**Richfield - General**

68th Street Sidewalk

Regional Solicitation - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

**ID:** R-2026-05393

**Matt Hardegger**

**Requested:** $1,800,000

**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.***

AT - Pedestrian Facilities

## General Information

**Organization Name:** Richfield - General

### ▼ Organization Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization Name | Richfield - General |
| Legal Name | Richfield - General |
| Street Address | 6700 Portland Ave S |
| Street Address 2 | |
| City | Richfield |
| County | Hennepin |
| State | Minnesota |
| Country | United States of America |

| | |
|---|---|
| ZIP Code | 55423 |

## ▼ Contact Information

| Contact | Full Name | Email | Phone |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Primary Grant Contact** | Matt Hardegger | mhardegger@richfieldmn.gov | |
| **Authorized User** | Joe Powers | jpowers@richfieldmn.gov | |
| **Grant Administration** | Kristin Asher | kasher@richfieldmn.gov | |
| **Developer 1** | | | |
| **Developer 2** | | | |

## ▼ Project Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project Name*** | 68th Street Sidewalk |
| **Select Primary county where project is located*** | Hennepin |
| **Cities or Townships where the Project is located*** | Richfield |
| **Jurisdictional Agency (if different than applicant):** | |

**Brief project description***

Construction of a sidewalk along 68th Street from Lyndale Avenue to Portland Avenue, including curb reconstruction.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Provide the project length to the nearest one-tenth of a mile*** | 0.9 |
| **Lead Agency*** | City of Richfield |
| **ZIP Code where majority of work is being performed*** | 55423 |
| **Approximate begin construction date (mo/yr)*** | 6/1/2028 |
| **Approximate end construction date (mo/yr)*** | 11/30/2028 |

**Name or description of trail/ped facility (i.e., Cedar Lake Trail, University Avenue Sidewalk)**

**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 corrdior)**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Roadway Name*** | 68th Street |
| **From Cross-Steet*** | Lyndale Avenue |
| **To Cross-Street*** | Portland Avenue |
| **Length of multimodal facilities included in project (nearest 0.1 miles, include all that apply using the best available information)*** | 0.9 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Multiuse trail*** | 0 |
| **Separated bicycle facility*** | 0 |
| **On-street bicycle facility*** | 0 |
| **Sidewalk*** | 0.9 |
| **Miles of facility on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles):** | 0 |
| **Miles of new RBTN facilities:** | 0 |
| **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*** | 528 |
| **Number of improved ADA ramps*** | 30 |
| **Number of intersection improvements*** | 14 |

**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.)***

Grade, Agg base, CONC Surf, Sidewalk, Ped Ramps

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*** | More |
| **Within 1/2 mile of project*** | More |

**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$*** | $1,800,000.00 |
| **Project Total: $*** | $1,800,000.00 |

*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:** $0.00

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

**Match percentage:** 0%

*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*** Local Funds

**Please check the years that are feasible for your program.*** 2028 (All projects), 2029 (All projects)

Active Transportation applications will need to complete the Total Project Cost Worksheet (attach this worksheet in the application documents) AND also complete the Fluxx Budget tool below (Click on the Edit button in the "What is the grant amount requested for each activity?")

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.

Read and Complete the Total Project Cost Worksheet Instruction and fill out the worksheet. After you have completed the worksheet then enter the costs from the Grant Request Amount column into Fluxx Budget Tool. You will need to enter all line items with associated costs, but only from the **Grant Request Amount column**.

- If you have “Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements” in your budget, you will be required to provide a description of the line item by replacing the Line Item text with your description.
- There is no local match. Therefore, it is possible your Total Project Cost will be equal to the Grant Request Amount. However, if your Total Project Cost exceeds the maximum award for the category, the entire cost must be identified in the Total Project Cost Worksheet.

The information entered into Fluxx should match your budget included in the attachments. This is how you will make claims against your grant award.

**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 and entered the required information.** Yes

## ▼ 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 (8)

Resolution 2026-12431 RegSol 68thWalk.pdf
**Resolution of Support**
Added by Matt Hardegger at 6:07 AM on June 25, 2026

RRS_68th_Figures_20260625.pdf
**Map or Concept Drawing**
Added by Matt Hardegger at 6:07 AM on June 25, 2026

68th_Sidewalk_One_Page_Summary.pdf
**Project Summary**
Added by Matt Hardegger at 6:28 AM on June 24, 2026

Key Destinations 68thStSidewalk_Revised.pdf
**Connection to Key Destinations Map**
Added by Matt Hardegger at 6:27 AM on June 24, 2026

Richfield_68th Walk_SPACE.pdf
**SPACE Tool Score**
Added by Matt Hardegger at 5:48 AM on June 24, 2026

