The Des Moines Transportation Safety Committee met at 7:30 a.m. on June 11, 2019, in the MacCrae Conference Room (Room 129) at the Municipal Service Center, 1551 E Martin Luther King Jr Parkway. Those members in attendance were:

Scott Bents
Dave Ferree
Luis Montoya

Meg Schneider
Carl Voss
Jim Windsor

Members Absent: Blake Hanson, Anne Pham, and Chad Zimmerman


Guests Present: Steve Naber, City Engineer, Item #1
Tom Vlach, Assistant City Engineer, Item #1
Dave Kamp, Chief Design Engineer, Item #1
"Brett" w/Jenny’s Attic, 521 Euclid Avenue, Item #1
Bill Wheeler, 3613 6th Avenue, Item #1
Drew Kelso, 815 E Seneca Avenue, Item #1
"Roxanne" w/Highland Park Country Club, 518 Euclid Avenue, Item #1
Rob Haaland, Bolton-Menk, 309 E 5th Street, #202, Observer
Ross Harris, 4814 NW 88th Street, Observer
Emily Jones, Chuck’s, 3610 6th Avenue, Item #1
Dean Meester, 621 Douglas Avenue, Item #1
Joel Westrum, 615 Euclid Avenue, Item #1
Chris Chiaramonte, 409 Franklin Avenue, Item #1
Jon Hobbs, North Side Library, 3516 5th Avenue, Item #1
Echo Stanley, 922 Euclid Avenue, Item #1
R. Rodriguez, 617 Euclid Avenue, Item #1
Jeremy Lewis, Des Moines Street Collective, 1620 Northwest Drive, Observer

Approval of Agenda

MOTION was made by Scott Bents to approve the agenda; seconded by Jim Windsor. Motion passed 7:0.

Old Business

1. Approval of May Minutes

MOTION was made by Scott Bents to approve the May minutes; seconded by Dave Ferree. Motion passed 7:0.

2. Other Old Business

There was no Other Old Business.

New Business

1. Euclid Avenue Lane Reduction Pilot Project

Steve Naber presented this item as follows.
There were several guests in attendance for this item, as listed above.

In response to a request from the Highland Park Neighborhood Association and the Ward Council Member, City staff prepared a Proposal for a Pilot Project which converts Euclid Avenue between 12th Street and 2nd Avenue to a three-lane cross section (one westbound lane, one eastbound lane, and center continuous two-way, left-turn lane) and adds on-street parking along both sides of Euclid Avenue between 2nd Avenue and 6th Avenue. The parking provided by these modifications will be available all day with no peak-hour time restrictions. The Pilot Project improvements would be accomplished with pavement markings and signage. Vertical delineators will be considered in the marked bump-out areas to shield on-street parking and shorten the pedestrian crossing distances. There would be no reconstruction of roadway, curb radii, and ADA-compliant curb ramps as part of the Pilot Project, but would be considered as a future permanent condition. The proposal will be presented to City Council at the June 24, 2019 Council meeting to direct staff to submit the proposal to the Iowa Department of Transportation for review and approval.

- Euclid Avenue between 12th Street and 6th Avenue is currently a four-lane cross section (two westbound lanes and two eastbound lanes). Euclid Avenue between 6th Avenue and 2nd Avenue is currently a five-lane cross section (two westbound lanes, two eastbound lanes, and center continuous two-way left-turn lane).

- The Highland Park Neighborhood Association requested that Euclid Avenue (U.S. Highway 6) from 12th Street to 2nd Avenue (State Highway 415) be converted to a three-lane cross section with the goals of improving vehicular and pedestrian safety by calming traffic, adding on-street parking between 6th Avenue and 2nd Avenue, and generating additional economic development along the corridor.

- A traffic engineering consultant completed a traffic operations and safety analysis in 2018.

- The analysis showed average speed for all classified vehicles was 34 mph with 78% vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit of 30 mph. The analysis also identified the calculated crash rate from crashes over the past five years is nearly double the statewide average, with 15% of those crashes resulting in known injuries.

