

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.