

Dakota County Pedestrian and Bicycle Study

Summary: Public, Staff and Project Management Team Review Comments and Study Changes

During phase two of engagement, staff solicited input on the Draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Study (Study) from the Project Management Team (PMT) and through online engagement and pop-up open houses. Members of the public were asked to share what they liked about the Study and what they felt was missing. Comments received, along with resulting changes are summarized below. Changes are reflected in the December 2018 Study.

Comment	Study Changes
Public Comments – Pop-up Open Houses and On-line Comments (comments summarized)	
Commenters appreciated that the County is studying how to improve walking and biking at a high level, and appreciated that the County is soliciting public input on the plan. Many felt the study is comprehensive and thorough.	No change
Commenters felt the focus on serving people of all ages and ability levels was appropriate. Feeling unsafe walking and biking with children was a common concern.	No change
Some commenters were concerned about the cost of building and maintaining bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	No change , will be addressed in 2040 Transportation Plan Update
Some commenters would like the County to support education and encouragement efforts around walking and biking, in addition to engineering.	Clarification. pg 2-23 Update heading to Education, Enforcement, and Encouragement
Many commenters highlighted the need for a shared use path along Flagstaff near Farmington High School.	No change. Flagstaff is a not a County road, comment will be forwarded to City of Farmington
Some commenters mentioned the new Vikings facility as a significant development that is not included in the plan.	Clarification, Addition. pg. 2-18 Network Connectivity, Text revised to clarify that gaps are based on current conditions. Discussion of areas guided for future development in City 2040 Comprehensive Plans added
Highway 3 is a significant barrier for people walking and biking.	Addition. pg 2-12 Section discussing gaps and barriers on the State highway system added
Commenters want better access to Lebanon Hills. Many do not want paved trails within Lebanon Hills. Improvements to Cliff Road are a high priority. Several commenters want to see better walking and biking facilities in West Saint Paul.	No Change. Recommended improvements in these areas are shown on Figures 2-3, 2-8,2-8,2-9, 2-10,2-11
Safer and more comfortable river/creek crossings	Clarification. pg 2-24 Roads and water crossings added to first bullet under <u>Provide for, Barrier Removal and Safety for All</u>

	<u>Users.</u>
Integrating with trails in other counties and east-west cross-county connections	No change. Connections to the State and Regional Systems are shown on Figures 2-3, 2-7,2-8,2-9,2-10
Availability of bike racks	No change. pg 2-27 Bike racks on County Roads are addressed per policy T.20 Complete Streets
Higher levels of separation from traffic on rural roadways	Addition. pg 2-24 Under the strategy Provide Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Along County Highways Based on Land Use Context, added a second bullet 'Construct road shoulders in the rural areas, based on Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) State-Aid guidance to provide widths that support bicycling, where practical.'
Lack of sidewalks on local streets and around neighborhood schools	No change. Gaps in ped-bike infrastructure along county highways is addressed; local roads are city jurisdiction.
More consideration of people using wheelchairs and motorized carts	Addition. pg 1-1 Inclusion of wheelchairs in the definition of pedestrian
More 'Bikes May Use Full Lane' signage and other signage that alerts drivers to bicyclist rights	No change. pg 2-24 addressed under Education and Enforcement and pg 2-26 Policy T.16
Need for sufficient lighting that does not produce light pollution	No change. pg 2-28 addressed in Policy T.20 Complete Streets
Planning for walking and biking in new developments	No change. City jurisdiction
Minimizing disturbance to wildlife	No change. Study focuses on pedestrian and bicycle facilities along County Roads
Eliminating distracted driving	No change. pg 2-23 addressed under Education, Encouragement and Enforcement
Repave existing bike paths Paying attention to flooding and winter maintenance of trails	No change. pg 2-26, Policy T.17 addresses maintenance. Maintenance policies will be considered as part of the 2040 Transportation Plan Update
Address concern about conflicts resulting from use of trails by both cyclists and pedestrians	Addition. pg 2-15, 2-16 Discussion added to the Complete Streets section

