



To: MAYOR AND COUNCIL

Work Session Item #: VI.

From: Chad A. Millner, PE, Director of Engineering

Action

Discussion

Date: July 1, 2014

Information

Subject: Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety Fund Approval Process

Action Requested:

Discussion regarding how the Council would like to approve Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety (PACS) Fund Projects in conjunction with neighborhood street reconstruction projects.

Information / Background:

Prior to the creation of the PACS Fund, sidewalk construction costs were assessed to benefiting adjacent properties. With the PACS Fund, the City now has a dedicated funding source for pedestrian and cyclist safety projects such as sidewalks. We feel the focus of this work session should be on the projects that have both a street assessment and a PACS project component. We would like to discuss how these types of projects are approved by Council.

Prior to the PACS Fund sidewalk construction costs were assessed to benefiting adjacent properties, which required a 4-1 vote by Council for approval. The PACS Fund allows Council to approve the PACS portion of projects on a 3-2 vote. While this would allow easier approval of PACS projects, staff felt it required some discussion on the topics listed below before going that route.

1. Communication Improvements
 - a. Over the past few years, improvements have been made to the communications process used for projects. We feel this continues to build trust with the community about our projects. Will voting separately impact this?
2. Policies – State versus Local
 - a. Assessments are governed by State Statute MN Chapter 429
 - b. PACS – Local policy
3. Resident Viewpoint
 - a. Impacts of street and sidewalk projects are City initiated. Residents do not see the difference.
 - b. Pre- vs post-acceptance of sidewalks.
 - c. Separate vote could be confusing.
 - d. Different viewpoints within a neighborhood
 - i. Direct impact with construction, right at installation point.
 - ii. Resident on side street, impact from improved pedestrian facility.
4. Cost
 - a. Less expensive if constructed at the same time as the roadway.
 - b. More staff required if designs had to be prepared separately.

Options for consideration

1. Continue 4-I combined vote.
2. Vote 3-2 on PACS and 4-I on assessable parts the same night.
3. Vote 3-2 on PACS and 4-I on assessable parts on different nights.
4. Approve a network plan and remove PACS voting as part of neighborhood projects.

Attachments:

G:\PW\CENTRAL SVCS\ENG DIV\PROJECTS\IMPR NOS\BA391 Living Streets\Arden Proposal\Workshop Item 1. PACS Approval Process.docx