CSAH 70 (210th St W / 215th St W - Lakeville): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing Rur	al	Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated		CIP Projects since	e 2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length Leng	th West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
west city boundary	Laredo Path	trail	U	0.36	0.00		none	U				0.36	good	Low	(a), (b)	Lakeville				
Laredo Path	Keswick Loop	trail	С	0.37	0.00		none	U				0.37	good	Low	(b), (c)	Lakeville				
Keswick Loop	I-35 west ramps	trail	U	0.21			trail	U	0.21				good		(d)	Lakeville]		
I-35 west ramps	I-35 east ramps	trail	С	0.25			trail	U	0.25				good			Lakeville				
I-35 east ramps	Bryant Av	trail	С	80.0			trail	С	0.08				good			Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	Kensington
Bryant Av	CSAH 5	trail	Ω	0.12			trail	С	0.12				good		(d)	Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	to
CSAH 5	215th St W	trail	U	0.70	0.00		none	U			0.70		good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	CSAH 23
215th St W	Jacquard Av	trail	С	0.46	0.00		none	U			0.46		good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Jacquard Av	CSAH 9	trail	Ω	0.64	0.00		none	U			0.64		good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
CSAH 9	Humboldt Ct	frontage road	R	0.29	0.00		trail	С	0.29	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Trail Constr.	2022	Trail	
Humboldt Ct	Holyoke Av	trail	C	0.29	0.00		trail	С	0.29	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Holyoke Av	Highview Av	trail	C	0.24	0.00		trail	С	0.24	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Highview Av	Heywood Av	trail	С	0.06	0.00		trail	С	0.06	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Heywood Av	Heath Av	trail	С	0.18	0.00		trail	С	0.18	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Heath Av	Hamburg Av	trail	C	0.24	0.00		trail	С	0.24	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Hamburg Av	Hanover Av	trail	С	0.12	0.00		trail	C	0.12	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Hanover Av	Grenada Av	trail	С	0.12	0.00		trail	С	0.12	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Grenada Av	CSAH 23	trail	С	0.24	0.00		trail	С	0.24	0.00			good	Medium		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
	TOTAL			4.97	0.00	0.00 0.	00		2.43	0.00	1.80	0.73			Total Area	9.93		1		

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) narrow shoulder, rural design with ditch
- (b) large lot rural residential with driveways
- (c) wider shoulders, multiple turn lanes
- (d) indications of soil erotion onto trail on south side

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	7.40	1.32
Poor or Missing Segments*		8.61
Poor Segments	0.00	
Missing Segments	1.80	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	9.20	9.93
Rural Segments**	0.73	
TOTAL	9.93	9.93

^{*} Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

0.00

	Linear	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	2.44	499
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	09
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	09
Total	2.44	49
One Side		
Trail on one side	2.53	51
Sidewalk on one side	0.00	0
Total	2.53	51

Land Use

- R Residential (house, apartment)
- C Commercial (business, industrial)
- I Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- U Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

Majority of new facilities added with reconstruction to four-lane divided.

Compliance percentage in 2023 based on urban/suburban land uses only.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

- 2023 80%
- 2016 13%

^{**} Rural segments were idenitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

CSAH 70 (210th St W / 215th St W - Lakeville): **Pedestrian Ramp Inventory**

CSAH 70 (210th St W /		2023 Invento	ory		2016 Invento	ry	Curb Ramp	Details	;			Location	Updated		CIP Projects sinc	e 2016
At	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
Laredo Path	2	0	0	0	0	0		2				Lakeville				
Keswick Loop	4	0	0	3	0	0		2				Lakeville				
I-35 west ramps	7	0	0	7	0	0		2	Yes	Yes		Lakeville				
I-35 east ramps	9	0	0	9	0	0		2	Yes	Yes		Lakeville				
private access	2	0	0	2	0	0		2				Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	Kensington
CSAH 5	10	0	0	10	0	0	trail stubs in place for future east	2	Yes	Yes		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	to
215th St W	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	CSAH 23
Jacquard Av	8	0	0	2	0	0	for Jacquard Av trails	2	Yes	Yes		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
CSAH 9	12	0	0	0	0	4		2	Yes	Yes		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Humboldt Ct	4	0	0	0	0	4		2				Lakeville	Trail Constr.	2022	Trail	
Holyoke Av	4	0	0	0	0	4		2				Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Highview Av	8	0	0	0	0	8		2			(a)	Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Heywood Av	2	0	0	0	0	2		2				Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Heath Av	4	0	0	0	0	4		2				Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Hamburg Av	4	0	0	0	0	4		2				Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Hanover Av	2	0	0	0	0	2		2				Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
Grenada Av	4	0	0	0	0	4		2				Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
CSAH 23	8	0	0	0	0	4		2	Yes	Yes		Lakeville	Road Reconstr.	2020	Construction	
TOTAL	94	0	2	33	0	42								1		

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Curb Ramp Case Ratings

- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- 6 No pedestrian facilities exist.

