SAINT PAUL PEDESTRIAN PLAN

Steering Committee Recap 5.14.18

Location: Saint Paul City Hall, 15 W. Kellogg Boulevard, Room 41

Attendees: Reuben Collins, Paul Sawyer, Kat Brown, Nora Riemenschneider, Russ Stark, Mai Chong Xiong, Tania Maki, Melanie McMahon, Libby Kantner, Stephanie Harr, Erin Laberee (for Ted Schoenecker), Berry Farrington, John Mark Lucas, Stuart Knappmiller, Jessica Treat, Jill Chamberlain, Mackenzie Tuner Bargen

2:00	Welcome and Introductions – Simer
2:10	Recap of Recent Activities – Simer • Stop for Me 2018 launched on April 30th with 1,000+ warnings issued to drivers. SPPD and SPPW will be boosting efforts to draw attention to this effort and encourage drivers to stop. Stop for Me volunteer committee is addressing education to enhance enforcement efforts. SPPW is creating a video starring Mayor Carter encouraging drivers not to pass vehicles stopped for pedestrians and will share when editing is complete. • Technical Working Group meetings – crosswalk striping Internal working group continues to review literature and best practices related to crosswalk striping, and discuss with national expert Charlie Zegeer to understand the state of the field related to crosswalk markings • Steering Committee updated schedule was distributed. Remaining tasks primarily focus on identification of recommendations and strategies to include in the draft plan, scheduled to be released in early fall.
2:20	Presentation of Draft Vision and Goals – Simer • Group endorsed draft vision. • Group reviewed draft goals and generally felt they were complete. Group will continue to review goals as strategies and recommendations are developed to assure these align as the plan progresses. Simer encouraged steering committee members to share goals and vision statements with stakeholders and elected officials to hear feedback; test emphasis of goals statements (too strong or too weak); affirm priorities
2:40	Presentation of Prioritization Methodology and Discussion – Ryan Rose Ryan presented the draft methodology to identify areas of Saint Paul where pedestrian needs are of highest priority.

	Ryan addressed earlier Steering Committee questions regarding potential for double counting among measures. For example, transit stops serve destinations that are also identified individually as priority measures. Ryan stated that the purpose of geographic-based prioritization is to see where criteria overlap, and to raise up priority areas where multiple criteria occur in the same location. Another example of potential double counting is neighborhood nodes and grocery stores. Not all neighborhood nodes contain grocery stores, so including both measures elevates neighborhood nodes that do contain grocery stores, a potential combination that can be very important for walking. Lucas asked: How do you treat boundary areas, for example the Como neighborhood close to the UMN and Fairgrounds? Rose responded that the city is divided among Census tracts. Neighborhood nodes and destinations had a quarter mile buffer placed around them and Census tracts received points for the number of these features whose buffer fell within that Census tract. E-mailed follow up requesting clarification of how destinations outside the city's boundary are incorporated, such as the UMN and Fairgrounds. ACP 50 Census tracts were ranked based on their designation over the last seven years. Tracts that have remained in this category for 6 or 7 of the last 7 years were scored high; 1 to 5 of the last 7 years were scored medium; and 0 of the last 7 were scored low. Farrington affirmed this categorization is how the developers of the ACP 50 designation intended these areas be analyzed, in order to show consistency over time in ACP 50 designation. High priority areas closely overlap with 1930s and 1940s redlining maps, which may be more familiar to the public. How were St. Paul and Ramsey County Roadway Safety Plans developed? These plans were funded by MnDOT to address severe crashes, approximately half of which occur on local roads statewide. The plans analyzed crash data in both jurisdictions, identified road and traffic characteristics associated with locations of severe crashes, systematically assessed each jurisdiction's streets, identified strategies for mitigating crashes, and identifying locations to be priority candidates for safety investment. These plans included lists of roads in Saint Paul where severe bicycle and pedestrian crashes are most common, along with the general recommendation to prioritize safety investments along higher