- With the reduced number of travel lanes for pedestrians and side street vehicles to cross and expectation of traffic calming, pedestrian accommodation, and safety is anticipated to improve.

- The operational analysis indicated that overall delay at the intersections would increase significantly and 95th percentile queue lengths would extend beyond the adjacent intersections with the lane reduction on Euclid Avenue during peak hours as shown in the graphics below.
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While City Engineering staff concurs that the conversion to a three-lane cross section will likely reduce speeds, resulting in a reduction in severe crashes, City Engineering staff has the following concerns for the conversion to a three-lane cross section:

- Significant increase in delay could result in motorists taking alternate routes through neighborhood streets, as there are not many other alternate east-west routes across the north side of Des Moines. Significant traffic delays can also result in poor driving behaviors by motorists and increased potential for crashes.

- A lack of parking demand and utilization could present a dangerous situation where traveling motorists do not recognize the on-street parking and use the lanes as travel lanes and create an increased potential for crashes. There is a significant amount of off-street parking along the corridor, along with a number of driveway and roadway access points along the corridor where parking wouldn’t be allowed. This could result in sporadically-occupied parking spaces.

- The Iowa Department of Transportation may request the City be responsible for maintenance of all pavement markings and snow removal operations along this stretch of roadway, resulting in significant costs to the City.

- In response to this request, along with the ongoing planning effort for the Douglas Avenue Corridor, the Iowa Department of Transportation may also request a jurisdictional transfer of roadway to the City requiring the City to be responsible for all maintenance of Highway 6 within the City’s corporate limits.

During initial meetings with Iowa Department of Transportation (IDOT) staff about the Pilot Project, IDOT staff requested the City provide Pilot Project Evaluation Criteria to determine whether or not the Pilot Project was a success (and permanent improvements should be further considered) or not a success (and Euclid Avenue should be restored to the current cross section).

The evaluation criteria include:

1. **Speed** – comparison of speeds during one year of pilot project to current speeds collected. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. The measured 85th percentile speed is 41 mph. Considered effective if the 85th percentile speed is reduced by more than 3 mph.

2. **Parking utilization** – determine ratio of on-street parking spaces used versus parking spaces available. Considered effective if parking is more than 25% occupied during three consecutive hours during the peak business hours in the area.

3. **Travel time** – comparison of travel time through project area with proposed configuration versus existing configuration. Considered effective if travel times increase by no more than 15% during peak hours.

4. **Demand** – comparison of peak hour volumes during one year of pilot project to current collected traffic volumes. Considered effective if volumes decrease by no more than 15%.

5. **Crashes** – comparison of crash rate during one year of pilot project to the crash rate from the previous five years. Considered effective if the crash rate and injuries are reduced.

6. **Economics** - before/after survey of businesses. Considered effective if positive responses are received from 67% of the businesses along the corridor.
Should any one of the above six Pilot Project Evaluation Criteria not be considered effective as defined above, the City will reevaluate the project and consider restriping Euclid Avenue in the Fall of 2021 back to its cross section prior to the Pilot Project.

Should all six of the Pilot Project Evaluation Criteria be considered effective as defined above, the City will refresh the pavement markings as marked for the Pilot Project in the Fall 2021, and the City will begin design of permanent improvements, including concrete bumpouts at the intersections between 6th Avenue and 2nd Avenue to shield parking and shorten the pedestrian crossing distances. The design of the permanent improvements would be submitted to the IDOT for review and approval prior to anticipated construction in 2022 or 2023.

The anticipated schedule for the Pilot Project includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019/Winter 2019-2020</td>
<td>Preparation of Construction Bid Documents and Bidding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Installation (after 2019-2020 school year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2020 - Summer 2021</td>
<td>Pilot Project Evaluation (minimum one-year evaluation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated cost for construction is $200,000. This does not include maintenance and operational costs. Should this project be approved by City Council and the Iowa DOT, the funding of this project will be reviewed by the City’s Budget Review Committee during the development of the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Capital Improvement Program.

Staff recommended that the Committee members provide a recommendation on whether or not they support the proposed Pilot Project for the June 24, 2019 Council Meeting.

