



NASHVILLE AREA

Metropolitan Planning Organization

Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, December 2, 2013 | 11:00 AM

MPO Office at the Fulton Office Complex | Davidson Conference Room
800 Second Avenue South, 2nd Floor | Nashville, Tennessee

Attendees: Leslie Meehan (MPO), David Kleinfelter (Walk/Bike Nashville), Kim Hawkins (Nashville BPAC), Beck Taylor (Clean Air Partnership), William Anderson (Veloteers), Dare Bible (TN Department of Health), Tom Evans (Bike/Walk Hendersonville and Bike Walk Tennessee), Michael Briggs (Metro Planning), Michele Etling (Meharry), Jessica Wilson (TDOT), Dan Furbish (Oasis Center), Lt. Michael Gilliland (MNPD), Phil Scharre (Harpeth Bicycle Club), Josh Stone (MTSU), Hank Clay (MNPS), Bob Richards (TDEC), Joe Pagetta (NPT), Mick Nelson (THDA), Craig Ott (MNPS), Ted Cornelius (YMCA), Maria Mejia de Grubb (Meharry)

1. **Welcome & Introductions – 10 Minutes – BPAC members introduced themselves.** *New representatives were welcomed from Harpeth Bicycle Club, Metro Police Department, Metro Public Schools, the Oasis Center, the Tennessee Housing Development Agency and Meharry. The MPO has not yet heard back from AARP on their interest in being involved.*
2. **TDOT Multimodal Access Fund – 1 Hour 20 minutes**
The primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss the five applications submitted to the MPO for consideration for the newly created TDOT Multimodal Access Fund grant program. In October of 2013, the Tennessee Department of Transportation announced the creation of a new funding opportunity for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. The TDOT Multimodal Access Fund is created out of state gas-tax revenue and is a statewide competition to fund bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects that can be completed within a short timeframe. TDOT announced a call for projects for \$10 million per year, beginning in 2013 and continuing until 2015.

Each MPO and RPO in the state was invited to submit up to two projects for TDOT to consider for funding. Each project could be up to \$1 million in total project costs, and had to be on a state route or within a 1/4 mile of a state route and connect to the state route.

Because of the short timeline between the fund announcement and the application deadline, the MPO required all applicants to submit a brief abstract between November 4th and November 11th. The purpose of the abstract was for MPO staff to review potential project submittals to ensure projects qualify for the program and are reasonable in terms of scope and time-frame. The MPO reviewed abstracts and provided approval or feedback to member jurisdictions within 24 hours of abstract receipt.

Upon abstract approval, applications were completed and submitted to the MPO by November 22nd. MPO staff reviewed the applications, and along with the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, today prepared a ranked list of projects, including the top two projects, for approval by the MPO Executive Board at the December 11, 2013 Executive Board Meeting.

Projects were reviewed based on scoring criteria provided by TDOT in the application guidelines and application. The categories included: safety, land-use connections, connections with other multimodal facilities, project priority in local plans, timeline and economic impact. For a full list of scoring criteria, a link the guidelines and application, and the timeline for project submittal and review, please visit the MPO website: http://nashvillempo.org/plans_programs/tip/TDOT_MMAF.aspx.

After reviewing, scoring and discussing each application, the BPAC decided that the top two scoring projects were the most competitive projects for the MPO to submit to TDOT. These projects are the MTA Mini Transit Hub in North Nashville on Clarksville Pike and the Nolensville Small Town Connection multiuse path.

The project summaries and BPAC overall comments are listed below. Detailed feedback was discussed for each application and sent to each applicant after the meeting. The BPAC wanted to strengthen the two applications submitted for the Multimodal Access Fund grant, as well as provide feedback to make the other applications stronger for other grant opportunities. The feedback is provided below for each application.

Project	Sponsor	Description	Cost Estimate/5% Match	Status	BPAC Comments
Nolensville Small Town Connections Multi-Use Path	Nolensville	Construct approximately ¾ mile of multi-use trail, connecting to existing trails as well as civic and commercial uses; also connecting with Nolensville Pike.	\$517,000, Nolensville BOMA passed a resolution committing to the 5% match.	Preliminary Engineering is complete and Environmental i underway.	Project has high economic development and safety benefits. Project connects to a system of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

