Saint Paul - Public Works

East 7th Street Reactive Safety Project

Regional Solicitation - Unique Projects

ID: R-2026-05415

David Peterson

Requested: $7,000,000

Status Initial Review

▼ Table of Contents

General Information
Project Information
Project Funding
Document Requirements
Documents
Qualifying Requirements
Prioritizing Criteria and Measures
Evaluative Criteria
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.*

Reactive Safety

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	David Peterson	david.peterson@ci.stpaul.mn.us	
Authorized User	Bryan Graveline	bryan.graveline@ci.stpaul.mn.us	
Grant Administration	Reuben Collins	reuben.collins@ci.stpaul.mn.us	651-266-6059
Developer 1			
Developer 2	Erin Jordan	ejordan@sehinc.com	800-325-2055

▼ Project Information

Project Name*	East 7th Street Reactive Safety Project
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. Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc. Limit of 400 words*

The E 7th St Reactive Safety Project will improve safety, mobility, and multimodal access along E 7th St between Minnehaha Ave E (TH 5) and Johnson Pkwy (CSAH 64). This urban major collector serves commercial, residential, and regional travel.

E 7th St serves a diverse community with long-established neighborhoods, businesses, cultural institutions, and destinations. Transit routes provide connections to downtown Saint Paul and surrounding areas, supporting transit riders and improving access to jobs, education, and services.

This corridor ranks third on the Met Council's High Injury Network, reflecting a history of severe and fatal crashes and the need for safety improvements. The Project will reconstruct and modernize the corridor with a focus on multimodal improvements and safety.

Proposed improvements align with roadway changes being built with MnDOT's TH 5/E 7th Street project, expected to be completed fall 2026. Along the Project corridor, the proposed configuration will add a center left-turn lane, narrower travel lanes, and parking removal to reduce speeds and conflicts. Additional safety changes include curb extensions, ped refuge islands, upgraded crossings, and modernized traffic signals with countdown timers, leading pedestrian intervals, and accessible pedestrian features. Improvements at intersections including Minnehaha Ave, Forest St, and Johnson Pkwy, will address safety and operational issues related to skewed geometry and traffic demands.

Multimodal improvements include a two-way separated bikeway and sidewalk between Minnehaha Ave and the Earl St bridge. East of the bridge a shared-use path will be added due to space constraints. A 6-foot sidewalk will be rebuilt along the south side of the road. These improvements enhance safety, comfort, and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists while supporting the City's Bicycle Plan. Additional upgrades to lighting, signage, and pavement markings will improve visibility and overall system usability.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Description*

E 7th Street Reactive Safety Project, between Minnehaha Ave E (TH 5) and Johnson Parkway (CSAH 64), roadway reconstruction, signals, curb and gutter, drainage, stormwater management, sidewalk, pedestrian refuge islands, separated bikeway, lighting, ADA improvements and ADA ped ramps

Provide the project length to the nearest one-tenth of a mile*	1
Lead Agency*	City of Saint Paul
ZIP Code where majority of work is being performed*	55106
Functional Class of Road*	Major Collector
Road System*	MSAS
Road/Route No.*	193
Name of Road*	East 7th Street
Approximate begin construction date (mo/yr)*	4/15/2030
Approximate end construction date (mo/yr)*	12/1/2031

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

East 7th Street 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*	East 7th Street
From Cross-Street*	Minnehaha Avenue (TH 5)
To Cross-Street*	Johnson Parkway (CSAH 64)
Length of multimodal facilities included in project (nearest 0.1 miles, include all that apply using the best available information)*	1

Multiuse trail*	0.6
Separated bicycle facility*	0.4
On-street bicycle facility*	0
Sidewalk*	1.4
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
Miles of Facility along Updated Regional Truck Corridors:	0
Miles along Tier 1 facilities:	0
Miles along Tier 2 facilities:	0
Miles along Tier 3 facilities:	0
Number of Improved ADA Ramps*	38
Number of Intersection Improvements*	10

Primary types of work (Examples: Grade, AGG Base, BIT Base, BIT Surf, Sidewalk, Signals, Lighting, Guardrail, Bike path, Ped Ramps, Bridge, Parek and ride, etc.)*

AGG BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, BIKE PATH, SHARED USE PATH, PED RAMPS, LIGHTING

Bridge/culvert projects (if applicable)

Old Bridge/Culvert No.	
New Bridge/Culvert No.	
Structure is over/under (Bridge or Culvert Name):	
Does the project constructs new left-turn lanes?	No
Does the project synchronizes traffic signals to reduce delay time*	No

Project Funding

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

No

Grant Request Amount, US$*	$7,000,000.00
Project Total: $*	$13,242,539.00

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:	$6,242,539.00

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

Match percentage:	47%

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 (City) Common Cent Sales Tax Funds
Please check the years that are feasible for your program.*	2030 (Federal projects), 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*	$10,652,796.00
Bicycle/Pedestrian Costs*	$2,589,743.00

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.

