Application

04751-2016 Roadway Expansion
05229 - Scott County Highway 14 Overpass of US 169
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Status:
Submitted Date:
Submitted
07/15/2016 3:48 PM

## Primary Contact

| Name:* |  | Lisa | Freese |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salutation | First Name | Last Name |
| Title: | Transportation Program Director |  |  |
| Department: | Physical Development Department |  |  |
| Email: | Ifreese@co.scott.mn.us |  |  |
| Address: | Scott County |  |  |
|  | 600 County Trail East |  |  |
| * | Jordan | Minnesota | 55352 |
|  | City | State/Province | Postal Code/Zip |
| Phone:* | 952-496-8363 |  |  |
|  | Phone |  |  |
| Fax: |  |  |  |
| What Grant Programs are you most interested in? | Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements |  |  |

## Organization Information

Jurisdictional Agency (if different):


## Project Information

Project Name
Primary County where the Project is Located

US 169 and CSAH 14 Grade Separation
Scott

Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

Brief Project Description (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

The project is construction of a grade-separated interchange facility at US 169/CSAH 14 with a supporting frontage road network. The US 169/CSAH 14 intersection is currently an at-grade unsignalized intersection. This application is for a quadrant access or quadrant interchange facility and is a lower cost approach than traditional interchange designs. CSAH 14 is an A-Minor Arterial that serves as an access point to US 169 for Louisville Township.
The project addresses access \& safety for the movement of heavy commercial vehicles (HCV) through the corridor. The interchange and frontage road system at CH 14 will eliminate exposure of slow moving industrial and mining vehicles to the existing full, at-grade crossing with the high speed of the US 169 mainline. The project removes direct private and public access to US 169 and creates alternate routes with safer access to US 169 for freight traffic generated from adjacent mining and industrial uses. The project facilitates movement across US 169 and allows for right-in right-out access via acceleration lanes on to US 169 to safely serve high-volume truck generators. Addition of and extension of truck deceleration (turn lanes) and acceleration lanes are part of the project layout. The addition of these lanes and elimination of full access turning movements create a safer environment for the movement of freight in and out of the project area. The overpass bridge will be constructed wide enough to accommodate a planned regional trail crossing. The separated grade facility will increase safety for crossing US 169.

Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.

TIP Description Guidance (will be used in TIP if the project is selected for funding)

Project Length (Miles)

US169 and CSAH 14 grade separation
0.5

## Project Funding

| Are you applying for funds from another source(s) to implement this project? | No |
| :---: | :---: |
| If yes, please identify the source(s) |  |
| Federal Amount | \$4,702,433.00 |
| Match Amount | \$1,175,608.00 |
| Minimum of 20\% of project total |  |
| Project Total | \$5,878,041.00 |
| Match Percentage | 20.0\% |
| Minimum of 20\% |  |
|  |  |
| Source of Match Funds | Local |
| 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 |  |
| Preferred Program Year |  |
| Select one: | 2020 |
| For TDM projects, select 2018 or 2019. For Roadway, Transit, or Trail/Pedestrian projects, select 2020 or 2021. |  |
| Additional Program Years: | 2019 |
| Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available. |  |

## Project Information: Roadway Projects

| County, City, or Lead Agency | Scott County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Class of Road | Non Freeway Principal Arterial |
| Road System | TH |
| TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET |  |
| Road/Route No. | 169 |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 |  |
| Name of Road |  |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE |  |
| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | 55379 |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date | $05 / 29 / 2020$ |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date | $06 / 30 / 2021$ |
| TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work) |  |
| From: |  |
| (Intersection or Address) |  |
| To: |  |
| (Intersection or Address) |  |

Or At CSAH 14

Primary Types of Work

Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, BRIDGE, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)
Old Bridge/Culvert No.:
New Bridge/Culvert No.: TBD
Structure is Over/Under
(Bridge or culvert name):

CSAH 14
GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, BRIDGE
$\qquad$

## Specific Roadway Elements

## CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES <br> Cost

Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost)
\$279,900.00
Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost) \$31,200.00
Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) \$1,043,800.00
Roadway (aggregates and paving) $\quad \$ 1,163,442.00$
Subgrade Correction (muck)
$\$ 311,700.00$
Storm Sewer \$180,000.00
Ponds \$180,000.00
Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) \$0.00
Traffic Control
\$36,000.00
Striping
\$30,000.00
Signing
\$30,000.00
Lighting
\$20,000.00
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping
\$120,000.00
Bridge
\$2,178,000.00
Retaining Walls
$\$ 0.00$
Noise Wall (do not include in cost effectiveness measure) \$0.00
Traffic Signals
Wetland Mitigation
\$50,000.00
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection \$0.00
RR Crossing \$0.00
Roadway Contingencies ..... \$163,000.00
Other Roadway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$5,817,042.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES
Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... $\$ 61,000.00$
Sidewalk Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... $\$ 0.00$
Streetscaping ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$61,000.00
Specific Transit and TDM Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES ..... Cost
Fixed Guideway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Stations, Stops, and Terminals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Support Facilities ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.)
Vehicles ..... $\$ 0.00$
Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Transit and TDM Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$

## Transit Operating Costs

| Number of Platform hours | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cost Per Platform hour (full loaded Cost) | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Substotal | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Other Costs - Administration, Overhead,etc. | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Totals

| Total Cost | $\$ 5,878,042.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 5,878,042.00$ |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Requirements - All Projects

## All Projects

1.The project must be consistent with the goals and policies in these adopted regional plans: Thrive MSP 2040 (2014), the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2015), and the 2040 Water Resources Policy Plan (2015).

