

To access the Agenda and Backup Materials electronically, go to www.gjcity.org



**URBAN TRAILS COMMITTEE AGENDA
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 250 N 5th STREET**

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2022 - 5:30 PM

Call to Order/Announcements

Approval of Minutes

Approval of the February 9, 2022 minutes.

Action Items

Discussion Items

[Infrastructure Priorities List and SRTS Ranking](#) - Click Link [HERE](#)

Public Works Presentation/Updates

Updates

Other Business/Public Comment

Adjournment

UTC Minutes – February 9, 2022

Members in attendance: Orin Zyvan, Steven Meyer, Athena Fouts, Ellynnne Bannon, Abe Herman, Shana Wade, Valerie Dobbs, Diana Rooney, Andy Gingerich, Ross Mittleman

Staff in attendance: Dani Acosta, Eric Mocko, Trent Prall, Kalli Saavas, Felix Landry, Rob Davis

Guests: Renee Krebs, Laney Heath (One Riverfront Commission), Ian Thomas, Jason Wen

Other Agencies: Rachel Peterson (RTPO)

Call to Order/Announcements

Diana R. called meeting to order at 5:30

RTPO provided details about the Winter Bike to Work Day on Feb 11.

Orin Z. informed the group that RTPO is still looking for the SRTS creative committee.

Shana shared past activities for UTC bike month in May – table resource fair in 2019, nothing in 2020. Typically, City would host breakfast, UTC would help with the breakfast, UTC in the past has organized bike rodeo for kids closer to end of the month.

Approval of Minutes

Valerie D. made a motion to approve and adopt with changes noted the January 12, 2021 minutes. Steve seconded the motion.

Action Items

Infrastructure Priorities List

Diana R. provided an overview of the workflow and familiarized folks with document. First piece of homework is to review the list. Dani A. to send out a list of that working spreadsheet.

Orin Z. clarified that it is not only a list that focused on infrastructure that need to be corrected, but also an aspirational list of projects that would make us more progressive as a multimodal community. It might be correcting an issue, but it might be a whole new approach – addressing needs or creating opportunity.

Steve M. expressed that social equity is a key component to the list development – need to consider both choice and captive riders.

Orin Z. explained that the numbers at the beginning of each project is the rank number.

Ross M. asked if there was status data on the list. Andy G. explained that projects that get completed get moved to a Completed Projects Page and clarified that projects are re-evaluated every year and reranked even if they were on the prior year's list.

Shana W. recommended that there may be a need to identify new priorities and reword description for multiphase project and suggested a workshop later in the month.

Orin Z. clarified that brainstorming projects will take place this month (February), finalizing items on the list will take place in March and approving the newly ranked list would occur in April.

Trent P. shared that the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) gets modified in June/July followed by formal discussions/workshops in September and October and that the timing of the UTC Infrastructure Priorities List development helps inform that CIP and aligns prioritization.

Andy G. shared that the UTC Infrastructure Priorities List also helps implement the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan, as well as to add to the RTP's project list. Andy G. also shared how RTPPO has been able to use this list in a letter of support for the Orchard Ave Used this list in a letter of support for the Orchard Avenue Corridor Study helped trickled up has direct impact.

Diana R. also reminded the group the direct impact of the list to the North Avenue Enhanced Transit Corridors study.

A discussion on not including cost estimates on the Infrastructure Priorities List ensued. It was clarified that UTC's role was to help the City identify the need, versus determining feasibility, which was the City's prerogative. Additionally, it was shared that there was a benefit to not include costs because it enabled the inclusion of aspirational projects. The list helps the City understand what is most impactful and helps inform long range planning.

May Bike Month – Subcommittee volunteers

Diana R. shared with folks about the opportunity to develop a UTC-led Bike Month activity. Orin Z. shared that folks interested in developing something should contact Sarah Brooks at RTPPO to participate in the Bike Month meetings. Ross M. also offered himself as a resource.

Crosby Ave Letter of Support

Trent P. shared that a letter was submitted last week.