The elements that are eligible to receive PROTECT funds include the storm sewer, erosion control, turf, portions of the concrete items (curb and gutter), roadway base improvements, lighting upgrades, and roadway elements.

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.

Other

1. For Proactive and Reactive Safety projects only: The applicant should attach the listing of crashes. For Reactive Safety projects only, attach the B/C worksheet(s) and the crash modification factors used. These documents must be attached within the web-based application form.

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)

Ramsey County Letter of Support - East 7th Street_BEI Signed.pdf

Other Document | Letter of Support (Ramsey County)
Added by David Peterson at 9:54 AM on June 24, 2026

STP_E 7thStReactiveSafety_Summary.pdf
Project Summary
Added by David Peterson at 7:00 AM on June 24, 2026

STP_E 7thStReactiveSafety_Existing Conditions Photo 2026.pdf
Photo Existing Conditions
Added by David Peterson at 7:00 AM on June 24, 2026

Total-Project-Cost-Worksheet_E-7th-St_Safety.xlsx
Total Project Cost Worksheet
Added by David Peterson at 6:55 AM on June 24, 2026

Regional Solicitation City of Saint Paul E 7th Street Safety Improvements.pdf
Other Document | Letter of Support (MnDOT)
Added by David Peterson at 5:56 AM on June 24, 2026

1 - 5 of 11 Records

1 2 3

Jump to Page

▼ Qualifying Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

Briefly list the applicable 2050 TPP objectives and policies*

An Equitable and Inclusive Region: Objectives 1, 2, and 3
Healthy and Safe Communities: Objectives 1, 2, 4, and 5
A Dynamic and Resilient Region: Objectives 1, 2, and 3
Leading on Climate: Objectives 1, 2, and 3
Natural Systems: Objective 1

Policy 1: Planning Support, Actions A, B, C, E, F, G
Policy 2: Funding, Actions A, B, C, E
Policy 3: Asset Management, Actions A, B, C
Policy 4: Shared Decision-Making, Actions A, B, C, E
Policy 5: Needs of People with Disabilities, Actions A, B, C, D, E
Policy 6: Gentrification & Displacement, Action A
Policy 7: Equitable Benefits & Burdens, Actions A, E, F
Policy 8: Repairing Past Harms, Action A
Policy 9: Quality Transportation Facilities, Actions A, B, C
Policy 10: Eliminate Traffic Deaths & Serious Injuries, Action A, B, C, F, G
Policy 11: Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety, Actions A, B, D
Policy 12: Safe, Secure, Welcoming Transit Facilities, Actions A, B, C, D
Policy 13: Reduce Negative Health Impacts, Actions A, B, C, F, I, J, M
Policy 14: Placemaking & Placekeeping, Actions A, C, D
Policy 15: Bicycle Network, Actions A, B, C, E

Policy 16: Eliminate Bicycle/Pedestrian Gaps & Barriers, Actions A, B, C, D, E
Policy 17: Pedestrian Network, Actions A, B, C, D
Policy 21: Travel Demand Management, Actions A, B, C, D
Policy 22: Multimodal Connections, Actions A, B, C, D
Policy 23: Complete Streets Approach, Actions A, B, C, D, E
Policy 27: Mitigate Climate Impacts, Actions A, B, C, D
Policy 30: Reduce Greenhouse Gases, Actions A, B, C, D
Police 31: Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled, Actions A, B, C
Policy 33: Protect Natural Systems, Actions A, B, C

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*

Metropolitan Council Regional Safety Action Plan (2022): pp. 3-5, 7, 11-12, 15-16, 24, 26, 36. (https://metrocouncil.org/getattachment/Transportation/Goals/Safety-and-Security/Regional-Safety-Action-Plan/Regional-Safety-Action-Plan.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US)

Saint Paul Transportation Safety Action Plan (2024): pp. 2-3, 11, 14-15, 22-23, 26; Appendix B pp. 10, 16. (https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/public-works/transportation-and-transit/transportation-safety-action-plan)

Saint Paul Bicycle Plan (2024): pp. 4-6, 15, 17, 23, 90, 98. (https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/2024-05/2024%20Saint%20Paul%20Bicycle%20Plan-for%20web.pdf)

Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan (2022): pp. 36-39, 41, 42, 47, 51, 57, 70, 72-76, 83, 84-87, 97, 112, 113, 116, 282, 286. (https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/2022-09/CSP_2040_CompPlan_FinalAdopted_Updated_091322.pdf)

Saint Paul Pedestrian Plan (2019): pp. 6, 7, 12, 13, 25-27, 29, 30, 34; Appendix A pp. 66, 67. (https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/Media%20Root/Public%20Works/Saint%20Paul%20Pedestrian%20Plan%206.13.19%20Compressed.pdf)

Saint Paul Climate Action & Resilience Plan (2019): pp. 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 32-33, 43, 48. (https://engagestpaul.org/climate2025/documents)

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. Applicants for the three application categories funded with Active Transportation Regional Sales Tax funds do not need to be a State Aid city or a county to apply.

