Application

04774-2016 Roadway Modernization
05352 - CSAH 54 Realignment
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Status: Submitted
Submitted Date:
07/15/2016 12:42 PM

## Primary Contact



## Organization Information

Jurisdictional Agency (if different):
Organization Type: County Government
Organization Website:
Address: 1440 BUNKER LAKE BLVD

| * | ANDOVER | Minnesota |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| County: | City |  |
| State/Province |  |  |
| Phone:* | Anoka |  |
| Fax: | $763-862-4200$ | Ext. |
| PeopleSoft Vendor Number | $0000003633 A 15$ |  |

## Project Information

Project Name
Primary County where the Project is Located
Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

CSAH 54 Realignment
Anoka

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

Anoka County proposes a realignment of 0.77 miles of CSAH 54, an A Minor Reliever roadway within the City of Columbus. Existing CSAH 54 runs parallel along the west side of I-35. It provides relief to I-35 and local access throughout the City of Columbus, as well important connections to the Cities of Lino Lakes, Centerville, and Ramsey County not otherwise served by l-35 interchanges

The proposed project will realign the existing CSAH 54 corridor 0.15 miles to the west.

The realigned two-lane roadway will include a median and turn-lanes at intersections.
The southern end of the project will include a fullaccess roundabout intersection which will connect to the southeastern corner of the Running Aces Harness Park and the Running Aces Park and Ride. This intersection will also connect to the existing alignment of CSAH 54 (which will function as a frontage road) for access to existing businesses and parcels. A 10-foot bituminous multiuse trail will be constructed along the west side of the project to provide safe transportation and recreational opportunities for travelers near CSAH 54.

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)

CSAH 54 Realignment
0.77

## Project Funding

Are you applying for funds from another source(s) to implement No
this project?
If yes, please identify the source(s)

Federal Amount
\$3,367,500.00
Match Amount
\$841,900.00

| Project Total | $\$ 4,209,400.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Match Percentage | $20.0 \%$ |
| Minimum of $20 \%$ |  |
| Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total |  |

Source of Match Funds Anoka County Highway FundA 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 federalsourcesPreferred Program YearSelect one:2020
For TDM projects, select 2018 or 2019. For Roadway, Transit, or Trail/Pedestrian projects, select 2020 or 2021.
Additional Program Years:2018, 2019
Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available.
Specific Roadway Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES
Cost
Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost) ..... \$437,400.00
Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost) ..... \$121,500.00
Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) ..... \$237,400.00
Roadway (aggregates and paving) ..... \$840,800.00
Subgrade Correction (muck) ..... \$497,600.00
Storm Sewer ..... \$733,700.00
Ponds ..... \$398,600.00
Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) ..... \$372,000.00
Traffic Control ..... \$47,900.00
Striping ..... \$56,500.00
Signing ..... \$25,100.00
Lighting ..... \$106,100.00
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping ..... \$198,300.00
Bridge ..... $\$ 0.00$
Retaining Walls ..... \$36,300.00
Noise Wall (do not include in cost effectiveness measure) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Traffic Signals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wetland Mitigation ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection ..... $\$ 0.00$
RR Crossing ..... $\$ 0.00$Roadway Contingencies$\$ 0.00$Other Roadway Elements\$16,100.00
Totals ..... \$4,125,300.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES
Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... $\$ 84,000.00$
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 ..... \$84,000.00
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 | $\$ 4,209,300.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 4,209,300.00$ |
| 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.

## 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP)

Goal B: Safety and Security: The regional transportation system is safe and secure for all users (page 60)
-Objectives: Reduce crashes and improve safety and security for all modes of passenger travel and freight transport.

Strategies: Regional transportation partners will incorporate safety and security considerations for all modes and users throughout the process of planning, funding, construction, and operation.

Goal C: Access to Destinations: People and businesses prosper by using a reliable, affordable, and efficient multimodal transportation system that connects them to destinations throughout the region and beyond (page 62).

List the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages:
-Objectives: Increase the availability of multimodal travel options, especially in congested highway corridors.
-Increase travel time reliability and predictability for travel on highway and transit systems.
-Ensure access to freight terminals such as river ports, airports, and intermodal rail yards.

Strategies: C7. Regional transportation partners will manage and optimize the performance of the principle arterial system as measured by person throughput.

