Saint Paul - Public Works

Wabash Raymond Separated Bikeway

Regional Solicitation - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

ID: R-2026-05278

Jimmy Shoemaker

Requested: $4,831,712

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: Saint Paul - Public Works

▼ Organization Information

Organization Name	Saint Paul - Public Works
Legal Name	Saint Paul - Public Works
Street Address	25 W 4th ST #1500
Street Address 2	
City	St Paul
County	Ramsey
State	Minnesota
Country	United States of America
ZIP Code	55101

▼ Contact Information

Contact	Full Name	Email	Phone
Primary Grant Contact	Jimmy Shoemaker	jimmy.shoemaker@ci.stpaul.mn.us	
Authorized User	Anna Potter	anna.potter@ci.stpaul.mn.us	
Grant Administration	Reuben Collins	reuben.collins@ci.stpaul.mn.us	651-266-6059
Developer 1			
Developer 2			

▼ Project Information

Project Name*	Wabash Raymond Separated Bikeway
Select Primary county where project is located*	Ramsey
Cities or Townships where the Project is located*	St. Paul
Jurisdictional Agency (if different than applicant):	

Brief project description*

The proposed project includes a sidewalk-level separated bikeway and other street safety improvements on Wabash Avenue (Wabash) and Raymond Avenue (Raymond) in Saint Paul between Cromwell Avenue (Cromwell) and Territorial Road (Territorial). Wabash and Raymond south of University Avenue (University) are Minor Collectors. Raymond north of University is a Minor Arterial. The project fills a critical all ages and abilities bikeway gap in the Saint Paul Grand Round, a 27-mile parkway that connects Regional Parks and the Mississippi River to one another. The Grand Round is mostly complete, with this proposed project being the last remaining gap before full implementation. It connects a separated bikeway on Pelham Boulevard (being added summer 2026) to the bikeway on Raymond north of Territorial. Along with the improvements for people biking, additional traffic calming and pedestrian crossing improvements are included in the project.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Description*

MSAS 213 (Wabash Ave) and MSAS 242 (Raymond Ave) from Cromwell Ave to CSAH 34 (University Ave) and CSAH 46 (Raymond Ave) from CSAH 34 to MSAS 205 (Territorial Rd), Construct separated bikeway and other street safety improvements.

Provide the project length to the nearest one-tenth of a mile*	0.5
Lead Agency*	City of Saint Paul
ZIP Code where majority of work is being performed*	55114
Approximate begin construction date (mo/yr)*	5/1/2031
Approximate end construction date (mo/yr)*	11/30/2031

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

Wabash Raymond Separated 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 corrdior)

Roadway Name*	Wabash-Raymond Aves
From Cross-Steet*	Cromwell Ave
To Cross-Street*	Territorial Rd
Length of multimodal facilities included in project (nearest 0.1 miles, include all that apply using the best available information)*	0.5
Multiuse trail*	0
Separated bicycle facility*	0.5
On-street bicycle facility*	0
Sidewalk*	0.3
Miles of facility on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles)*	0.5
Miles of new RBTN facilities*	0.25
Miles of improved existing RBTN facilities*	0.25
Miles of facility on the regional trail network (nearest 0.1 miles)*	0.5

Miles of new Regional Trail facilities*	0.25
Miles of improved existing Regional Trail facilities*	0.25
AADT on parallel or adjacent roadway*	7000
Number of improved ADA ramps*	32
Number of intersection improvements*	9

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.)*

Curb and gutter, lighting, separated bikeway, sidewalk, ped ramps, signals, road geometry, traffic calming

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$*	$4,831,712.00
Project Total: $*	$6,039,640.00

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:	$1,207,928.00

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

Match percentage:	20%

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 capital funding (MSA)
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*	$3,996,410.00
Bicycle/Pedestrian Costs*	$2,043,230.00
Transit/TDM Capital Costs*	$0.00
Transit/TDM Operating Costs*	$0.00

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.