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

▼ Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

2050 TPP Goal: Our communities are healthy and safe.
The Reactive Safety application category seeks to fund projects that reduce fatalities and serious injuries, as well as increase safety and comfort for people outside of vehicles by focusing on locations with a high documented severe crash history.

This application contributes to these 2050 TPP Objectives or Policies:

- Work to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries from traffic crashes and incidents on the transportation system by 2050 using the Safe System Approach.
- Emphasize and prioritize the safety of people outside of vehicles in the transportation right-of-way.

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.

- New intersection controls (e.g., roundabouts, reduced conflict intersections (RCIs), J-turns, refer to FHWA's Proven Safety Countermeasures for additional information)
- Intersection modifications (e.g., pavement messages, stop bars, lighting)
- New or modernized grade separations/interchanges that are driven by a safety need
- Separated bicycle or pedestrian facilities
- Pedestrian crossing treatments (e.g., curb extensions (bump-outs), pedestrian countdown timers, pedestrian refuge islands and raised medians, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs)
- Roadway reconstruction or reconfiguration that focuses on safety improvements (e.g., adding turn lanes, adding medians, adding bypass lanes or bypass lane conversions, changing intersection control, etc.)
- Road diets, lane modifications or turn lanes (e.g., 3 to 2-lane conversions, lane narrowing, bypass lane conversion, turn lane modifications, etc.)
- Segment safety improvements (e.g., rumble strips, wider striping (6"), embedded wet reflective striping, cable median barrier, delineation for sharp curves (chevrons), new guardrail (not replacement), shoulder widening, safety edge, friction treatments, lighting)
- Sight distance improvements (e.g. lighting, turn lane modification, intersection modification, etc.)
- Access management changes (e.g. frontage roads or access removals)

▼ Evaluative Criteria

1. Expected Reduction in Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes

This criterion measures the project's expected reduction in fatal and serious injury crashes based on the proposed Crash Modification Factors (CMFs).

Measure A – Crashes reduced (Benefit/Cost ratio)

Calculate the reduction in the total number of crashes due to improvements made by the project.

Crash data must be obtained for the project length for calendar years 2021 through 2025. Crash data should

include all crash types and severities, including pedestrian and bicycle crashes. Only crashes contained within the Minnesota Department of Public Safety's database can be used. If the agency submitting the application has access to MnCMAT2, crash data from that system can be used as part of the submittal. MnCMAT2 data will be reviewed by MnDOT to ensure accuracy. Crash data can also be obtained from MnDOT if an agency does not have access to MnCMAT2. MnDOT Metro District Traffic Office (Kaare Festvog at kaare.festvog@state.mn.us) will provide a crash listing upon request. Applicants should request crash data from MnDOT at least three weeks before the application deadline. If applicants wish to include crash data not available in MnCMAT2 they should reach out to MnDOT Metro District Traffic Office (Kaare Festvog at kaare.festvog@state.mn.us) to discuss further. The applicant must then attach a listing of the crashes reduced and the MnDOT HSIP Benefit/Cost (B/C) worksheet that identifies the resulting benefit associated with the project.

Applicants should select Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) from the supplied list of commonly used CMFs. For treatments where a CMF is not chosen from the list, the applicant will provide a reasonable CMF from the FHWA's CMF Clearinghouse (MUST include a printout of the CMF reference page). Additionally, the applicant is required to write a brief logical explanation of why they chose a particular CMF. No more than two CMFs per crash type and location will be allowed. For example: a crash that occurs where multiple countermeasures are proposed – median construction, lighting, stop sign improvements – an applicant will need to choose which two CMFs that provide the greatest reduction in crashes. For projects with multiple intersections, different CMFs can be used for each intersection depending on the crash types occurring at each intersection but no more than two CMFs can be used for each intersection or location along the project per crash. Refer to the HSIP guidance if using multiple CMFs.

Crash Modification Factor(s) Used (100 words or less)*

Roadway Segment CMFs:
CMF ID: 2337 (Install Two Way Left-Turn Lane)
CMF ID: 8101 (Wet-Reflective Pavement Markings)

Forest Street Intersection CMFs:
CMF ID: 2337 (Install Two Way Left-Turn Lane)
CMF ID: 4140 (Change Permissive to Protected/Permissive)

Atlantic Street Intersection CMFs:
CMF ID: 2337 (Install Two Way Left-Turn Lane)

Johnson Parkway Intersection CMFs:
CMF ID: 2337 (Install Two Way Left-Turn Lane)
CMF ID: 4177 (Change Protected/Permissive to Flashing Yellow Arrow)

Rationale for Crash Modification Factor(s) Selected and how the CMF(s) connect to FHWA's Safe System Approach (300 words or less)*

The selected CMFs provide the greatest reduction in crashes with the highest cost benefit along the corridor and at the key intersections based on observed crash patterns along the corridor and at key intersections. The CMFs identified for the entire roadway segment crashes (CMF IDs: 2337 and 8101) apply to all crash types. The majority of the CMFs chosen at the intersections apply to all crash and severity types.

