

Hennepin County - Public Works Transportation

CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) Regional Bikeway Project

Regional Solicitation - Bicycle and Pedestrian
Facilities

ID: R-2026-04918

Emily Buell

Requested: \$5,500,000

Status

Initial Review

▼ Table of Contents

General Information
Project Information
Project Funding
Document Requirements
Documents
Qualifying Requirements
Prioritizing Criteria and Measures
Evaluative Criteria
Community Considerations
Funds & Payments - Internal
Grant Requirements - Internal
ArcGIS - Internal
Review & Feedback - Internal
Dates & Financials - Internal Only
Communications & Relationships - Internal
Notes & History - Internal

What application category are you applying for.*

Regional Bike Facilities

General Information

Organization Name: Hennepin County - Public Works Transportation

▼ Organization Information

Organization Name	Hennepin County - Public Works Transportation
Legal Name	Hennepin County - Public Works Transportation
Street Address	1600 Prairie DR
Street Address 2	
City	Medina
County	Hennepin
State	Minnesota
Country	United States of America
ZIP Code	55340

▼ Contact Information

Contact	Full Name	Email	Phone
Primary Grant Contact	Emily Buell	Emily.Buell@hennepin.us	
Authorized User	James Weatherly	james.weatherly@hennepin.us	
Grant Administration	Carla Stueve	Carla.Stueve@hennepin.us	

Developer 1	Jason Pieper	jason.pieper@hennepin.us
Developer 2	Victoria Lincourt	victoria.lincourt@hennepin.us

▼ Project Information

Project Name* CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) Regional Bikeway Project

Select Primary county where project is located* Hennepin

Cities or Townships where the Project is located* Golden Valley

Jurisdictional Agency (if different than applicant):

Brief project description*

This is a regional bikeway project along CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) from 400' west of Xenia Ave to 300' east of Theodore Wirth Pkwy in Golden Valley. A map of the project location can be found in Attachment 1. The existing roadway, classified as a Minor Arterial, is nearing the end of its useful life. The current roadway consists of a 2-lane undivided configuration, with turn lanes at key intersections. The corridor includes paved shoulders adjacent to bituminous curb, serving the surrounding residential area, including Meadowbrook Elementary and Breck High School. The existing rural design offers poor drainage as water collects in the shoulder or in driveways adjacent to the roadway surface. The existing experience for people biking is relatively uncomfortable as the on-road bike lanes offer no vertical separation. The existing sidewalk facility along the north side is in relatively poor condition - exhibiting settlement in a number of locations, and many intersections do not satisfy current ADA design requirements. Photos of existing conditions are included in Attachment 2.

The proposed project will introduce a continuous bikeway facility - acknowledging that the specific location and type will be determined based on community input, data analysis, and environmental review. These improvements will be designed and constructed as part of a larger reconstruction project that will include new assets, including pavement, curb, stormwater structures, and intersection control devices. It is anticipated that a 2-lane section with boulevards and multimodal facilities on both sides of the roadway will be provided. Pedestrian crossing enhancements will be considered to promote accessibility, mobility, and safety for multimodal users. In recognition that the existing design lacks visual cues to manage vehicle speeds, the roadway design will be focused on promoting traffic calming through a Safe System Design. The proposed typical section and concept are included in Attachments 3 and 4.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Description*

CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) from 400' west of Xenia Ave to 300' east of Theodore Wirth Pkwy in Golden Valley.

Provide the project length to the nearest one-tenth of a mile* 1.4

Lead Agency* Hennepin County

ZIP Code where majority of work is being performed* 55422

Approximate begin construction date (mo/yr)* 5/1/2031

Approximate end construction date (mo/yr)* 10/29/2032

Name or description of trail/ped facility (i.e., Cedar Lake Trail, University Avenue Sidewalk)
CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) Bikeway

Termini (Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work) (Do not include legal description; include name of roadway if majority of facility runs adjacent to a single corridor)

Roadway Name* CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave)

From Cross-Street* Xenia Ave

To Cross-Street* Theodore Wirth Pkwy

Length of multimodal facilities included in project (nearest 0.1 miles, include all that apply using the best available information)* 1.4

Multiuse trail*	0
Separated bicycle facility*	1.4
On-street bicycle facility*	0
Sidewalk*	1.4
Miles of facility on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles)*	1.4
Miles of new RBTN facilities*	1.4
Miles of improved existing RBTN facilities*	0
Miles of facility on the regional trail network (nearest 0.1 miles)*	0
Miles of new Regional Trail facilities*	0
Miles of improved existing Regional Trail facilities*	0
AADT on parallel or adjacent roadway*	8500
Number of improved ADA ramps*	50
Number of intersection improvements*	13
Primary types of work (Examples: Grade, AGG Base, BIT Base, BIT Surf, Sidewalk, Signals, Lighting, Guardrail, Bike path, Ped Ramps, Bridge, Park and ride, etc.)*	
RECONSTRUCTION, SIGNAL UPGRADES, ADA, APS, STREETSCAPE, BIKEWAY, PED IMPROVEMENTS	
Number of key destinations (Bank, Post Office, Childcare Center, Grocery Store, Medical Center, Office Park, Pharmacy, Place of Worship, Public Library, Public Park, School, University or College):	
Within 1/4 mile of project*	0-2
Within 1/2 mile of project*	4-6

Bridge/culvert projects (if applicable)

Current Bridge/Culvert No.

New Bridge/Culvert No.

Structure is over/under (Bridge or Culvert Name):

Project Funding

Are you applying for competitive funds from another source(s) to implement this project?*

No

Grant Request Amount, US\$* \$5,500,000.00

Project Total: \$* \$17,320,000.00

Match Amount: \$ (Minimum of 20% of the project total for federally funded projects; no match for Active Transportation regional sales tax-funded projects)

Match Amount: \$11,820,000.00

Match Percentage (Minimum of 20% for federally funded projects, no match required for Active Transportation Sales Tax-funded projects)

Match percentage: 68%

Source of Match Funds (For federally funded projects, a minimum of 20% of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the 20% minimum can come from other federal sources)

Source of Match Funds* Hennepin County

Please check the years that are feasible for your program.* 2031 (Federal projects)

To provide the required budget information, complete the Total Project Cost Worksheet and then upload into

the Documents section. Refer to the Total Project Cost Instructions for instructions on what to submit in Fluxx.

Roadway Costs*

Bicycle/Pedestrian Costs*

Transit/TDM Capital Costs*

Transit/TDM Operating Costs*

One of the federal funding sources is Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT). Please describe which specific elements of your project and associated costs out of the Total TAB-Eligible Costs are eligible to receive PROTECT funds.

Based on a planning level review of the proposed scope of work, the following project elements appear to be eligible for the PROTECT Program: Storm Sewer, Landscaping, and Streetscaping (within the Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements section).