Notes

(a) Count includes four ramps at the railroad crossing to the west

Comparison Summary

No facilities exist in 2016. Facilities added with four-lane roadway construction.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 100% 2016 100%

CSAH 71 (Rich Valley Blvd): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated		CIP Projects since	2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Type	Segment
TH 149	Alverno Av W	none	U				0.34	none	R				0.34	n/a		(a), (b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
Alverno Av W	Aladin Tr	none	U				0.26	none	U				0.26	n/a		(a), (b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
Aladin Tr	TH 3	none	U				0.25	none	U				0.25	n/a		(a), (b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H	realign roadway	2018	Construction	@ TH 3
TH 3	96th St E	none	U				0.36	none	U				0.36	n/a		(a), (b), (c)	Inver Grove H]		
96th St E	97th St E	none	U				0.23	none	U				0.23	n/a		(a), (b), (c)	Inver Grove H		J		
97th St E	99th St E	none	U				0.10	none	U				0.10	n/a		(a), (b), (c)	Inver Grove H		J		
99th St E	102nd St E	none	U				0.28	none	U				0.28	n/a		(a), (b), (c)	Inver Grove H		J		
102nd St E	Rich Valley Park	none	- 1				0.21	none	R				0.21	n/a		(a), (b)	Inver Grove H		J		
Rich Valley Park	CSAH 73	none	- 1				0.12	none	R				0.12	n/a		(a), (b)	Inver Grove H		J		
CSAH 73	CSAH 32	none	U				0.49	none	U				0.49	n/a		(a), (b)	Inver Grove H				
CSAH 32	117th St E	none	U				0.85	none	U				0.85	n/a		(a), (b), (c)	Inver Grove H				
117th St E	120th St E	none	U				0.27	none	U				0.27	n/a		(a), (b), (c)	Inver Grove H		1		
	TOTAL			0.00	0.00	0.00	3.76	•		0.00	0.00	0.00	3.76			Total Area	7.52				

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) narrow shoulders
- (b) utility poles and vegetation near the road
- (c) mostly undeveloped space with some rural residential
- (d) jurisdictional transfer candidate to the city

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	0.00	0.00
Poor or Missing Segments*		7.52
Poor Segments	0.00	
Missing Segments	0.00	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	0.00	7.52
Rural Segments**	7.52	
TOTAL	7.53	7.53

TOTAL 7.52 7.52

^{**} Rural segments were idenitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

	Linear	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	0.00	0%
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
One Side		
Trail on one side	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on one side	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
None	3.76	100%
TOTAL	3.76	

ind Use

- R Residential (house, apartment)
- C Commercial (business, industrial)
- I Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- U Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

No facilities exist.

Entire segment is considered rural land use.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 0% 2016 0%

^{*} Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

CSAH 71 (Rich Valley Blvd): Pedestrian Ramp Inventory

CSAH 71 (Rich Valley B		2023 Invento	ry	:	2016 Invento	ry	Curb Ramp	Details	5			Location	Updated		CIP Projects since	2016
At	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
Alverno Av W	0	0	2	0	0	2		6			(a)	Inver Grove H				
Aladin Tr	0	0	2	0	0	2		6			(a)	Inver Grove H				
TH 3	0	0	4	0	0	4		6			(a)	Inver Grove H	realign roadway	2018	Construction	@ TH 3
96th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
97th St E	0	0	4	0	0	4		6			(b)	Inver Grove H				
99th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
102nd St E	0	0	4	0	0	4		6				Inver Grove H				
Rich Valley Park	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
CSAH 73	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
CSAH 32	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H		1		
117th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H	·			
120th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H		1		
TOTAL	0	0	30	0	0	30								Ī		

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Curb Ramp Case Ratings

- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- 6 No pedestrian facilities exist.

Note

- (a) jurisdictional transfer candidate to the city
- (b) includes two no facility locations on Anawanda Path

Comparison Summary	,
--------------------	---

No facilities exist.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 100%

2016 100%

CSAH 71 (Rich Valley Blvd/Blaine Ave - Rosemount): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated	(IP Projects since	2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Type	Segment
120th St E	RR crossing	none	U				0.16	none	U				0.16	n/a		(a), (b)	Rosemount				
RR crossing	Bonaire Path E	none	С				0.51	none	U				0.51	n/a		(a), (b), (c)	Rosemount				
Bonaire Path E	140th St E	none	U				0.50	none	U				0.50	n/a		(a), (b)	Rosemount				
140th St E	CSAH 42	none	U				0.49	none	U				0.49	n/a		(a), (b), (d)	Rosemount				
	TOTAL			0.00	0.00	0.00	1.66			0.00	0.00	0.00	1.66			Total Area	3.32				

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) narrow shoulders
- (b) utility poles and vegetation near the road
- (c) several industrial site entrances with heavy truck traffic
- (d) several private entrances and rural residential sites

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	0.00	0.00
Poor or Missing Segments*		3.32
Poor Segments	0.00	
Missing Segments	0.00	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	0.00	3.32
Rural Segments**	3.32	
TOTAL	3.32	3.32

 $^{{\}color{red}^*}\textit{Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.}$

^{**} Rural segments were idenitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

	Linear	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	0.00	0%
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
One Side		
Trail on one side	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on one side	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
None	1.66	100%

Land Use

- R Residential (house, apartment)
- C Commercial (business, industrial)
- Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

No facilities exist.