These CMFs directly support FHWA's Safe System Approach by prioritizing infrastructure that is designed to reduce the chance of transportation-related mistakes that lead to death and serious injury. The installation of a TWLTL reduces rear-end and left-turn conflicts by separating turning vehicles from through traffic, which supports separating users in a transportation space. The wet-reflective pavement markings will improve visibility during nighttime and wet conditions and help narrow the roadway widths compared to existing conditions to manage speeds and reduce crash impact. These CMFs are critical in reaching zero deaths by managing speeds, reducing conflict points, and improving driver and non-motorized user awareness, which are essential in achieving the goals identified with the Safe System Approach. These CMFs and proposed improvements, including the separated bikeway and shared-use path segments, will significantly improve safety along E 7th Street and advance the City's goals to provide a more resilient transportation system.

MnDOT HSIP Project B/C ratio* 1.2

Measure A Scoring Guidance

The applicant with highest Benefit/Cost ratio will receive the full points for the measure. The remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. The scoring committee may reduce the points awarded if the methodology or data provided by the applicant is not reasonable.

---

2. Connection to Existing Plan

This criterion measures how the project connects to the Regional Safety Action Plan, existing safety plan, road safety audit, and/or other safety studies focused on reducing fatal and serious injury crashes.

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. Please select all of the following that apply.

Identified on Regional Top 25 Priority Lists (reactive or proactive), Identified on Regional High Injury Streets maps, Identified on County Top 10 priority lists (reactive or proactive), Crash Risk Index > 15 (for pedestrians, use the bicyclists' layers)

Is the location listed in another safety plan that prioritizes reducing fatal and serious injury crashes?*

Yes

Please describe and provide reference or link to the plan*

Saint Paul Transportation Safety Action Plan (2024): pp. 2-3, 14-15, 22-23, 26. (https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/public-works/transportation-and-transit/transportation-safety-action-plan)

This segment of E 7th Street is included in Saint Paul's High Injury Network, which have approximately the top 20 percent of weighted crash scores within Saint Paul. The High Injury Network captures about 62 percent of all fatal and injury crashes and represents about 11 percent of the surface street roadway miles in Saint Paul. This segment is also included as part of the city's High Crash Network for vulnerable road users as a top crash corridor for both bicyclists and pedestrians.

Saint Paul Bicycle Plan (2024): pp. 24, 44-46, 86, 88. (https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/2024-05/2024%20Saint%20Paul%20Bicycle%20Plan-for%20web.pdf)

The E 7th Street corridor is included as part of the city's High Crash Network for vulnerable road users as a top crash corridor for bicyclists. The Bicycle Plan outlines how the city will prioritize investments to address areas with severe injury risks, and evaluate the progress of safety improvements.

Saint Paul Pedestrian Plan (2019): pp. 6, 7, 12, 13, 25-27, 29, 30, 34; Appendix A pp. 66, 67. (https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/Media%20Root/Public%20Works/Saint%20Paul%20Pedestrian%20Plan%206.13.19%20Compressed.pdf)

The Pedestrian Plan identifies the E 7th Street corridor a “Priority Walking” area for the City of Saint Paul.

Measure A Scoring Guidance

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

- High: Projects identified in the Regional Safety Action Plan on either the regional top 25 or county top 10 lists will score the highest followed by projects identified on the Crash Risk Index over 15 or on the Regional High Injury Streets maps.
- Medium-High
- Medium: Projects identified as a priority location for safety investment in a local (e.g. county or city) safety action plan based on a recent injury crash analysis.
- Medium-Low
- Low: Projects only identified in a 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.
- 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.).

---

3. Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History

This criterion measures the history of fatal and serious injury crashes from 2016 to 2025 that have occurred along the proposed project.

Measure A – 10-year crash history of fatal and serious injury crashes

Total correctable fatal and serious injury crashes for 2016-2025 will be tallied with each fatal (type K) crash being worth two times the number of each serious injury (type A) crash.*

Note possible injury (type B) crashes can be included for pedestrian and bicycle crashes only. Crash data must be obtained for the project length for calendar years 2016 through 2025. Crashes within a 250 ft radius of an intersection or along a corridor should be included. Crash data should include all crash types and severities, including pedestrian and bicycle crashes. Only crashes contained within the Minnesota Department of Public Safety’s database can be used. If the agency submitting the application has access to MnCMAT2, crash data from that system can be used as part of the submittal. MnCMAT2 data will be reviewed by MnDOT to ensure accuracy. Crash data can also be obtained from MnDOT if an agency does not have access to MnCMAT2. MnDOT Metro District Traffic Office (Kaare Festvog at kaare.festvog@state.mn.us) will provide a crash listing upon request. Applicants should request crash data from MnDOT at least three weeks before the application deadline.

If applicants wish to include crash data not available in MnCMAT2 they should reach out to MnDOT Metro District Traffic Office (Kaare Festvog at kaare.festvog@state.mn.us) to discuss further.