<p>Mini MTA Hub on Clarksville Pike</p>	<p>MTA</p>	<p>MTA proposes applications for a mini transit hub that will include enclosed climate-controlled shelters, lights, seating, ticket machines, bicycle racks and potential pedestrian improvements.</p>	<p>\$715,110</p>	<p>Identified in MTA master plan. Architectural and Engineering Plans Complete.</p>	<p>Proposed project provides a hub for three lines with high ridership. Project will improve safety, multimodal connections and economic development.</p>
<p>Rosa Parks Bicycle Lanes</p>	<p>Metro Nashville</p>	<p>Approximately 1 mile of bicycle lanes and on-street parking on Rosa Parks from Jefferson to Buchanan.</p>	<p>\$632,900, Metro Public Works will provide the 5% match.</p>	<p>TDOT has completed conceptual design. No ROW required.</p>	<p>Project has high safety potential. Application needed more information on demonstrating need for project and project benefits.</p>
<p>Ocana Park and Ride Facility</p>	<p>Sumner County</p>	<p>Construct 24 parking spaces for a transit park and ride.</p>	<p>\$92,400</p>	<p>Existing gravel base and drawings for the layout of park and ride.</p>	<p>Project was proactive in preparing for future transit service, but TDOT has demonstrated a greater need for connecting with existing transit, walk and bike facilities.</p>

<p>Multiuse path on Hurt Road connecting to Duplex Road</p>	<p>Spring Hill</p>	<p>Construct a 1,000 foot path on Hurt Road near Allendale School and several subdivisions.</p>	<p>\$702,000 City commits to provide 5% match.</p>	<p>Cross sections drawings are complete.</p>	<p>Project has potential to increase safety but does not connect all the way to school. No indication of connects with other multimodal facilities.</p>
--	--------------------	---	--	--	---

Feedback for Nashville MTA:

The BPAC made the following recommendations for your consideration to add to the strength of the application:

Section 6:

If there is a possibility of doing a park and ride at this location, the BPAC suggested it would be a great way to show how the hub could also serve people who could drive to the hub and access transit.

Section 7:

Good job pointing out that the hub serves a high ridership line. Can you provide numbers? There was some confusion in the application with reference to secure bicycle parking, which the BPAC took to mean bicycle lockers. They did not consider a standard bicycle rack to be secure. Can you clarify whether or not the bike racks will be bike lockers, and if not, can you remove the word secure or describe in a different way (prominently placed bicycle racks will have lighting to increase security).

Section 8:

The BPAC was concerned that MTA does not yet know whether or not ROW will be needed, felt that this uncertainty takes away from the strength of the application, and could be a red flag to TDOT that acquiring ROW may delay the project timeline. If you can try to firm up whether or not ROW will be needed, that would improve the application. Also, how did you arrive at the budget line item for ROW if you are not sure whether or not it will be needed?

Section 10:

This is a strong section, but could be made stronger by providing crash information from Metro Public Works or Metro Police on both vehicular and bike/ped crashes. The guidelines state that safety data should be included in the applications. The BPAC noted congestion in this area and said that providing more contextual information and quantitative data could provide the

reviewers with a better picture of why the project is needed. The TDOT reviewers represent the entire state and may not be familiar with Nashville or this area. The BPAC also recommended mentioning anecdotally how the mini-hub could increase personal safety in this lower-income area by providing more eyes on the street, more lighting, etc., and that the hub will in general make people feel safer when utilizing transit.

Section 11:

Also a strong section, but could you add some language about how the hub could potentially be used in the future as more routes are added. In other words, the BPAC felt that the hub could be a transit anchor in this part of Nashville, and as more routes and frequency are added, the transit hub will serve as a bedrock for transit in North Nashville.

Section 12:

Another strong section, but could be fleshed out a bit more like section 11. This is really the heart of the application to showcase connections to land uses and connections to sidewalks, bikeways and greenways. A little more narrative in this section could really paint a complete picture for reviewers not familiar with this area of town.

Section 13:

Real opportunity here to highlight the North Nashville Community Plan, the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Study, the Major Street and Collector Complete Streets Plan and the Nashville Sidewalk and Bikeway Strategic Master Plan. Also, the application will look stronger if you can say that you have already spoken with Metro Planning and Public Works instead of saying that you plan to do so.

Section 14:

This section needs work, especially to clarify the ROW issue. How has the Engineering been done if you don't know how much land will be needed? Can you include architectural renderings? Also need to add to the narrative about the timeline. If work will begin up to six months after the contract is awarded, can you demonstrate that the entire project will be complete within one year after that?. I think it would help to add some project milestones and explain what would need to happen for the work to start 3 months after the contract versus 6 months.

Section 15:

Another strong section. Might revisit to see if there is anything else you could add that would add to the description of the low-income nature of the area. Could site some national studies that have shown an increase in businesses along routes with hubs or something similar.

Appendixes: Would be helpful to add a list of what attachments are included. Can you change the color of the green star on the maps and make them larger (maybe yellow)? They are hard to locate. Also should explain that the pictures are of Music City Center and that this project would have similar amenities. Need to label what the reviewer is looking at (climate controlled waiting rooms, bathrooms, ticket validation for waiting room entry, etc.).