Carl Voss asked that before and after data be provided by staff to the Committee.

Drew Kelso said that commuter traffic should be using the Interstate Highway System instead of Euclid Avenue. He said success for his neighborhood would be if those cars were to begin using 80-35.

Drew Kelso told the Committee that he presented this issue to Council last year. His main concern with this Pilot Project is that it be tied to neighborhood revitalization. If the City is claiming to reinvest, this area is considered as part of four of the investment zones. He would like to move forward with the Pilot Project.

Bill Wheeler said he lives and works near 6th Avenue and Euclid Avenue. He said on-street parking would help tremendously. The majority of traffic appears to be coming from outside of the neighborhood. As a business owner and resident of this neighborhood, he was not concerned with how long it takes Altoona and Ankeny traffic to commute to Downtown Des Moines. He believes they should use the Interstate.

R. Rodriguez has recently opened a furniture store in the neighborhood. He reported that two cars have struck his duplex after going over the curb. He believes people would begin renovating the houses along Euclid Avenue if on-street parking were allowed.
Drew Kelso said the neighborhood has been talking about this issue for over one year. He said it started to be more of a reality last year when he presented the idea it to the City Council. The Pilot Project will not be a surprise to the neighborhood.

Emily Jones with Chucks Restaurant said that criteria is the major concern for her. She believes the neighborhood should sit down and hash out the criteria.

Dave Ferree also asked that staff report back to the Committee with an evaluation before and after the Pilot Project.

Steve Naber said if the Pilot Project is a success, the City will need to make permanent improvements.

**MOTION** by Dave Ferree to express support to the City Council that the City present the Proposed Euclid Avenue Lane Reduction Pilot Project to the Iowa Department of Transportation; seconded by Meg Schneider. Motion passed 7:0.

2. **2nd Avenue Reconstruction—University Avenue to Des Moines River**

Due to time constraints, Item 2 was tabled until the July 9, 2019 meeting.

At 8:35 a.m., prior to discussions regarding Item 3, Carl Voss excused himself from the meeting and passed on his Committee Chair duties to Scott Bents for the remainder of the meeting.

3. **Neighborhood Sidewalk Three-Year Project**

Steve Naber presented this item as follows utilizing the attached presentation and referring to the attached map as necessary.

MoveDSM identified 667 miles of sidewalk gaps in the City. City staff presented at the January 30, 2019 City Council Quarterly Planning Session on the City’s existing sidewalk programs, a proposed approach to filling sidewalk gaps, and on various City policies regarding sidewalks.

City Council gave direction to allocate Capital Improvement Program Funding in the amounts of $1.5 Million in Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and $3 Million per year starting in Fiscal Year 2020-2021 and beyond with the focus on filling sidewalk gaps on recommended school walk routes; routes close to schools, bus stops, and commercial nodes; and routes that provide connectivity for long sections of existing sidewalks. City Council directed staff to draft an initial three-year plan for filling sidewalk gaps.

City staff presented a draft three-year plan for filling sidewalk gaps at the April 24, 2019 City Council Quarterly Planning Session. City Council concurred with the first two years of the plan and directed staff to move forward with the first two years of the plan.

At the June 24, 2019 City Council Meeting, there will be a hearing approving plans, specifications, form of contract documents, engineer’s estimate, and designating lowest responsible bidder for the 2019 Neighborhood Sidewalk Program, which is the first project of the three-year plan.

At the City Council Planning Sessions, staff also received direction on the following items regarding sidewalks:
Waivers will no longer be issued by staff for the installation of sidewalks adjacent to developments as part of site development process. Waivers can be taken to the Planning and Zoning Commission as an appeal and, ultimately, appealed to the Council.

Sidewalk gaps will be filled on both sides of the street where:
- The speed limit on the street is 35 mph or greater
- The road is a multi-lane roadway
- Locations have been approved by the Ward Council Member as part of a street reconstruction project.