Total crashes = 2* “Fatal” crashes + “Serious Injury” crashes + “Minor Injury” crashes (pedestrian and bicycle only)

"Fatal Crashes" (Type K):	0
"Serious Injury" Crashes (Type A):	8
"Minor Injury" Crashes (Type B):	10
Total crashes:	18

Measure A Scoring Guidance

Correctable crashes are those that the treatment being proposed is anticipated to mitigate. The applicant with the highest number of correctable fatal (type K), serious injury (type A), and minor injury (type B) (for pedestrians and bicycles only) crashes will receive the full points for the measure. The remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the points.

---

4. Improvement for People Outside of Vehicles

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

Measure A – Project-based pedestrian safety enhancements and risk elements

To receive maximum points in this category, pedestrian safety countermeasures selected for implementation in projects should be, to the greatest extent feasible, consistent with the countermeasure recommendations in the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and state and national best practices. Links to resources are provided on the Regional Solicitation Resources web page. Answer the following questions with as much detail as possible based on the known attributes of the proposed design. If any aspect referenced in this section is not yet determined, describe the range of options being considered to the greatest extent available. If there are project elements that may increase pedestrian risk, describe how these risks are being mitigated.

1. Describe how this project will address the safety needs of people crossing the street at signalized intersections, unsignalized intersections, mid-block locations, and roundabouts.*

Treatments and countermeasures should be well-matched to the roadway's context (e.g., appropriate for the speed, volume, crossing distance, and other location attributes). Refer to the Regional Solicitation Resources web page for guidance links (400 words or less)

Consider the following when responding

Is the distance in between signalized intersections increasing (e.g., removing a signal)?*

No

Will your design increase the crossing distance or crossing time across any leg of an intersection?*

(e.g., by adding turn or through lanes, widening lanes, using a multi-phase crossing, prohibiting crossing on any leg of an intersection, pedestrian bridge requiring length detour, etc.).

This does not include any increases to crossing distances solely due to the addition of bike lanes (i.e., no other through or turn lanes being added or widened).

No

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

(e.g., nearest protected or enhanced crossing opportunity).

The project addresses pedestrian crossing safety comprehensively across signalized intersections, unsignalized locations, and mid-block crossings, with treatments tailored to the corridor's urban context, traffic volumes, and target operating speeds. The Saint Paul Pedestrian Plan (2019) identifies this corridor as a high-priority area for walking investments, reinforcing the need for targeted safety improvements.

Signalized intersections will incorporate multiple countermeasures to reduce conflicts, improve visibility, and enhance accessibility:

-Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) will be implemented at all signals to give pedestrians a 3–7 second head start, allowing them to enter the crosswalk and establish visibility before vehicles begin turning, significantly reducing conflicts.

-Updated signal phasing will better manage turning movements, reducing instances where pedestrians must compete with turning vehicles for right-of-way and improving predictability for all users.

-High-visibility crosswalk markings and signage will increase awareness and yielding behavior while pedestrians are crossings.

-The updated roadway configurations will reduce pedestrian crossing distances and shorten exposure time at signalized intersections. This will allow pedestrians to cross more comfortably.

-ADA-compliant curb ramps, accessible pedestrian signals (APS), and countdown timers will ensure crossings are usable for people of all abilities, including those with mobility or visual impairments.

Unsignalized intersections will be improved to enhance pedestrian safety, comfort, and accessibility, as well as increase driver awareness:

-Curb extensions will reduce crossing distance, improve sight lines between pedestrians and drivers, and slow turning speeds, making it easier and safer to cross for pedestrians.

-Landscaped boulevards and separation from traffic will create a more comfortable and inviting pedestrian environment and provide a buffer from moving vehicles, reducing perceived and actual risk when approaching crossings.

Mid-block and corridor-wide improvements will further support safer pedestrian crossings. The addition of a continuous two-way left-turn lane will reduce unpredictable mid-block turning movements, allowing pedestrians to better anticipate vehicle behavior. Tighter curb radii at intersections will slow turning vehicles, reducing the severity of potential conflicts and improving driver yielding. Driveway and curb cut consolidation will reduce the number of conflict points between pedestrians and turning vehicles, creating more predictable and continuous pedestrian travel paths.

Multimodal improvements will enhance pedestrian safety by reducing conflicts and organizing space. A separated bikeway and shared-use path along the north side of E 7th Street will clearly define space for bicyclists, reducing interactions between pedestrians and bikes on sidewalks and improving comfort for both modes.

Collectively, these improvements are designed to create safer, shorter, and more intuitive crossings, reduce delay and exposure for pedestrians, and improve comfort for users of all ages and abilities. The project

prioritizes direct, at-grade crossings and predictable vehicle behavior, aligning with the Safe System Approach by reducing both the likelihood and severity of pedestrian crashes along the corridor.

There are no midblock crossings included in the proposed project since the distance between the intersections are typically a reasonable 300-ft block distance.