As part of this application process, you must enter your project location(s) information into our Geographic Information System (GIS) via the link below.

The GIS link is not generated until a project name has been added to the question "Project Name" above and the application has been saved. For multiple locations, you will refresh the window to add additional locations. If you make a mistake, please refresh and add the correct location and add a comment describing the error and correction. The project location(s) are used to determine some of the outcomes below. Please note that it may take several minutes for the GIS data to be populated in the application below.

Please click the following link which opens in a new window: Draw Project Location

I acknowledge that I clicked the GIS link Yes
and entered the required information.

▼ Document Requirements

Instructions

Upload a PDF for the applicable project elements listed below. Multiple files can be uploaded with the attachment link below. Each individual attachment must be saved as an 8.5"X11"pdf and cannot be more than 15 pages in length to be considered. Only pdf files that meet the size and length limits will be accepted. Please do not submit entire plans or studies.

Summary

1. Applicants are required to submit a one-page Project Summary to be used by the scoring committees and TAB members. This one-pager may include the project name, applicant, route, a map, township/city/county where project is located, requested award amount, total project cost, before photo, project description, list of project benefits, or other pertinent information.
2. A Photograph from within the past year showing the Existing Conditions within the project area. If awarded funds, this photograph will be utilized in the Metropolitan Council's online mapping tool to show a before-and-after comparison of the improvement. By submitting the application, the applicant agrees to allow the Council to use this photograph. Applicants should not use copyrighted images from other sources.

Maps

1. All infrastructure projects must include a map or concept drawing of the proposed improvements that clearly labels the beginning and end of the project, all roadways in the project area, roadway geometry, and any bicycle, pedestrian, and transit components anticipated upon completion of the project.

Coordination

1. The applicant must include a letter of support from the agency that owns/operates the facility, will operate the transit service, or will be expected to maintain the project (if different than the applicant) indicating that it is aware of and understands the project being submitted, and that it commits to operate and maintain the facility for its design life.
2. Transit applicants that propose a project that begins or ends within another agency's service area must include a letter of support from the other transit agency.
3. If the applicant expects any other agency or competitive grant program to provide part of the local match, the applicant must include a staff-level letter from the other agency agreeing to financially participate/documentation of the competitive award.

To add a document, select the green plus sign on the far right of the screen in the row below. A new screen will appear. Upload files by selecting Add files on the bottom left of the screen. After all files have been added, select Start Upload. (Note: if you need to add more files to the same group of attachments, use the green + button in the "Documents" section at the bottom.)

▼ Documents

To add other documents, click the green + sign, then click "Add Files." Then select the document category from the dropdown and click "Start Upload"

APPLICATION DOCUMENTS

Filter by Type All document types (14) ▼

 Attachment 13 - Year Round Maintenance Committment.pdf





Year-Round Maintenance Commitment
Added by Emily Buell at 4:51 AM on June 18, 2026

 Attachment 12 - Letters of Support.pdf





Resolution of Support
Added by Emily Buell at 4:49 AM on June 18, 2026

 Attachment 11 - Previous Engagement Efforts.pdf





Optional Attachments 3
Added by Emily Buell at 3:24 AM on June 17, 2026

 Attachment 10 - Community Considerations Maps.pdf





Optional Attachments 2
Added by Emily Buell at 3:21 AM on June 17, 2026

 Attachment 09 - CMFs.pdf





Crash Modification Factors
Added by Emily Buell at 3:21 AM on June 17, 2026

1 - 5 of 14 Records

1 2 3

Jump to Page

▼ Qualifying Requirements

The applicant must show that the project meets all the qualifying requirements to be eligible to be scored and ranked against other projects. All qualifying requirements must be met before completing an application.

By selecting each checkbox, the applicant confirms compliance with the following project requirements*

The project will follow all applicable federal and state design standards, including state statutes such as **State Aid Rule 8820** as required*

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and actions of the 2050 Transportation Policy Plan Briefly list the applicable 2050 TPP objectives and policies.

Briefly list the applicable 2050 TPP objectives and policies*

1) An equitable and inclusive region: Policy 4: shared decision making, Policy 5: Needs of people with disabilities, Policy 6: Equitable benefits and burdens

This project will build upon outreach completed outreach that was completed as part of a 2020 mill and overlay and restriping project along the corridor. During these previous engagement efforts, the county met with residents as part of a study group, held several open houses, and presented to city council. As part of these efforts, county staff learned more about the desire for separated bicycle facilities, improved sidewalk connections, and safe crossings along the corridor. Future engagement will build upon feedback from this project, as well as comments received as part of the county's mumble strip pilot along a portion of the corridor. This project will significantly improve multimodal connectivity, including accessibility upgrades.

2) Healthy and safe communities: Policy 9: Quality transportation facilities, Policy 10: Eliminate traffic deaths

and serious injuries, Policy 11: Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety, Policy 13: Reduce negative health impacts, Policy 14: Placemaking and placekeeping

This project represents phase 1 (of 2) for improvements along CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) in which it is anticipated that a continuous off-street bicycle facility will connect people biking from TH 55 to the Grand Rounds Regional Trail Network at Theodore Wirth Parkway. Additionally, the improvements constructed as part of this project are anticipated to reduce speeding along the corridor. Traffic calming strategies will be explored as part of project development. Hennepin County will leverage the strategies outlined in its Toward Zero Deaths action plan to contribute to the Met Council's goal of eliminating traffic deaths and serious injuries via a Safe System Design as outlined in Policy 10.

3) A dynamic and resilient region: Policy 15: Bicycle network, Policy 16: Eliminate bicycle/pedestrian gaps and barriers, Policy 17: Pedestrian network, Policy 22: Multimodal connections, Policy 23: Complete Streets approach, Policy 27: Mitigate climate impacts, Policy 28: Minimize disruption

This project will provide multimodal options to users traveling along the corridor. This segment of CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) is an RBTN Tier 2 corridor and will connect to a Tier 1 alignment (east of Theodore Wirth Pkwy) and a Tier 2 alignment (Grand Rounds Regional Trail Network). This segment of CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) is also anticipated to connect to the planned CP Rail Regional Trail, which will travel north/south along Xenia Ave. Hennepin County will approach this project from a Complete & Green Streets lens, as noted in the county's approved policy.

4) Leading on climate: Policy 30: Reduce Greenhouse gases, Policy 31: Reduce vehicle miles traveled

This project will provide dedicated facilities for people rolling, walking, and biking, and promote connections to existing and future local and regional trails in an effort to reduce vehicle miles traveled along and across the corridor. It is also anticipated that this project will include boulevard space and streetscaping (as feasible) for separation from vehicles, as well as for snow storage.