N/A

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 (11)

[FINAL] 2026 Letter of Support - Wabash-Raymond Separated Bikeway.pdf
Optional Attachments 1
Added by Jimmy Shoemaker at 10:30 AM on June 24, 2026

Ramsey County Letter of Support - Wabash and Raymond_BEI Signed.pdf
Optional Attachments
Added by Jimmy Shoemaker at 10:26 AM on June 24, 2026

Wabash Raymond One Pager.pdf
Project Summary
Added by Jimmy Shoemaker at 10:24 AM on June 24, 2026

Cost Worksheet Wabash Raymond Separated Bikeway.xlsx
Total Project Cost Worksheet
Added by Jimmy Shoemaker at 10:22 AM on June 24, 2026

Wabash Raymond Bikeway CEZ Letter of Support 6.24.26.docx.pdf
Resolution of Support
Added by Jimmy Shoemaker at 5:01 AM on June 24, 2026

1 - 5 of 11 Records

▼ 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*

The following objectives and policies apply to the Wabash Raymond Bikeway project:
Objective: An Equitable and Inclusive Region, Policies 5, 6 (the project will meet or exceed ADA standards; the project will not include right of way takings)
Objective Healthy and Safe Communities, Policies 9, 10, 11, 13 (the project design is high-quality and comfortable, and reflects guidance from NACTO, MnDOT BFDM; the design works to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries by separating modes, improving visibility, and slowing drivers; the design prioritizes safety of people outside vehicles; the project invests in streets to reduce the reliance on modes that contribute to negative impacts to health)
Objective: A Dynamic and Resilient Region, Policies 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23 (the project implements the RBTN Tier 1 alignment; the project prioritizes a gap in the RBTN; the project improves pedestrian safety and traffic calming; the project promotes multimodal travel options; the project provides high-quality connection for people walking and biking to Green Line LRT; the project implements a more balanced and complete street).
Objective: Leading on Climate, Policy 31 (the project reduces VMT)

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*

City of Saint Paul Bicycle Plan (2024), pages 9, 91
City of Saint Paul Master Plan for the Grand Round North Regional Trail (2020), pages 11, 43
City of Saint Paul Grand Round Design and Implementation Plan (2017), pages 1, 68

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*	1/13/2016
Link to plan*	https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/Media%20Root/ADA%20Transiton%20Plan%20for%20Public%

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 Alignment (Tier 1)

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

The alignment proposed is both an RBTN Tier 1 Alignment and a Regional Trail (Grand Round North Regional Trail).

(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.

The Raymond-Wabash bikeway project connects several important destinations within a half mile. Perhaps more importantly, the project fills a critical gap in the broader bikeway network, and increases the reach beyond the limits of the project.
Immediately adjacent to the project is Avalon School, a 6-12 alternative school. The project also directly connects to Mountain of Fire Ministries on University and Raymond. This intersection of University and Raymond is seen as "downtown South Saint Anthony Park" and is a community destination for many daily needs. The intersection along the proposed project is often seen full of people walking to and from the light rail and businesses. Along the project, the bikeway connects to Dual Citizen brewery, four restaurants, a coffee shop, and several other retail shops on the blocks on either side of Raymond and University. Additionally, there are several office spaces and large apartment buildings in the immediate vicinity (Moda on Raymond, C & E Lofts, and Seal Hi-Rise).
Perhaps more importantly, the project fills a gap between Raymond Ave bike lanes on the north, and the Pelham Blvd separated bikeway on the south (being constructed summer 2026). These bikeways connect to four parks and the Hampden Park co-op grocery store all within a half mile.
Extended past a half mile from the project, the UMN Transitway and Como portion of the Grand Round (separated bikeways) connect to the U of M, the Minnesota State Fairgrounds and an additional 27 miles of separated bikeways along the Grand Round and the Mississippi River.
Finally, the proposed project connects directly to Metro Transit's Green Line LRT, with a station platform directly at Raymond Ave and University Ave. Filling this gap in the network would extend the reach of existing bikeways and the regional transit network for first and last mile connections.