Strategies: C8. Regional transportation partners will prioritize all regional highway capital investments based on a project?s expected contributions to achieving the outcomes, goals, and objectives identified in Thrive MSP 2040 and the

## Transportation Policy Plan.

Strategies: C9. The Council will support investments in A-minor arterials that build, manage, or improve the system?s ability to supplement the capacity of the principal arterial system and support access to the region?s job, activity, and industrial and manufacturing concentrations.
Goal D: Competitive Economy: The regional transportation system supports the economic competitiveness, vitality, and prosperity of the region and state (page 64).
-Objectives: Support the region?s economic competitiveness through the efficient movement of freight.

Goal F: Leveraging Transportation Investment to Guide Land Use: The leverages transportation investments to guide land use and development patterns that advance the regional vision of stewardship, prosperity, livability, equity, and sustainability (page 70).
-Objectives: Encourage local land use design that integrates highways, streets, transit, walking, and bicycling.
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:
2030 Columbus Comprehensive Plan (2008) Page 37
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

## Project Information-Roadways

| County, City, or Lead Agency | Anoka County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Class of Road | "A" Minor Arterial Reliever |
| Road System | CSAH |
| TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET |  |
| Road/Route No. | 54 |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 | West Freeway Drive |
| Name of Road | 55025 |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE | $04 / 03 / 2018$ |
| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | $11 / 01 / 2018$ |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date |  |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date |  |
| TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work) |  |

From:
(Intersection or Address)
To:
(Intersection or Address)
DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Or At

Primary Types of Work

CSAH 23/CSAH 54 Intersection

Immediately north of Gander Drive\&\#1048576;

Grading, aggregates/paving, storm sewer, bituminous bike path, roundabout, ped ramps

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

## Expander/Augmentor/Connector/Non-Freeway Principal Arterial

Select one:

| Area | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Length | 0 |
| Average Distance | 0 |
| Upload Map |  |

Upload Map

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

Facility being relieved

I-35
Number of hours per day volume exceeds capacity (based on the Congestion Report)

## Reliever: Relieves a Principal 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: 2019

Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile:

Existing Students:
0
Upload Map 1467739115699_Map_CSAH 54 Regional Economy.pdf

## Measure C: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

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

CSAH 54, south of CSAH 23
210
May, 2015

## Measure D: Freight Elements

The proposed project includes paved shoulders, turn-lanes, and intersection roundabouts, all of which will improve travel times and economic efficiencies for the movement of freight on CSAH 54 and the parallel l-35 corridor. Also, it is necessary to realign CSAH 54 in order for the reconstruction of the I-35 and TH 97 interchange, as currently, it is located too close to the l-35 on/off ramps.

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

| Location | CSAH 54, south of CSAH 23 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current AADT Volume | 3000 |
| Existing Transit Routes on the Project | 2 |

For New Roadways only, list transit routes that will be moved to the new roadway
Upload Transit Map 1467743764070_CSAH54_T C.pdf

## Response: Current Daily Person Throughput

Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership 0
Current Daily Person Throughput

## Measure B: 2040 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

## 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 Yes includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:

The CSAH 54 expansion and realignment will improve travel times and economic efficiencies for local, commuter, freight, and recreational travel on CSAH 54 and the parallel I- 35 corridor, all of which support the health and growth of northern Anoka County's local economy. These benefits help to provide opportunities for job growth and stability for low-income households (10\%) living around the project and immediately northeast of the project (15\%) (above the County and 7-county average, respectively).

The project's connection to the Metro Transit Park and Ride and I-35 will also enable efficient transit connections to job concentrations and manufacturing centers in and near Minneapolis and St. Paul for low-income populations taking advantage of the service.

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

The multiuse trail facility included in the proposed project will improve access, local and regional connectivity to nearby Forest Lake HS and Century Jr. HS, transportation choice, and recreational opportunities for all populations living in proximity to the project, including the elderly ( $10 \%$ ) and children (22\%), which are above and equal to county averages.

Finally, the project is consistent with the goals and desired outcomes in Thrive 2040 to connect local residents in these neighborhoods (inclusive of all races, ethnicity, incomes, and abilities) with a safe and reliable transportation system to improve their overall quality of life.

The response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations affected by the project.