5) Natural systems: Policy 32: Impervious surfaces, Policy 33: Protect natural systems

It is anticipated that this project will include boulevard space and streetscaping (as feasible). Hennepin County's Complete and Green Streets Policy will serve as a guide during project development.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project or the specific transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document completed within the last 10 years. Reference the name of the comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study, Safe Routes to School Plan, Bicycle System Plan, or other approved/adopted plan or program of the applicant agency. The Active Transportation Planning application category (whose projects will be creating the plan itself) is exempt from this requirement.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

List the applicable document(s) and pages*

The CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) Regional Bikeway Project is included in the Work Plan associated with the county's 2026-2030 Capital Improvement Program (see Attachment 6).

Additionally, Attachment 6 provides links to other county supporting documents, including the Hennepin County Comprehensive Plan, the Hennepin County Complete and Green Streets Policy, the Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan, and the Hennepin County Toward Zero Deaths Action Plan.

The project complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project year-round for the useful life of the improvement. This includes assurance of year-round use of bicycle and pedestrian facilities per FHWA direction established 9/27/2008 and updated 4/15/2019. Project sponsors of standalone bicycle and pedestrian projects or bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are part of a roadway project must include information on how the requirement to maintain facilities for year-round use will be met. This information may include:

- A local ordinance or policy that requires abutting property owners to maintain pedestrian or bicycle facilities, or that directs agency staff to maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- A letter or resolution that confirms the proposed local facility will be maintained by agency staff or abutting private property owners.
- A cross-jurisdictional agreement with another agency to maintain the proposed local pedestrian or bicycle facility.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term "independent utility" means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any other construction elements to be delivered for the proposed project to be achieved.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The infrastructure project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project applicant has sent written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected units of government prior to submitting the application. Staff-level letters of support are required if another agency owns the roadway, will deliver the transit service, will contribute financially to the project, will be expected to sponsor the project, or will be expected to maintain the project. Transit projects proposing a project that crosses into another agency's service area must include a letter of support from all relevant transit agencies.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The Metropolitan Council and the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) get the first opportunity to utilize a share of the greenhouse gas and vehicle miles traveled offsets of any awarded federal or active transportation regional sales tax projects proportionate to the share of the total project cost funded by TAB to fulfill state requirements for the Greenhouse Gas Impact Assessment (MN Statute 161.178) enacted in 2023. Each offset can only be used one time. If the projects are not needed by the Metropolitan Council and TAB as offsets to other awarded Regional Solicitation highway projects, ownership of them will revert, in whole or in part, to the original project sponsor. Based on inputs provided in the application, Met Council staff will calculate the magnitude of the offsets.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The applicant agrees to provide Metropolitan Council staff with post-construction data, as requested, in order to

perform before-and-after analyses.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

Federally funded projects must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way acquisition costs are only eligible as part of transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project that is otherwise eligible.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

Applicant is a public entity (e.g., county, city, tribal government, transit provider, etc.), or non-profit organization in the TDM category only. Applicants for federal funds that are not State Aid cities in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The public agency sponsor must either have a current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) self-evaluation or transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation, as required under Title II of the ADA. The transition plan must be completed by the local agency before the Regional Solicitation application deadline.

Choose one*

The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and has a completed ADA transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation.

Date plan completed by governing body*

9/25/2025

Link to plan*

<https://www.hennepincounty.gov/-/media/Hennepin-Headless/Hennepin-Gov/government/projects-initiatives/transportation/ada/ada-transition-plan.pdf?rev=04f9d475a32543e1ba5885b7038743bf&hash=1DB1D0864783D1062F5431538448ED1A%20evaluation%20complete>

All projects that are located within right-of-way occupied by an active railroad must confirm that the railroad has been engaged in project planning.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

All projects must relate to surface transportation. Surface transportation is defined as primarily serving a commuting purpose and/or that connects two destination points. A facility may serve both a transportation purpose and a recreational purpose; a facility that connects people to recreational destinations may be considered to have a transportation purpose.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

Regional Bike Facilities: The proposed project in the Regional Bike Facilities application category must be identified on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN), Regional Bike Barrier Study (RBBS), or council-approved regional trail plan. For projects that implement or improve RBTN facilities, at least 50% of the

total project length must follow an existing or planned alignment or extend along and within an RBTN corridor. Projects including less than 50% of total project length to improving the RBTN (excluding regional trails that are not on the RBTN) should apply in the Local Bicycle Facilities application category.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

▼ Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

2050 TPP Goal: Our Region is Dynamic and Resilient

Category Definition: The Regional Bicycle Facilities application category is intended to fund construction of and improvements to the regional bicycle system, and projects must either build out the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN), address barriers identified in the Regional Bicycle Barrier Study (RBBS), or construct regional trails identified in the Regional Parks and Trails System Plan.

2050 TPP Objectives or Policies:

- People have better travel options beyond driving alone to meet their daily needs, with a focus on improving travel times, reliability, directness, and affordability.
- People do not die or face life-changing injuries when using any form of transportation.
- People can increase physical activity with more opportunities to walk, roll, or bike.

Please note that this list is not exhaustive and is intended only to provide examples. For questions regarding project eligibility, see the qualifying requirements for this application category and contact the Metropolitan Council.

- Multiuse trails
- Bicycle or multiuse trail facility bridges or underpasses
- Dedicated on- or off-street bicycle facilities, including separated or protected bikeways
- Filling multiple gaps, improving multiple crossings, or making other similar improvements along a trail corridor

▼ Evaluative Criteria

1. Regional Bicycle Priorities

This criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy based on established regional policies and priorities.

Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) is the official regional bikeway network that sets the region's priority vision for planning and investment. The network was established in 2014 based on a Regional Bicycle System Study analysis and prioritization of potential corridors. This analysis was based on factors such as bicycle trip demand, network connectivity, social equity, population and employment density, and connections to transit.

Regional Trails are part of the Regional Parks system and include planned alignments from the 2050 Regional Parks and Trails Policy Plan.

Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossings are the barrier segments within the "Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas" as adopted in 2025 and shown in the Regional Bike Boulevard Study (RBBS) online map. Projects must create a new regional barrier crossing, replace an existing regional barrier crossing at the end of its useful life, or upgrade an existing barrier crossing to a higher level of bicycle facility treatment, to receive points.

Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings include all existing and planned highway and bicycle/pedestrian bridge crossings of the Mississippi, Minnesota, and St. Croix Rivers as identified in figure 6 of the Bicycle Investment Plan within the 2050 Transportation Policy Plan. Projects must create a new major river bicycle barrier crossing, replace an existing major river crossing at the end of its useful life, or upgrade the crossing to a higher level of bike facility treatment to receive points.

Measure A Identified Network Priorities

Select the category that best applies, based on the project's location*

RBTN Corridor (Tier 2)

Provide an optional narrative to explain why multiple boxes were selected:

The entire segment of the CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) is a Tier 2 corridor on the RBTN. This corridor directly connects to a Tier 1 alignment on CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) east of Theodore Wirth Pkwy, as well as a Tier 2 alignment (Grand Rounds Trail Network) that runs north/south along Theodore Wirth Pkwy. This segment of CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) is also anticipated to connect to the planned CP Rail Regional Trail, which will travel north/south along Xenia Ave.

