5
Brooklyn Park Community Workshop

Wednesday, April 5, 6 to 8pm
Brooklyn Park City Hall

Background
This was the second community workshop for Brooklyn Park residents, organized jointly with the Bottineau Community Works station area rezoning policy team.

The workshop was attended by about 15 people.

The purpose of the workshop was to identify potential walking and biking projects in the Brooklyn Park station areas and to gather community guidance on which criteria are most important when deciding which station connectivity projects should be prioritized for implementation.

Summary of guidance received
Current assets
Generally, participants recognized the following as assets near the Brooklyn Park station areas:

- Sidewalks, bike path, and pedestrian crossing near the 63rd Avenue Station area.
- There are sidewalks along the main roads.
Current issues
Participants identified the following as important issues to address for improving connectivity in the station areas:

- Improving safety around motorized traffic
- Expanding access to destinations
- Improving safety around intersections and expanding/extending paths for walking and biking

Ideas for making improvements
Among the ideas participants provided for improving conditions in and near the station areas are:

- Implementing designated pedestrian and bicycle paths
- Developing interconnected pedestrian, bicycle and transit systems
- Maintaining and fixing infrastructure

Criteria for selecting projects
Participants at this workshop ranked the criteria for selecting which projects to prioritize for implementation in this way:

1) Solves a safety problem
2) Serves a large number of households without cars
3) Serves a large number of people
Out in the Community

Pop-Up Engagement Events

Adult Education Center in Crystal (Bass Lake Road Station Area)
Brooklyn Park Library (85th Avenue Station Area)
610 West Apartments in Brooklyn Park (Oak Grove Parkway Station Area)

Background

Pop-Up Workshops take the project workshops to the places where people are already congregating - so they don’t have to go out of their way to attend a project meeting, and to bring in and engage new communities in development of the project’s direction.

Pop-Up materials are quick, informative and fun activities. Thus far, the project team has coordinated and staffed Pop-Ups at a school, a library, and an apartment building. The Pop-Up kiosks are generally staffed for between 2 and 3 hours, with individual engagement lasting from 5 to 15 minutes per person.

The Pop-Ups have so far engaged more than 75 people and have generated hundreds of data points. Attendance and locations for the Pop-Ups held is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place / Institution / Host</th>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/07/18</td>
<td>Adult Education Center, Crystal</td>
<td>Bass Lake Road</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/18</td>
<td>Brooklyn Park Library</td>
<td>85th Avenue</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/18</td>
<td>610 West Apartments, Brooklyn Park</td>
<td>Oak Grove Parkway</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we heard

What keeps you from walking or riding a bicycle more often?

The top three responses to this question were:

1) I feel unsafe around motorized traffic
2) There are no trails, sidewalks, or bike routes where I want to go
3) Sidewalks, trails, and bike routes are covered in ice and snow during winter

What priorities are most important to you?

Participants identified the following as important issues to address for improving connectivity in the station areas:

- Project connects to regional trails
- Project serves a large number of people
- Project connects to schools and libraries

Mapping activity findings

Mapping activities at each of the Pop-Ups collected locations identified by participants as dangerous for walking and biking, and routes participants would use to walk or bike to the station area. In some cases (for example in the Bass Lake Road map), this helped identify locations where pedestrian or bicycle infrastructure is not currently provided. Connections include:

- Georgia and Hampshire Streets between 51st and 52nd Avenues in Crystal (Bass Lake Road Station Area)
- Missing sidewalk on 96th Avenue between Hampshire and Colorado Streets (Oak Grove Parkway Station Area)
Pop-Up #2 - Brooklyn Park Library
Routes and issues near 85th Avenue Station

Legend
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- Biking Routes
- Walking Routes
- Dangerous for walking and biking
- Parks
Pop-Up #3 - 610 West Apartments
Routes and issues near Oak Grove Parkway Station
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