Regional Solicitation Evaluation – Listening Sessions

Input Related to Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding & Projects

What are high priorities that have not been funded?

- Trail projects that are not part of the RBTN
- Network gaps
  - A small project that would connect 60 miles of trail wouldn’t score well based on the metrics in the application.

Other Observations

- Anoka County
  - Typically, roadway projects must have bike/ped elements.
- Carver County (Staff)
  - Scoring based on population density may not be a good metric for developing connected systems.
- Consultants
  - Lack of pedestrian count data prevents analysis of projects related to high generators of ped activity.
- Corridor Coalitions
  - Smaller coalitions have trouble getting the funds to meet the match, so other funding sources are being explored.
- Dakota County (Staff)
  - Large trail projects use up a lot of the funding.
  - RBTN is more spread out in the southern metro and less relevant to more concentrated areas of local bike/ped activity.
- Hennepin County
  - There are communities that can’t figure out how they would do maintenance for trail projects, much less build and fund. If there’s a barrier to year-round maintenance, they don’t look at additional funding.
  - The current solicitation awards points for multimodal even if people aren’t going to use it. We need to find a way to measure actual mode shift based on use.
- Metro Cities
  - Smaller projects not on county roads but provide connections to county infrastructure should be considered.
- Metro Transit
  - Modal balance is necessary for bike/ped to be competitive.
  - While there is increased weight for safety, this hasn’t necessarily led to increased safety for bike/peds (e.g., roundabouts).
- MnDOT Central Office
  - The bike/ped category has a lot of applicants and not enough money.
Concern that new funding sources will backfill existing demand for bike/ped projects rather than address the specific purpose of the funding (e.g., PROTECT and Carbon Reduction Program).

- Park Board/DNR
  - Favoring population density makes sense, but bike/ped should focus on developing a growing network.
  - It’s almost impossible to get funding when you’re beyond the beltway.
  - There should be funding for new projects, but we’re not taking care of what we have.
  - The RBTN builds off the arterial transportation network, but people prefer separated trails.

- Suburban Transit Providers
  - Set-asides for specific geographies are most relevant/needed for bike/ped and trail projects.

- TAB (citizen and modal reps)
  - More project coordination is necessary to ensure trail connectivity.