2. Describe how separation will be provided for modes (vehicles and people outside of vehicles), including if there will be separation between bicyclists and pedestrians (400 words or less)*

The project reconfigures the available width to provide a multimodal corridor that prioritizes safety and comfort consistent with Complete Streets goals and Safe System principles. Between Minnehaha Ave E and Earl St, a separated two-way bikeway and sidewalk will be built on the north side of E 7th St, and a sidewalk on the south side. A tactile delineator strip will separate the bikeway and sidewalk, reducing conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians. A boulevard and curb will provide additional modal separation.

East of Earl St, right-of-way narrows and will accommodate a 10-ft wide shared-use path on the north side with a boulevard . On the south side, a 6-ft sidewalk with a boulevard will be built. Where feasible, street trees will be planted to provide separation, and to provide shade and comfort to people walking.

Modal separation results from removal of on-street parking and narrowing of travel lanes. These changes create dedicated space for people walking, bicycling, and rolling, and also contribute to lower operating speeds and improved driver awareness. Landscaped boulevards provide physical and visual separation from traffic, reducing exposure to moving vehicles.

At signalized intersections, separation between users will be enhanced through implementation of Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs). LPIs provide pedestrians with additional time (3-7 seconds, typically) to enter the crosswalk before traffic receives a green light. This allows pedestrians to establish their presence and reduce conflict with turning vehicles, improve visibility, and improve driver yielding behavior. LPIs may also be used by bicyclists using shared use path or parallel separated bikeway facilities.

Overall, the project establishes clear spatial separation between modes and from vehicular traffic, which is critical to reducing crash risk, minimizing user conflicts, and improving perceived and actual safety for vulnerable users along the corridor.

3. Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, in both through-traffic and turning movements.*

Describe any project-related factors that may affect speed directly or indirectly, even if speed is not the intended outcome (e.g., wider lanes and turning radii to facilitate freight movements, adding turn lanes to alleviate peak hour congestion, etc). If known, what are the existing and proposed speed limits? Is this an increase or decrease from existing conditions? (400 words or less)

Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower (e.g., visual narrowing, narrow lanes, truck aprons to mitigate wide turning radii, etc.)
or protect pedestrians and bicyclists if motorist speed will increase (e.g., buffers or other separation from moving vehicles, crossing treatments appropriate for higher speed roadways, etc.).

If known, what are the existing and proposed speed limits? Is this an increase or decrease from existing conditions? (400 words or less):*

Motorist speeds along E 7th St will be managed primarily through roadway reallocation, geometric design, and visual narrowing elements that influence driver behavior. The existing cross section will be converted to one through lane in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. This configuration akin to a “road diet” is a proven FHWA safety countermeasure that reduces conflicts between through and turning traffic and moderates driver behavior. FHWA research shows road diets can decrease speed differentials, contributing to more consistent and appropriate operating speeds.

Lane narrowing will be implemented along the corridor, reducing excessively wide 20-ft lanes to context-appropriate urban widths of 11-ft. This creates both physical and perceptual narrowing, which encourages drivers to select lower, more comfortable speeds. Visual friction will be reinforced through landscaped boulevards, street trees, and the addition of off-street multimodal facilities. Perceptual lane narrowing and roadside elements such as landscaping are recognized strategies that create a sense of enclosure and lead drivers to reduce speed.

The center left-turn lane further reduces speed variability by removing turning vehicles from the through lane, minimizing abrupt braking and lane changing. This creates more consistent traffic flow and reduces aggressive driving behavior. Additionally, on-street parking removal in targeted segments allows space to be reallocated to separated pedestrian and bicycle facilities while contributing to a narrower traveled way that supports speed management.

At intersections, turning speeds will be managed through geometric and operational changes. Tighter curb radii and defined crossing alignments will further slow turning vehicles and increase yielding behavior.

These combined treatments are expected to result in operating speeds that are better aligned with the posted 25 mph speed limit, supporting the corridor’s urban context and multimodal goals.

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 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 convenient or direct at-grade crossing opportunities to prioritize directness and convenience with safety. Score projects higher if design elements are included to help motorists drive slower or mitigate multiple crash types or threats. 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 convenient or direct 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 along E 7th Street serves approximately 15,757 residents within a 0.5-mile radius and represents a diverse and culturally rich community, with a high concentration of populations identified by the Metropolitan Council as communities of consideration (see EJSCREEN Summary Report Attachment).

The population living directly along and adjacent to the corridor is predominantly people of color (72%), significantly higher than state and national averages, with notable representation of Asian populations (37%), Hispanic/Latino residents (14%), and Black residents (13%). Nearly half of residents (44%) speak a language other than English at home, including a large share speaking Asian and Pacific Island languages, and approximately 7% of households are classified as limited English-speaking.

Approximately 31% of the population is under age 18, indicating a strong need for safe access to schools and services.

The corridor also experiences elevated socioeconomic vulnerability, with 46% of residents identified as low-income and 22% of households living below the poverty line. Additionally, 19% of residents have less than a high school education.

Approximately 3% of households have zero vehicles, and 4.1% residents use public transit to commute to work. Metro Transit Route 74 serves the corridor, connecting to Saint Paul's east side, downtown, and the greater network. Transit along the corridor supports transit-dependent populations.

