Members Present: Gary Bentrup, Parks Coble, Rick Dockhorn, Barb Fraser, Marynelle Greene, Elaine Hammer, Damon Hershey, Delrae Hirschman, Jordan Messerer, Luke Pitts, Roy Rivera, Michael Wylie, Susan Larson Rodenburg

Staff Present: Kellee Van Bruggen, Lynn Johnson, Shane Dostal, Mike Heyl, Sara Hartzell

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 a.m., followed by announcement recognizing regulations of the Open Meetings Act as posted by the door.

Minutes:
Approval of September 13, 2016 minutes: Moved by Hammer, seconded by Larson Rodenburg.

Staff Reports:
Hartzell reported work on Jamaica continues. Last remaining piece is the re-routed section north of 14th street where the creek bank eroded and we lost about 20 feet. This reroute is not covered by FEMA funds since the creek bank was not “protected”. May be a future project to protect this segment from further erosion. Also continuing to work on the coal at the base of the “train wreck bridge”. Murdock Trail application from Land and Water grant application, have not yet had any word on project grants, still waiting for those awards. This was for a 50% share on the conversion of Murdock from Touzalin to 70th Street from limestone to concrete with a limestone side path. TAP (Transportation Alternatives) update – Cavett Connector trail is being let for Construction bids on November 10. This is the segment from San Mateo, along the south side of Cavett Elementary, then through an outlot to Yankee Hill Trail. Received the agreement for signature and resolution for the Beal Slough Trail. Runs from 56th and London Road underpass through park property to Pine Lake and Blanchard. Undercrossings are being constructed with the Pine Lake Road expansion project. Then the trail will continuing through the Campus Life property, along the Beal Slough drainage, and down to Yankee Hill trail which is being constructed with the Yankee Hill Road expansion project. This will give us a trail loop from the Billy Wolff Trail at 91st Street along Yankee Hill and then up the Beal Slough to 56th and Old Cheney Rd. Costco continues to move forward. Trail will remain along Pine Lake and the crossing of the drive into Costco will have some treatments to address the trail crossing and provide queuing for turning vehicles, still planning for the sidewalk to go around the north side of the property. VanBruggen shared that there were 3 proposal received for bike share – one of which did not meet the minimum requirements for bid. The team will be reviewing the two proposals and making an award to one of those. The Big Jump application has been made, should hear from them in January.

Old Business:

