



Active Transportation Working Group

Meeting #4



April 24, 2024

Meeting #4 Agenda

1. Meeting 3 recap and debrief TAB meeting feedback (Glen Johnson, Chair)
2. Active transportation 2024 response summary (Joe Widing)
3. 2024 Regional Solicitation Active Transportation Funding Scenarios (Steve Peterson)
 1. 2024 projects funding considerations and details
4. 2025 Active Transportation Solicitation discussion
5. Next steps

Purpose of Today



Review Additional Responses Summary and Regional Solicitation Funding Scenarios + begin 2025 discussion

- Review and discuss 2024 Active Transportation Regional Solicitation Applicant Responses
- Review and discuss 2024 Regional Solicitation Funding Scenarios
- Begin 2025 Active Transportation Solicitation Discussion

2024 Funding Details Revisited



Details for Funding 2024 RS Projects

Will not be able to fund all of the 65 submitted AT projects

- Estimated total of \$28 million regional AT funding to be collected by end of 2024.

Need to set total funding and project cap for grants management pilot

- To build up internal capacity, limit total funds to up to \$15M and subsequently limit total number of projects.

Eligible projects to receive funding

- Small projects (AT projects with a funding request of \$2M or below).
- Earliest projects (Regional Solicitation application includes option to indicate earlier start dates).
 - 2025 or 2026 construction start.
- Projects that meet all legislative requirements.
 - High ranking projects which do not meet all requirements may still be funded with federal funds.

Pilot Project

- Details determined for this one-time process do not need to be carried over into future solicitations.
- Learning experience, will report back on lessons learned.

Regional Solicitation Project requirements

- Overall regional solicitation requirements (local match, eligibility of project costs, program year, scope change process, etc.) will remain for this round

2024 Funding Option Rec. Revisited



The Working Group voted on the following motion:

1. To distribute up to \$15 million in regional sales tax funds for Regional Solicitation Active Transportation projects.
2. To select at least one project from each active transportation category in the Regional Solicitation (Multiuse Trails, Pedestrian and Safe Routes to School).
3. To select from smaller projects which requested less than \$2 million funding.
4. To select from projects which can begin their projects early, either in 2025 or 2026. Projects must begin construction by the end of 2026.
5. To select projects that can meet the additional legislative requirements.
6. That the highest scoring Regional Solicitation applications will receive priority for Active Transportation funding.
7. That selected projects will be required to still meet the 20% local match for Regional Solicitation projects.

All members voted in favor to send recommendation for TAB consideration

***TAB at 4/17 meeting included geographic balance to this consideration**

Active Transportation Additional Requirements



Staff requested additional information to determine project eligibility

- Requirement 1: Please indicate where and how your project is included in either a municipal or regional nonmotorized transportation system plan. For Safe Routes to School projects, it must be included in a district wide or multi-school plan or in another nonmotorized plan. The nonmotorized element of a community comprehensive plan will also be considered.
- Requirement 2: Please describe the extent to which polices, or practices encourage and promote the planning, design, and construction of complete streets in your community. References may include comprehensive planning or other planning documents, city ordinances, policies, or practices, among others.
- Confirm if project could begin construction in 2025 or 2026.

Project Type	AT Eligible	\$ Request	Req 1	Req 2	Timing
Bike/MTF	6/38*	13/38*	6/38*	6/38*	6/38*
Pedestrian	13/17	All	All	All	13/17
SRTS	9/10	All	All	All	9/10

*Only top 6 below \$2M were contacted due to number of bike/trail projects and scoring

Findings from Applicant Responses (1)

Requirement 1: Inclusion in local or regional non-motorized plan

Bike/Trail Projects – 6

- All included in the RBTN
- 5 included in dedicated local non-motorized plan
- 1 included in local comprehensive plan

Pedestrian Projects – 17 (4 could not go early and did not respond to questions)

- 10 included in dedicated local non-motorized plan
- 3 included in local comprehensive plan

SRTS Projects – 10

- 4 included in district or areawide SRTS Plan
- 5 included in dedicated local non-motorized plan
- 1 included in trail feasibility study and single school SRTS Plan



Findings from Applicant Responses (2)

Requirement 2: Extent to which community advances complete streets in planning, practices etc.

Bike/Trail Projects – 6

- 4 included policies on complete streets (CS) principals in comprehensive plan
- 1 included CS in comprehensive plan but did not identify policies
- 1 agency does not have jurisdiction over ROW

Pedestrian Projects – 17 (4 could not go early and did not respond to questions)

- 9 included an adopted local CS policy or ordinance
- 2 included CS elements in local comprehensive plan goals
- 2 included limited references to CS in comprehensive plan or ordinance

SRTS Projects – 10

- 5 included an adopted local CS policy or ordinance
- 4 included CS elements/related goals in local comprehensive plan goals
- 1 included limited reference to AT requirements in development code



Findings from Applicant Responses (3)

Findings relating to 2025 or further solicitations

Most applicants had little issue connecting project applications to local or regional non-motorized system plans. (many included in multiple plans)

The complete streets requirement and regional progress on this is less clear.