Environmental and transportation burdens are also disproportionately high. The area ranks in the 95th percentile for several environmental justice indicators, including traffic proximity and volume, diesel particulate matter, and overall environmental indices. High traffic volumes and proximity to major roadways contribute to increased exposure to pollution and safety risks, particularly for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.

These characteristics highlight a need for inclusive, accessible improvements. Historical and ongoing transportation impacts, including high traffic volumes, elevated crash rates with severe injury risk, fragmented crossings, and environmental exposure, have created barriers to safe and equitable mobility. The project corridor ranks third on the Metropolitan Council's Regional Safety Action Plan High Injury Network (HIN), which emphasizes the disproportionate impacts on vulnerable and underrepresented populations.

The corridor provides access to key community destinations, including six schools, multiple places of worship, parks, and commercial services that serve minority and immigrant populations. This area is home to dozens of small businesses, which many are owned by immigrants and people of color.

Immediately west of the project area, is the Consulate of Mexico in Saint Paul, an essential service for Mexican residents across Minnesota and surrounding states. Adjacent to the Consulate is Comunidades Latinas Unidas en Servicio (CLUES), a regional organization offering programs related to arts and culture, health and wellness, parenting, child wellbeing, economic development, and senior services. This location also hosts multiple events that draw a regional crowd, including "Fiesta Latina," which attracts more than 4,000 visitors annually. The Indigenous Roots Cultural Arts Center is also located nearby and provides services that support cultural expression and community wellbeing.

Immediately north, MSS is a nonprofit organization that supports individuals with disabilities through workforce, employment, arts, and personal development services.

Hmong Village is located just north of the project corridor on Johnson Parkway. This is a major commercial and cultural gathering place on Saint Paul's East Side, and a variety of services are provided on site in addition to food and shops. Hmong Village attracts employees and patrons from across the East Side, and certainly from neighborhoods adjacent to E. 7th Street.

Brittany's Place, located at the E 7th Street and English Street intersection, is Minnesota's largest shelter for youth experiencing homelessness or at risk of sex trafficking. Other nearby organizations include the Latino Economic Development Center, 180 Degrees, and Energy CENTS Coalition.

These organizations serve vulnerable populations, many of whom are transit-dependent, have limited access to vehicles, and are disproportionately impacted by the existing corridor conditions.

The Saint Paul Pedestrian Plan (2019) identifies this corridor as a high-priority area for walking investments. This designation indicates strong existing pedestrian activity despite current safety challenges and reinforces the need for improved pedestrian safety and accessibility.

The E 7th Street project area lies within the City's "Tier 1" priority areas for engagement. This means that all City of Saint Paul projects, including the Transportation Safety Action Plan (2024), Bicycle Plan (2024), and Pedestrian Plan included robust engagement with underrepresented communities.

This project directly responds by prioritizing safety improvements along a high-injury corridor serving a diverse, low-income, and transit-dependent community, with the goal of reducing crash risk, improving access to essential destinations, and addressing long-standing disparities in transportation safety and exposure.

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 East 7th Street project was identified through multiple planning and data-driven processes that reflect both regional priorities and community needs. The corridor ranks third on the Metropolitan Council's Regional Safety Action Plan High Injury Network (HIN), highlighting a documented history of severe crashes and the need for targeted safety investment. This regional designation, combined with demographic data from EJSCREEN and Living Atlas, confirms that the corridor serves a community with elevated vulnerability and disproportionate exposure to environmental and transportation-related risks.

The demographic analysis shows that the project area includes high concentrations of populations that have been historically underrepresented in decision-making processes, including 72% people of color, 46% low-income residents, 13% individuals with disabilities, transit-dependent populations, and households with limited English proficiency.

Elevated traffic proximity, pollution exposure, and environmental burden indices (often above the 90th percentile statewide) further highlight the need for safety-focused improvements. Poor air quality also presents greater health risks for the approximately 11% of adults with asthma in the project area. Together, these conditions demonstrate a clear need for safer, more accessible transportation infrastructure that encourages nonmotorized transportation options, particularly for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.

Community needs have also been identified through prior planning and engagement efforts, including the City's Transportation Safety Action Plan, Pedestrian Plan, and Bicycle Plan, all of which included extensive public outreach and interactive comment mapping. These engagement efforts prioritized outreach to historically disadvantaged, low-income, and BIPOC communities that experience higher rates of traffic-related crashes and have been under-engaged in traditional planning processes. These areas are designated as "Tier 1" priority areas for engagement, and the entire East 7th Street corridor lies within one of these areas.

The Saint Paul Pedestrian Plan identifies East 7th Street as a high-priority corridor for walking investments. Community input during this process highlighted the importance of improving walking conditions in areas where residents are more likely to rely on walking, including areas with concentrated poverty, higher proportions of people with disabilities, and higher rates of vehicle-less households.