1 - 5 of 8 Records

1 2

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 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***

Objectives: An equitable and inclusive region, Healthy and safe communities, A dynamic and resilient region, Leading on climate

Policies: Policy 2: Funding, Policy 3: Asset management, Policy 4: Shared decision-making, Policy 5: Needs of people with disabilities, Policy 7: Equitable Benefits and Burdens, 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, Policy 16: Eliminate bicycle/pedestrian gaps and barriers, Policy 17: Pedestrian network, Policy 21: Travel demand management, Policy 22: Multimodal connections, Policy 23: Complete Streets approach, Policy 27: Mitigate climate impacts, Policy 30: Reduce greenhouse gases, Policy 31: Reduce vehicle miles traveled

**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***

2018 Richfield Pedestrian Master Plan, page 43 (Lyndale to Nicollet segment)
2024 Richfield Active Transportation Action Plan, page 47: https://mn-richfield.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/985/Richfield-Active-Transportation-Action-Plan-PDF (full project)

---

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 state statute 473.4465 Subd. 3(7). All bicycle and pedestrian applications 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 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 |

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*** | 2/25/2014 |
| **Link to plan*** | https://mn-richfield.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/1634 |

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 |

Projects must exclude right-of-way acquisition costs. Projects within these categories are eligible to include costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering.

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 Local Pedestrian Facilities application category is intended to fund construction of and improvements to pedestrian-focused facilities that improve mobility, safety or accessibility for pedestrians in local communities.

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.

Selected projects in this category will be funded through the Regional Active Transportation Sales Tax, and as such, project selection must be based on:

1. Project's inclusion in a municipal or regional nonmotorized transportation system plan;
2. Extent to which policies or practices of the political subdivision encourage and promote complete streets planning, design, and construction;
3. Extent to which the project supports connections between communities and to key destinations within a community;
4. Identified barriers or deficiencies in the nonmotorized transportation system;
5. Identified safety or health benefits;
6. Geographic equity in project benefits, with an emphasis on communities that are historically and currently underrepresented in local or regional planning; and
7. Ability of a grantee to maintain the active transportation infrastructure following project completion.

The qualifying and scoring criteria for this category are designed to address these seven state requirements.

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.

- Sidewalk construction (single corridor or areawide improvements)
- At-grade pedestrian crossing improvements
- ADA improvements
- Streetscape improvements that encourage walking

## ▼ Evaluative Criteria

**1. Complete Streets**

This criterion measures the extent to which the applicant encourages or promotes complete streets planning, design, and construction in direct response to one of the statutory funding requirements.

**Measure A Complete Streets Planning, Design, and Construction**

**If applicable, provide a link to the applicant agency's complete streets policy, or another document that provides information on the agency's practices. Agencies or organizations without roadway ownership or jurisdiction may include the community's local ordinance or policy where the project is located and describe how the project would support advancing complete streets in this community***

https://mn-richfield.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/979/Complete-Streets-Policy-PDF

**Additionally, provide a description (400 words or less) of ways the agency encourages or promotes complete streets planning, design, and construction as part of its operations and how those practices will be applied to the project.***

Richfield first adopted a Complete Streets policy in 2013, which has guided the reconstruction of seven four-lane arterial or collector roadways to accommodate users of all ages and abilities using all forms of transportation. Through this policy, bikeways, sidewalks, and other multimodal features are required inclusions, except in rare circumstances with heavy constraints. In practice, Richfield has prioritized the pedestrian and bicyclist experience in roadway reconstructions since the adoption of this policy, constructing buffered sidewalks, separated bikeways, and adding pedestrian scale lighting to all full reconstructions, as well as retrofitting sidewalks into existing roadways where space is available.

For this project, the primary mode of travel being prioritized is pedestrians and mobility device users, while maintaining sufficient space and through movement for vehicles. The roadways are relatively low-volume, neighborhood streets with sufficient right of way available to re-allocate existing space for pedestrians. This separated path will help to create a more inviting walking environment for neighbors and a more inviting multimodal environment for students and others traveling to Downtown Richfield, Wood Lake Nature Center, Holy Angels, and Richfield City Hall.

**Measure A Scoring Guidance**

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may score at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria. For agencies or organizations without roadway jurisdiction, scores should be based on the community policy in which the project is located. These applications may score higher if the applicant organization demonstrates a commitment to complete streets principles in their activities beyond the local community the project is located.