The City's long-term goal is to provide sidewalks on both sides of every street. However, in locations that do not meet the criteria listed above, sidewalks will be constructed initially on one side of the street in the following manner:
- Placed on the side with on-street parking.
- Placed on the side of a school, bus stop, or in a manner to minimize street crossings.
- Placed on the side where topography more easily accommodates construction.

The minimum sidewalk width will be 5 feet.

The current Sidewalk Assessment Policy will be rescinded.

The current Sidewalk Removal Policy will be rescinded.

A short discussion was had by the Committee regarding this presentation. This item was for information only. No action was required.

4. **Other New Business**

There was no Other New Business.

Adjourned at 8:58 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Schomer
Recording Secretary

Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approval of Agenda</th>
<th>Old Business Item 1</th>
<th>New Business Item 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Bents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Ferree</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Pham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Hanson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Montoya</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Schneider</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Voss</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Windsor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Witt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME/BUSINESS</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. Jones</td>
<td>521 Euclid</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wheels8476@gmail.com">wheels8476@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>515-584-6872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wheeler/H. P. Hardware</td>
<td>3618 6th St/514-523 Euclid</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hightandhardware3413@yahoo.com">hightandhardware3413@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>244-2445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Kelso</td>
<td>815 E. Sycamore Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:drewkelso@gmail.com">drewkelso@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>515-720-5379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Highland Park Country Club</td>
<td>518 Euclid</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Roxanne@hpccom.com">Roxanne@hpccom.com</a></td>
<td>515-708904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hareland</td>
<td>309 E 5th, suite 202</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robhaurton@americare.net">robhaurton@americare.net</a></td>
<td>515-255-9140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Harris</td>
<td>5114 NW 88th St Johnson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ross@chiccom.com">ross@chiccom.com</a></td>
<td>615-847-8228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Jones</td>
<td>3610 4th Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cachucks@gmail.com">cachucks@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>515-708-4915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Meenter</td>
<td>621 Douglas Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dean.j.meeantor@gmail.ca">dean.j.meeantor@gmail.ca</a></td>
<td>319-892-396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Westrum</td>
<td>615 Euclid</td>
<td><a href="mailto:taija.group12@gmail.com">taija.group12@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>615-705-8350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Chivarronke</td>
<td>909 Franklin Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chivarronke@ymail.com">chivarronke@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>515-771-9948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Hoeks-Nemshinov</td>
<td>353 5th Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhoeks616@gmail.com">jhoeks616@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>515-989-1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Stanley</td>
<td>922 Euclid Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eunalec828@gmail.com">eunalec828@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>319-538-4080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Rodriguez</td>
<td>617 Euclid Ave</td>
<td>Tezoro <a href="mailto:casegond@gmail.com">casegond@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>515-713708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Lien</td>
<td>620 Northwest</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeremy@dsmbikecollective.org">jeremy@dsmbikecollective.org</a></td>
<td>515-713-6449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighborhood Sidewalk 3 Year Program

Legend
- Schools
- Phase 1
- Phase 2
- Phase 3
Agenda

Sidewalk Programs

Sidewalk Funding and General Approach for Sidewalk Gaps

Sidewalk Policies
Sidewalk Programs

Sidewalk Replacement Program: Complaint Driven

ADA Sidewalk Ramp Program: 2010 Project Civic Access

Neighborhood Sidewalk Program: Filling Gaps
Sidewalk Replacement Program

• Per City Ordinance, adjacent property owners are responsible for sidewalk maintenance.

• When the City receives a complaint, inspections are conducted and notices are sent to the property owner. Property owners have 180 days to make repairs once the notice is issued.
Sidewalk Replacement Program

- When property owners do not complete the work required or qualify for an income subsidy, the City will do the repair as part of a construction contract.

- Generally, the City is responsible for the repairs of sidewalks where the location is adjacent to City property, part of the corner ramp or related to a City street tree.
Sidewalk Replacement Program

• The timing of repairs depends on the responsiveness of property owners, the current backlog of sidewalk work to be performed by the City and weather.

• We have about a two year backlog of sidewalk replacement work generated from complaints.
ADA Sidewalk Ramp Program

• Over the past 9 years, the City has spent over $14 Million through 34 sidewalk contracts to upgrade ~6,400 sidewalk ramps to meet ADA Standards.