(Note: Projects that create or improve a bicycle barrier crossing AND an RBTN facility of differing tiers will receive points for the higher tier level improvement.)

Measure A Scoring Guidance

The applicant will receive points based on the project's ability to advance previously defined regional bicycle priorities. Projects that include more than one type of improvement will receive the point value of the highest scoring improvement (e.g., RBTN Tier 1 alignment and Regional Trail would get the highest of those point totals based on the table below). In cases where a Regional Trail alignment that runs along and adjacent to a roadway does not match exactly with the parallel RBTN alignment in the same roadway corridor, the trail alignment may be interpreted as the RBTN alignment at the scorer's discretion. The scoring for regional trails will be revisited next funding cycle based on the results of the planning project to add RBTN corridors and alignments in rural communities. This regional effort will evaluate additions to the RBTN network in the rural parts of the region.

- 30 Points Projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 1 RBTN alignment Improvements to a Tier 1 Regional Bicycle Barrier or Major Bicycle Barrier Crossing
- 25 Points Projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 1 RBTN corridor or Tier 2 RBTN alignment, or a non-RBTN Regional Trail Corridor or alignment Improvements to a Tier 2 Regional Bicycle Barrier
- 20 Points Projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 2 RBTN corridor Improvements to a Tier 3 Regional Bicycle Barrier
- 10 Points N/A Non-tiered bicycle barriers
- 0 Points Project does not implement a regional facility or address a regional barrier

Scorers may use discretion to apply a lower point value to projects that are located at a defined barrier crossing, but do not meaningfully improve upon existing condition

2. Connection to Key Destinations

This criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose by connecting users to key local destinations.

Measure A - Connection to key destinations

Attach a map that clearly identifies key destinations within ½ mile of the project limits. Key destinations may include destinations important to the local community, including (but not limited to) banks, post offices, high-frequency transit stations, childcare centers, grocery stores, medical centers, office parks, pharmacies, places of worship, public libraries, public parks, schools, universities, or colleges. Other destinations may be included with an explanation as to their importance to the local community.

Upload that map (in the Document Requirements section), along with a written response (300 words or less) that highlights the key destinations served and their importance to the local community. Applicants may identify additional destinations up to 1 mile from the project location but will need to demonstrate that these destinations have a continuous bicycle facility connection to ensure safe access from the project location. These destinations must be clearly marked outside of the ½ mile buffer for this criterion.

If the project does not directly serve any key destinations but facilitates an important connection to a destination more than ½ mile from the project, please explain.

Key destinations include four K-12 schools serving different grade ranges within a half mile of the project limits, including: Meadowbrook Elementary School, Breck School (K-12), Perpich Arts High School, Bryn Mawr Elementary School, and Anwatin Middle School. Within a mile of the project limits, there are two more schools, Good Shepherd School and the Minneapolis Jewish Day School.

The project's eastern terminus ends at Theodore Wirth Regional Park and connects to the Grand Rounds Trail Network, two very popular destinations/resources for recreation for area residents and visitors from across the metro region. It's anticipated that Three Rivers Park District will construct a new north/south regional trail at the project's western limit, located at Xenia Ave, serving as a key connection between the Luce Line Regional Trail and the North Cedar Lake Regional Trail, linking multimodal users with a variety of businesses and services at St. Louis Park's West.

There is one religious institution located immediately along the project corridor and within a mile of the project limits, there are four more key religious institution destinations.

Measure A Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will make a strong case about how the project will significantly increase access to key destinations. This may include providing new connections and/or improvements to existing connections. The narrative should also explain why the destinations are critical to the community and/or region. Destinations beyond ½ mile should be considered only if the respondent clearly demonstrates a safe connection from the project location to the identified destination.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may minimally increase access to key destinations by only connecting to a few destinations and/or providing small improvements to existing connections. Differentiation among these projects should consider how many destinations are connected, the importance of the destinations to the community and/or region, and the level of increased access as provided in the narrative. Destinations beyond ½ mile should be considered only if the respondent clearly demonstrates a safe

connection from the project location to the identified destination.

- Medium-Low
- Low: Projects that have minimal destinations within the project area or do not create safe connections to those destinations should receive minimal points for this criterion. Consider whether the project adds new connections and/or improves existing connections when making this assessment.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that do not create any new connections, do not have any destinations within the project area, or do not provide adequate information should receive zero points for this measure.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that do not create any new connections, do not have any destinations within the project area, or do not provide adequate information should receive zero points for this measure.

3. All Ages & Abilities Design

This criterion measures how well the project provides bicycling infrastructure for all ages and abilities. Guidance from sources such as the following may be referenced as part of the written explanation, but the applicant should, at a minimum, provide the information requested below.

- Minnesota Department of Transportation's Bicycle Facility Design Manual
- National Association of City Transportation Officials' (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide 3rd Edition
- American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials' (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities 5th Edition
- Federal Highways Administration's Bikeway Selection Guide
- FHWA guidance provides authorization for use of alternate roadway design guides in federally-funded projects. See Alternate Roadway Design Publications Recognized by FHWA under IIJA and FAST Act for details.

Measure A – Facility Type

Describe the minimum level of protection this facility will provide. If your project proposes more than one facility type, provide the following information for each segment. Applicants are encouraged to consider how the project development process may affect the final layout after application to minimize need for scope changes.*

- Proposed facility types: Multiuse trail, sidepath, off-street bikeway, on-street bikeway protected with permanent materials, on-street bikeway protected with temporary materials, on-street bikeway with painted buffer, constrained bike lane, advisory bike lane, bike boulevard, shared space.
- Roadway AADT: Use the highest value from the most recent count available.
- Motor vehicle design speed: This is collected only to score facility types other than off-street bikeways or on-street bikeways protected with permanent materials, which will receive high scores regardless of design speed. If state aid rules require a design speed greater than 25 mph, the applicant should acknowledge risk of a scope change if their application bases facility selection on a lower design speed on premise of receiving a variance.
- Number of lanes in each direction: This is collected only to score facility types other than off-street bikeways or on-street bikeways protected with permanent materials, which will receive high scores regardless of number of lanes. If state aid rules require or the project development process could lead to requiring more than one lane in any direction, the applicant should acknowledge risk of a scope change if their application bases facility selection on the premise of having no more than one lane per direction.

The table below shows the minimum recommended level of separation based on roadway features and operational characteristics.

