Hennepin County
Pedestrian Plan

Complete Streets Task Force, January 28, 2013
Pedestrian Plan

• Goals of the plan
• Process and timeline
• Community engagement
• Content of the plan
• Next steps
Goals

- Increase the safety of walking
- Increase rates of walking for transportation
- Improve the health of county residents through walking
Process and timeline

- **Spring/Summer 2012**: Background research and information gathering
- **Summer/Fall 2012**: Community engagement
- **Fall/Winter 2012-2013**: Preparing draft plan
- **Winter/Spring 2013**: Review and finalize
- **Summer 2013**: Anticipated approval by County Board
Community Engagement

- Timeframe: July – October
- Approach:
  - 10 Workshops with existing groups as part of regular meetings
  - Online survey
  - Brooklyn Park Farmers Market
Workshops

- North Minneapolis
- Bloomington Senior Leader Group
- Little Earth youth group
- Crystal
- Orono/Navarre
- Dayton
- New Hope
- Latino Economic Development Center
- Brian Coyle Center
- Brooklyn Park
Key themes and issues

• Winter sidewalk maintenance
• Missing sidewalk segments
• Crossing improvements
• Enforcement of crosswalk laws
• Improving pedestrian access to commercial nodes, transit stops
Influence on the plan

• Locations of community concerns about pedestrian safety or comfort
• Strategies/recommendations for the plan
• Priorities for plan implementation
Recommendations

Strategies to implement

• Infrastructure: Curb extensions and refuge medians, signals, sidewalks, trails, accessibility, transitways, Safe Routes to School

• Process: design guidelines, project review processes
Sidewalk inventory

• Plan will include updated sidewalk and trail inventory along county roads
• Plan will identify high priority sidewalk/trail gaps to construct:
  – Propose to target high-priority sidewalk segments for CIP Sidewalk Participation Program
Next Steps

• Internal review of draft plan: February 2013
• External review of draft plan: March 2013
• Finalize plan: April-May 2013
• Anticipated adoption by County Board: June 2013
Questions

Draft plan will be posted for review on the county website:

www.hennepin.us/pedestrianplan
Hennepin County
Bicycle Transportation Plan - Update

Approach

- Full update of the original 1997 plan
- Intent to “take to the next level” of providing a bike friendly network, making biking safer, more convenient and more comfortable
- Inclusion of an extensive public engagement process including community and agency outreach and technical peer review
- Emphasis on a collaborative effort between county staff and the consultant (Bob Byers & Rose Ryan will be the primary contacts)
Hennepin County
Bicycle Transportation Plan - Update

Consultant Scope of Work

- Organize an internal working team and technical peer review approach
- Conduct a robust community outreach and engagement process
- Information gathering including an assessment of current practices
- Various deliverables such as technical memos, updated maps, typical section graphics and sample application tech sheets
- Preparation of draft and final plan documents
Hennepin County
Bicycle Transportation Plan - Update

Study Timeline

- RFP released by the end of February
- Consultant selection in early spring
- Community engagement process beginning in summer
- Plan completion anticipated in summer 2014
Bikeway and Sidewalk CIP Solicitations

Complete Streets Task Force, January 28, 2013
CIP Solicitation Process

- October 1, 2012: Applications posted
- November 1, 2012: Applications due
- November 1-30, 2012: Review
- December 12, 2012: Applicants notified
- January 29, 2013: Anticipated County Board approval
- February 2013: Begin drafting agreements for funding participation
Review Process

• Applications reviewed by 4-5 staff from Transportation, HCWT, and HSPHD

• High priority considerations:
  – Project improves safety
  – Project readiness for construction
  – Cost effectiveness
  – Project serves a transportation purpose
## Sidewalk Participation Program

### Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount awarded</th>
<th>Anticipated Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka CSAH 4 Sidewalk</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorewood CSAH 19 Sidewalk</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Plain CSAH 19/Budd Ave Sidewalk</td>
<td>$5,970</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Plain CSAH 19/Main Street Sidewalk Reconstruction</td>
<td>$12,531</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior CSAH 19 Sidewalk</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley CSAH 156/Winnetka Ave Sidewalk Reconstruction</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Prairie CSAH 60/Mitchell Rd Sidewalk</td>
<td>$48,750</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis CSAH 5/Franklin Ave Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$48,840</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis CSAH 81/West Broadway Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$27,420</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Bikeway Development Program

## Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Bikeway Type</th>
<th>Amount awarded</th>
<th>Anticipated Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis 36th Street Bikeway</td>
<td>Cycle track or bike lanes</td>
<td>$55,450</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Broadway St NE Bikeway</td>
<td>Cycle track or bike lanes</td>
<td>$54,971</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope Boone Ave N Bikeway</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Park Cedar Lake Rd</td>
<td>Feasibility study</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior/Shorewood Mill Street</td>
<td>Feasibility study</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Bassett Creek Trail</td>
<td>Feasibility study</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minneapolis: 36th Street Bikeway

Two-way cycle track under consideration
## Bikeway Program Discretionary Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Bikeway Type</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Anticipated Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooklyn Park</strong></td>
<td>Connections at Shingle Creek</td>
<td>Off-street trail</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minneapolis</strong></td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave SE Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>Bicycle boulevard</td>
<td>$47,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plymouth</strong></td>
<td>Xenium Lane/CSAH 6</td>
<td>Off-street trail</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minneapolis: 6th/5th Ave SE Bicycle Boulevard

Curb extensions and street markings as part of a bicycle boulevard project
Changes to Process for 2014

• Release applications in August 2013 to allow additional time for applicants to prepare applications
Questions/Discussion
American With Disabilities Act (ADA)

Efforts in the Public Rights of Way
January 28, 2013

Complete Streets Task Force Update
Today’s Discussion

• ADA requirements
  – Transition Plan
  – Self-evaluation

• Accomplishments

• Next steps
ADA Law

ADA requires that pedestrian infrastructure must be accessible for all users of differing abilities

How do we meet the law?

• Develop Transition Plan
• Perform Self-evaluation
  – Inventory and evaluate infrastructure
• Make changes / modify infrastructure as necessary
ADA Law Requires

• Transition Plan
  – Draft released for public review (March 2011)
    • Four open houses
    • Comments received/changes made
      – Subject areas
        » Grammar and document organization
        » APS (mostly against systemwide proliferation)
        » Department ADA approach and process
  – Final draft ready for public review
    • First quarter 2013
ADA Law Requires

Are we providing accessibility for all users?

• Self-evaluation
  – Attitude and action
    • Policies and practices promote accessibility
    • Capturing data on the county system
Attitude

• Complete Streets, Active Living
• Staff training and engagement
  – MnDOT ADA Training
    • 55 public works staff, included 14 engineers
  – Staff presentations (MPA, CEAM conferences)
  – Developed Accessible Pedestrian Signal Guidance
Actions

• 2011 and 2012 curb ramp programs
  – Constructed 447 pedestrian ramps
• Complete Streets Inventory (high-level Self-evaluation)
• 2013 curb ramp program
  – Vicinity of the Central Corridor facility (SE Minneapolis)
  – Expected 2013 construction
Curb Ramp Construction

Before

After

Marshall Street (CSAH 23) at 23rd Avenue in NE Minneapolis
Complete Streets Inventory

Lake Drive (CSAH 9) in Robbinsdale
Collecting ADA Self-evaluation data (Fall 2012)

University Avenue (CSAH 34) in SE Minneapolis
Meeting with residents to address railroad crossing concerns

Humboldt Avenue (CSAH 57) at CP Rail in North Minneapolis
Next Steps

• Release draft Transition Plan
• Meet with key stakeholders
• Finalize Transition Plan
• Detailed Self-evaluation (in progress)
  • Pedestrian Ramps
  • Sidewalks
  • Accessible Pedestrian Traffic Signal
• Continue curb ramp program
  – Funded via capital improvement line item
• Internal and external (agency) coordination
• Engage the public on ADA issues
Discussions with Margot