## Measure B: Affordable Housing

City/Township Segment Length in Miles (Population)
Columbus 0.77

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length (Total Population)
0.77

## 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) | 0.77 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Housing Score | 0 |

## Measure A: Year of Roadway Construction

Year of Original
Roadway Construction
or Most Recent
Reconstruction

| 1961 | 0.77 | 1509.97 | 1961.0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 1}$ |

## Average Construction Year

Weighted Year

## Total Segment Length (Miles)

## Measure B: Geometric, Structural, or Infrastructure Improvements

Improving a non-10-ton roadway to a 10-ton roadway:
Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words
Improved clear zones or sight lines:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Improved roadway geometrics:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Access management enhancements:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Vertical/horizontal alignments improvements:
Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words) Improved stormwater mitigation:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Signals/lighting upgrades:
Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words) Other Improvements

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Yes
The roadway, currently a 9-ton roadway, will be reconstructed as a 10-ton roadway.

Yes
Sight lines at all intersections/access points will be improved, particularly for the intersection of CSAHs 54 and 23, which will be moved away from the l-35 SB on/off ramps.

Yes
The roadway will include turn-lanes at all intersections.

Yes
Realignment of CSAH 54 west out of the interchange area will significantly improve traffic operations at the CSAH 54/CSAH 23 intersection, and will also help to bring CSAH 23 into compliance with Anoka County's access spacing guidance for a 55 mph arterial roadway.

Yes
The existing highway does not have any controls for the stormwater rate or quality control. This project will address these deficiencies.

## Yes

The proposed project includes the contruction of a roundabout at the intersection of CSAHs 54 and 23, which has tremendous benefits for travel mobility and safety. The project will also include paved shoulders and a multiuse trail.

## Measure A: Congestion Reduction/Air Quality

| Total Peak | Total Peak | Total Peak |  | EXPLANATIO |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | N of |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total Peak | methodology |  |
| Hour Delay | Hour Delay | Hour Delay | Volume <br> (Vehicles per | Hour Delay | used to | Synchro or |
| Without The | With The | Reduced by |  | Reduced by |  | HCM Reports |
| Project | Project | Project | hour) | the Project: | crossing |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | delay, if |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | applicable. |  |


| 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1131 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

> 14677406542
> 83 _CSAH 54 -
> Synchro
> Reports.pdf

## Total Delay

Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced
1131.0

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



## Total

Total Emissions Reduced:
Upload Synchro Report
11.31

1467740844447_CSAH 54 - Synchro Reports.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):

EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit
1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

## Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction

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 stakeholders have occurred
Yes
100\%
Stakeholders have been identified
$40 \%$
Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted
0\%
2)Layout or Preliminary Plan (5 Percent of Points)

Layout or Preliminary Plan completed
100\%
Layout or Preliminary Plan started
Yes
50\%
Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
04/03/2017
3)Environmental Documentation (5 Percent of Points)

EIS
EA
Yes
PM
Document Status:

Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)

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

50\%
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
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 resources present within the project area, but no known adverse effects

80\%
Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely
coordination/documentation has begun

Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely
coordination/documentation has not begun
30\%
Unsure if there are any impacts to Section $4 \mathrm{f} / 6 \mathrm{f}$ 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

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
7)Railroad Involvement (25 Percent of Points)

No railroad involvement on project
100\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature page)

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

| 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 |
| 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) |
| Anticipated Letting Date |
| Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title |
| sheet) |
| 100\% |
| Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review |
| 15\% |
| Construction plans in progress; at least 30\% completion |
| 50\% |
| Construction plans have not been started |

## Measure A: Roadway Projects that do not Include Railroad Grade-Separation Elements

Crash Modification Factor Used:
41.0

CR 1 = Installation of a median

CR 2 = Conversion of stop-controlled intersection to a roundabout
Rationale for Crash Modification Selected:
(Limit 1400 Characters; approximately 200 words)

Project Benefit (\$) from B/C Ratio

Worksheet Attachment
\$149,726.00
1468527506812_CSAH 54 HSIP Worksheets and Attachments.pdf

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

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

0

0

0

Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

The proposed 10 -foot multiuse trail on the west side of the CSAH 54 corridor will connect to the CSAH 23/Lake Avenue corridor and the existing Hardwood Creek Trail. The project will enable travelers from Columbus, Forest Lake, and other surrounding communities in Washington and Anoka Counties to more safely travel to Running Aces Harness Park, a casino, music venue, restaurant, event center, and employer of nearly 400 people

A future extension of the projects proposed trail approximately 1.8 miles to the south will directly connect the facility to the Cities of Lino Lakes, Centerville, and a future Tier 1 Route on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network. This connection to the growing regional bicycle trail network will allow travelers a broader array options for commuting and recreation. Furthermore, this southern extension of the trail will provide a local connection to Rice Creek Chain of Lakes Regional Park Reserve.