Entire segment is considered rural land use.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails) 2023 100%

2016 0%

CSAH 71 (Rich Valley Blvd/Blaine Ave - Rosemount): Sidewalk Inventory

CSAH 71 (Rich Valley B		2023 Invento	ory		2016 Invento	ry	Curb Ramp	Details	;			Location	Updated		CIP Projects sinc	e 2016
At	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
RR crossing	0	0	4	0	0	4		6				Rosemount				
Bonaire Path E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Rosemount				
140th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Rosemount				
CSAH 42	0	0	0	0	0	0	included in CSAH 42 inventory	6				Rosemount				
	0	0	8	0	0	8										

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

- **Curb Ramp Case Ratings**
 - 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- No pedestrian facilities exist.

Comparison Summary

No facilities exist.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 100%

2016

100%

CR 73 (Akron Av - Inver Grove Heights): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural	1	Land G	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated		CIP Project	s since 2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length We	est/South	Use L	ength I	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
CSAH 32	114th St W	none	U				0.39 nor	ne	U				0.39			(a), (b)	Inver Grove H	none		none	
114th St W	Alameda Av	none	U				0.25 nor	ne	U				0.25			(a), (b)	Inver Grove H	none			
Alameda Av	Albavar Path	none	U				0.20 nor	ne	U				0.20			(a), (b)	Inver Grove H	none	1		
Albavar Path	south city border	none	U				0.16 nor	ne	U				0.16			(a), (b)	Inver Grove H	none			
	TOTAL			0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00			0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00			Total Area	2.00				

 $Shaded\ areas\ represent\ priority\ locations,\ areas\ of\ missing\ infrastructure\ and/or\ areas\ to\ address$

Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) gravel road
- (b) includes large lot residential

2023	2016
0.00	0.00
	2.00
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	2.00
2.00	
	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00

*** TOTAL 2.00 2.00

**Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

** Rural segments were idenitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

	Lilleui	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	0.00	0
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	0
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	0
Tota	0.00	0
One Side		
Trail on one side	0.00	0
Sidewalk on one side	0.00	0
Tota	0.00	0
None	1.00	100
TOTAL	1.00	

Land Use

- R Residential (house, apartment)
- C Commercial (business, industrial)
- Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
 Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

Gravel road, rural design

2023 Compliance based on rural land use in place of missing segments.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 100% 2016 0%

CR 73 (Akron Av - Inver Grove H): Pedestrian Ramp Inventory

CR 73 (Akron Av)		2023 Invent	ory		2016 Inventor	ry	Curb Ramp In	formati	ion			Location	Updated		CIP Projects	since 2016
At	# Ramps	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
114th St W	0	0	0	0	0	0		6			(a)	Inver Grove H	none		none	
Alameda Av	0	0	0	0	0	0		6			(a)	Inver Grove H	none	1		
Albavar Path	0	0	0	0	0	0		6			(a)	Inver Grove H	none			
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0										

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Curb Ramp Case Ratings

- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- 6 No pedestrian facilities exist.

Notes

(a) gravel road



CR 73 (Akron Av - Rosemount): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated	CIP Projects sin	ce 2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year Type	Segment
north city boundary	121st St W	none	U			0.11		none	U				0.11	n/a		(a), (b)	Rosemount	reconstruction	2020 Reconstruction	IGH to
121st St W	124th Ct W	none	U			0.31		none	U				0.31	n/a		(a), (b)	Rosemount	reconstruction	2020 Reconstruction	Bonaire Path
124th Ct W	127th St W	none	U			0.36		none	U				0.36	n/a		(a), (b)	Rosemount	reconstruction	2020 Reconstruction	
127th St W	Aulden Av	partial trail	- 1	0.10		0.43		trail	R	0.53			0.00	good		(c)	Rosemount	reconstruction	2020 Reconstruction	
Aulden Av	Bonaire Path W	trail	U	0.22				trail	U	0.22				good			Rosemount	reconstruction	2020 Reconstruction	
Bonaire Path W	west field access	trail	U	0.08				trail	U	0.08				good			Rosemount			
west field access	RR crossing	trail	U	0.10				trail	С	0.10				good			Rosemount			
RR crossing	141st St W	trail	R	0.30				trail	С	0.30				good			Rosemount			
141st St W	Connemara Tr	trail	U	0.27				trail	R	0.27				good			Rosemount			
Connemara Tr	new street	trail	U	0.12				trail	С	0.12				good			Rosemount			
new street	CSAH 42	trail	U	0.13				trail	U	0.13				good			Rosemount			
	TOTAL			1.32	0.00	1.21	0.00			1.75	0.00	0.00	0.78			Total Area	5.06			

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) gravel road
- (b) includes large lot residential
- (c) trail adjacent to athletic complex