• The City has ~400 sidewalk ramps remaining to upgrade to meet ADA Standards from the DOJ Overlay Backlog (2010 Project Civic Access), all of which will be completed by the imposed deadline of 2023.
Recent Past Years Sidewalk Funding (FY2018-19 and prior)

- Sidewalk Replacement Program: ~$675,000/year
- ADA Sidewalk Ramp Program: ~$1,500,000/year
- Neighborhood Sidewalk Program: ~$250,000/year
## Proposed Sidewalk Funding (FY2019-20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Replacement Program</td>
<td>~$675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Sidewalk Ramp Program</td>
<td>~$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Sidewalk Program</td>
<td>~$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Sidewalk Funding (FY2020-21 and beyond)

Sidewalk Replacement Program  ~$675,000/year

ADA Sidewalk Ramp Program  $0
(Completed with other Capital Improvements – Streets, Sidewalks Sewers, Other Public Improvements/Alterations)

Neighborhood Sidewalk Program  ~$3,000,000/year
Targeted Sidewalk Gap Approach (based on Proposed Funding)

Priority 1 (Red) – School Recommended Walk Routes / Proximity to Schools, Bus Stops, and Commercial Nodes; or provides connectivity for long sections of existing sidewalks

~20 years to complete 180 miles of sidewalk gaps in Priority 1 based on $3 Million Budget for Neighborhood Sidewalk Program.

Plan is to work with the School District, start at schools and work our way out based on Recommended Walk Routes.
Targeted Sidewalk Gap Approach

City Council gave direction to allocate Capital Improvement Program Funding in the amounts of $1.5 Million in Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and $3 Million per year starting in Fiscal Year 2020-2021 and beyond with the focus on filling sidewalk gaps on recommended school walk routes; routes close to schools, bus stops, and commercial nodes; and routes that provide connectivity for long sections of existing sidewalks.

City Council directed staff to draft an initial three-year plan for filling sidewalk gaps.
Targeted Sidewalk Gap Approach

At the June 24, 2019 City Council Meeting, there will be a hearing approving plans, specifications, form of contract documents, Engineer’s estimate and designating lowest responsible bidder for the 2019 Neighborhood Sidewalk Program, which is the first project of the three-year plan. This project includes:

Site 1: E. Euclid Avenue between E. 26th Street and E. 29th Street (both sides)
Site 2: S.E. 8th Court from E. Bell Avenue to King Avenue (East side)
Site 3: 918 E. Bell Avenue
Site 4: 2632/2628 S.E. 8th Street
Site 5: Watrous Avenue between S.W. 26th Street and Fleur Drive (North side)
Site 6: E. Payton Avenue from S.E. 3rd Street to S.E. 5th Street (South side)
Site 7: E. Hillside Avenue between S.E. 4th Street and S.E. 6th Street (South side)
Site 8: Scott Avenue between S.E. 28th Street and S.E. 30th Street (North side)
Site 9: 318/254 S.E. 30th Street
Site 10: Easter Lake Trail Connection (between 2439 and 2501 E. Leach Avenue)
Policy Discussions/Questions

1. City staff will not issue waivers on requiring Priority 1 or 2 sidewalk gaps to be filled as part of a site development when adjacent to the development.

2. The City’s current policy is to add sidewalks (fill sidewalk gaps) where needed as part of street reconstruction projects.

3. City staff recommend that sidewalks be added on both sides of the street.

4. City’s current practice is to install sidewalks at a minimum 5’ width.

5. Should the Sidewalk Assessment Policy be rescinded?

6. Should the Sidewalk Removal Policy be rescinded?
Site Plan Ordinance and Site Plan/Landscape Policies

Sidewalks are required where there are existing sidewalks on adjoining property, or when it appears there will be a definite need for sidewalks in the future.
1. City staff will not issue waivers on requiring Priority 1 or 2 sidewalk gaps to be filled as part of a site development when adjacent to the development.