Need to consider how legislative requirements will be interpreted for future solicitations

- “Extent to which...” for multiple requirements – score based? Eligibility threshold? To what extent is this requirement to be met?
- Agencies/applicants which are not cities or counties with jurisdiction over ROW – how to connect to complete streets?
- Does “*inclusion in a municipal or regional nonmotorized transportation system plan*” mean simply a line on a map? Or could more be considered (safety, improvements, ADA)? Does system plan need to be specific to non-motorized facilities? Can it be general transportation plan with non-motorized specific identification?



2024 Reg. Sol. Funding Scenarios (1)



Considerations for AT funding with RS Scenarios

Pilot project

- Limiting total number of projects to enable capacity building for Council grant management
- Spreading recipients to get exposed to different types, sizes and locations of projects to aid learning for grants management

Meeting Work Group motion

- Small projects under \$2M
- Projects which can begin by the end of calendar year 2026
- At least one project from each active transportation RS category
- Awarding highest scoring applications with local funding

Not skipping over any projects on the scoring ranking

- Utilize federal funds to aid in this

2024 Reg. Sol. Funding Scenarios (2)

MULTIUSE TRAILS AND BICYCLE FACILITIES					Base Federal	Active Transportation	Carbon Reduction	
Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Year	Eligible for AT Pilot	Base Scenario	1A. Midpoint	1B. Midpoint-Safety	2. Bike/Ped Heavy
1	Hennepin Co	CSAH 152 (Washington Ave) Bikeway Project	28	No	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000
2	Minneapolis	Northside Greenway Phase 2	28	No	\$2,865,490	\$2,865,490	\$2,865,490	\$2,865,490
3	Minneapolis	University Avenue and 4th Street Separated Bicycle Facilities	28 27	No	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000
4	Minneapolis	E/W 34th St Neighborhood Greenway	29	No	\$3,024,000	\$3,024,000	\$3,024,000	\$3,024,000
5	Three Rivers PD	CP Rail Regional Trail: North Segment (New Construction)	29	No	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000
6	Dakota Co	CSAH 42 Trail Gap Project	28, 29 26, 27	Yes		\$1,444,000	\$1,444,000	\$1,444,000
7	Hennepin Co	CSAHs 33 and 35 (Park Ave and Portland Ave) Bikeway Project	28	No		\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000
8	Farmington	North Creek Greenway - Farmington	28, 29 26, 27	Yes		\$1,579,776	\$1,579,776	\$1,579,776
9	Three Rivers PD	North Cedar Lake Regional Trail - Reconstruction	29	No				\$4,104,674
10-T	Three Rivers PD	Shingle Creek Regional Trail – Reconstruction	29	Yes				\$966,963
10-T	Three Rivers PD	CP Rail Regional Trail - South Segment (New Construction/Reconstruction)	29	No				\$5,500,000
12	Dakota County	River to River Greenway Valley Park Trail & TH 149 Underpass	25 28	Yes				\$2,080,000

PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES								
Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Year	Eligible for AT Pilot	Base Scenario	1A. Midpoint	1B. Midpoint-Safety	2. Bike/Ped Heavy
1	Minneapolis	Nicollet Avenue pedestrian improvements	29	Yes	\$1,983,200	\$1,983,200	\$1,983,200	\$1,983,200
2	Minneapolis	Marcy-Holmes Dinkytown Pedestrian Improvements	28	Yes	\$1,508,000	\$1,508,000	\$1,508,000	\$1,508,000
3	Minneapolis	26th St, 27th St, and 28th St pedestrian improvements	28	Yes	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000
4	Brooklyn Center	Brooklyn Center High School Pedestrian Improvements	28, 29 26, 27	Yes		\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
5	Brooklyn Park	Blue Line Extension LRT Sidewalk Connections	28, 29 26, 27	No		\$1,480,800	\$1,480,800	\$1,480,800
6	Saint Paul	Saint Paul Gold Line Pedestrian Enhancement	2028 2027	No		\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
7	Richfield	Richfield 73rd Street Sidewalk	28, 29 26, 27	Yes		\$1,046,040	\$1,046,040	\$1,046,040
T-8	Burnsville	Greenwood Drive Sidewalk	28, 29 25, 26, 27	Yes		\$269,150	\$269,150	\$269,150
T-8	Woodbury	Valley Creek Road Trail Gap	2028 2027	Yes		\$963,200	\$963,200	\$963,200
10	Richfield	Richfield 64th Street Sidewalk	28, 29 26, 27	Yes		\$853,660	\$853,660	\$853,660
11	West Saint Paul	Lothenbach Avenue Sidewalk	28, 29 27	No		\$756,800	\$756,800	\$756,800
12	Bloomington	Normandale Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements	28, 29 26, 27	Yes				\$2,000,000