- High: The highest rated projects in this measure will be from agencies that have a strong adopted complete streets policy and show how the applicant generally encourages and promotes the use of complete streets principles as part of its operations. This may include citing specific requirements, practices, and examples. For agencies or organizations without roadway jurisdiction, consider the local community's policies or practices where the proposed project is located. Agencies without an officially adopted complete streets policy may score highly with a strong narrative response that demonstrates how they employ similar practices as an organizational priority.
- Medium-High
- Medium: Mid-range projects in this measure may be from agencies that have an adopted complete streets policy, but the policy may lack specifics, or the agency does not cite evidence for how they encourage and promote complete streets on a daily basis. This may include a lack of specific examples. For agencies or organizations without roadway jurisdiction, consider the local community's policies or practices where the proposed project is located.
- Medium-Low
- Low: Agencies that do not have an adopted complete streets policy and make minimal effort to follow complete streets principles should be rated low. For agencies or organizations without roadway jurisdiction, consider the local community's policies or practices where the proposed project is located.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Agencies that do not have an adopted complete streets policy and do not provide evidence for how the applicant generally follows complete streets principles should receive zero points for this measure.

---

**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, along with a written response (300 words or less) that highlights the key destinations served and their importance to the local community. 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.***

This sidewalk creates an alternate east-west path connecting key destinations in and around downtown Richfield. The 66th and Lyndale area is a retail and medical hub for the community, with three primary clinics, a dentist, and several specialty clinics. The sidewalk also strengthens the neighborhood connection to Wood

Lake Nature Center, a 150-acre natural area that is a regional destination dedicated to environmental education, wildlife observation, and outdoor recreation. The middle of the project connects residents to the Academy of Holy Angels and the Catholic Church of St. Peter as well as the major local bus transfer point at 66th Street and Nicollet Avenue, while the east end of the project connects to Richfield City Hall, Heredia Park, and the METRO D Line station at 66th Street and Portland Avenue.

67th Street is not a continuous street, so 68th Street provides the only east-west alternate pedestrian route south of 66th Street.

**Measure B - Connection to schools**

Projects that improve safe connections to K-12 schools are eligible for additional points as a way to continue implementing the principles of providing Safe Routes to Schools.

**Select all that apply***

This project provides an indirect connection to a K-12 school by constructing improvements that come within ¼ mile of a K-12 school.

**Indirect Connection - List the school(s):**

Academy of Holy Angels, Blessed Trinity Catholic School

**Measure B Scoring Guidance**

Consider the information provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the guidance provided below.

- 5 points: Project provides a direct connection to a K-12 school.
- 3 points: Project provides an indirect connection to a K-12 school
- 0 points: Projects that are not within 1/4 mile of a K-12 school will also receive zero points.

**Measure C - Active Transportation Demand**

Identify the project location's score on MnDOT's Priority Areas for Walking (PAWS) Tool. This score measures the location's relative priority for pedestrian improvements based on a variety of environmental, physical and demographic factors.

**Use the PAWS tool to identify the highest score in the project area. PAWS scores will be verified as part of the scoring process.***

28

**Measure C Scoring Guidance**

The applicant with the highest PAWS score will receive the full points available to this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored showed a PAWS score of 10, and the top project had score of 15, this applicant would receive (10/15)*5 points, or 3.33 points. Rounded to the nearest integer, this application would receive 3 points.

---

**3. Identified Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies**

This criterion measures the project's contribution toward creating a connected, accessible, and comfortable active transportation network. Projects will be scored based on a tiered system that prioritizes filling network gaps.

**Measure A - Gaps, barriers or deficiency addressed**

**Select all that apply***

This project fills a network gap or improves a barrier by constructing a new facility that connects to other existing bicycle facilities or a community destination and serves users of all ages and abilities.

**Please provide a written response (300 words or less) that explains the ways this project addresses a gap, barrier, or deficiency on the existing system.***

Due to the railroad bisecting Richfield at Pleasant Avenue, there are limited routes that connect Richfield from Lyndale Avenue to the east. Currently, there are sidewalks on 66th Street and 70th Street, which are 1/2 mile apart. This project would reduce the distance from most residents in the area to an east-west sidewalk to less than 1/4 mile and provides a lower traffic separated sidewalk as an alternate pedestrian route to 66th Street.

**Measure A Scoring Guidance**

Scoring for this measure will be based on the tiered system listed below. Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and score projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Scores will be based upon the scorer's discretion and the information provided in the written response, with the option to provide reduced points if the scorer does not believe the gap, barrier or deficiency cited is adequately addressed to a level that makes the facility comfortable for all ages and abilities. Projects that checked multiple boxes will receive the highest tier of points that is adequately supported by the applicant's response.