Facility Type	Target Motor Vehicle Speed	Motor Vehicle Lanes in Same Direction	Motor Vehicle AADT
Off-street (multiuse trail, sidepath, or bikeway)	Any	Any	Any
Protected Bike Lane (with permanent materials)	Any	Any	Any
Bike Lane with Buffer or temporary protection	≤25 mph	Single lane	≤6,000
Bike Lane	≤20 mph	Single lane	≤1,500-3,000
Advisory Bike Lane or Bicycle Boulevard	≤20 mph	Single lane or no centerline	≤500-2,000
Shared Spaces	≤10 mph	No centerline	≤1,000

Click the + button below to add and provide details of the Proposed Facilities. Add all of the facilities required.*

Proposed Facilities*

Segment Name/Description	Proposed Facility Type	Proposed Facility Length	Roadway AADT	Motor Vehicle Design Speed	Number of Lanes in Each Direction
CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) Bikeway	Off-street bikeway	1.4	8500	35	1

Measure A Scoring Guidance

The project will be scored based on the following guidance. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

Single facility type

- **High:** All off-street multiuse trails, sidepaths, or bikeways and on-street bike lanes separated with permanent materials will receive high scores. All on-street facilities matching the recommended facility type or providing a higher level of protection will receive high scores.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Projects that do not adhere to the facility type guidance but provide an accepted justification for why they are providing the “next best facility type,” such as the examples listed in the prompt above, will receive a medium score.
- **Medium:** Applicants who are not in alignment with the recommended facility types may receive a medium score if they cite alternate guidance along with a clearly stated and accepted explanation of why that guidance is appropriate for the project.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Projects that do not adhere to the facility type guidance and do not provide an accepted justification.

Multiple facility types

Projects that include multiple facility types will receive length proportionate points based on the score of each proposed segment.

Measure B - Design Features and roadway crossings

Provide a brief description (400 words or less) outlining the ways the project will meet or exceed the applicable design standards, specifically focusing on ways the project provides facilities suitable for users of all ages and abilities.*

The description should include the best available information on the facility’s proposed width, buffer or separation, pavement markings and signage, facility transitions, ADA considerations, intersection design, driveways and conflict points, and any traffic calming elements.

In order to implement the Imagine 2050 Transportation Policy Plan actions seeking to provide a bicycle network suitable for riders of all ages and abilities, applicants are encouraged to meet or exceed the outlined guidance wherever possible.

The design of this project will prioritize a comfortable, safe, and accessible experience for users of all ages and abilities by exploring the feasibility of a one-way separated bike facility along both sides of the entire length of the project corridor. The specific bike facility design and associated width will be determined based on community engagement, design engineering, and environmental review, acknowledging that it is anticipated to meet the minimum recommended 5' width according to the FHWA Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide. If determined to be feasible, people biking will be separated from people driving via curb separation, and further separated from people walking via boulevard space. It is also anticipated that a sidewalk facility will be constructed on both the north and south side of the corridor to not only provide separate space for people walking and rolling, but also to reduce the need for unnecessary crossings.

This facility type was tentatively identified to promote use among “Interested but Concerned” riders by choosing design elements that lower Bicycle Levels of Traffic Stress. This is especially important as the project corridor connects to two schools (Breck School and Meadowbrook Elementary) and Theodore Wirth Regional Park, destinations that are likely to attract bicycle traffic and less-experienced riders. A new dedicated facility for people biking will offer choices in transportation for students, parents, and faculty.

The feasibility of providing a dedicated facility for people across the TH 100 Bridge will be evaluated with the project development process. Where appropriate, the project will incorporate pavement markings and signage for wayfinding and traffic management purposes. A roundabout is under consideration to replace the existing all-way stop at the Theodore Wirth Pkwy intersection. The design at this intersection will better accommodate the needs of all modes traveling along and across the project corridor.

Measure B Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the guidelines provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** High rated projects will provide low-stress facilities suitable for riders of all ages and abilities, provide simple to navigate and/or protected crossings, and provide strong vertical and horizontal separation from traffic or a low-speed, low-volume traffic place to ride.

- Medium-High
- Medium: Medium rated projects will provide bicycle facilities that are suitable for most adults, provide crossings that are easy for an adult to navigate, and provide a place to ride separated with permanent materials from higher speed and multilane traffic.
- Medium-Low
- Low: Low-rated projects have elements that meet minimum state design standards, but do not provide a low-stress facility. This may include providing facilities with adequate width and temporary or painted separation, but few improvements to roadway crossings or other conflict points.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that do not meet minimum state design standards should receive zero points for this measure.

4. Safety

This criterion measures the project's ability to promote safety for all users, including how the project responds to existing risks and makes use of proven safety countermeasures.

Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts

Project Location (or part of the location) is listed in the Regional Safety Action Plan on any of the following lists *(note an online map is being developed and a link will be provided in final application)*

Project location is not listed in a regional or local safety plan but provides a parallel or alternative route that will improve safety for people walking or biking., Location is listed in another safety plan that prioritizes reducing fatal and serious injury crashes.

Please describe and provide information on the ways the project will provide a safe alternative route (300 words or less).*

The CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) Regional Bikeway Project will provide an All Ages and Abilities bicycle facility where only a buffered bike lane exists today. There are few east/west connections with dedicated bicycle facilities in this area of Golden Valley. The Luce Line Trail to the north is nearly 1.0 mile away if a person biking takes the most direct route, and requires crossing TH 55, while the North Cedar Lake Trail is about 1.2 miles to the south. This project represents phase 1 (of 2) for improvements along CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave). Once complete, this corridor will connect people biking to the Grand Rounds Trail Network on the eastern limits of this project corridor to a potential future trail connection to both the Luce Line Regional Trail and the CP Rail Regional Trail near TH 55. Attachment 8 highlights key existing multimodal connections near the project corridor.

It is anticipated that this project will provide separated facilities for people walking and biking on both sides of the corridor and improved crossing enhancements as feasible. Currently, people biking utilize an on-street buffered bike lane with no vertical separation from people driving. A sidewalk exists only on the north side and is in poor condition. Additionally, there is little to no separation between the sidewalk and the roadway, making conditions uncomfortable for people walking and rolling.

Please describe and provide reference or link to the plan.*

The corridor is identified in the County Road Safety Plan (CRSP) as having several risk factors for urban roadways. For the intersection risk factor analysis for People Walking and Biking, the following intersections were noted:

At Xenia Ave: 4 of 7 stars
 At TH 100 SB Ramps: 3 of 7 stars
 At TH 100 NB Ramps: 3 of 7 stars
 At Meadow Ln: 3 of 7 stars

Measure A Scoring Guidance

The project will be scored based on the scorer's discretion, using the following guidance:

- High: Project is identified in the regional safety action plan on either the regional top 25 or county top 10 lists or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- Medium-High
- Medium: Project location is identified in a regional safety action plan on High Injury Streets or Crash Risk Index, or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- Medium-Low
- Low: Project location is identified in a local (e.g. county or city) safety action plan, local or district Safe Routes to School plan, or project has a completed targeted study (e.g., NEPA document, corridor study, intersection study, ICE report, etc.) that identifies the specific safety measures needed to improve safety and those safety measures have been incorporated into the proposed project or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that are not identified in the Regional Safety Action Plan or any local safety plan. This could also include projects that also have not completed a targeted study that defines an existing safety issue (e.g., NEPA document, corridor study, intersection study, ICE report, etc.)

Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles

Please provide a written response that explains how the project will mitigate existing risk factors noted above and any other steps taken to ensure the project promotes safety for all users. Please cite any specific proven safety countermeasures that will be part of the project's design or methods the project will use to promote safety for people outside of vehicles (600 words or less).

Consider the following when developing your response. Note that not all considerations are applicable to all projects, but please respond to those that are applicable.

- Will crossing distances or times between protected crossings for people outside of vehicles be increasing or decreasing? If so, how many locations will be affected? If increasing, what measures will be considered to recognize the increase in distance between crossing opportunities?
- Describe what measures are being used to reduce exposure and delay for people outside of vehicles.
- If grade separated pedestrian crossings are being added and increasing crossing times, describe any features that are included that will reduce the detour required of pedestrians and make the separated crossing a more appealing option.
- If mid-block crossings are restricted or blocked, explain why this is necessary and how pedestrian crossing needs and safety are supported in other ways.
- Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, in both through-traffic and turning movements. Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower or protect pedestrians and bicyclists if motorist speeds will increase.
- Consider these resources for safety improvements: Regional Safety Action Plan's Programmatic Recommendations, FHWA's Safe System Roadway Design Hierarchy, and MnDOT's Traffic Engineering Countermeasures

From 2016-2025 two bicycle-involved crashes and one pedestrian-involved crash happened at the CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) intersection at Theodore Wirth Parkway. The corridor currently provides on-street bicycle facilities with no vertical separation from people driving. This creates significant exposure to vehicle traffic along a corridor with a posted speed limit of 35 mph where drivers often exceed the limit.

The proposed project design would upgrade the existing bikeway to construct a separated bicycle facility along both sides of CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave). At the east end of the project corridor, this would provide a connection to trails at Theodore Wirth Park and the Grand Rounds Trail Network, eliminating a mixing zone where bicyclists previously had to enter the roadway in order to cross CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave).

Existing pedestrian facilities are deteriorating and many do not meet current ADA design standards. The CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) intersection at Theodore Wirth Parkway, though pedestrian ramps exist, does not provide marked crosswalks at all four legs of the intersection, creating confusing and unsafe conditions for people walking and crossing the street. An appropriate intersection design will be considered for this intersection with upgraded pedestrian infrastructure including high visibility markings. The project will correct all existing deficiencies by constructing all crossings and signal systems to fully comply with ADA standards. The proposed design also anticipates constructing new sidewalk facilities connecting to the existing sidewalk over the TH 100 bridge along the entire south side of the project corridor. This will create safer conditions for people walking who access CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave) from the residential area immediately south of the project corridor by eliminating the need to cross traffic to access sidewalk facilities. On portions of the north side of the project corridor where sidewalk facilities are located immediately adjacent to the curb, the proposed design will create separation between pedestrian and vehicle traffic by locating new sidewalk facilities behind a boulevard strip.

The following list identifies the key safety countermeasures anticipated for this project:

- Protected bikeway facility anticipated along both sides of corridor (CMF# 8279 - 17.2% reduction)
- APS and signal design operation considerations for people biking, such as: detection, phasing, and optimization (MnDOT Best Practices for Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety - No crash reduction estimated)
- Improved/installed pedestrian crossings (CMF# 1697 - 25% reduction)
- Converted all-way stop to roundabout (CMF# 4924 - 36% reduction)
- New sidewalk facilities (CMF# 9240 - 65-89% reduction)

Crash Modification Factors can be found in Attachment 9.

Measure B Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- High: The highest rated projects in this criterion will serve the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists with the greatest safety and least pedestrian and bicyclist delay, detour, or discomfort. Score projects higher if selected countermeasures are designed to be comfortably used by people of all ages and abilities. The highest scoring projects will provide frequent, safe, at-grade crossing opportunities to prioritize directness and convenience with safety. Score projects higher if design elements are included to help motorists drive slower. The response will include quantitative or qualitative metrics showing a high level of improvement using an established methodology.
- Medium-High
- Medium: Mid-range projects in this measure may make a strong case as to how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for people outside of vehicles but without quantitative data or using a less established methodology. These projects may require lengthy detours or elevation changes or have less

frequent at-grade crossings that do not align well with destinations. Similarly, mid-range projects may have quantitative or qualitative data and an established methodology but only offer a small improvement to the multimodal experience.

- Medium-Low
- Low: Projects that make minimal improvement to the travel experience, safety and security for people outside of vehicles should receive low points in this measure. These projects may include motor vehicle design elements that raise concerns for pedestrian and bicyclist safety, such as increased vehicle speeds or increased crossing distances that would not be fully mitigated by any safety countermeasures for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that do not improve the travel experience and safety for people outside of vehicles should receive zero points for this measure.

▼ Community Considerations

The Regional Solicitation **Community Considerations** criterion draws on multiple Metropolitan Council and Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) policies, including:

Imagine 2050 and Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) Goal: Our region is equitable and inclusive. Racial inequities and injustices experienced by historically marginalized communities have been eliminated and all people feel welcome, included, and empowered.

Imagine 2050 Equity Statement: Equity means that historically excluded communities – especially communities of color – have measurably improved outcomes through an intentional and consistent practice of adapting policies, systems, services, and spending so that they contribute to the repair of both historic and ongoing injustice.

Imagine 2050 contains an Equity and Environmental Justice Framework, which is a people-centered approach that should guide regional processes and actions to work toward a more equitable region. A description of the framework is linked here [Imagine 2050: Regional Vision, Values, Goals - Revised for Adoption](#). The three components of the framework include:

- A people-centered, data-driven decision-making approach
- Prioritized engagement with overburdened communities
- Provision of benefits to the communities that go beyond harm mitigation

TPP Policies or Objectives: TPP Policies and Objectives related to achieving the regional equitable and inclusive goal include:

- Conduct engagement activities and implement shared decision making with historically underrepresented communities throughout policy making, planning, and project development to ensure equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of transportation investments.
- Evaluate processes, policies, programs, and plans to ensure that community benefits and burdens from transportation investments are distributed equitably.
- Implement investments that repair harms and impacts to historically disadvantaged communities from past highway investments.
- Implement strategies against gentrification and displacement caused by transportation investments.

TAB Communities to Consider: Beginning with the Regional Solicitation redesign in 2014, the Transportation Advisory Board has identified “specific communities” that should be prioritized in transportation decision-making processes: people of color, Indigenous people, low-income, disabled, youth and older adult populations. These specific communities should be engaged and empowered in transportation decision-making processes, and projects should be developed to specifically address their transportation needs.