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL								
Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Year	Eligible for AT Pilot	Base Scenario	1A. Midpoint	1B. Midpoint-Safety	2. Bike/Ped Heavy
1	Fridley	Fridley SRTS Improvements Project	28 25, 26, 27	Yes	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
2	South Saint Paul	Marie Avenue SRTS	27 26	Yes	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
3	Minneapolis	Pleasant Ave Safe Routes to School Improvements	29	Yes		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
4	Dakota Co	Butler Avenue (CR 4) School Safety Improvements	28, 29 25, 26, 27	No		\$320,000	\$320,000	\$320,000
5	Saint Paul	West Side SRTS Pedestrian Improvements	28	Yes		\$777,400	\$777,400	\$777,400
6	Minneapolis	Hayes St & Ulysses St Safe Routes to School	28	Yes		\$953,320	\$953,320	\$953,320
7	Jordan	Sunset Drive Improvements	26 25	Yes		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
8	Lakeville	185th Street Trail Project (SRTS)	28, 29 25, 26, 27	Yes		\$704,500	\$704,500	\$704,500

Projects which did not receive funding in any scenario not shown

Total # of projects

Bike/Trail: 38

Pedestrian: 17

SRTS: 10

Potential AT funded projects = 12

2024 Reg. Sol. Funding Scenarios (3)



Funding Scenarios Details

1A. Midpoint:

- 8/37 Bike/Trail
- 11/17 Pedestrian
- 8/10 SRTS

Total ped/bike funding: \$52.1M

Total AT funding: \$15.4M

Heavy Bike/Ped:

- 12/37 Bike/Trail
- 12/17 Pedestrian
- 8/10 SRTS

Total ped/bike funding: \$66.8M

Total AT funding: \$15.4M

1B. Midpoint-Safety:

- 8/37 Bike/Trail
- 11/17 Pedestrian
- 8/10 SRTS

Total ped/bike funding: \$52.1M

Total AT funding: \$15.4M

Funding Scenarios Discussion

Do we add more AT funding to get more projects?

Do we want to spread the funding out to more applicants?

- Move larger projects to federal funds to fund more small projects with local funds?

Do we want to spread funding to more applicants (i.e., limit the total number of projects a single applicant can receive local funding for)?

Do we want to move funding sources (federal vs. non-federal) in order to give priority to defederalize the smallest projects?

2025 AT Solicitation Discussion (1)



2025 AT Specific Solicitation

Timeline:

Fall 2024: Need to set up solicitation eligibility, program parameters, funding amount to be awarded, application materials, legislative requirements

- Solicitation details would likely need to be similar to Regional Solicitation with additional requirements built in from legislative language for 2025
 - 2026 and ongoing could deviate more from Regional Solicitation with more time to work out details
- Would need to move through full TAB/TAC review process to review and confirm program details identified by Work Group

Early 2025: Solicitation would need to be opened for applications to be selected later in 2025 by TAB.

Could have \$40M-\$50M to award based on remaining 2023/24 and anticipated 2025 sales tax revenue

2025 AT Solicitation Discussion (2)

Pros for 2025 Solicitation

- Allows for more applicants to consider applying for specific AT funding
 - 2024 Regional Solicitation applicants were not aware regional AT funding would be included when they applied for the federal funds
- Spends more funding for local projects quickly vs. waiting one more year
- Gives applicants some time and understanding to apply for funding in 2025
 - AT Solicitation could better incorporate legislative requirements

Cons for 2025 Solicitation

- Will not have time to learn lessons from 2024 grant pilot
- Will not have time to set up fully new solicitation process
 - Will likely be modification of existing Regional Solicitation application
- May not see new project applications
- Adds another competitive application cycle for local partners
- Could take focus away from building the 2026 and beyond solicitations

Next Steps



- Funding scenarios will move through TAB/TAC process with AT funds identified and acted on separately
- May AT Work Group meeting looking to go into 2025 Active Transportation Solicitation in detail
 - Will need decision to move forward or not on a 2025 solicitation soon in order to work out details over the summer and fall



Steve Peterson

Senior Manager of Highway Planning and TAB/TAC Process

Steven.Peterson@metc.state.mn.us

Amy Vennewitz

Deputy Director of Planning and Finance

Amy.Vennewitz@metc.state.mn.us

Joe Widing

Senior Transportation Planner, MTS

Joseph.Widing@metc.state.mn.us