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*

- Entire project length — Edit | View

Segment Name/Description	Proposed Facility Type	Proposed Facility Length	Roadway AADT	Motor Vehicle Design Speed	Number of Lanes in Each Direction
Entire project length	Off-street bikeway	0.5	7000	25	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 project provides a separated bikeway for the entire length of the project. This all-ages-and-abilities design will be distinct and separated from the walking space, which in a dense urban area with destinations along the property line, is an essential design element to avoid conflicts between people walking and biking. This separation between people walking and biking (and further physical separation from vehicle traffic) is consistent with best practices from NACTO, the new Design Guidance for Separated Bicycle Facilities (MnDOT), AASHTO Bike Guide, and FHWA Bike Facility Selection Guide.
The project has thought through specific design questions in a feasibility study. The two-way, sidewalk level bikeway is proposed at 10 feet wide typically, but achieves 12 feet in width when there is space within the right of way. Width between the bikeway and the curb is maximized for comfort where feasible, and to accommodate trees, snow storage, lighting, signage, and utilities. For most of the project, there is a minimum of 6 feet between the bikeway and street. The sidewalk, where proposed to be replaced with the project, is a comfortable 6 feet wide, and the space between the bikeway and sidewalk is often 6 feet, but a minimum of 2 feet in constrained areas. At driveway crossings, the sidewalk and bikeway are kept at grade, where they will be given priority (drivers will be entering bike and ped space, not the other way around). At minor street crossings, raised crossings and bumpouts will be considered and analyzed for drainage and feasibility at a later stage.
At Territorial Road on the north end of the project, the design will allow for a smooth and comfortable transition from separated bikeway to on street bike lanes that exist on Raymond north of Territorial. On the south end at Pelham, the design will match into the separated bikeway being added on Pelham Blvd in 2026.
Along the entire project, where impacted by construction, curb ramps are planned to be upgraded to ADA compliance. Additionally, several ped ramps are being added for comfort and accessibility (even if not impacted by construction).
Because the curb line is proposed to be moved toward the center of the street to accommodate the sidewalk-level bikeway, the entire curb-to-curb distance will be narrower than existing, and the resulting drive lanes will be narrower than existing. At intersections with a curb-side parking lane, crossings will be narrowed further with bumpouts.

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*):

Crash Risk Index >15, Location is listed in another safety plan that prioritizes reducing fatal and serious injury crashes.

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

The entire length of Raymond in the proposed project (from Wabash to Territorial) is identified in the Saint Paul Transportation Safety Action Plan (2024). The Plan identifies it as a High Crash Corridor for Vulnerable Road Users (bike and pedestrians). The Plan also identifies University Avenue as both a High Crash Corridor for Vulnerable Road Users and a High Injury Corridor (all crash types). See Figure 8 on page 11.

https://us.document-remediator.reciteme.com/storage/95d6b161-f753-4561-ab92-e3592d150c52/remediated/FINAL_TSAP_04.30.24-remediated.pdf

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

The proposed project will provide many safety benefits to people using Wabash and Raymond. Currently, the project area has segments of on-street striped bike lanes and no bike facility at all. A sidewalk-level separated bikeway will be added to the street along the entire project. The separated bikeway will fill a gap and directly connect bikeways on both ends of the project – no detour and no delay. The bikeway space will also be distinct and separated from people walking. A separated bikeway as proposed is consistent with FHWA Safe System Roadway Design Hierarchy guidance to Remove Severe Conflicts by separating road users who move at different speeds – cars separate from bikes and pedestrians, and bikes separate from pedestrians; each user has their own physically separated space. This design is very important as e-bikes become more popular. Because the existing curb will be moved in toward the center of the street to accommodate the separated bikeway, the at-grade crossings at intersections will be made narrower. Narrower crossings reduce exposure. Where on-street parking is proposed to remain, bumpouts will be added into the parking lane, further improving visibility at crossings, and improving the likelihood of drivers yielding to pedestrians. In addition to bumpouts at intersections, raised crossings are being considered at several minor intersections. These raised crossings prioritize the vulnerable user at conflict points, and indicate to drivers that they should expect people walking and biking. At driveways, the bikeway and sidewalk remain at sidewalk level (as opposed to ramping down). At the signalized intersections of Raymond University and Raymond Territorial, high visibility crosswalk markings will be added. Unsignalized intersections will be evaluated for markings. These types of improvements to visibility and sightlines are consistent with FHWA guidance to Increase Attentiveness and Awareness.
To be consistent with FHWA guidance to Reduce Vehicle Speeds, a narrower street will have a positive effect on traffic calming. The addition of bumpouts at corners will further narrow an already narrower street, which

has been proven to encourage slower driving speeds. Raised crossings across minor streets encourage slower approach and turning speeds at conflict points.
According to FHWA, converting an on-street bicycle lane to a separated bicycle lane can reduce bicycle-vehicle crashes by up to 53 percent. The CMF clearinghouse indicates a separated bike lane installed where there was no bike facility has a crash reduction factor (CRF) of 54 percent. A raised crossing has a CRF of 46 percent. MnDOT Design and Engineering webpage and supplement on curb extensions (bumpouts) indicates bumpouts “have been shown to improve driver yielding, slow vehicles, and reduce conflicts”.
Compared to the existing street, the proposed project will have a highly positive impact on safety for people outside vehicles.