Metropolitan Council staff have provided an interactive map that can be used to understand the composition of the communities of consideration within your project area. This map can serve as a basis for your response to each measure but applicants are encouraged to provide additional detail and understanding of community.

Other Key Concepts

Community Definition: For the Community Considerations scoring criterion, “community” is defined as people and groups of people who are adjacent to and/or impacted by the proposed project. This includes those who live, work, attend school, or access essential destinations (such as healthcare, shopping, or services) within the project area. Prioritized consideration is given to communities of color, Indigenous communities, low-income, disabled, youth, and older adult populations. The term “community” does not include transportation system users who only travel through the area without connecting to destinations within it. Transit users and others outside personal vehicles may be considered part of the community if their trips begin, end, or include stops within the project area.

Scoring: Three qualitative measures are used for the Community Considerations criterion as described below. Applicants will receive a High, Medium/High, Medium, Medium/Low, or Low rating for each of the three measures: (1) Community Data and Context, (2) Community Needs and Future Engagement, and (3) Community Benefits.

Funding Priority: Projects receiving a high score on each of the three measures, if any, will be considered for funding priority. Up to one (1) project from each solicitation round that was not otherwise selected for funding will be recommended for full funding in either the Roadway, Bike/Ped, Transit, or Environment categories.

Applicant Training Opportunities: The Met Council will provide optional yearly trainings for local agency staff to build their understanding of the Community Considerations criterion and measures. This training will also be centered around best practices set forth by the Council’s Equity Evaluation of Regional Transportation Investment Processes study.

Community Considerations Scoring: Scorers for the Community Considerations criterion will be selected based upon their experience and knowledge in community work, will have completed the Community Considerations training, and will meet multiple times as a group of scorers to discuss and agree upon scoring expectations. Projects recognized as a funding priority will be reviewed and agreed upon by all Community Considerations scorers. 2-3 Community Considerations scorers will be assigned to each project application.

This criterion measures the project's ability to ensure the needs of specific populations are considered and prioritized in transportation decisions.

A. Community Data and Context

Describe the project area's community data and context* including locations of specific communities and important regional and local destinations those community members access regularly. Relate the community data to the project purpose. Supplement widely available demographic data with community-specific information via additional maps or descriptions. Include any transportation history impacting the communities and intentional or unintentional past and ongoing harms caused by the transportation system (600 words or less).*

*Examples of detailed community data: demographics (race, ethnicity, age, low income, disabled), affordable housing locations, essential services, employers/job centers, schools, cultural resources, places of worship and social destinations.

The project area is located in the City of Golden Valley with a surrounding context that is primarily urban residential. Housing in the area is majority single-family homes with a few apartment complexes near the Xenia Avenue terminus. The project corridor crosses over Trunk Highway 100 and includes access ramps to/from the highway. There is a large commercial hub, nicknamed the Shops at West End, approximately 0.5-1 mile south of the western project terminus that includes multiple grocery stores, apartment buildings, restaurants, and employers.

Meadowbrook Elementary School and The Breck School are located immediately along the project corridor. Meadowbrook serves grades kindergarten through 5th and is part of the Hopkins Public School District. The Breck School is a private school serving preschool through 12th grade. Both schools are key destinations for families in the area.

Bryn Mawr Elementary School, Anwatin Middle School, and the Perpich Center for Arts Education are all within approximately a half mile of the project area. Bryn Mawr Elementary School is part of Minneapolis Public Schools and serves preschool through 5th grade students. Anwatin Middle School is also a part of the Minneapolis Public Schools district and serves grades 6th through 8th. Perpich Center for Arts Education (also called Perpich Arts High School) is a public arts-focused high school serving grades 11th through 12th. Heilicher Minneapolis Jewish Day School and Good Shepherd School are located within up to one mile of the project area. Given the very high density of K-12 educational institutions within the area served by this segment of CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave), it can be assumed that the project corridor experiences a high level of multimodal traffic from users under the age of 18 who have less experience navigating traffic safely as a person walking or biking.

Within the Hopkins Public School District, approximately 20% of students speak a language other than English as their primary language at home, including 9% of students who speak Spanish at home. Within the Minneapolis Public School District, approximately 30% of students speak a language other than English as their primary language at home, including 19% of students who speak Spanish at home.

Overall, approximately 24,000 people live in the census tracts within one half mile of the project, with 16% of the population being children under the age of 18 and 19% being adults over the age of 65. 59% of people in this area own their own homes and 35% of households rent. Attachment 10 provides an overview of the demographic makeup of the corridor and Attachment 7 outlines key community destinations within the corridor.

Applicants will receive a High, Medium/High, Medium, Medium/Low, or Low rating for each of the three measures. The expectations should be considered as cumulative, i.e., Medium builds on Low; High builds on Medium. Scoring via this rubric will be based exclusively on the application materials provided.

High: The project application:

- has granular, neighborhood-scale data and context on specific communities
- identifies cultural assets & significant sites validated by the communities (e.g., this community of low-income residents expressed a need to be able to walk to a health care destination)
- Describes any past and present transportation harms to community
- Has data on cultural history of communities

Medium: The project application:

- Has local maps and/or description beyond census data
- Has granular data or maps (e.g., knowledge of a concentration of a large youth population in this neighborhood or location)
- Identifies affordable housing locations and areas of low-income
- Links data to project purpose
- Identifies past system burdens.

Low: The project application:

- Include general census data on "specific communities," (e.g. "community has x% low-income population, versus the regional average of y%")
- Has a basic list of important destinations without demonstrating local knowledge
- Has a project area community description but lacks community insight or context

B. Community Needs and Future Engagement

Describe how the project was identified, and how it addresses a community need. Community needs may be identified through long-range or strategic planning, community surveys, formal or informal meetings and conversations with community members or neighborhood groups, outreach, and other means. Describe any discussion with specific communities, and how it contributed to identifying the project need. Describe how community engagement will occur throughout the project. Reference the engagement spectrum on page 55 of the Imagine 2050 Regional Vision, Values, and Goals chapter of the Regional Development Guide. Describe and link (if possible) documented organizational structures that support future engagement on the project; these structures could include policies, procedures, financial or staff resources, or other documents (600 words or less).*

Hennepin County uses a data-driven approach to identify transportation road and bridge projects, with many new projects identified on a biennial frequency based on criteria around asset condition, safety, disparities elimination and usage. This project builds upon outreach completed as part of a 2020 mill and overlay and restriping effort along the corridor. During previous engagement efforts, the county met with residents as part of a study group, held multiple open houses, and presented project information to city council members. These efforts surfaced a community desire for separated bicycle facilities, improved sidewalk connections, and safe crossings along the corridor.