Discussion Items

SRTS CDBG

Trent provided presentation of what has been funded in the past and which projects were not and the rationale behind that.

City has provided that funding from federal government and used a portion of that funding to meet community needs (operational/capital) and allocated some funding towards meeting different infrastructure short falls. Projects have to be in CDBG eligible areas defined as economically disadvantaged and identified by census tract. Claried that there is a separate federal and state SRTS- federal SRTS reporting requirements are less stringent.

Trent provided the schedule for project selection:

- 2/10 – 2/20: Nominate new projects
- 2/21 – 3/9: Score Projects
- 3/9 – Adjust and Finalize at Regular UTC Meeting.

Orin Z. asked what the relation was between Fix It Report and SRTS was. Trent shared that Fix It was for items smaller in scale and therefore not eligible for SRTS CDBG.

Diana r. asked if projects for non-public schools were eligible. Trent explained that they would not be CDBG eligible, but they could still meet the requirements for other funding opportunities like ADA accessibility projects.

Sarah asked if a link for the School Walk Routes could be included in the minutes. Link: <https://arcgis-app.gjcity.org/Transportation%20Map%20Internal/index.html?extent=707299.0558166116,4331543.174030988,707585.5683896368,4331677.029123697,32612>

GIS Navigation: 1) Select Transportation Map, 2) Select School Walk Routes Layer from Layer List

Orin Z. asked if the percentage that appears on the CDBG Eligible Areas layer indicates if a tract is more disadvantaged. Dani A. to follow up.

Answer: CDBG eligible census tracts are tracts where at least 51 percent of the residents are low-to-moderate income (defined as households with incomes below 60 percent of the Area Median Income). The percentage of on each tract on the layer indicates the proportion of resident who meet that definition.

Trent P. shared that City is conducting an income survey for the Riverside El Poso neighborhood to and petition HUD to recategorize it and give the neighborhood its own census tract.

MCPH and RTPO Appointments

The group discussed the appropriate roles of the RTPO and MCPH roles going forward. Both roles are currently voting members. One of the many functions of UTC is to provide letters of support to different agencies for grants. Members vote to write a letter of support. RTPO is one of the agencies that frequently asks for letters, which may present a conflict of interest if the RTPO representative votes on something that that RTPO is trying to bring forward.

Diana R. made a motion to open the discussion to the group and Shana W seconded it.

Shana W. shared that it has been helpful have representatives from RTPO and MCPH as subject matter experts and suggested that converting them to non-voting ex-officio members will increase stability and continuing of their role.

The committee agreed that conversion was the most appropriate route.

Orin Z. made the first motion to convert the RTPO and MCPH representatives to non-voting members and remove any term limits for those positions and the requirement to reapply. Shana W. seconded the motion. Motion was approved with RTPO and MCPH abstaining.

Orin Z. made a second motion to amend the verbiage in the bylaws to clarify the number of voting members. Shana W. seconded the motion. Motion was approved with RTPO and MCPH abstaining.

Dani A. will present the draft amendment to the committee at the next regular meeting.

Updates

Dani a. provided an update about the Ped & Bike Plan RFP posting timeline.

Valerie D. shared that a conflict came up in her schedule and recommended that Athena F. will now be the UTC representative for the proposal review committee. Athena F. accepted.

Andy G. made a motion to extend the meeting for ten minutes. Steven M. seconded the motion.

Public comment

Ian T. expressed that he was curious about how the UTC coordinates with CDOT. Trent P. shared that the City works closely with CDOT from a CIP standpoint and that City staff serve as liaisons between UTC and CDOT. Orin Z. also shared that there is opportunity for UTC members to attend CDOT open houses and funnel comments back to Trent P. to relay to CDOT.

Abe H. asked if the committee felt there were any groups that should have representation on UTC and to reach out with any ideas. Shana W. pointed out residents who rely on mobility aids. Diana R. raised the issue of including the unhoused population and how that relates to UTC's mission to focus on underserved population.

Adjournment

Shana W. made a motion to end the meeting. Orin Z. seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 7:12 pm.