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
2.The project must be consistent with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Reference the 2040 Transportation Plan objectives and strategies that relate to the project.

# Goal C: Access to Destinations (Page 2.24), Objectives B \& C (Page 2.24) 

List the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages:
Strategies C9 (Page 2.32), C10 (Page 2.32-2.33), C19 (Page 2.37)
3. The project or the transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document. Reference the name of the appropriate comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study document [studies on trunk highway must be approved by the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Council], or other official plan or program of the applicant agency [includes Safe Routes to School Plans] that the project is included in and/or a transportation problem/need that the project addresses.

List the applicable documents and pages:

# Scott County 2016-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (part of County?s CIP). Listed in program year 2016 on page 43 of CIP. Project \# CTP 169-09 is related to frontage road development in project area. <br> Scott County 2030 Comprehensive Plan <br> Amendment, October 25, 2011. TH 169 Frontage Road Alignment Study, Page 15 ? 16 of amendment. <br> TH 169 Frontage Road Alignment Study, Louisville <br> Township. Prepared by Bolton \& Menk, Inc. (2010). <br> Full study is applicable to project; specifically project alignment figure is on Page 11. 

## Transportation Tax Implementation Plan, Page 4 on list of projects

4.The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of bicycle/pedestrian projects, 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, which is otherwise eligible.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5.Applicants that are not cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
6.Applicants must not submit an application for the same project elements in more than one funding application category.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
7.The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Funding amounts by application category are listed below.
Roadway Expansion: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Roadway System Management \$250,000 to \$7,000,000
Bridges Rehabilitation/ Replacement: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
8.The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
9.The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
10.The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project for the useful life of the improvement.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
11.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 construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match. Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
12. The 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. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages. 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 this requirement. Yes
13. The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected state and local units of government prior to submitting the application.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

## Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

1.All roadway and bridge projects must be identified as a Principal Arterial (Non-Freeway facilities only) or A-Minor Arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Roadway Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization projects only:
2. The project must be designed to meet 10-ton load limit standards.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:
3.Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a Principal Arterial freeway must be limited to the federal share of those project costs identified as local (non-MnDOT) cost responsibility using MnDOTs Cost Participation for Cooperative Construction Projects and Maintenance Responsibilities manual. In the case of a federally funded trunk highway project, the policy guidelines should be read as if the funded trunk highway route is under local jurisdiction.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
4.The bridge must carry vehicular traffic. Bridges can carry traffic from multiple modes. However, bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or pedestrian traffic must apply under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities application categories. Rail-only bridges are ineligible for funding.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
5. The length of the bridge must equal or exceed 20 feet.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
6. The bridge must have a sufficiency rating less than 80 for rehabilitation projects and less than 50 for replacement projects. Additionally, the bridge must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

## Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Select one:
Area
Project Length
Average Distance
Upload Map

Non-Freeway Principal Arterial
2.185
0.505
4.3267

1468534965031_US169_Roadway_Area_Def_Map.pdf

## Reliever: Relieves a Principle Arterial that is a Freeway Facility

Facility being relieved
Number of hours per day volume exceeds capacity (based on the Congestion Report)

## Reliever: Relives a Principle Arterial that is a Non-Freeway Facility

Facility being relieved
Number of hours per day volume exceeds capacity (based on the table below)

## Non-Freeway Facility Volume/Capacity Table

| Hour | NB/EB Volume | SB/WB Volume | Capacity | Volume exceeds capacity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00am-1:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 1:00am-2:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 2:00am-3:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 3:00am-4:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 4:00am-5:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 5:00am-6:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 6:00am-7:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 7:00am-8:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 8:00am-9:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 9:00am-10:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 10:00am - 11:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 11:00am-12:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 12:00pm-1:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 1:00pm-2:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 2:00pm-3:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 3:00pm - 4:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |

```
4:00pm - 5:00pm 0
5:00pm-6:00pm 0
6:00pm-7:00pm 0
7:00pm-8:00pm 0
8:00pm-9:00pm 0
9:00pm-10:00pm 0
10:00pm -11:00pm 0
11:00pm-12:00am 0
```


## Measure B: Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, and Education

Existing Employment within 1 Mile: 397
Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1
Mile:
Existing Students: 0
Upload Map 1468535008953_US169_Regional_Economy_Map.pdf