	speed and higher volume collectors and arterials. Each of these streets are included in the prioritization measures. Harr noticed a concentration of crashes on W. 7th near the Excel Center. However, this area did not score highly when measured against concentration of jobs and residents, likely because most of the area's pedestrian activity is generated by visitors. Simer suggested reevaluating this as other measures are added to see how this affects the overall ranking of this district. Xiong asked why places of worship were not included as destinations. Ryan will review data availability. Kantner noticed that "hospitals and clinics" are missing many clinics. Ryan will review data availability. Farrington and Treat suggested other measures for transit density, such as transit frequency or on/off boardings at a given location. E-mailed follow up: Boardings plus alightings (people getting on, off) aggregated by transit stop and then census tract would be a good proxy for transit related foot traffic. I think the Como & 280 park and ride would be the only exception, where the ridership is largely attributed to people driving and parking at the transit stop. https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/us-mn-state-metc-trans-stop-boardings-alightings High Frequency network will be less detailed like the parks or the other binary measures. https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/us-mn-state-metc-trans-hi-frequency-transit-servc Ryan will review available data and suggest potential revisions. Ryan next explained the prioritization scenarios. Model 1 shows all criteria weighted equally. Model 2 shows all criteria weighted relative to each other in the same way they were prioritized by survey respondents. Model 3 takes model 2 and adds additional weight to criteria favored by groups who were underrepresented in the survey. For example, grocery stores were a key destination to those with incomes below $20,000, and were ranked more highly. Model 4 takes model 3 and increases the weighting on equity so that all ACP 50 areas have high or medium scores on the priority map.

	Steering committee members discussed preferred scenarios and measures in small groups. The following comments were reported back: Measures: • Transit measure should incorporate ridership. Map does not draw intuitive conclusion based on high-frequency network or number of buses stopping. Additional comments on transit measures sent via e-mail follow up: • Schools as destinations should account for school population (size matters). Number of students could provide proxy for trips. • Safety: can barriers be incorporated, such as difficult intersections to cross or places with poor lighting? Freeway crossings are uncomfortable and dampen demand. Crashes are an imperfect way of measuring safety. Could we incorporate streets SPPS defines as barriers for crossing in its bussing policy? • Sawyer asked via e-mail: If there are any measures that are extreme outliers (2+ standard deviations), does it make sense to add/subtract another point from their score. Having everything one point apart makes it difficult to get significantly different scores in each tract. This is helped significantly if scenarios 3 and 4 are used with their higher weightings. Prioritization • Steering committee members expressed preference for Models 3 and 4 and discussed pros and cons of each. • Model 3 is more easily defensible because it is grounded in feedback. • Model 4 (focusing on ACP 50 areas) is harder to defend without an overriding policy by the City of Saint Paul regarding ACP 50 areas or equity. • Model 3 shows areas of priority spread more evenly throughout the city.
3:40	Potential Applications of Prioritization Maps – Simer Simer explained that next step with these maps is to identify ways these can help guide future decision-making. She asked what questions steering committee members have these maps can help answer. • Kantner: suggested showing alignment with PW five-year plan so we can identify places where we will have the most bang for our buck. • Collins acknowledged that local funding priorities don't always align with federal funding priorities.

	• Collins pointed out that improving our sidewalk network requires more funding. Existing funding is so small that we cannot break the city into meaningful quadrants to systematically make repairs. In addition, we don't have staff resources to collect data on our sidewalk system to know where needs are greatest based on condition. • Treat asked whether we can get residents more involved in assessments of sidewalk condition and helping with data collection effort. • Chamberlain stressed importance of identifying early wins to build momentum, such as a budget for infill of sidewalk gaps or an annual repair budget.
4:00	Adjourn

Materials

- Prioritization methods packet (distributed 5.9.18 via email)
- Draft vision and goals (distributed 5.9.18 via email)
- Steering Committee schedule (distributed 5.9.18 via email)