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	3.07	2.44
Poor or Missing Segments*		2.62
Poor Segments	0.00	
Missing Segments	1.21	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	4.28	5.06
Rural Segments**	0.78	
TOTAL	E 06	E 06

TOTAL 5.06 5.06

^{**} Rural segments were idenitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

Linear

Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	1.75	69%
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	0%
Total	1.75	69%
One Side		
Trail on one side	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on one side	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
None	0.78	31%
TOTAL	2.53	

Land Use

R Residential (house, apartment)

- C Commercial (business, industrial)
- I Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

Recent development included trails and ramps

New APS signal at CSAH 42 intersection

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 72% 2016 48%

 $^{^{*}}$ Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

CR 73 (Akron Av - Rosemount): Pedestrian Ramp Inventory

CR 73 (Akron Av)		2023 Invent	tory	2	016 Invento	ry	Curb Ramp I	nformat	ion			Location	Updated		CIP Projects sin	ce 2016
At	# Ramps	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
121st St W	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Rosemount	reconstruction	2020	Reconstruction	IGH to
124th Ct W	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Rosemount	reconstruction	2020	Reconstruction	Bonaire Path
127th St W	2	0	0	0	0	0	added with development	2				Rosemount	reconstruction	2020	Reconstruction	
Aulden Av	4	0	0	4	0	0		2				Rosemount	reconstruction	2020	Reconstruction	
Bonaire Path W	6	0	0	2	4	0	added with development	2				Rosemount	reconstruction	2020	Reconstruction	
west field access	2	0	0	2	0	0		2				Rosemount				
RR crossing	4	0	0	4	0	0		2				Rosemount				
141st St W	4	0	0	4	0	0		2				Rosemount				
Connemara Tr	4	0	0	4	0	0		2				Rosemount				
new street	8	0	0	8	0	0	included partial access islands	2				Rosemount				
CSAH 42	0	0	0	0	0	0	included as CSAH 42 inventory	2			7	Rosemount				
TOTAL	34	0	4	28	4	4								1		

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Curb Ramp Case Ratings

- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- 6 No pedestrian facilities exist.
- 7 Signal included in CSAH 42 inventory

Compariso	on Summary				
gravel road	d, rural design				
Compliance	e Percentage (i	ncludes areas of r	no sidewalk)		
2023	100%				
2016	88%				

CSAH 73 (Babcock Trail): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated		CIP Projects since	2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
CSAH 14	46th St E	sidewalk	R	0.07				none	- 1			0.07		Fair	Medium		Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	CSAH 14
46th St E	47th St E	sidewalk	R	0.11				none	R			0.11		Fair	Medium		Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	to
47th St E	49th St E (north)	sidewalk	R	0.15				none	R			0.15		Fair	Medium		Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	1-494
49th St E (north)	49th St E (south)	sidewalk	R	0.11				none	U			0.11		Fair	Medium		Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	
49th St E (south)	50th St E	sidewalk	U	0.11				none	С			0.11		Fair	Medium		Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	
50th St E	I-494 overpass	sidewalk	U	0.10				none	U			0.10		Fair	Medium		Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	
I-494 overpass	52nd St E	none	U			0.10		none	U			0.10		n/a	High	(a)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	1-494
52nd St E	Greystone Dr	none	С			0.17		none	R			0.17		n/a	High	(a)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
Greystone Dr	55th St E	none	С			0.18		none	R			0.18		n/a	High	(b)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	to
55th St E	Upper 55th St E	none	- 1			0.14		none	U			0.14		n/a	High	(b)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	CSAH 26
Upper 55th St E	59th Ct E	none	R			0.16		none	R			0.16		n/a	Low	(b), (c)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
59th Ct E	60th St E	none	R			0.08		none	R			0.08		n/a	Low	(b), (d)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
60th St E	63rd St E	none	R			0.24		none	R			0.24		n/a	Low	(b), (d)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
63rd St E	65th St E	none	R			0.30		none	С			0.30		n/a	Low	(b), (d)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
65th St E	67th St E	none	R			0.17		none	R			0.17		n/a	Low	(b), (d)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
67th St E	68th St E	none	R			0.08		none	R			0.08		n/a	Low	(b), (d)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
68th St E	Inverness Tr	none	R			0.18		none	R			0.18		n/a	Low	(b), (d)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
Inverness Tr	CSAH 26	none	U			0.17		none	С			0.17		n/a	Low	(b), (d)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
CSAH 26	Baldwin Av	trail	R	0.11				none	_			0.11		Good	Low		Inver Grove H				
Baldwin Av	75th St E	trail	R	0.24				none	_			0.24		Good	Low		Inver Grove H				
75th St E	CSAH 28	none	R			0.56		none	R			0.56		n/a	Medium	(b), (d)	Inver Grove H		l		
	TOTAL	,		0.99	0.00	2.53	0.00	•		0.00	0.00	3.52	0.00	•	•	Total Area	7.04				

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) wide shoulders for bicycling
- (b) shoulders narrow
- (c) elementary school
- (d) utility poles in areas of potential sidewalk/trail