• Pedestrian ramps with the Pavement Preservation program (overlays)

• Timing of work

• Diagonal curb ramps

• APS message at the street corner
For bituminous overlays, the department will do an assessment of the curb ramps along the segments of county roads scheduled for overlay maintenance work, or update the assessment already completed through the department’s countywide ADA Self-evaluation of its curb ramps. From this, the department would develop a plan for the scope of pedestrian ramp improvements we would complete in conjunction with each annual bituminous overlay project. At locations along our overlay areas where sidewalk facilities exist but a curb ramp is not present (not built) the department would construct new compliant curb ramps. For locations where sidewalk facilities exist and curb ramps are present, the department would make a case-by-case assessment of improvements needed based on there being a “high state of disrepair” for the ramp. This work to construct new curb ramps or replace existing curb ramps would be included as part of our annual curb ramp program.

For locations along our overlays where sidewalk facilities exist and curb ramps are present, the department would evaluate these locations for new curb ramps through the normal scheduling and implementation of curb ramp replacements through its annual curb ramp program when it is programmed for a given location.
Timing of Work

• The annual assessment of overlay areas

• Construction of the annual curb ramp project

• Completion of the annual overlay work
Diagonal curb ramps

• “They are not directional”
• Avoid using
• Provide statement of rationalization for using
Pedestrian curb ramp standard plans
Sheet 1
Curb Ramp Guidelines

6. **Curb-cut width**: When possible, a 6-ft wide curb cut / ramp width, exclusive of fiber, is preferred over a 4-ft. width in new and major reconstruction. The wider width is often impractical on retrofit projects but is a key consideration on signaled intersections (see A37 guidelines) and at locations that never consistently keep pedestrian volumes or deal with street clearance. The ramp width / delineable warning should reach the existing trail or sidewalk sublale, whenever feasible or sidewalk convenient travel.

7. **Perpendicular Grade Breaks**: Grade breaks are a critical element for all curb ramp designs and should allow users to smoothly transition from the sidewalk to the ramp and the ramp to the street. Grade breaks are required at the top and bottom of any ramp and must be perpendicular to the running slope of the ramp. Abrupt or improperly placed grade breaks create a tripping hazard for wheelchair users and a tripping hazard for blind and low vision users.

8. **Pedestrian Access Route (PAR)**: A continuous and unobstructed pedestrian access route must be maintained for paths of travel including around corners. The PAR must be 4 ft. wide, with passing zones of at least 5 ft. at least 100 feet, with a maximum 2% cross slope. Consideration must be given to all directions of travel when planning PARs around traffic.

9. **Orientation**: The orientation of curb ramps has historically been placed on the 90-degree “border” of the visual (framed) curb ramp. This orientation is not desirable because it directs protection into the middle of the intersection rather than into the crosswalk. Tilting curb ramps should be avoided while possible. The designer must rotate a ramp diagonally, to receive increased scrutiny and must be documented in the project file.

Pedestrian ramps should be oriented in line with the preferred path of travel, which is usually a line between the approaching sidewalk and the ramp that is on the other side of the road. If ramps across from one another are not aligned, it will result in a skewed crosswalk. Straight crosswalks are preferred. Depending on the scope of a retrofit project, obstacles such as catch basins, signal poles, and/or steep gutter grades can complicate ramp orientation.

**PEDESTRIAN RAMP TYPES**

PROMAC identifies three broad categories of pedestrian curb ramps: perpendicular, parallel, and blended transition, creating the foundation of describing for basic curb ramp types and providing basic design parameters. Based on guidance found in PROMAC, the PROMAC special report, and feedback from Mn/DOT and local designers, these guidelines have identified variations of the broad types with detailed design and construction guidance:

1. **Perpendicular curb ramps**
   a. Combined Perpendiculars – See Figure 3 and 4.
   b. One-way directional – See Figure 5 and 6.
   c. Standard Ramp – See Figure 2.
APS Message