## Measure C: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

Location:
Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume:
Date heavy commercial count taken:

TH 169 north of CSAH 14 3966

June 2016

## Measure D: Freight Elements

Response (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

US 169 is a high priority interregional corridor serving as a key freight connection between Southern MN, Savage Ports \& Twin Cities. The project addresses access control for the movement of heavy commercial vehicles (HCV) through the corridor. 13-16 percent of the daily traffic through the corridor is HCV. The overpass and frontage road system at CH 14 will eliminate exposure of slow moving industrial vehicles to the at-grade crossing with the US 169 mainline. The project removes direct access to US 169 and creates alternate routes with safer access to US 169 for freight traffic generated from adjacent mining and industrial uses. The project facilitates movement across US 169 and allows for right-in right-out access via acceleration lanes on to US 169 to safely serve high-volume truck generators. Addition of and extension of truck deceleration (turn lanes) and acceleration lanes are part of the project layout. The addition of these lanes and elimination of full access turning movements create a safer environment for the movement of freight in and out of the project area. A grade-separated interchange at CH 14/145th Street is important because construction of the interchange at US 169/TH 41 will decrease gaps for turning movements onto US 169 at CH 14 and 145th Street. Decreased gaps in through traffic on US 169 will make it difficult for slow moving freight to enter US 169.

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

| Location | TH 169 south of CSAH 14 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current AADT Volume | 28500 |
| Existing Transit Routes on the Project | N/A |

For New Roadways only, list transit routes that will be moved to the new roadway

## Response: Current Daily Person Throughput

| Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current Daily Person Throughput | 37050.0 |

## Measure B: $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ Forecast ADT

Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume

If checked, METC Staff will provide Forecast (2040) ADT volume

## OR

Identify the approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume

Forecast (2040) ADT volume
45000

## Measure A: Project Location and Impact to Disadvantaged Populations

Select one:
Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with $50 \%$ or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):

Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:
Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:

Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:

Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

The TH 169 and TH 14 interchange project is located in an area above the regional average for race or poverty. In Louisville Township, 11.1 percent of the population is nonwhite with 8.9 percent Hispanic or Latino (2010 U.S. Census). Approximately 15.2 percent of the population is below the poverty level according to the Poverty Status for Individuals computation from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate. Additionally, 9.6 percent of the population is over the age of 65 .

The project will include a pedestrian crossing of TH 169. This grade separated pedestrian crossing of TH 169 is safer for non-auto users such as bicyclists and pedestrians compared to the existing at grade, high speed uncontrolled condition. The overpass bridge will be constructed wide enough on one side to accommodate a planned regional trail crossing which will make a connection to the US Fish and Wildlife Service Louisville Swamp and, eventually, across the Minnesota River connecting into the regional trail system in the City of Carver. This grade separation will provide an opportunity to co-locate the planned Minnesota Valley regional trail on the bridge. The grade separation also allows for a safer vehicle crossing of TH 169 for residents or the local dial-a-ride transit service. Intercity bus service is provided in this area by Land to Air. All pedestrian facilities will be upgraded to current ADA standards to improve access for populations with disabilities.

The response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations affected by the project.
Upload Map
1468535399390_US169_Socio-Economic_Cond_Map.pdf

## Measure B: Affordable Housing

City/Township
Louisville Township
Segment Length in Miles (Population) 0.505

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length (Total Population)
0.5

## Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

City/Township \begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
Segment <br>
Length (Miles)

 

Total Length <br>
(Miles)

$\quad$ Score $\quad$

Segment <br>
Length/Total <br>
Length

 

Housing Score <br>
Multiplied by <br>
Segment <br>
percent
\end{tabular}

## Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

| Total Project Length (Miles) | 0.505 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Housing Score | 0 |

## Measure A: Infrastructure Age

Year of Original

| Roadway Construction <br> or Most Recent <br> Reconstruction | Segment Length | Calculation | Calculation 2 |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1968.0 | 0.5 | 984.0 | 1968.0 |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | 984 | 1968 |

## Average Construction Year

Weighted Year
1968.0

## Total Segment Length (Miles)

Total Segment Length

Measure A: Vehicle Delay Reduction


## Total Delay

Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced
2107.0

## Measure B:Roadway projects that do not include new roadway segments or railroad grade-separation elements



## Total

Total Emissions Reduced:
Upload Synchro Report
294.98

1468535682281_US169-14 PM Synchro Report.pdf

Measure B: Roadway projects that are constructing new roadway segments, but do not include railroad grade-separation elements (for Roadway Expansion applications only):

| Total (CO, NOX, | Total (CO, NOX, |
| :---: | :---: |
| and VOC) Peak | and VOC) Peak |
| Hour Emissions | Hour Emissions |
| Per Vehicle | Per Vehicle with |
| without the Project | the Project |
| (Kilograms): | (Kilograms): |