The City has received direct emails and calls commenting on the unsafe and uncomfortable conditions along E 7th Street. A resident shared the following, "Eastbound E. 7th St., between Minnehaha and the Earl St. bridge is very dangerous to drive because it is wide and there are no lane marking or signs. It needs to be obvious that it's one or two lanes. I have seen high speed and road rage incidents here on too many occasions." Additional comments raised concerns about excessive vehicle speeds, wide lanes, traffic weaving, and reckless driving behavior, as well as the need for traffic calming measures to improve safety and comfort along the corridor.

The project is further informed by engagement conducted through MnDOT-led projects and other citywide planning efforts, which consistently identify concerns related to safety, accessibility, and mobility along the corridor.

Consistent with the Imagine 2050 engagement spectrum (page 55), future engagement for this project will move beyond basic information sharing toward consultation and involvement, with opportunities for ongoing feedback throughout project development. The City of Saint Paul has established engagement practices that prioritize historically underrepresented communities, including multilingual outreach, partnerships with community-based organizations, and accessible engagement formats. These approaches are supported by city policies, procedures, and dedicated staff resources that guide equitable engagement and shared decision-making.

As the project advances, engagement will focus on refining design concepts, validating community priorities, strengthening trust, and ensuring that proposed safety improvements align with local needs. Engagement activities will continue to include targeted outreach to residents and businesses along the corridor, coordination with transit users and community organizations, and accessible opportunities to provide feedback on design alternatives. Materials and outreach will be provided in multiple languages to ensure the decision-making process is inclusive and accessible.

Through these efforts, the project will continue to be shaped by community input, ensuring that investments address identified needs while delivering meaningful safety and access benefits.

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 East 7th Street project will provide significant safety, mobility, and access benefits for a community experiencing elevated socioeconomic and environmental burdens. The project area includes a high concentration of historically underrepresented populations, including 72% people of color, 45% low-income residents, and households with limited English proficiency. These communities rely heavily on walking, transit, and local access to essential services and employment along the corridor.

The project will directly address long-standing transportation burdens associated with high traffic volumes, unsafe crossings, and exposure to environmental pollutants. Environmental justice indicators show that the area ranks in the 90th percentile or higher statewide for traffic proximity, diesel particulate matter, and overall environmental burden. These conditions reflect historic transportation investments that prioritized vehicle throughput over community health, safety, and accessibility, creating barriers to safe movement for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.

Project benefits include reduced fatal and serious injury crashes, improved pedestrian crossing safety, new bicycle facilities, and safer access to transit stops and key destinations such as schools, businesses, places of worship, parks, and services. These improvements will support safer and more reliable access to jobs and daily needs, particularly for vulnerable populations including youth, low-income residents, individuals with disabilities, seniors, immigrants, and people of color.

One potential tradeoff of the project is the removal of on-street parking along select segments of the corridor to accommodate multimodal improvements and achieve a safer roadway cross section. While this may be perceived as a burden, existing conditions already include parking restrictions and no-parking zones along portions of the corridor, and observed utilization is relatively low in most segments. As a result, the overall impact is expected to be limited.

The preliminary design phase will include robust engagement to discuss the safety benefits of removing parking at specific locations to accommodate other improvements. This may include maintaining or reintroducing on-street parking in targeted areas where it supports adjacent businesses and economic vitality, while balancing safety needs. Parking removal at specific locations will be confirmed based on community feedback as well as other design constraints and needs.

To further mitigate potential impacts, the project will take a context-sensitive approach to parking and access. In these segments, design flexibility, such as adjusting lane configurations or modifying the extent of the center two-way left-turn lane, will be considered to preserve parking where feasible without compromising core safety objectives.

The project will also help mitigate environmental and public health burdens by improving traffic operations, reducing stop-and-go conditions, and supporting mode shift to walking, bicycling, and transit. Potential impacts, such as temporary construction disruptions or changes to roadway operations, will be addressed through clear multilingual communication, accessible outreach, and context-sensitive design within the existing right-of-way.

The project is expected to deliver meaningful, equitable benefits by improving safety, reducing exposure to risk, and enhancing access for communities that have historically experienced disproportionate transportation and environmental burdens.

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_taz_jobs:

gis_regional_destinations:

gis_project_location_description:

▼ **Review & Feedback** - Internal

Program:	Regional Solicitation
Sub Program:	Regional Solicitation - Unique Projects
Assigned Council Program Contact:	
Finance Unit Reviewer:	

External Reviewers

Reviewers

▼ Internal Reviewers

Comments Returned to Applicant:

Program Feedback:

▼ Evaluative Criteria

Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts:

Measure A – Crashes reduced (Benefit/Cost ratio):

Measure A – 10-year crash history of fatal and serious injury crashes:

Measure A – Project-based pedestrian safety enhancements and risk elements:

Evaluative Criteria Total: 0

Dates & Financials - Internal Only

Start Date:

End Date:

Amount Requested: $7,000,000.00

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

NOTES

Draft → Initial Review
Created by David Peterson at 7:07 AM on June 25, 2026

NOTES

HISTORY

Show History

Updated By:	David Peterson
Created By:	Bryan Graveline
Updated At:	6/25/2026
Created At:	6/22/2026