- 25 points: Project fills a network gap or barrier by constructing a new facility that connects to other existing facilities or a key community destination.
- 20 points: Project addresses a system barrier or deficiency by constructing crossing improvements or increasing separation on an existing facility.
- 15 points: Project constructs a new bicycle facility but does not currently connect to another existing facility.
- 10 points: Project addresses a deficiency by improving facility condition but no additional improvements are anticipated.

---

**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.

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

Large portions of 66th Street between Lyndale Avenue and Portland Avenue have Crash Risk Indexes greater than 15 for pedestrians (using the bicyclist layer as requested). 68th Street is the closest south street that crosses the railroad tracks and is with 1/4 mile of 66th Street.

**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

Currently, 68th Street is a shared street, where pedestrians and bicyclists share space with vehicles. This project proposes to reduce that risk with two strategies from the Safe Systems Design Hierarchy.

The proposed project would construct a sidewalk for the full length of the segment to reduce pedestrian exposure to vehicles, and narrow the roadway with restricted parking on the sidewalk side to increase visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists. The separated sidewalk is intended to provide additional protection and comfort for pedestrians using the route by removing severe conflicts, while the narrower road is intended to reduce vehicle speeds through the project area.

A sidewalk is a a proven safety countermeasure that can reduce pedestrian crashes along roadways by 65-89% (FHWA).

**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.

Downtown Richfield is demographically older than other areas of the city, with two 55+ condominium communities, one 62+ housing cooperative, and two senior/assisted living buildings. Providing this sidewalk will increase access for these residents and other neighbors along the path to walk or roll to Holy Angels, the Catholic Church of St. Peter, and Richfield City Hall. The Census tract where this project is located (244), is 44.9% people over the age of 65, compared to 19.1% of the city as a whole.

The secondary benefit is an additional separated sidewalk facility for the residents in the NOAH apartment buildings along the railroad tracks and neighbors in the east half of Richfield generally, providing safer access to walk west to Wood Lake Nature Center and the other amenities of Downtown Richfield or east to City Hall.

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).***

This project has been identified through multiple rounds of citywide bike/ped planning. In 2018, the segment from Lyndale Avenue to Nicollet Avenue was identified as a Priority Pedestrian Corridor in the city's Pedestrian Master Plan. In 2024, it was again identified as a Key Neighborhood Corridor in the city's Active Transportation Action Plan from Lyndale Avenue all the way to Cedar Avenue. The downtown area is a large generator of pedestrian traffic with the concentration of retail, medical centers, and parks, including Wood Lake Nature Center.

Engagement with the residents of the area has not yet occurred. Engagement with the senior community living in the 66th/Lyndale Avenue area as well as the residents in the naturally occurring affordable housing along Pleasant Ave on the east side of the railroad tracks. Richfield has a well-documented Public Engagement Policy for projects in the public right of way that requires activities that span consult, involve, and collaborate on the engagement spectrum (https://www.richfieldmn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/984/Public-Engagement-Process-PDF). Staff collaborate with the public to develop a project problem statement that guides the design direction of the project. Staff then consult and involve the public through the remainder of the open house process to gain feedback on various tools that can address the collaborative problem statement and explain how that feedback influenced the design. This process leads to a final design that achieves the community-developed goals and can be supported by the public, policymakers, and staff.

For this project, since the problems have been identified through other planning means, the process will begin by confirming the previously defined problems with the community as a whole, to ensure that nothing has been missed and that perspectives previously not included are able to collaborate on the project's development. The public will be involved in sidewalk location, intersection and pedestrian crossing design, and greenspace usage.

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 primary benefit of this project is an ADA-compliant, buffered sidewalk along a key neighborhood route that connects Wood Lake Nature Center and Downtown Richfield to Holy Angels and Richfield City Hall. Within Richfield, locations to cross the railroad tracks at grade are limited, and this will upgrade an existing crossing location to provide more separation from motor vehicles.

The buffered sidewalk will create a more inviting path for residents of all ages and incomes to travel between these city landmarks via non-motorized means of transportation, as well as locations for additional greenery and plantings to make the path more comfortable.

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 – Complete Streets:**

**Measure A – Connection to Key Destinations:**

**Measure B – Connection to schools:**

**Measure C – Active Transportation Demand:**

**Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts:**

**Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles:**

**Measure A – Gaps, barriers or deficiency addressed:**

**Evaluative Criteria Total:** 0

## Dates & Financials - Internal Only

**Start Date:**

**End Date:**

**Amount Requested:** $1,800,000.00

**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 Matt Hardegger at 7:53 AM on June 25, 2026

HISTORY

Show History

| | |
|---|---|
| **Updated By:** | Matt Hardegger |
| **Created By:** | Matt Hardegger |
| **Updated At:** | 6/25/2026 |
| **Created At:** | 6/18/2026 |