0

| Total (CO, NOX, |  | Total (CO, NOX, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| and VOC) Peak |  | and VOC) Peak |
| Hour Emissions | Volume (Vehicles | Hour Emissions |
| Reduced Per | Per Hour): | Reduced by the |
| Vehicle by the |  | Project |
| Project |  | (Kilograms): |
| (Kilograms): |  |  |

0

## Total Parallel Roadways

Emissions Reduced on Parallel Roadways
Upload Synchro Report

0

## New Roadway Portion:

Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project: 0
Vehicle miles traveled with the project: 0
Total delay in hours with the project: 0
Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project: 0
Fuel consumption in gallons: 0
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced or
Produced on New Roadway (Kilograms):
EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):

## Measure B:Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements

Cruise speed in miles per hour without the project:
Vehicle miles traveled without the project: 0
Total delay in hours without the project: 0
Total stops in vehicles per hour without the project: 0
Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project: 0
Vehicle miles traveled with the project: 0
Total delay in hours with the project: 0
Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project: 0
Fuel consumption in gallons (F1) 0
Fuel consumption in gallons (F2) ..... 0
Fuel consumption in gallons (F3) ..... 0
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): ..... 0
EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit
1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
Measure A: Benefit of Crash Reduction
Crash Modification Factor Used:(Limit 700 Characters; approximately 100 words)Rationale for Crash Modification Selected:CMF ID 2219 - Install raised medianChosen because it was the only CMF whichaddressed installing a raised median along acorridor.

$$
\text { CMF }=0.29
$$

(Limit 1400 Characters; approximately 200 words)
Project Benefit (\$) from B/C Ratio: ..... 1.58
Worksheet Attachment 1468600454640_169-14 FINAL cost benefit.xls

## Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements:

Current AADT volume
Average daily trains:
Crash Risk Exposure eliminated:00

0

Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

This project provides major safety improvements for the crossing of US 169 via an interchange overpass facility at CH 14. The overpass segment of the project will enable bicyclists and pedestrians to use a grade-separated facility to cross US 169. The closest grade-separated facilities are a planned interchange 2.3 miles north at TH 41, to be constructed in 2017, and 4.6 miles to the south at TH 21, in Jordan. The overpass bridge will be constructed wide enough on one side to accommodate a planned regional trail crossing which will make a connection to the USFWS Louisville Swamp and, eventually, across the Minnesota River connecting into the Minnesota Valley Recreational Area including the Louisville Swamp and the City of Carver. This grade separation will provide an opportunity to co-locate the planned Minnesota Valley regional trail on the bridge. The grade separation will also allow snowmobiles to safely cross TH 169 to access trails on both sides of TH 169. Today snowmobiles pick a gap to cross TH 169. This causes conflicts as motorists usually are on their brakes in icy conditions when they see snowmobiles unexpectedly cross TH 169 in front of them. Shoulders will also be included as part of the project, which will increase the walkability of the area. Pedestrian facilities will be upgraded to current ADA standards. Fixed route transit service is not present in the project area, but Dial-A-Ride transit service, Land to Air for intercity bus service, and school buses would all benefit from the grade separation. Land to Air or another provider is likely to expand public intercity bus service from Mankato to Shakopee in the near future. The project is a key safety improvement for all corridor users because it reduces the high volume of peak hour left turn movements.

If the applicant is completing a transit or TDM application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment.
Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.
Check Here if Your Transit Project Does Not Require Construction

## Measure A: Risk Assessment

1)Project Scope (5 Percent of Points)
Meetings or contacts with stakehol
$100 \%$
Stakeholders have been identified
$40 \%$

40\%

Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted
0\%
2)Layout or Preliminary Plan (5 Percent of Points)

Layout or Preliminary Plan completed Yes
100\%
Layout or Preliminary Plan started
50\%

Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started
$0 \%$
Anticipated date or date of completion
3)Environmental Documentation (5 Percent of Points)

EIS

EA
Yes

PM
Document Status:

Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)

Document submitted to State Aid for review

Document in progress; environmental impacts identified; review request letters sent

Document not started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion/approval

## 4)Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (10 Percent of Points)

No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National
Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and Yes
project is not located on an identified historic bridge
100\%
Historic/archeological review under way; determination of no
historic properties affected or no adverse effect anticipated
80\%

Historic/archaeological review under way; determination of adverse effect anticipated

40\%
Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological resources in the project area

0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review:

Project is located on an identified historic bridge
5)Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (10 Percent of Points)

4(f) Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild \& scenic rivers or public private historic properties? 6(f) Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild \& scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?