Let me know if you have any questions. Please have the final application to us **December 17th** so that we can do a final proofread and edit in order to get the application to TDOT on the 20th.

Feedback for Nolensville:

Below is some feedback from the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. Please have the final application turned into the MPO by **December 17th** so that staff will have time for a final review before turning in the application to TDOT on the 20th.

Overall comment: The BPAC recommended changing the order of the application so that the application comes first and the pictures, resolutions, maps, etc. come at the end. One option could be to label the attachments and refer to them in the application. You have already done this in some areas, and the yellow highlighting is extremely helpful.

Section 10:

If there is any safety data you could add to this area, even anecdotally, that would help the strength of this section? I see an attached letter that mentions crashes. Could you clarify that these are all auto crashes and that since there are so many crashes on such a short segment of road, that is exactly why it will improve the safety of bikes and peds to completely remove them from the roadway. The application guidelines strongly emphasize safety, and what I think you would want to highlight is the narrow nature of the road, lack of bike lanes, maybe point out that opportunities to cross the state highway at a signalized intersection with painted crosswalks and pedestrian signals are rare, and so for the safety of people of all ages, the town is opting to add on to the trail system. Use the word 'right sizing', which is TDOT's word for coming up with solutions that are less costly but still get the job done. For example, a more expensive approach would be to build a five lane section with sidewalks and bike lanes. By building the trail, cars still have their space but the bikes and peds have their own space. It would help to point out that Nolensville is only a few miles long, and that most trips in town (to school, the park, the post office, etc.) could easily be made by walking or bicycling. Point out that the highway does not currently have bike lanes or sidewalks, which is why this trail system is so badly needed. All of these points will make it clear to TDOT that you are a rural (try to use that word as much as possible) community who is strategically thinking about how to incorporate walking and bicycling trips in the most economically advantageous way possible.

Appendix A – it is possible to label the pictures so the reviewers know what they are looking at? I am familiar with the area but don't know the context of all of the pictures. The reviewers are from all over the state, so it is good to try to paint the picture of the context of the area for them.

Section 11:

Excellent. Underlining the different types of land uses is really helpful.

Section 12:

Also excellent.

Section 13:

Really good section. Maybe underling the Nolensville Land Use Policy Plan and Nolensville Master Trails Concept Plan to draw the reviewers' eyes to these plan names.

Section 14:

The BPAC committee wanted to know where the town is in the environmental work. How close is the work to completion? Also, there was a question about money for Right of Way. I remember that one of the trail heads was moved (right?), so maybe just clarifying why there is a line item for ROW.

Section 15:

Good Section. One suggestion is to start out with a statement or brief paragraph getting right to relationship between this trail and economic development, and then get into the history of the historic district, the Jack Trail, etc.

Feedback for Metro Public Works:

Thank you for submitting an application to the MPO for the TDOT Multimodal Access Fund grant program. The MPO staff as well as the 20-member MPO BPAC reviewed the applications and scored them using the TDOT scoring criteria. The application had many strengths including the ability of the project to be completed quickly. However, the BPAC felt that the application could have been stronger in a few areas. I am providing feedback below that will hopefully be useful in future applications for this project:

Section 7:

The BPAC was impressed by the proposal to reduce the travel lane width and provide bicycle lanes. Great visuals and cross sections.

Section 10:

The application guidelines strongly emphasized including safety data. The bicycle and pedestrian crash study your department is conducting would be perfect to include in this area. There was also a good deal of concern about having the bike lane so close to park cars and the 'door zone'. Some asked if the parking could be reduced to 6' and the bike lane increased to give more separation between the bicyclist and door zone. There was also a question of if this project could be funded as part of the routine bicycle lane and sharrow work of public works. Some wondered why this project in particular warranted separate funding.

Section 11:

The BPAC awarded full points in this section, stating the good connectivity to land uses.

Section 12:

The BPAC commented this section could be expanded to better describe the surrounding multimodal connections. For example, the sharrows on James Robertson. The reviewers from TDOT are not necessarily familiar with Nashville or this roadway segment, and the BPAC encouraged more description to paint a complete picture for the reviewers.

Section 13:

BPAC awarded full points, noting the connection that has already been established with TDOT on this project.

Section 14:

The BPAC wanted more information in this area about the work that has already been completed, the timeline needed to complete the project, etc.

Section 15:

Although Davidson is not an economically disadvantaged county, this section is required to be filled out. By not filling it out, 10% of the potential points are automatically lost. There is opportunity here to describe the low income housing, the nearby neighborhoods, the connection to downtown and Metro Center, etc. The BPAC strongly encourage focusing on the ability of this project to connect no-car households with jobs and transit.