Clearer maps	Addition. Appendix C Addition of more detailed maps for key areas Higher resolution maps in the document
Add 2040 population	Addition. pg 1-11 County 2040 population estimates added
Metropolitan Council (MC)	
In <i>Executive Summary, p. ES-7, para. 2</i> Acknowledge that roads most often provide the most direct connections to major destinations like work or shopping and that good planning requires a balancing of providing trails and protected bikeways carefully integrated with on-road (incl. road-adjacent) facilities. Even the majority that prefer biking on trails may need to ride on roads for segments of their trips to reach their destinations.	No change. Comment does not reflect County direction of providing off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities along County roads in the majority situations
Please include the reference for Figure 1-1	Addition. pg 1-1, Figure 1-1 Reference added
"The Four Types of Cyclists" report states this qualification: "This typology is for using the bicycle for transportation, only. People in all these groups—especially the "interested but concerned" group—may bicycle for recreation. This categorization addresses only their willingness to use a bicycle as a main means of transportation." This is an important distinction that should be referenced in the Study.	Clarification. pg 1-2 Qualifier added "This group may bicycle or recreation but are unlikely to use a bicycle as their main means of transportation."
Introduction, page 1-9, para. 2 suggest updating text to reflect RBTN adoption in the Regional Transportation Policy Plan.	Clarification. pg 1-9 Text updated
Within this "Study Context" section, it would be prudent to discuss the relationship bet. Dakota County as one of 10 regional parks (incl. trails) implementing agencies and Metropolitan Council Regional Parks & Trails	Addition. pg 1-9 Paragraph discussing Regional Trails added
Specify the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB); suggest "The Council's Transportation Advisory Board has aligned...."	Addition. pg 1-9 Edited to reflect TAB
Since there's a "notable increase in the number of women cyclists" it would be useful to specify the % increase.	Clarification. pg 1-10 Text updated to reflect percentage
Would be useful to identify the factor weights	Clarification. page 1-11 Factor weights added.
Possible clarification needed: is this statistic 37% of county residents overall or 37% of those in low-income census tracts?	Clarification. pg 1-13 Sentence reworded
Appears to be combining 2 different classification schemes which were developed from two independent studies. Recommend reviewing these different schemes and study and describe/list each scheme separately	Clarification. pg 2-5 Suggested change made

<p>Not sure that TH 3 between TH 55 and Farmington should be considered an existing "on-road bikeway"</p>	<p>Map edit. Figure 2-1 MnDOT Mississippi River Regional Trail (MRRT) route removed from map. Route not an on-road facility</p>
<p>Describe what is meant by "bicycle supportive shoulders." Legend under Rural Shoulders, what's the difference bet. a "shoulder supports bicycling" and a "shoulder >= 4' but inadequate?"</p>	<p>Clarification. pg 2-5 Definitions of bicycle supportive shoulders added to the body text</p>
<p>"Countywide Greenway System" is the appropriate caption and should be consistent in text that follows. The term "regional" is reserved for trails having a Council-approved Master Plan. Collectively, County Greenways are not a "regional system." All study text and figure references to "regional greenways" should be revised to "countywide" or "county greenways." Based on a review of MC regional trail status, there are a few inaccuracies in what is shown as "Master Planned,"(see Fig. 3 w/MC comments attached to MC e-mail).</p>	<p>Clarification. Map Legends revised to 'county greenways' Pg 2-10 Sentence describing relationship between the county greenway system and regional trails added Figure 2-3 Simplified and retitled County Greenway System</p>
<p>Consider rewording to "Dakota County will continue to work w/MC to plan & implement bicycle facilities on the RBTN as roadway/trail project opportunities will allow."</p>	<p>Clarification. pg 2-12 Suggested change made</p>
<p>What is the definition of a "bicycle gap" with respect to the RBTN? Since the RBTN does not prescribe specific facility treatments, it may be challenging to accurately reflect what would be considered a regional gap.</p>	<p>Clarification. pg 2-14, Figure 2- 5 Changed language to refer to shared use trail gaps on the RBTN rather than the generic 'bicycle gaps'</p>
<p>In comparing Figures 8 (Intro p. 1-17) "Bike Level of Traffic Stress" with facility & gap maps (Fig. 1, p. 2-6 & Fig. 8, p. 2-18) there appear to be some inconsistencies, esp. in rural areas. Several segments have "Inadequate shoulders" but are Bike LTS level 2: CR 47 N/of Hampton & S/of CR 86; CR 81 S/of CR 66; CR 54 in Ravenna Twnshp. Also, why does a "shared use trail" along CSAH 42 bet. Apple Valley & Burnsville have some segments rated as LTS 4? Or CSAH 46 with shared trail E/of CR 33 rated as LTS 3? Are these issues explicable or are adjustments needed in final Study?</p>	<p>Clarification. pg 1-17 to 1-18 Discussion explaining inconsistencies added</p>
<p>Under Support County Greenway System, suggested added text at end of bullet: "...where greenway trails would meet regional intent with respect to connectivity, continuity, & existing or potential bicycle trip demand."</p>	<p>Clarification. pg 2-25 Suggested change made</p>
<p>Policy T-19. Clarification needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must all, one, or several conditions exist? If all must be met, seems like a very high bar to just "consider the use of on-road bicycle facilities where appropriate." One condition should suffice. • Second bullet may be too limiting, as many major destinations may only be accessible from a county hwy; 	<p>Clarification. pg 2-26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added all to clarify the intent is all conditions exist; the intent is on-road facilities will be considered only in limited situations • Second bullet, no change,