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	0.99	0.99
Poor or Missing Segments*		6.05
Poor Segments	0.00	
Missing Segments	6.05	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	7.04	7.04
Rural Segments**	0.00	
TOTAL	7.04	7.04

^{**} Rural segments were idenitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

	Linear	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	0.00	0%
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
One Side		
Trail on one side	0.35	10%
Sidewalk on one side	0.65	18%
Total	1.00	28%
None	2.52	72%

Land Use

- Residential (house, apartment)
- C Commercial (business, industrial)
- I Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- U Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

Mostly rural design. Areas of steep slope.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 14%

2016 14%

TOTAL 3.52

^{*} Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

CSAH 73 (Babcock Trail): Pedestrian Ramp Inventory

CSAH 73 (Babcock Tr)	- 2	2023 Invento	ory		2016 Invento	ry	Curb Ramp	Details				Location	Updated		CIP Projects since	2016
At	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
46th St E	2	0	2	2	0	2		2			(a)	Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	CSAH 14
47th St E	2	0	0	2	0	0		2				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	to
48th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	I-494
49th St E	2	0	2	2	0	2		2				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	
50th St E	3	0	1	3	0	1		2				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	
I-494 overpass	0	0	0	0	0	0		5				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	
52nd St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2020	Mill & Overlay	
Greystone Dr	0	0	4	0	0	4		6				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	I-494
55th St E	5	0	1	1	0	3		2				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	to
Upper 55th St E	0	1	3	0	1	3	for trail EB on Upper 55th St E	4				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	CSAH 26
59th Ct E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
60th St E	0	0	4	0	0	4		6				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
63rd St E	0	1	3	0	1	3	for 63rd St E	4				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
65th St E	1	0	1	1	0	1	for 65th St E	2				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
67th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
68th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
Inverness Tr	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
CSAH 26	2	0	2	2	0	2	trail cross at grade, south side	2				Inver Grove H	Repaving	2023	Mill & Overlay	
Baldwin Av	2	0	0	2	0	0	_	2				Inver Grove H				
75th St E	1	0	1	1	0	1	_	3				Inver Grove H	·			
CSAH 28	2	0	2	2	0	2	for 80th St E trail & sidewalk	3				Inver Grove H				
TOTAL	22	2	38	18	2	40	•									

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Curb Ramp Case Ratings

- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- 6 No pedestrian facilities exist.

Notes

(a) No facilities exist on west side at Atwater Path

Comparison Summary

Ramps required at Upper 55th St E and 63rd St E

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 92%

2016 90%

CSAH 73 (Barnes Avenue): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated	CI	P Projects since	2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
CSAH 28	TH 55 entrance	none	U			0.52		none	U			0.52		f/a	Medium	(a)	Inver Grove H				
TH 55 entrance	TH 55 exit	none	U			0.12		trail	U	0.00	0.12			poor	Medium	(a), (e)	Inver Grove H				
TH 55 exit	Courthouse Blvd	none	U			0.08		trail	U	0.00	0.08			poor	Medium	(a), (e)	Inver Grove H				
Courthouse Blvd	91st St E	none	U				0.39	none	U				0.39	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
91st St E	94th Ct E	none	U				0.36	none	U				0.36	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
94th Ct E	96th St E	none	U				0.28	none	U				0.28	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
96th St E	99th St E	none	U				0.21	none	U				0.21	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
99th St E	100th St E	none	U				0.12	none	U				0.12	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
100th St E	Barnes Way	none	U				0.19	none	U				0.19	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
Barnes Way	Barnes Way E	none	U				0.19	none	U				0.19	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
Barnes Way E	105th St E	none	U				0.17	none	U				0.17	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
105th St E	Rich Valley Park	none	U				0.32	none	U				0.32	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
Rich Valley Park	CSAH 71	none	- 1				0.22	none	U				0.22	n/a		(b), (c), (d)	Inver Grove H				
	TOTAL			0.00	0.00	0.72	2.44			0.00	0.20	0.52	2.44			Total Area	6.32				

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) wide shoulders to accommodate bicyclists
- (b) shoulder narrows significantly
- (c) utility poles and vegetation near the road
- (d) mostly undeveloped space with some rural residential
- (e) numerous horizontal cracks and vegetation growth

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	0.00	0.20
Poor or Missing Segments*		6.12
Poor Segments	0.20	
Missing Segments	1.24	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	1.44	6.32
Rural Segments**	4.88	
TOTAL	6 32	6.32

^{*} Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

^{**} Rural seaments were idenitied as missing seaments within municipalities in 2016.