No Section 4f/6f resources located in the project area Yes

100\%
No impact to 4 f property. The project is an independent
bikeway/walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway
Negative Declaration statement; letter of support received
100\%

Section 4 f resources present within the project area, but no known adverse effects

80\%
Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely
coordination/documentation has begun
50\%
Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely
coordination/documentation has not begun
30\%
Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area

0\%
6)Right-of-Way (15 Percent of Points)

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements not required

100\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired

100\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made

75\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made

50\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified

Yes

25\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not identified

0\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed

0\%
Anticipated date or date of acquisition
01/15/2020
7)Railroad Involvement (25 Percent of Points)

No railroad involvement on project Yes
100\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature
page)
100\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated

60\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

40\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations not begun
0\%
Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement
8)Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)*
*Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mn.us or 651-234-7784)
to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway
Interchange Request Committee.
Project does not involve construction of a new/expanded
interchange or new interchange ramps
100\%

| Interchange project has been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee | Yes |
| :---: | :---: |
| 100\% |  |
| Interchange project has not been approved by the Metropolitan |  |
| Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee |  |
| 0\% |  |
| 9)Construction Documents/Plan (10 Percent of Points) |  |
| Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet) |  |
| 100\% |  |
| Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review |  |
| 75\% |  |
| Construction plans in progress; at least 30\% completion |  |
| 50\% |  |
| Construction plans have not been started | Yes |
| 0\% |  |
| Anticipated date or date of completion | 11/15/2019 |
| 10)Letting |  |
| Anticipated Letting Date | 04/15/2020 |
| Measure A: Cost Effectiveness |  |
| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | \$5,878,042.00 |
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | \$0.00 |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | \$5,878,042.00 |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria |  |
| Cost Effectiveness | \$0.00 |

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scott County - Revised Synchro Report for US 169-CSAH 14 Roadway Expansion App.pdf | Revised Synchro for scoring | 198 KB |
| Scott County Resolution 2016-130.pdf | Local Match Resolution | 258 KB |
| Scott County US169-14 PM Synchro Report-Revised.pdf | Revised Synchro for scoring | 50 KB |
| US 169-CSAH 14 Layout.pdf | Project Layout | 607 KB |
| US 169-CSAH 14 Louisville Township Letter of Support.pdf | Louisville Township Letter of Support | 243 KB |
| US 169-CSAH 14 Streetview.pdf | Project Streetview | 234 KB |
| US169 at CSAH14 Completion letter.pdf | MnDOT Interchange Review Comm Letter | 28 KB |
| US169_CSAH 14 Overpass MnDOT letter of support_071116.pdf | Letter from Agency with Jusrisdiction | 105 KB |

## Roadway Area Definition

Results
Project Length: 0.505 miles
Project Area: 2.185 sq mi


- Project Points $\square$ Project Area
Project
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit http://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx





## Existing Conditions

## 122: US 169 \& 145th

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2076 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.21 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.74 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2137 |
| Total Delay $/$ Vh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 1 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.01 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.59 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.70 |

122: US 169 \& 145th

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2119 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.24 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.75 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2130 |
| Total Delay $/$ Vh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions | $\mathrm{kg})$ |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.80 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.54 |

## Existing Conditions

## 122: US 169 \& 145th

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2076 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.21 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.74 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2137 |
| Total Delay $/$ Vh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 1 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.01 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.59 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.70 |

122: US 169 \& 145th

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2119 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.24 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.75 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2130 |
| Total Delay $/$ Vh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions | $\mathrm{kg})$ |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.80 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.54 |


| From: | Stenson, Angie |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Koutsoukos, Elaine |
| Cc: | Lisa Freese; Miner, Kate; Craig Jenson |
| Subject: | Revised Synchro Report for US 169-CSAH 14 Roadway Expansion App |
| Date: | Monday, July 18, 2016 3:23:53 PM |
| Attachments: | $\underline{\text { image001.png }}$ |
|  | $\underline{\text { image002.png }}$ |
|  | $\underline{\text { US169-14 PM Synchro Report-Revised.pdf }}$ |

Hi Elaine,
Attached is the revised Synchro report document for Scott County application on US 169-CSAH 14 under the Roadway Expansion category. Page 2 was inserted into the report to show existing conditions once the programmed interchange at US 169 and TH 41 is constructed. The interchange project is currently in the TIP and STIP as project \#070-596-013. The expected construction of the US 169-TH 41 interchange is 2018.

The new Synchro analysis better reflects the existing conditions at the time of potential funding availability. The US169-TH 41 interchange project is located approximately 2 miles north of the project area at US 169-CSAH 14 and converts an at-grade signalized intersection to an interchange. It is forecasted that gaps on US 169 at CSAH 14 will be shortened, creating difficult conditions for turning movements for heavy commercial vehicles. For example, by 2040, turning movement delay from CSAH 14 onto US 169 is forecasted for the peak period between 5.5 minutes up to 41.9 minutes. The attached Synchro report, including existing conditions once the interchange at US 169 and TH 41 is constructed, better reflects the delay reduction accomplished by the proposed project.

Thank you for your consideration of the attached revised Synchro report for the US 169-CSAH 14 application under the Roadway Expansion category. Please enter the numbers from page 2 of the revised report for the Vehicle Delay Reduction and Total Emissions Reduction sections of the application.