• Traffic Division
  – Hennepin County APS messages give you the name of the street/intersection leg you are crossing
Questions

Peter M Lemke, P.E.
Senior Transportation Engineer
Hennepin County Transportation Department
1600 Prairie Drive | Medina, MN 55340
Office 612 596 0394 | Blackberry 612 990 0654
pete.lemke@co.hennepin.mn.us
2013 Paving Program

Status of Review

- Have examined the proposed paving projects for areas where opportunities may exist to add bike accommodations
- Discussions have been held with both the Hennepin County and Minneapolis Bicycle Advisory Committees (BACs)
- Next Steps:
  - Discussion with Operations/Maintenance and Traffic staff
  - Further development of concept layouts
  - Follow-up discussions with city staffs, neighborhood organizations, BACs
  - Scheduling of paving and striping activities
2013 Hennepin County Overlay Paving & Striping Projects

Minneapolis

1M - Franklin Avenue (CSAH-5) – 16th Avenue South to 21st Avenue South
Other initiatives – TLC Study and NACDI proposal for art / gathering space. Further evaluation and discussions underway.

2M - Franklin Avenue (CSAH-5) – 28th Avenue South to 30th Avenue South
Completion of Riverside Avenue area improvements (skipped during Riverside project). Coordination with city regarding follow-thru (median removal & signal revisions).

7M - Osseo Road (CSAH-152) – Thomas Avenue North to Penn Avenue (CSAH-2)
TLC Study recently finalized – recommendations under review, meeting with Victory neighborhood on January 14th. Roadway striping reconfiguration and intersection improvement options being considered.

8M - Washington Avenue (CSAH-152) – Webber Parkway to 22nd Avenue North
Portion of Washington Avenue (south of Lyndale Avenue) has existing bike lanes connecting to North 2nd Street. Segment to the north (around curve to Lyndale Avenue) was originally planned, but not implemented by Minneapolis in 2010. City is interested in connecting to Webber Parkway via 41st Avenue & Aldrich Avenues.

10M - 4th Street SE (CSAH-37) – Oak Street SE to I-35W
Minneapolis is pursuing right side bike lanes (4th Street is on the left), might be able to shift, but 4th Street has the extended gutter pan. City also wants to examine the termini of the bike lane which ends at 10th Avenue, just prior to the I-35W bridge.
2013 Hennepin County Overlay Paving & Striping Projects

Other Portions of Hennepin County

2 - Old Shakopee Road (CSAH-1) – Old Cedar Avenue to Killebrew Drive (Bloomington)
Traffic volumes in the 8-10,000 ADT range, and currently the road is a 4-lane undivided design. Old Shakopee Road is designated as a bikeway on the county bike plan, and considered a “core linking trail” as part of the Bloomington Alternative Transportation Plan. Consider reconfiguration of a portion of the segment as a 3-lane roadway?

13 - Zachary Lane (CR-202) – CSAH-81 to 95th Place North (Maple Grove)
Traffic volumes are in the 8-10,000 ADT range. This segment is a 4-lane divided on the southern portion with an off-road trail on the west side. Some shoulder areas do exist, however the striping is unusual. Consider striping reconfiguration?

15 - Main Street (CSAH-150) – Territorial Road (CSAH-116) to Douglas Drive (Rogers)
Traffic volumes are in the 5-6,000 ADT range. This road is a 2-lane rural design with 6-8 foot wide shoulders. This road is also planned as part of a future jurisdictional exchange with Rogers when the Fletcher Bypass is completed. The shoulders currently end near Douglas Drive, but on-road could possibly be extended since no parking is allowed—discuss with the city?

19 - Lynwood Boulevard (CSAH-15) – West Edge Boulevard to Old School Trail (Mound)
Traffic volumes for this segment are in the range of 4-4,500 ADT. The road is a 2-lane rural design with 3-4 foot wide shoulders. This road is not designated on the county bike plan due to the close proximity of the Dakota Rail Trail. The speed limit is 30 mph, and some possible shoulder width could be achieved with minor lane narrowing—consider?