	Linear	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	0.00	09
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	09
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	09
Total	0.00	09
One Side		
Trail on one side	0.20	69
Sidewalk on one side	0.00	09
Total	0.20	69
None	2.96	949
TOTAL	3.16	

Land Use

- Residential (house, apartment)
- C Commercial (business, industrial) Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

The existing .2 miles of trail is now in poor condition compared to 2016. Segments south of Courthouse Blvd is considered rural land use.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails) 2023 0%

2016 3%

CSAH 73 (Barnes Avenue): Pedestrian Ramp Inventory

CSAH 73 (Barnes Av)		2023 Invento	ory		2016 Invento	ry	Curb Ramp	Details	;			Location	Updated		CIP Projects since	2016
At	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
TH 55 entrance	2	0	0	2	0	0	for trail from City Hall	2				Inver Grove H				
TH 55 exit	2	0	0	2	0	0		2				Inver Grove H				
Courthouse Blvd	1	0	3	1	0	3	trail ends	2			(a)	Inver Grove H				
91st St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
94th Ct E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
96th St E	0	0	4	0	0	4		6				Inver Grove H				
99th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
100th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
Barnes Way	0	0	4	0	0	4		6				Inver Grove H				
Barnes Way E	0	0	4	0	0	4		6				Inver Grove H				
105th St E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
Rich Valley Park	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Inver Grove H				
CSAH 71	0	0	0	0	0	0	included in CSAH 71 inventory	n/a				Inver Grove H				
TOTAL	5	0	27	5	0	27										

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Curb Ramp Case Ratings

- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- 6 No pedestrian facilities exist.

Notes

(a) drainage/washout problem observed near pedestrian ramp

Comparison Summary

In compliance where facilities exist.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 100% 2016 100%

CSAH 73 (Oakdale Ave): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated		CIP Projects since	2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
E. Annapolis St	Hurley St E	sidewalk	R	0.06	0.00			sidewalk	R	0.06	0.00			Poor		(a)	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	CSAH 8
Hurley St E	Haskell St E	sidewalk	R	0.06				sidewalk	R	0.06				Fair			West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	to
Haskell St E	Mainzer St	sidewalk	R	0.06				sidewalk	R	0.06				Fair			West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	Annapolis
Mainzer St	Bernard St E	sidewalk	R	0.06				sidewalk	R	0.06				Fair			West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
Bernard St E	Roeller Av	sidewalk	R	0.06				sidewalk	R	0.06				Fair			West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
Roeller Av	Arion St E	sidewalk	R	0.06				sidewalk	- 1	0.06				Fair/E, Good/W			West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
Arion St E	Stanley St	sidewalk	R	0.06				sidewalk	R	0.06				Fair/E, Good/W			West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
Stanley St	CR 4	sidewalk	R	0.06				sidewalk	R	0.06				Fair/E, Good/W			West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	CSAH 8
CR 4	Conver St	sidewalk	R	0.06				sidewalk	R	0.06				Fair			West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	to
Conver St	Westchester St	none	- 1			0.06		sidewalk	R	0.06				Good/W	Medium	(b)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	CSAH 4
Westchester St	Moreland Av E	none	- 1			0.06		none	R			0.06		n/a	Medium		West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Moreland Av E	Stassen Dr	none	R			0.10		none	R			0.10		n/a	High		West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Stassen Dr	Logan Av W	none	R			0.03		sidewalk	R		0.03			Poor	High		West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Logan Av W	Logan Av E	none	R			0.10		none	R			0.10		n/a	High	(c)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Logan Av E	Emerson Av E	none	R			0.08		none	R			0.08		n/a	High	(c)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Emerson Av E	Oakdale Ct	trail	R		0.17			none	R			0.17		Poor	Medium	(c), (d), (e)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Oakdale Ct	Rehnberg PI	trail	R		0.04			none	R			0.04		Poor	Medium	(c), (d), (e)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Rehnberg Pl	CSAH 6	trail	R		0.09			none	R			0.09		Poor	Medium	(c), (d), (e)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
CSAH 6	Schletty Ln	none	R			0.08		trail	R	0.08	0.00			Good	Medium	(d), (e)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Schletty Ln	CSAH 8	none	R			0.18		trail	R	0.18	0.00			Good	Medium	(d), (e)	West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	CSAH 8
CSAH 8	Lothenbach Av	trail	С	0.26	0.00			none	R			0.26		Good	High	(c)	West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	to
Lothenbach Av	Holiday Rd	trail	R	0.13	0.00			none	O			0.13		Good	High	(c)	West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	CSAH 14
Holiday Rd	Marie Av E	trail	R	0.14	0.00			none	С			0.14		Good	High	(c)	West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	
Marie Av E	Westview Dr	trail	R	0.10	0.00			none	R			0.10		Good	High		West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	
Westview Dr	CSAH 14	trail	R	0.37	0.00			none	R			0.37		Good	High	(c), (e)	West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	
	TOTAL			1.56	0.29	0.67	0.00			0.89	0.03	1.64	0.00	•		Total Area	5.08		Ī		

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) multiple cracking, sloping issues, limited ROW
- (b) no sidewalk on west side along St. Croix Lutheran High School
- (c) utility poles and trees in areas of potential sidewalk
- (d) narrow bituminous with perpendicular cracking
- (e) limited ROW

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	2.45	1.14
Poor or Missing Segments*		3.94
Poor Segments	0.32	
Missing Segments	2.31	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	5.08	5.08
Rural Segments**	0.00	
TOTAL	5.08	5.08

^{*} Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

^{**} Rural segments were idenitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