Feedback for Sumner County:

Thank you for submitting an application to the MPO for the TDOT Multimodal Access Fund grant program. The MPO staff as well as the 20-member MPO BPAC reviewed the applications and scored them using the TDOT scoring criteria. The application had many strengths, however the BPAC felt that the application could have been stronger in a few areas. The application was not selected as one of the two that the MPO will turn in to TDOT for the competitive grant program. I am providing feedback below that will hopefully be useful in future applications for this project:

Overall Comment: It was very apparent to the committee that an incredible amount of thought and effort went into the preparation of the application. The BPAC appreciated the depth and breadth of the information provided.

Section 7: The committee liked the idea of the park and ride. It is a great opportunity to build on the gravel lot that TDOT provided and to make a transit accessible park and ride and a connection to the local greenway. The cost was appealing since it was under \$100k.

Section 10: Many of the applications lacked data on the current issues of safety in the area, which was strongly emphasized in the application guidelines. TDOT is looking for information on the number of crashes, particularly those for bicyclists and pedestrians. That data may be challenging in this case, as I imagine there may not currently be many people walking or bicycling in the area. The BPAC applauded the county for thinking ahead and anticipating future transit use, but TDOT commented to the committee that they first want to put money

where the existing issues are on state highways, and hopefully soon they will be able to get to projects that are anticipating increases in transit, walking and bicycling.

Section 11: The strength of this section is the demonstration of the connection to area homes and schools. The committee was concerned that since fixed route transit is still on the horizon, that this parking lot would be used more as a trailhead for the greenway. That may not be the case, but that was their interpretation from the application. The committee feared that TDOT would not score the project highly because of this.

Section 12: Good demonstration to multimodal facilities.

Section 13: Very good section. BPAC awarded full points from demonstrating that the project is a part of local plans.

Section 14: Another great section. BPAC awarded full points.

Section 15: The BPAC thought that although this section contains some good information, that a stronger case could be made for how congestion and transportation options impact economic development.

Feedback for Spring Hill:

Thank you for submitting an application to the MPO for the TDOT Multimodal Access Fund grant program. The MPO staff as well as the 20-member MPO BPAC reviewed the applications and scored them using the TDOT scoring criteria. The application had many strengths, however the BPAC felt that the application could have been stronger in a few areas. The application was not selected as one of the two that the MPO will turn in to TDOT for the competitive grant program. I am providing feedback below that will hopefully be useful in future applications for this project:

Overall comment: There was a little confusion from the BPAC about the idea to have a sidewalk on one side of the road and a trail on the other side. Folks were confused if bikes would travel both ways on the trail, and if that would create conflict with pedestrians. It is an interesting design idea, and I think this was a new idea for the BPAC to have both types of facilities. The committee was impressed with the city's desire to connect neighborhoods with the elementary school. Very impressive that the city is looking out for the safety of children.

Section 10: The application guidelines place a strong emphasis on safety data. It would be useful to include crash data for all modes, or at least to describe the roadway context and the average daily traffic. The reviewers are from all across Tennessee, so the more description of the city, roadways and land use context, the better.

Section 11: Fantastic that the project connects with so many homes. Unfortunately, there were other project submittals that connected to lots of destinations such as residential,

commercial, business space, etc. It is not that this is not a good project, but that a few of the other projects (for example- one in Nolensville) ended up being a bit more competitive.

Section 12: As we discussed over email, not having this section filled out was a detriment to the application since this section accounts for 1/4 of the total points. The committee and application were asking for information about connections to other sidewalks and bikeways, since there is no transit in this area. There was some confusion about whether or not Prescott Way had sidewalks, and if the children walked on Hurt Road, would they have a sidewalk to travel on all the way to the school.

Section 13: There was confusion about the fact that this project is part of an existing TIP project. If that is the case, is there funding already programmed for the project?

Section 14: The committee was looking for clarification on whether or not ROW was needed. There is a line item in the budget for ROW, but they were looking for a mention of it here. There was concern that if ROW was needed, it may slow down the ability of the project to be completed within 18 months. It may help to include project milestones. Points were given for the fact that the engineering drawings and cross section are complete.

Section 15: This section is an opportunity to really sell the project to TDOT on how the sidewalk and trail will have a strong economic impact. The BPAC commented that this section could be expanded in more detail to really make the case. For example, citing data that shows that homes located in a walkable year tend to have higher values than those without sidewalks to destinations.

Attachments: the maps, summaries and resolution were extremely helpful and added to the strength of the application.

- 3. Next Steps, Announcements, other Discussion – *Mt. Juliet is forming a BPAC for the city.***
- 4. Adjourn - Next Meeting: TBD – *the next meeting will be held after the first of the year.***