## Angíe Stenson, $\mathcal{A} I C \mathcal{P} \cdot \operatorname{Principal~Planner-Transportation~}$

Scott County Community Services Division • Highway Department 600 Country Trail East • Jordan, MN 55352
Phone: 952-496-8839•Email: astenson@co.scott.mn.us

## Existing Conditions

## 122: US 169 \& 145th

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2076 |
| Total Delay $/ \mathrm{Veh}(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.21 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.74 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2137 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 1 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.01 |
| NOx Emissions kg$)$ | 0.59 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.70 |

## 122: US 169 \& 145th Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 40.4 | 29.2 | 1.7 | 4.9 | 3.9 |
| HC Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 0 | 0 | 427 | 697 | 1124 |
| C Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 6 | 6 | 10221 | 16189 | 26421 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 1 | 1 | 1443 | 2695 | 4139 |
| Vehicles Entered | 5 | 9 | 847 | 1380 | 2241 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14 Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 45.4 | 43.2 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 4.5 |
| HC Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 0 | 24 | 598 | 456 | 1079 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 3 | 861 | 14979 | 10995 | 26838 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 0 | 100 | 1989 | 1758 | 3847 |
| Vehicles Entered | 4 | 66 | 877 | 1370 | 2317 |

Total Zone Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 326.9 |
| HC Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 2203 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 53258 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 7987 |
| Vehicles Entered | 966 |

122: US 169 \& 145th

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2119 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.24 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.75 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2130 |
| Total Delay $\operatorname{Vvh}(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.80 |
| NOx Emissions kg$)$ | 0.54 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.65 |

## AGENDA \# 5.3 <br> SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION <br> MEETING DATE: JULY 5, 2016

| ORIGINATING DIVISION: ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: |  | Community Services Physical Development |  | CONSENT AGENDA: | V Y | $\Gamma$ No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRESENTER: |  | Lisa Freese - 8363 Program Director |  | ATTACHMENTS: | V Y | $\Gamma$ No |
| PROJECT: |  | Regional Solicitation G Applications | Grant | TIME REQUESTED: | N/A |  |
| ACTION REQUESTED: |  | Adopt Resolution No. 2016-130; Authorizing Submittal of Transportation Projects to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) for Consideration in the 2016 Regional Solicitation Process |  |  |  |  |
| CONTRACT/POLICY/GRANT: |  | $\Gamma$ County Attorney Review <br> $\Gamma$ Risk Management Review |  | FISCAL: | $\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{V i n} \\ & \Gamma \mathrm{Bu} \end{aligned}$ | Review <br> Change |
| ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES: |  | $\Gamma$ Provide a Supportive Organizational Culture <br> IV Develop Strong Public Partnerships <br> $\sqrt{\mathrm{V}}$ Manage Challenges and Create Opportunities <br> VI Assure Long Term Fiscal Stability <br> T Emphasize Excellence in Customer Service |  |  |  |  |
| DEPARTMENT/DIVISION HEAD SIGNATURE: |  |  | COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE: |  |  |  |
| Gutryfthinule. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | DISTRIBUTION/FILING INSTRUCTIONS: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Community Services, Tony Winiecki Community Services, Lisa Freese |  |  |  |
| Tabled: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deputy Clerk : Date: |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Background/Justification:

The purpose of this agenda item is to adopt Resolution No. 2016-130, authorizing submittal of transportation projects to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) for consideration in the 2016 Regional Solicitation process.

The Metropolitan Council, in partnership with TAB, is requesting project submittals for federal funding under the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TA). This funding provides up to 80 percent of the project construction cost. The local agency submitting the applications must commit to providing at least 20 percent local match and maintaining the constructed facilities for their useful life. A total of approximately $\$ 180$ million in federal funds is anticipated to be available in this solicitation for program years 2020 and 2021 for projects in the 7-County Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Also, due to increased funding levels under the new federal FAST Act legislation, limited federal funding is also available in 2017, 2018, and 2019 for projects that can be implemented sooner. Project submittals are due on July 15, 2016 for all applications. The Highway Safety

Improvement Program Solicitation (HSIP) applications are administered by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and are due September 1, 2016. The HSIP applications will be brought to the County Board for consideration in August as a separate action.

Funding applications are categorized by transportation mode (auto/roadway, bike/ped, transit) instead of by funding program. The applications also include considerations based on measures emphasized in Thrive MSP 2040, including project relationship to regional economy, equity and affordable housing, and system preservation and modernization.