<p>also, distance to the parallel local street should also be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third bullet may also limit roadway re-striping possibilities that may only require taking parking from one side of roadway. Many cities are in fact removing parking specifically to provide on-road bicycle facilities. • Fifth bullet, suggest adding "State aid guidelines can be met, or exceptions granted (e.g., 5 foot wide bike shoulder instead of 6 feet)." 	<p>alternate routes will be considered on an individual basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third bullet, no change , decision to remove parking is under city jurisdiction. County will consider on-road after City has removed parking • Fifth bullet, no change. State guidelines are met if an exception is granted
<p>Under Parks CIP clarify how the funding chart totals are calculated.</p>	<p>Removal. pg 2-27. Chart removed, not needed</p>
<p>Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)</p>	
<p>MnDOT is currently creating their Metro District Bicycle Plan. Identifying gaps and barriers in the County Study would assist in communicating County goals and desires with MnDOT.</p>	<p>Addition. pg 2-12 Section discussing gaps and barriers on State Highways added</p>
<p>Dakota County Staff</p>	
<p>Remove 'Communication related to ped bike facility closures and detours.' And 'Pedestrian and bicycle signage from topics that will be addressed in the 2040 Transportation Plan Update.' These are addressed as practices, not in a policy document.</p>	<p>Removed. pg ES-6, pg 2-1, pg 2-28 Suggested change made</p>
<p>Add 'Coordination with cities to fill gaps' to the topics to be addressed in the 2040 Transportation Plan Update'</p>	<p>Addition. pg ES-6, pg 2-1, pg 2-28 Suggested change made</p>
<p>Clarify what improvements would be made to the contiguous plat ordinance</p>	<p>Clarification. pg ES-6, pg 2-1, pg 2-28 Text revised to reflect desired change to continuous plat ordinance</p>
<p>Add to Highlights section in the Executive Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct trails where there are existing gaps (34 miles). • Work with Cities to build trails in priority areas independent of highway projects. • Provide off road trails in urban areas, shoulders in rural areas, and on-road bike facilities only under special circumstances. 	<p>Addition. pg ES-6. Suggested change made</p>
<p>Remove network connectivity as a gap prioritization criteria. This is not factored into the scoring.</p>	<p>Removal. pg 2-17 Suggested change made</p>

<p>Potential 4 lane county roads that are candidates for three lanes to allow for a more complete shoulder network in the urban areas</p>	<p>Change. pg 2-7 Reword first bullet under road system improvements to “Consideration of bicycle needs in safely designing intersection improvements.”</p> <p>Addition. pg 2-7 Geometric changes existing roads to improve pedestrian visibility and safety at crossings</p> <p>Addition. pg 2-24 ‘and shoulders’</p> <p>Addition pg 2-25 Where there is excess vehicle capacity, evaluate geometric and striping changes to make space for pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities, and shoulders</p>
<p>There are gaps on both sides of Dodd Road in Lakeville. A planned trail should be added to the south side of the road.</p>	<p>Map Change. Planned County Pedestrian Network and Planned County Bicycle Network Planned trail on the south side of Dodd Rod between County Road 23 and County Road 31 added</p>
<p>Differentiate between strategies and policies in the 2030 Transportation Plan and new or revised policies in the Study</p>	<p>Change pg 2-25 to pg 2-26 New and revised policies are noted</p>
<p>Address emerging technology – dockless bike share, electric scooters and bicycles</p>	<p>Addition. pg 2-16 Section on emerging technology added</p>
<p>Under Provide for <i>Continuity, Barrier Removal and Safety for All Users</i> change “Perform a pedestrian safety analysis to identify and address safety needs with all Transportation Capital Improvement Program(CIP) projects.” To “Perform a pedestrian safety analysis with transportation improvement projects.”</p>	<p>Change. pg 2-24 Suggested change made</p>
<p>Under <i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Section</i>, page 2-27. Dakota County also funds new or improved bike and pedestrian facilities from the Safety and Management set aside. Reference this funding source.</p>	<p>Addition & clarification. p 2-27 More detail provided about the pedestrian and bicycle funding areas within the Transportation CIP</p>
<p>Language on page 2-7 suggesting bicycle lanes to guide road users at right hand turn lanes is too specific, design will be considered on a project by project basis.</p>	<p>Change. pg 2-7 Reworded</p>
<p>More detail on High Priority Gaps</p>	<p>Addition. Appendix D Information on each High Priority Gap added.</p>