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 identified in the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan as a Neighborhood Node. This definition is based on both existing and planned land use and development, neighborhood and master plans, community feedback on locations with market potential and neighborhood support, and locations of existing or planned transit. The land use of the area might appear primarily industrial, but this is changing, and will soon change more. Streets like Raymond and Wabash were designed and built for rail and freight operations, and lack sidewalk and safe bikeways to support today’s changing land use. These past decisions and designs harm and limit the community. For example, the large Westrock paper processing plant on the project’s south end at Raymond and Wabash closed in 2025 after decades of operation. Though no developer has been identified for the 25-acre site, the land use will likely change to include more density of people and jobs. The 2026 Pelham reconstruction (led by the City of Saint Paul) will remove rail tracks at Wabash and Pelham, and the project has coordinated directly with the railroad (M T Properties and Minnesota Commercial) to facilitate the removal.
Other land use changes and adaptive reuses of historic industrial buildings in the area are ongoing, including the popular Dual Citizen Brewery at University and Raymond. New restaurants like Khue’s Kitchen across Raymond from the new Playwright’s Center are drawing people to the area. Avalon School behind Khue’s Kitchen is a 6-12 grade school that uses project-based learning from the surrounding area in their education. A student from Avalon reflected on walking and biking in the area, including the importance of a Pelham connection and hazards of biking on Raymond. Please see that attached. Just west of Raymond on University is Jennings Community School. Students walk and take transit to Avalon and Jennings, and a new bikeway filling the gap between Raymond and Pelham will open new travel and project-based learning opportunities for students. Across University on Raymond is “downtown” South Saint Anthony Park, with a bustling commercial stretch of restaurants, coffee shops, a hardware store, and a record store. This project area is part of the larger “Creative Enterprise Zone” (CEZ), with a growing mix of makers and creative enterprises. Each year, the CEZ hosts Chromazone, a weekend-long mural installation on the sides of industrial buildings. The CEZ has been engaged in this application and is supportive of the proposed bikeway on Raymond and Wabash. Please see letter of support attached to this application.
There are two U.S. Census Tracts that include the project area. Generally, one north of University, and one south of University. According to the Regional Solicitation Data Atlas and 5 year ACS estimates, the two census tracts have the following demographics (north tract, south tract, respectively): 35.4 percent and 46.2 percent of people below 185% poverty rate, 43.5 percent and 47.3 percent of people identify as non-white, 10.2 percent and 12.0 percent identify as having a disability, 10.9 percent and 13.4 percent below age 18, and 7.0 percent 20.9 precent older than 65 years.
This demographic data, compared to the rest of the Metro area, show the need for this project. Indeed, even compared to many areas of Saint Paul and Minneapolis, the data shows how important this project is to meeting needs of certain groups. Particularly compelling is the relatively high proportion of people in poverty in tracts along the project. A high quality bicycle connection, and the related pedestrian and traffic calming proposed with this project fill a critical gap in the all ages and abilities system for people who have less access to a personal automobile – connecting the first and las mile from their home or workplace to high frequency and high quality transit like the Green Line LRT.