	Linear	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	0.00	09
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	09
Sidewalk on both sides	0.54	219
Total	0.54	219
One Side		
Trail on one side	1.56	629
Sidewalk on one side	0.09	49
Total	1.65	659
None	0.34	135
TOTAL	2.53	

Land Use

- R Residential (house, apartment)
- C Commercial (business, industrial)
- Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

Follow up/site visit required to confirm/update segment between Conver St

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 48% 2016 22%

CSAH 73 (Oakdale Ave): Pedestrian Ramp Inventory

CSAH 73 (Oakdale Av)	Complies To Comply No Facility Complies To Comply 2						Curb Ramp	Detail	s			Location	Updated		CIP Projects since 2	2016
At	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
E. Annapolis St	2	0	0	2	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	CSAH 8
Hurley St E	4	0	0	4	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	to
Haskell St E	4	0	0	4	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	Annapolis
Mainzer St	4	0	0	4	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
Bernard St E	4	0	0	4	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
Roeller Av	4	0	0	4	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
Arion St E	4	0	0	4	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
Stanley St	4	0	0	4	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Repaving	2017	Mill & Overlay	
CR 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	included in CR 4 inventory	n/a				West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	CSAH 8
Conver St	2	0	0	2	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	to
Westchester St	2	0	0	2	0	0		2			striped	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	CSAH 4
Moreland Av E	2	0	2	2	0	2		2			(a)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Stassen Dr	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Logan Av W	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Logan Av E	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Emerson Av E	0	0	8	0	0	8		6				West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Oakdale Ct	2	0	0	0	2	0		4			(b)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Rehnberg Pl	2	0	0	0	2	0		4			(b)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
CSAH 6	16	0	0	0	3	1	roundabout	3			(c)	West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
Schletty Ln	0	0	4	0	0	2		5				West St. Paul	Trail	2022	Trail Construction	
CSAH 8	16	0	0	2	2	0	roundabout	3			(d)	West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	CSAH 8
Lothenbach Av	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	to
Holiday Rd	2	0	0	0	0	2		6				West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	CSAH 14
Marie Av E	5	0	0	1	0	3		6			(e)	West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	
Westview Dr	2	0	2	0	0	4		6				West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	
CSAH 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	included in CSAH 14 inventory	n/a				West St. Paul	Trail	2018	Trail Construction	
TOTAL	81	0	24	39	9	30										

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Curb Ramp Case Ratings

- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- 6 No pedestrian facilities exist.

Notes

- (a) Ramps for Moreland Av E and St. Croix Lutheran High School entrance
- (b) Trail crossing, needs to be checked
- (c) Trail ends on east side and continues on west side
- (d) Trail ends on west side and continues on east side
- (e) Ramp to bus stop on Marie Av E

Comparison Summary

Follow up/site visit required to confirm/update segment between Conver St and Emerson Av.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023	100%
2016	81%

CSAH 74 (Ash St - Farmington): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated		CIP Projects since	2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
CSAH 31	Westdel Rd (west)	none	R			0.04		none	- 1			0.04		n/a	Medium	(a)	Farmington				
Westdel Rd (west)	Westdel Rd (east)	none	R			0.07		none	_			0.07		n/a	Medium	(a)	Farmington				
Westdel Rd (east)	Dakota Electric	none	R			0.12		none	С			0.12		n/a	Medium	(a)	Farmington				
Dakota Electric	1st St	none	R			0.14		none	R			0.14		n/a	Medium	(a), (b)	Farmington				
1st St	railroad crossing	none	U			0.02		none	U			0.02		n/a	Medium	(a)	Farmington				
railroad crossing	Honeysuckle Ln	sidewalk	R	0.03				none	С			0.03		fair	Low	(b)	Farmington				
Honeysuckle Ln	2nd St	sidewalk	R	0.06				none	- 1			0.06		fair	Low	(b)	Farmington				
2nd St	3rd St	sidewalk	R	0.08				none	- 1			0.08		fair	Low	(b)	Farmington				
3rd St	4th St	sidewalk	R	0.08				none	- 1			0.08		fair	Low		Farmington				
4th St	5th St	sidewalk	R	0.07				none	R			0.07		fair	Low		Farmington				
5th St	6th St	sidewalk	- 1	0.07				none	R			0.07		fair	Low		Farmington				
6th St	7th St	sidewalk	R	0.07				none	R			0.07		fair	Low	(b)	Farmington				
7th St	Highland Cir	sidewalk	R	0.01				none	R			0.01		fair	Low		Farmington				
Highland Cir	TH 3	sidewalk	С	0.05				none	R			0.05		fair	Low		Farmington				
	TOTAL	,		0.52	0.00	0.39	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.91	0.00			Total Area	1.82				

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) wide shoulder
- (b) driveways

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	0.52	0.52
Poor or Missing Segments*		1.30
Poor Segments	0.00	
Missing Segments	1.30	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	1.82	1.82
Rural Segments**	0.00	
TOTAL	1.82	1.82

^{*} Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

** Rural segments were idenitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

nara segments were racinica as missing segments within manicipanites in 2010.