(Cost Pointe presentation in meeting materials) Hartzell gave a review of the planning and programming documents. Comprehensive Plan is the guiding document. Long Range Transportation Plan is a more detailed plan, part of which becomes the Transportation chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. Both are updated every 10 years with a 5 year minor update in between. Both tend to be fairly general in language although the LRTP has become more detailed in recent years with fiscal constraint requirements. Subareas plans are referred to in the Comp Plan and adopted by reference. These might be for a particular system, facility, neighborhood or other area that needs more detailed planning. Focused community input is part of that. Capital Improvements Program (CIP) looks at physical improvements over the next 6 years. The first two years become the Capital Budget. Four out years
are more speculative and funding is not considered to be appropriated with the adoption of the CIP. Just because funding is appropriated, doesn’t necessarily mean that it has actually been secured. Sometimes funding is in the form of grants which have not been awarded yet, so application may have to be made over a period of several years before it is secured. For that reason a project which had once been shown in the budget years will not be shown in the CIP again, even though funding has not been secured and the project has not actually been started. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a 4 year program with year one being considered the budget year. Projects anywhere in the County, including State, County and small town project are included. Unlike the TIP, funding is not shown in the budget year until the funding has actually been secured. For that reason you will see a project that has been “appropriated” in a budget year of the CIP, doesn’t show up in the CIP any longer, but still is shown in the “out years” of the TIP until the funding has actually been secured for the project. The TIP is folded into the States TIP (STIP). Projects for transportation that use any federal funding must be show in the TIP. The Parks Dept. started doing a Facilities Master Plan about 3 years ago. It looks out 10 years into the future, reflects the goals and priorities as shown in the Comp Plan. It takes a little shorter look into the future and identifies specific maintenance, replacement, repair, and new facility projects. Operational staff play a big part in identifying the maintenance, repair and replacement. The Parks and Rec Advisory Board has played a major part in prioritizing projects in this plan. Staff would like to have the PBAC play a similar role in reviewing trail projects with the next update in summer of 2017. Would like to have a subcommittee that could do the main review work and then bring a recommendation to the full PBAC. Would likely be two or three meetings to get through the subcommittee work and bring it to the full PBAC in September 2017. With this schedule would probably want to start the project in May or June. The CIP can be accessed online by typing “CIP” into the City’s main page. How do we keep track of CIP projects that have been appropriated but not yet constructed? Parks does keep a list of all the CIP projects, even if they don’t show in the CIP any longer. Parks accounting program does track those projects. Planning is discussing creating a sort of “dashboard” on GIS where the public could go to view projects that are in that sort of appropriated list of projects. Would like to have some common understanding of how we discuss these projects so that as donors are approached there is a common vocabulary. For instance the Murdock Trail project – how do we explain to donors that we are looking for grant funds, but we don’t have all the funds? Can we build half the project with the donations and then move forward with looking for the remaining funds? This would mean, then, that we wouldn’t have those donor funds to make a match for an additional grant application. The Land and Water grant that we are currently waiting to hear on was a 50/50 match. If we do not get that grant, we would have to regroup and look for other grant sources. Concerned that the two usual sources will not fund this project. The RTP application that was made in 2015 was for an 80/20 match where we were asking the RTP program for about $400,000. With GPTN’s efforts to raise ~$250,000, a future application could go back to RTP with a 50/50 match and an ask that does not exceed the cap, which should be a stronger application. The Wilderness Park bridge may be a good application to have the County as the applicant, since it is on County owned property. This is how the last application was made, and the north bridge had the County and City as partners on the application. Match for this project should be secured between the settlement dollars and GPTN funds, although the cost estimate likely needs updating. Would like to have some sort of a working list to show these projects and anticipated timing. This may be something that could be done for the subcommittee. Demonstration of the CIP mapping application. Will discuss the subcommittee again in December.

**New Business**

Bike Friendly Community Application: Have received a preliminary response from the League of American Bicyclists. Although scores on the “5 Es” have tripled, from 8 to 24, our rating has not changed and we are still a Bronze Community. A comparison of Lincoln the all Silver Communities was made and Lincoln appears to compare pretty well with those communities. Hartzell shared the preliminary results of this comparison. An appeal is being prepared to the League to ask them to reconsider their finding in light of the increased scores and other achievements over the past several years. The appeal will be shared with the PBAC when it is completed. There was a question about the
crash rate as reported. (Note: According to the 2014 5-year average, the total number of workers in Lancaster County was 140,146. Of those 2,331 rode a bike to work, which is 1.66 or 1.7%. The 5 year average for vehicle accidents involving a bicycle is 147 per year. The number of crashes in the Leagues report was per 10,000 bike commuters. So, take 10,000 divided by 2,331 and you get a multiplier of 4.29. 4.29 times 147 is 630.6 or 631.) There was also discussion about “Bike Friendly Business” counts. The number reported in the response was based on the official Bike Friendly Business designation given by the League. Does not include any local designation, although that was shared with the application in the response section. If no appeal is allowed, there is an opportunity to reapply in February.

Fraser shared that the first State Biking and Walking summit will be March 23rd and 24th in the Downtown Embassy Suites, sponsored by the Nebraska Bicycling Alliance and other partners. Planning a tour of N-Street, the Capital/Centennial Mall and P Street. This would be similar to a tour done by the Nebraska APA last month and they might be willing to give the same tour for this conference.

Nominations for officers was made by the subcommittee, Jordan Messerer for Chair and Susan Larson Rodenburg for Vice Chair. Will be voting in December.

**Other Items**
The committee designated a nomination committee of Susan Larsen Rodenburg, Gary Bentrup, Barb Fraser. This committee will work on identifying nominees for presentation in November and election in December.

Adjourn 8:12