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).*

The proposed project was identified through years of planning and engagement. The vision for the Saint Paul Grand Round as a connected route of parkways dates back to Horace Cleveland's work in 1872! Since then, much additional planning has taken place. The Grand Round Design and Implementation Plan (2017) and the Grand Round North Regional Trail Master Plan (2020) and the Saint Paul Bicycle Plan (2024) all identify this as a need. All three plans were informed by robust community engagement work. The project proposed fills the final segment in the 27 mile Grand Round network.
There is also hyper local, community, and grassroots-identified need. The City of Saint Paul takes applications from community members for public improvements every other year and has a small pot of money to deliver the projects. This process is called the Capital Improvement Budget (CIB). It is a highly competitive application process and many quality applications go unfunded. In 2024, the Saint Anthony Park Community Council (District Council 12, aka SAPCC), submitted a CIB application to "create a two-way protected bike facility on Wabash Ave. to connect the Grand Round bike facility on Pelham Boulevard" – a subsegment of the proposed application here. Unfortunately, the CIB application was unfunded due to budget constraints, but the CIB shows local grassroots and District Council support for the project described in this application. In the CIB application from SAPCC, the community describes the need and impact: "Adding protected lanes on the block between Pelham and Cromwell meets an unmet need for an accessible, low-stress east-west bike connection between the Grand Round and many destinations/locations to the west, which would have positive effects on St. Anthony Park as well as other districts, most obviously Union Park."
Outside of the CIB application, SAPCC has documented support in their local 10 year District Council Plan. Item T4: Encourage bicycling through safer infrastructure and better amenities; T4.3: Advocate for bicyclist safety through street design, including separated/protected lanes and bicyclist intervals at traffic signals. Please see the attached letter of support from SAPCC.
In documentation, SAPCC has identified this specific project area as the "worst part of the Grand Round" because of the existing railroad tracks, unprotected bike lanes, and sharrows". In SAPCC comments submitted during the Saint Paul Bicycle Plan update in 2024, the District Council requests to "Kill the last Sharrow…on the block of Raymond between Myrtle and University. Restriping with narrower lane widths is one option; removing one side of parking is another".
The project proposed in this application would specifically address the documented requests from the hyper-local community-identified need.
If funded, city staff would continue engaging with SAPCC, the Creative Enterprise Zone, and local businesses and residents. This is typical of any funded project, and typically begins two years before construction with a project manager, a transportation planner, and specific engagement staff. SAPCC hosts many events per year, and staff have a long history of participating in those events to solicit feedback and communicate with the neighborhood. CEZ hosts an annual mural fest called Chromazone, which includes mural installations on buildings in this area. If this application is successful, CEZ has offered to partner with staff to further engage the neighborhood and businesses. Referencing the engagement spectrum in Imagine 2050, City of Saint Paul uses a variety of strategies depending on the timing and scope of a project. The city typically works towards a Collaborative level of engagement, by establishing and maintaining trust between staff and community organizations. Staff would partner with communities to define problems with the existing roadway design, developing alternatives, and choose solutions that address the problems with Wabash and Raymond.

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 separated bikeway on Wabash and Raymond would unlock access to a larger all ages and abilities network by filling a critical 0.5 mile gap. Identified by the Saint Anthony Park Community Council (SAPCC) as the “worst spot” of the entire Grand Round, the proposed improvements would provide safe access to young people traveling to school (Avalon, Jennings schools), neighbors and regional visitors looking to shop and visit locally-owned, small businesses, and everyone who wants to experience the Grand Round in its full and completed vision. A 2024 CIB application for funding submitted by SAPCC asked the city for funding to implement a portion of separated bikeway on Wabash - consistent with this application. The project was too expensive to be funded by the CIB funding, but this demonstrates a specific request and support from the local community for this project.
The past decisions to build streets to prioritize freight and rail traffic has left this area of the city with inadequate and uncomfortable streets for anyone besides those who have access to a private automobile. Where remaining freight operations still exist, they can be accommodated with the proposed design, though at a slower speed and safer operation. To implement the separated bikeway proposed in this application, it is likely that some on-street parking will be impacted. Consistent with the process of any project development, city staff intend to perform a parking study that looks at available parking capacity and demand, and where existing regulations could be modified to meet the demand.
As noted in a previous section, the demographic profile of the two census tracts indicates a need for investment consistent with the proposed project. Compared to many areas in Saint Paul, Minneapolis, and the metro area, this neighborhood has relatively high numbers of people under 18, over 65, experiencing poverty, are disabled, or non-white. Additionally, the two census tracts containing the project have 18.3 percent and 20.9 percent of households without access to a vehicle.
The above demographics indicate a need for investment in populations who have historically been disinvested in. Combined with the fact that 20 percent of people do not have access to a vehicle, the proposed design of a separated bikeway connecting to high quality transit would be highly beneficial to the community.

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:	$4,831,712.00
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 Jimmy Shoemaker at 10:42 AM on June 24, 2026

HISTORY

Show History

Updated By:	Jimmy Shoemaker
Created By:	Jimmy Shoemaker
Updated At:	6/24/2026
Created At:	6/11/2026