Waivers will no longer be issued by staff for the installation of sidewalks adjacent to developments as part of site development process. Waivers can be taken to the Planning and Zoning Commission as an appeal and, ultimately, appealed to the Council.
2. The City’s current policy is to add sidewalks (fill sidewalk gaps) where needed as part of street reconstruction projects.
3. Sidewalk Locations (Both Sides or One Side of Street)

City staff recommend that sidewalks be added on both sides of the street.

Per Council’s direction, the approach to programming sidewalks is:

Sidewalks shall be completed on both sides:
• along “major corridors” (streets with speed limits of 35 mph or greater),
• along multilane roads, and
• along street reconstruction projects as approved by the Ward Councilmember.
3. Sidewalk Locations (Both Sides or One Side of Street) (continued)

While Council’s direction is to ultimately construct sidewalks on both sides of the street (long term goal), on local residential streets (streets which do not meet above criteria (major corridors, multi-lane roads, reconstruction projects)), sidewalks shall be constructed initially on one side of the road (i.e. initial goal is to get sidewalks on at least one side of the street) in the following manner:

i. Placed on side with on-street parking.

ii. Placed on side of school, bus stop, or in a manner to minimize street crossings.

iii. Placed on side with traversable topographic features and existing conditions (i.e. ease of construction).
4. **City’s current practice is to install sidewalks at a minimum 5’ width** for the following reasons:

- To provide adequate width enough for two people to walk side by side.

- 5’ x 5’ minimum accessible passing zones at maximum 200’ spacing intervals is required by the “Proposed Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way” written by the US Access Board.

- Iowa DOT designs 5’ minimum sidewalks.
Current Sidewalk Assessment Policy

The following is the list of sidewalk that is exempt from assessment:

• Multipurpose recreational trails are not assessed.

• Sidewalk that is constructed on a project utilizing federal funds or other non-City sources, the remaining cost of the sidewalk is not assessed to the abutting property owners.

• Sidewalk that is constructed as part of a participating streetscape project, the abutting property owners are not assessed.

• Sidewalk construction as part of a major construction project where the sidewalk is an incidental item, the property owners are not assessed.
Current Sidewalk Assessment Policy

The following is the list of sidewalk that is exempt from assessment: (continued)

• Sidewalk deemed by Council as being a **High Priority Sidewalk** based upon an analysis of the surrounding environs ½ mile from the proposed sidewalk project. The analysis considers the number of elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools with more emphasis placed upon elementary schools. It also considers other factors such as grocery stores or convenience stores, senior centers or medical clinics, bus stops and density of residences. (Added August 29, 2011)
Current Sidewalk Assessment Policy

The following is the list of sidewalk that is exempt from assessment:

(continued)

- Sidewalk deemed by City Council as Discretionary Connection Sidewalk, which criteria includes a total length project of less than 400 feet or less than 8 abutting property owners, the section must connect to an existing network of sidewalk and provide access to other neighbors or special pedestrian areas such as schools.

(Added September 26, 2011)
5. **Rescind Sidewalk Assessment Policy**

With the City’s initiative to fund construction of new sidewalks (filling gaps), Council’s direction is to rescind the Sidewalk Assessment Policy which provides sidewalks exempt from assessment.
Current Sidewalk Removal Policy

On January 9, 2012, City Council approved a policy to evaluate removal of existing sidewalks within City right-of-way.

Those considered for removal are only isolated sidewalks, or sidewalk that does not connect to any other sidewalk, are not along a school walking route, are not near a pedestrian generator (park or community center), are not in an area where future sidewalk is planned, and removal is not in conflict with an established Neighborhood Plan.
6. **Rescind Current Sidewalk Removal Policy**

On January 9, 2012, City Council approved a policy to evaluate removal of existing sidewalks within City right-of-way. Those considered for removal are only isolated sidewalks, or sidewalk that does not connect to any other sidewalk, are not along a school walking route, are not near a pedestrian generator (park or community center), are not in an area where future sidewalk is planned, and removal is not in conflict with an established Neighborhood Plan.

Council’s direction is to rescind the Sidewalk Removal policy.
Questions?