Staff is recommending six projects be submitted for scoring under the regional solicitation process. If successful, projects dates of delivery may need to be accelerated by the County to align with federal funding or if federal funding availability is after the County program year, Advanced Construction (AC) will be requested. The selection process timeline will allow the County to make adjustments for successful applications in the annual update of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2018-2027,

| Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | CH 21 / TH 13 Intersection Improvements | The intersection of County Highway (CH) 21 and Trunk Highway (TH) 13 in Prior Lake has been studied by the City, County, and MnDOT. This project would add right and left turn lanes to improve operations of the intersection. TIP Year 2019 |
| 2. | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH} 83 \text { from } 12^{\text {th }} \text { to } \\ & 4^{4 \mathrm{~h}} \text { Improvements } \end{aligned}$ | CH 83 Corridor Readiness Study completed in 2016 with the City of Shakopee and MnDOT recommended several features to upgrade and modernize this segment. The reconstruction of CH 83 would include such improvements as a median down the center of the roadway, turn lanes extension at $12^{\text {th }}$ and a grade separated trail on both sides. |
| 3. | CH 21 from CH 87 to Adelman Ave | This segment of CH 21 was studied in the CH 21 Study by the City and County. This project would realign CH 87 and $170^{\text {th }}$ street/Credit River Road, add medians, and turn lanes, and replace deteriorated pavement on this segment of the corridor. TIP Program year 2018. |
| Roadway Expansion |  |  |
| 4. | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH} 27 \text { from } \mathrm{CH} 21 \\ & \text { to } \mathrm{CH} 44 \end{aligned}$ | The CH 27 Corridor Study is completed. This segment of CH 27 is planned to be reconstructed to a four lane divided roadway with bike/pedestrian connections to Cleary Lake Regional Park. TIP Program Year 2021 |
| 5. | CH 14 Overpass of US 169 | The soon to be completed US 169 South Frontage Study identified the need to create additional grade separated crossings of US 169. An overpass of US 169 would be the next stage of extending freeway status south of CH 78 . |
| Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities |  |  |
| 6. | CH 17 Bike/Ped Overpass of US 169 | A pedestrian and bicycle overpass at County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 17 is required to complete a gap in the current trail system near the intersection with US 169. The overpass would connect the core of Shakopee and the commercial area north of US 169 with the Marschall Road Transit Station, Saint Francis Regional Medical Center and other commercial businesses. |
| Transit Expansion |  |  |
| 7. | Scott County <br> Transportation Management Association (TMA) | The proposed Scott County TMA would consist of representatives from Scott County working with area Chambers of Commerce, employers, Mystic Lake Transportation, health and human service provides and other stakeholders yet to be determined. The mission would be to increase the overall accessibility of Scott County employers by leveraging and promoting existing transportation services SmartLink, MVTA reverse commute routes, Mystic Lake Transportation, Metro Vanpools, Land to Air, etc. -as well as aiding creation and setting up of new options (fixed route, 169 transit way and Orange Line, ride sharing, van pools, volunteer drivers and programs aimed at increasing transit, and alternative forms of transportation) |

## Fiscal Impact:

The federal grant programs require a 20 percent local match for the project. Funding match obligations for several of the projects are included in the 2016-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). If the grant is secured for a currently non-funded project, the funding match obligations will be identified in the 2017 update of the County's TIP.

# BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA 

Date: $\begin{aligned} & \text { July } 5,2016\end{aligned}$
Resolution No:: 2016 -130
Motion by Commissioner: Beard
Seconded by Commissioner: Ulich

## RESOLUTION NO. 2016-130; AUTHORIZING SUBMITTAL OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS TO THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE 2016 REGIONAL SOLICITATION PROCESS

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) is requesting project submittals for federal funding under Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP), Transportation Alternatives Program (TA), and Congestions Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ); and

WHEREAS, funding is available in the 2017-2021 federal fiscal years; and
WHEREAS, funding provides up to 80 percent of project construction costs; and
WHEREAS, this federal funding of projects reduces the burden on local taxpayers for regional improvements; and

WHEREAS, Scott County has identified projects that improve the safety and transportation system of the region; and

WHEREAS, the Scott County Board of Commissioners desires to support these projects.
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Scott County Board of Commissioners hereby supports the submittal of the following projects to the Transportation Advisory Board for Consideration in 2016 Regional Solicitation Process:

1. $\mathrm{CH} 21 / \mathrm{TH} 13$ Intersection Improvements
2. CH 83 Improvements from $12^{\text {th }}$ to $4^{\text {th }}$ Ave
3. CH 21 Improvements from Adelmann St to CH 87
4. CH 27 Expansion from CH 44 to CH 21
5. CH 14 Overpass of US 169
6. CH 17 Bike/Ped Overpass of US 169
7. Scott County Transportation Management Association

[^0]
## Existing Conditions

## 122: US 169 \& 145th

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2076 |
| Total Delay $/ \mathrm{Veh}(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.21 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.74 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2137 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 1 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.01 |
| NOx Emissions kg$)$ | 0.59 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.70 |

