



ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX FUNDING

Additional AT Requirements Response Summary

Following the motion to recommend using some regional funds for Regional Solicitation for active transportation projects, Council staff requested clarifying responses from Regional Solicitation applicants. Of the 7 requirements listed in the legislation associated with the new funding, 2 of these requirements needed to be confirmed from applicants to ensure project eligibility for the funds. The first question (Requirement 1) seeks to confirm if an applicant's project is included in a regional or local non-motorized transportation system plan. The second question (requirement 2) seeks to know what the extent to which a community encourages complete streets planning and design within their policies and practices. In addition, staff requested applicants to confirm if projects could begin construction prior to the end of 2026.

Staff asked for additional information for the following projects:

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle

- 20196 Dakota County, CSAH 42 Trail Gap Project
- 20247 Farmington, North Creek Greenway
- 20166 Three Rivers Park District, Shingle Creek Regional Trail Reconstruction
- 29226 Dakota County, River to River Greenway Valley Park Trail and TH 149 Underpass
- 20227 Dakota County, North Creek Greenway CSAH 42 Trail and Crossing
- 20493 Shakopee, Stagecoach Road Trail

Pedestrian

- 20063 Brooklyn Park Blue Line Extension LRT Sidewalk Connections
- 20077 Richfield 73rd Street Sidewalk
- 20079 Richfield 64th Street Sidewalk
- 20147 Brooklyn Center High School Pedestrian Improvements
- 20193 Carver County Rolling Acres Road Pedestrian Grade Separated Crossing
- 20201 Woodbury Valley Creek Road Trail Gap
- 20202 Woodbury Pedestrian System Gaps Project
- 20210 Minneapolis Nicollet Avenue pedestrian improvements
- 20248 West St Paul Lothenbach Avenue Sidewalk
- 20255 Hennepin County CSAH 35 (Portland Ave) Pedestrian Project
- 20256 Hennepin County CSAH 70 (Medicine Lake Rd) Pedestrian Project
- 20303 Saint Paul Gold Line Pedestrian Enhancement Project
- 20373 Bloomington Normandale Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements
- 20402 Minneapolis 26th St, 27th St, and 28th St pedestrian improvements
- 20409 Minneapolis Marcy-Holmes Dinkytown Pedestrian Improvements
- 20476 Carver Main Street Pedestrian Project

Safe Routes to Schools

- 20128 Jordan Sunset Drive Improvements
- 20251 St Paul West Side SRTS Pedestrian Improvements

- 20258 Hennepin County CSAH 82 (Mill St) SRTS Project
- 20262 Minneapolis Hayes Street & Ulysses Street Safe Routes to School Improvements
- 20263 Minneapolis Pleasant Avenue Safe Routes to School Improvements
- 20408 Arden Hills Old Highway 10 Trail SRTS Improvements
- 20410 Fridley SRTS Improvements Project
- 20414 South St Paul Marie Avenue SRTS
- 20449 Lakeville 185th Street Trail Project (SRTS)
- 20495 Dakota County Butler Avenue (CR 4) School Safety Improvements

Active Transportation Projects Additional Requirements Response Summary

Requirement 1

All projects were able to indicate that they are included in a regional or local nonmotorized plan. Many were included in multiple plans, many were also found on the RBTN network (identified when RBTN inclusion may be more important for an application if local inclusion is less clear). Only 1 application may not be eligible based on the first requirement (Hennepin County SRTS application), but was deemed eligible for the pilot.

Overall, most communities are adequately identifying pedestrian and bicycle needs in local plans.

Considerations for future solicitations:

- Could this requirement be satisfied with safety specific plans? I.E. if a corridor or project was identified on a “high-injury” street or corridor, could that be something which meets this requirement? Or must it be included on a specific local non-motorized plan?
- How should we define non-motorized plan in the future? Does a larger plan (transportation plan) with a non-motorized element satisfy this requirement? Or should the community have a specific non-motorized plan adopted separately from other more general transportation or comprehensive plans?
 - This could be a scored measure in the future.

Requirement 2

The second requirement seems less clear for applying eligibility and for applicants to meet. Complete streets is more of a process or planning philosophy than a final result of any single project. Some communities have elected to codify a complete streets process either in policy or ordinance which is straightforward evidence that they are considering the process into planning, design and operations, many others have not done this, however. Communities that have not done so, generally point to requirements for the installation of sidewalks or trails along new roadways or in new subdivisions, but typically do not address existing roadways which may be deficient in complete streets as defined by state law. Some do touch on the reconstruction of streets in their community, others only focus on new subdivisions or developments. Some have references in their comprehensive plan, but do not have a clear connection to these references in street design and planning practice.

Of the 33 applications in which additional information was requested, 14 of them have explicit complete streets policies adopted and integrated in their design process and 11 have complete streets concept or goals within their comprehensive plans. 3 applications indicated that they have existing easement or non-motorized facility requirements in subdivision or other ordinances guiding new development, but do not have policies directly in place which address complete streets planning. There were 4 which could not go early and were not required to respond and 1 which is an agency which does not have ROW jurisdiction.

Considerations for future solicitations:

- For agencies which may not have ROW jurisdiction and as such could not really have a complete streets policy (as they do not build streets), how should these situations be

considered? If building a trail facility along a roadway, should the applicable jurisdiction be considered? I.E. a trail along a county roadway default to county status.

- The requirement includes the two means by which a jurisdiction can meet it, either an adopted policy or demonstrate that complete streets are implemented or planned in practice. To what extent do we require this to be met? Does having subdivision ordinances meet this requirement? Does having requirements to build sidewalks with street projects meet the spirit of complete streets as defined by state statute?
- Many communities mention or discuss the concept in their comprehensive plans, but do not have explicit policies or clear connection to how this concept is carried out in the community, to what extent will we require complete streets language in comprehensive plans to meet this requirement?

The State defines complete streets as the following: (174.75) *"Complete streets" is the planning, scoping, design, implementation, operation, and maintenance of roads in order to reasonably address the safety and accessibility needs of users of all ages and abilities. Complete streets considers the needs of motorists, pedestrians, transit users and vehicles, bicyclists, and commercial and emergency vehicles moving along and across roads, intersections, and crossings in a manner that is sensitive to the local context and recognizes that the needs vary in urban, suburban, and rural settings.*