This project builds upon several rounds of outreach completed as part of a 2020 mill and overlay and restriping effort along the corridor. During previous engagement efforts, the county met with residents as part of a study group that held four meetings, held multiple open houses, and presented project information to city council members. These efforts surfaced a community desire for separated bicycle facilities, improved sidewalk connections, and safe crossings along the corridor.

The project need and initial scope as a regional bikeway project was further identified from direct feedback from residents, business owners, and elected officials from the City of Golden Valley and the county's own Bicycle Advisory Committee. Multiple comments from community members expressed a desire for separated bicycle facilities, intersection improvements at Theodore Wirth Parkway, and pedestrian facility improvements. In response to a mailer sent out by the county as part of the repaving engagement, the county received nearly 50 mailed comment forms from residents and multiple email communications from residents. Certain comments specifically highlighted the need for safe bikeways for students who wish to access Meadowbrook Elementary School by bicycle. This community input supports the county's assessment that a safe, separated bicycle facility is needed and desired by residents along CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave).

Future engagement will build off of feedback from the 2020 project as well as comments received through the county's mumble strip pilot along a portion of the project corridor. Based on information collected to-date, the piloting of mumble strips has been viewed as a success. The engagement for the 2020 project included multiple meetings with key stakeholders, an open house at Golden Valley City Hall, and a coordinated study group comprised of city and county staff, Breck School staff, and residents. The recommendations from this engagement included sidewalk improvements, safety improvements at the intersection with Theodore Wirth Parkway, and a dedicated bicycle facility. Attachment 11 provides material from this engagement effort.

Applicants will receive a High, Medium/High, Medium, Medium/Low, or Low rating for each of the three measures. The expectations should be considered as cumulative, i.e., Medium builds on Low; High builds on Medium. Scoring via this rubric will be based exclusively on the application materials provided.

High: The project application:

- References documented organizational structures that support future engagement on the project, e.g. Policy, procedure, and/or budget to compensate engagement participants; Formal, approved engagement plan; Anti-displacement policy, strategy, or funding; Reparative project goals shaped by community; Commitment to financial opportunity for local businesses and contractors; Advisory committee charter; Dedicated project engagement staff; Other governing board or council action demonstrating a commitment to community considerations.

Medium: The project application:

- Describes how the project need was identified through planning and information-gathering work with communities
- Describes how input from engagement with "specific communities" helped identify the project need and purpose
- References Imagine 2050 Engagement Spectrum (engagement and power sharing levels) and identifies future community engagement activities
- Describes how specific communities will be included and prioritized in future engagement efforts

Low: The project application:

- Does not link past planning and information-gathering work with communities to identify project need
- References planning work that is too broad to practically influence project need
- Does not include description of input and interactions with "specific communities" that helped identify the project need
- Does not include description or commitment to future engagement efforts with communities

C. Community Benefits

Provide a description of the anticipated project benefits and how these benefits address the needs of the identified communities. Describe any past or ongoing burdens the project will mitigate and how any potential new impacts or burdens will be addressed (600 words or less).*

The proposed project will benefit families and residents biking, walking, and rolling to any of the six K-12

schools, Theodore Wirth Park, or the neighborhoods within the project area by constructing a separated bicycle facility with protection from vehicle traffic. The addition of new sidewalk along the majority of the corridor will meet the expressed community need for safe, accessible, and dedicated pedestrian facilities along CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave). The project also anticipates meeting the need for an improved intersection design at Theodore Wirth Parkway and will introduce proven safety countermeasures to calm vehicle traffic, promoting safety and comfort for all users.

The anticipated off-street and protected bikeway design will encourage cycling among “Interested by Concerned” users and expected lower-experience users under the age of 18. The proposed project will provide an important connection to bicycle trails at Theodore Wirth Park and the Grand Rounds Trail Network at the eastern terminus. An anticipated future Three Rivers Park District trail will provide connections to the project’s western terminus at Xenia Ave and will benefit residents of affordable housing just over a mile from the project’s limits, southwest of this segment of CSAH 40 (Glenwood Ave).

Increased noise and impacts to the roadway and sidewalks are anticipated during construction. The contractor will be required to follow temporary traffic control plans which will specify detour routes for all people travelling through the corridor. Maintaining neighborhood access points will be critical and staff will seek out opportunities to ensure that residents are not negatively impacted during construction.

Applicants will receive a High, Medium/High, Medium, Medium/Low, or Low rating for each of the three measures. The expectations should be considered as cumulative, i.e., Medium builds on Low; High builds on Medium. Scoring via this rubric will be based exclusively on the application materials provided.

High: The project application:

- Describes how project repairs past burdens and barriers
- Describes how project improves safe access to priority destinations
- Describes how project adds context-sensitive features beyond transportation needs (e.g. art, greenspace, other community-influenced elements).

Medium: The project application:

- Describes benefits for specific communities
- Ties benefits directly to community-identified needs
- Describe how benefits were identified through engagement
- Includes early mitigation plans for project burdens.

Low: The project application:

- Does not describe project benefits for specific communities
- Describe benefits in general terms for all users
- Does not acknowledge potential project burdens, despite high potential for them to arise.

▼ Funds & Payments - Internal

Current Amount Recommended:

▼ Funding Sources

Funding Sources

No Funding Sources available

▼ Payments and Refunds

Payments and Refunds

Add Payment

No transactions available

▼ Grant Requirements - Internal

Progress Reports

No Progress Reports available

▼ ArcGIS - Internal

gis_taz_population:

gis_regional_destinations:
gis_taz_jobs:
gis_project_location_description:

▼ Review & Feedback - Internal

Program: Regional Solicitation
Sub Program: Regional Solicitation - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
Assigned Council Program Contact:
Finance Unit Reviewer:

External Reviewers

Reviewers

▼ Internal Reviewers

Comments Returned to
Applicant:

Program
Feedback:

▼ Evaluative Criteria

Measure A – Connection to Key
Destinations:

Measure A – Identified Network
Priorities:

Measure A – Connection to existing
safety planning efforts:

Measure B – Safety improvements for
people outside of vehicles:

Measure A – Facility Type:

Measure B – Design Features and
roadway crossings:

Evaluative Criteria Total: 0

Dates & Financials - Internal Only

Start Date:

End Date:

Amount Requested: \$5,500,000.00

Total Project Budget:

▼ Communications & Relationships - Internal

Relationships

Interactions

► Signals (0 Signals)

► Internal Notifications (0 internal notifications)

OUTLOOK EMAIL COMPONENT

SYSTEM GENERATED EMAIL ALERTS

▼ Notes & History - Internal

Status

Initial Review

Adobe Sign

Agreement ID:

Adobe Status:

Latest Event:

Adobe Executed Date:

NOTES

Draft → Initial Review

Created by Emily Buell at 7:34 AM on June 22, 2026

HISTORY

Show History

Updated By: Emily Buell

Created By: Emily Buell

Updated At: 6/22/2026

Created At: 5/14/2026