## 122: US 169 \& 145th Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 40.4 | 29.2 | 1.7 | 4.9 | 3.9 |
| HC Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 0 | 0 | 427 | 697 | 1124 |
| C Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 6 | 6 | 10221 | 16189 | 26421 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 1 | 1 | 1443 | 2695 | 4139 |
| Vehicles Entered | 5 | 9 | 847 | 1380 | 2241 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14 Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 45.4 | 43.2 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 4.5 |
| HC Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 0 | 24 | 598 | 456 | 1079 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 3 | 861 | 14979 | 10995 | 26838 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 0 | 100 | 1989 | 1758 | 3847 |
| Vehicles Entered | 4 | 66 | 877 | 1370 | 2317 |

Total Zone Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 326.9 |
| HC Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 2203 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 53258 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{g})$ | 7987 |
| Vehicles Entered | 966 |

122: US 169 \& 145th

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2119 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.24 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.75 |

124: US 169 \& CR 14

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 2130 |
| Total Delay $\operatorname{Vvh}(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.80 |
| NOx Emissions kg$)$ | 0.54 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.65 |



TH69 OVERPASS
Scott Transporation Layout

Cheryl Doucette, Township Clerk (952) 445-8715
town clerk@hotmail.com

July 14, 2016
Lisa Freese
Transportation Program Director
600 Country Trail East
Jordan, MN 55352
Re: CSAH14 Overpass of US 169
Dear Ms. Freeze:
Louisville Township is pleased to support the 2016 Federal Regional Solicitation application for the Scott County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 14 overpass of US 169, under the Roadway Expansion category.

US 169 is a Principal Arterial on an interregional corridor that serves a key freight connection between Southern Minnesota including Mankato to the Twin Cities, including the Ports of Savage.

The proposed overpass is endorsed by Louisville Township and we are supportive of the Regional Solicitation application.

Sincerely,



Google Street View screen shot: US 169 at CSAH 14 facing south in southbound lane


Minnesota Department of Transportation
Metropolitan District
Waters Edge Building
1500 County Road B2 West
Roseville, MN55113

July 14, 2016
Lisa Freese
Scott County Public Works
600 County Trail East
Jordan MN, 55352
Dear Ms. Freese,
This letter is to serve as your notification that the Interchange Review Committee has determined that the proposed overpass with limited access to US169 at CSAH14 is consistent with the qualifying criteria found in Appendix F of the Council’s Transportation Policy Plan and no additional documentation is necessary.

It is MnDOT's understanding that between the US169/MN41 interchange and the US169/CSAH 14 overpass project that the ultimate vision is to close all access between the two interchanges.

As the project layout and design progresses, please continue to work with MnDOT, FHWA and Met Council to assure the technical and design criteria of Appendix F continue to be met and that appropriate steps are taken to complete the Metropolitan Council’s Controlled Access Approval (Contact Steve Peterson 651-602-1819) when needed.

We appreciate your efforts to work with the Interchange Review Committee in our effort to understand this project.

If you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact me at (651) 234-7784.
Sincerely,


Karen Scheffing
Principal Planner
CC:
Lynne Bly, MnDOT
Tony Fischer, MnDOT
Jon Solberg, MnDOT
Diane Langenbach, MnDOT
Cyrus Knutson, MnDOT
Steve Peterson, Met Council
Angie Stenson, Scott County

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Metro District
1500 West County Road B-2
Roseville, MN 5511

July 11, 2016
Lisa Freese,
Transportation Program Director
Scott County Highways
Physical Development
600 Country Trail East
Jordan, MN 55352-9339
RE: Regional Solicitation Application for CSAH 14 Overpass of US 169
Dear Ms. Freese:
Thank you for requesting a letter of support from MnDOT for the Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) 2016 Regional Solicitation. Your application for the CSAH 14 Overpass of US 169 project impacts MnDOT right of way on US 169.

MnDOT, as the agency with jurisdiction over US 169, would allow the improvements included in the application for CSAH 14 Overpass of US 169. Details of a future maintenance agreement with the County would be determined during project development to define how the improvements will be maintained for the project's useful life.

This project has no funding from MnDOT. In addition, the Metro District currently has no discretionary funding in year 2020 of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) or year 2021 of the Capital Highway Investment Plan (CHIP) to assist with construction or assist with MnDOT services such as the design or construction engineering of the project. Please continue to work with MnDOT Area staff to assist in identifying additional project funding if needed.

Sincerely,


Scott McBride, P.E.
Metro District Engineer
Cc: Elaine Koustsoukos, Metropolitan Council Jon Solberg, MnDOT Metro District - South Area Manager
$\bigcirc$
$\bigcirc$


[^0]:    State of Minnesota)
    County of Scott )
    I, Gary L. Shelton, duly appointed qualified County Administrator for the County of Scott, State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of a resolution with the original minutes of the proceedings of the Board of County Commissioners, Scott County, Minnesota, at their session held on the $5^{\text {th }}$ day of July, 2016 now on file in my office, and have found the same to be a true and correct copy thereof. Witness my hand and official seal at Shakopee, Minnesota, this 5th day of July, 2016.