	Linear	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	0.00	0%
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
One Side		
Trail on one side	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on one side	0.52	57%
Total	0.52	57%
None	0.39	43%
TOTAL	0.91	

Land Use

- R Residential (house, apartment)
- C Commercial (business, industrial)
- I Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- U Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails) 2023 29% 2016 29%

CSAH 74 (Ash St - Farmington): **Pedestrian Ramp Inventory**

CSAH 74 (Ash St)		2023 Invento	ory	2016 Inventory			Curb Ramp	Details	;		Location	Updated		CIP Projects since	2016	
At	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Туре	Segment
Westdel Rd (west)	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Farmington				
Westdel Rd (east)	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Farmington				
Dakota Electric	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Farmington				
1st St	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Farmington				
railroad crossing	1	0	4	0	0	4		6				Farmington				
Honeysuckle Ln	2	0	0	2	0	0		2				Farmington				
2nd St	2	0	2	2	0	2		2				Farmington				
3rd St	2	0	2	2	0	2		2				Farmington				
4th St	2	0	0	2	0	0		2				Farmington				
5th St	2	0	0	2	0	0		2				Farmington				
6th St	3	0	1	3	0	1		2			(a)	Farmington				
7th St	2	0	0	2	0	0		2				Farmington				
Highland Cir	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Farmington				
TH 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	included in MnDOT inventory	n/a				Farmington				
TOTAL	16	0	19	15	0	19										

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Curb Ramp Case Ratings

- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant
- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.
- 6 No pedestrian facilities exist.

Notes

(a) ramp in southwest corner with no connection

Comparison Summary

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 100% 2016 100%

CSAH 78 (240th St E - Hampton): Sidewalk Inventory

			Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Land	Good/F	Poor	Missing	Rural		Pedestrian Gap			Updated		CIP Projects since	2016
From	То	East/North	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	West/South	Use	Length	Length	Length	Length	Rating (G/F/P)	Priority	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Type	Segment
west city boundary	CSAH 47	none	U				0.32	none	U		twp			n/a		(a), (b)	Hampton	repaving	2021	Construction	CSAH 79
CSAH 47	TH 50	none	U				0.50	none	U		twp			n/a		(a), (c)	Hampton	int. realign.	2021	Construction	to TH 50
	TOTAL			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.82			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			Total Area	0.82				

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

Updated information shown in red text

Rural segments were identified as a Rural Land Use Context in the Dakota County Bicycle and Pedestrian Study

Notes

- (a) south side of highway is in Hampton Township
- (b) no shoulders
- (c) rural residential with driveways

Includes Both Sides	2023	2016
Good or Fair Segments	0.00	0.00
Poor or Missing Segments*		0.82
Poor Segments	0.00	
Missing Segments	0.00	
TOTAL Urban/Suburban Only	0.00	0.82
Rural Segments**	0.82	
TOTAL	0.02	0.03

UIAL 0.82 0.82

rearen segments were identitied as missing segments within manicipalities in 201

	Linear	
Both Sides	Miles	%
Trail on both sides	0.00	0%
Trail on one side, sidewalk on other	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on both sides	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
One Side		
Trail on one side	0.00	0%
Sidewalk on one side	0.00	0%
Total	0.00	0%
None	0.82	100%
TOTAL	0.82	

Land Use

- R Residential (house, apartment)
 C Commercial (business, industrial)
- I Institutional (school, church, park, athletic complex)
- U Undeveloped (open space, utilities, transportation)

Comparison Summary

Entire segment is identified as a rural land use.

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

2023 100% 2016 0%

^{*} Poor and Missing Segments were combined as one category in 2016 for ADA compliance purposes.

** Rural segments were identitied as missing segments within municipalities in 2016.

CSAH 78 (240th St E - Hampton): **Pedestrian Ramp Inventory**

2016 Inventory

C3AH 80 (240th 3t E)		zuza inventu	лy	2016 inventory			Curb Kamp				Location	Opuateu		CIP Projects since a	7010	
At	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Complies	To Comply	No Facility	Additional Description	Case	Signal	APS	Notes	City	Revisions	Year	Type	Segment
CSAH 47	0	0	4	0	0	4		6				Hampton	repaving	2021	Construction	CSAH 79
TH 50	0	0	2	0	0	2		6				Hampton	int. realign.	2021	Construction	to TH 50
TOTAL	0	0	6	0	0	6								L		
•																

Curb Bown Dotaile

Shaded areas represent priority locations, areas of missing infrastructure and/or areas to address

6 No pedestrian facilities exist.

CCAU 90 /240+b C+ E)

- **Curb Ramp Case Ratings**
- 1 Ramps with truncated domes that have been checked for compliance
- 2 Ramps that appear substantially compliant

2022 Incompany

- 3 Ramps without truncated domes
- 4 Ramps in need of construction installation or modification
- 5 Trail exists on one side of road. Trail is at grade & does not require ramps.

Comparison Summary

2016

Compliance Percentage (includes areas with sidewalks or trails)

100%

CID Duciosta since 2016

100%