The roadway will include an access to the Running Aces Harness Park, which will also serve as an entrance to the Running Aces Park and Ride (P\&R) facility. This 300-space lot serves two Metro Transit routes (285 and 288), and directly connect commuters from the City of Columbus and surrounding areas to job concentrations in Minneapolis and St. Paul. Furthermore, the Heartland Express rural transit service of Chisago \& Isanti Counties directly serves the Running Aces P\&R and enables two-seat, handicap accessible trips from the County Road 17/I-35 P\&R outside of the City of North Branch to the core cities.

The relocation of existing CSAH 54 approximately 0.15 miles to the west will improve congestion on the corridor, which will positively impact transit operations and travel time for vehicles traveling to and from I-35 on CSAH 23.

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | $\$ 4,209,300.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | $\$ 4,209,300.00$ |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria |  |
| Cost Effectiveness | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 05352AnokaRRMRad.pdf | 05352AnokaRRMRad | 284 KB |
| 05352AnokaRRMSEC.pdf | 05352AnokaRRMSEC | 186 KB |
| 05352AnokRRMREC.pdf <br> 05352AnokRRMTRC.pdf | 05352AnokRRMREC | 217 KB |
| Anoka County Board Resolution in <br> Support of CSAH 54 Project.pdf | Anoka County Board Resolution of <br> Support for Project | 207 KB |
| CSAH 54 and 23_Synchro Summary <br> Report.pdf | Synchro Summary Reports | 669 KB |
| CSAH 54 and CSAH 23_Updated_6-30-- <br> 16.pdf | Project Layout | 15 KB |
| CSAH54_ProjectArea.pdf | Project Area | 646 KB |

Regional Economy Roadway Expansion Project: CSAH 54 Realignment and Expansion | Map ID: 1467055590785

Results
WITHIN ONE MI of project:
Totals by City:
Columbus
Population: 754
Employment: 692
Mfg and Dist Employment: 18
Forest Lake
Population: 3694
Employment: 1327
Mfg and Dist Employment: 298

Postsecondary Students:
0


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

Transit Connections Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project: CSAH 54 in Columbus | Map ID: 1467743202252

Results
Transit with a Direct Connection to project: 275288
*indicates Planned Alignments


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


## 115: CSAH 54 (W. Freeway Dr.) \& CSAH 23

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1131 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 3 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.45 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.09 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.10 |

## 115: CSAH 54 (W. Freeway Dr.) \& CSAH 23

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1131 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 2 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.44 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.09 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.10 |

## 115: CSAH 54 (W. Freeway Dr.) \& CSAH 23

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1131 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 3 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.45 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.09 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.10 |

## 115: CSAH 54 (W. Freeway Dr.) \& CSAH 23

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1131 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 2 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.44 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.09 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.10 |



## Dual CRF for CSAH 54

Improvements include conversion of stop controlled intersection to a roundabout and installation of a raised median.

CR1=Installation of median
CR2=Conversion of stop controlled intersection to a roundabout
$C R=1-(1-C R 1) *(1-C R 2)$
Left Turn: CR=1 $-(1-.39)^{*}(1-.71)=.82$
Right Angle: $\mathrm{CR}=1-(1-.39)^{*}(1-.71)=.82$
Ran Off Road: CR=. 39 (CR1 applies only)

- Countermeasure: Convert intersection with minor-road stop control to modern roundabout
- 

.


| $\Gamma$ | ${ }_{[B]}^{0.18}$ | 82 |  | All | Serious Injury, Minor Injury | All | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rodegerdts } \\ & \text { et al., } \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | Countermeasure name changed from "convert [read more] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


"

Countermeasure
name changed
from "convert ...
[read more]





# BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS 

Anoka County, Minnesota
DATE: July 12, 2016
RESOLUTION \#2016-95
OFFERED BY COMMISSIONER: Schulte

## RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMITTAL OF FEDERAL FUNDING APPLICATION FOR CSAH 54

WHEREAS, CSAH 54 is an "A" minor arterial reliever route that provides an important northsouth transportation connection through eastern Anoka County; and,

WHEREAS, existing and future traffic volumes on CSAH 54have been increasing and are projected to continue to increase as the area develops; and,

WHEREAS, existing travel safety is a concern at the intersection of CSAH 54 and CSAH 23; and,
WHEREAS, Anoka County has identified the need to realign CSAH 54 to the west to provide better spacing between intersections and to improve mobility and safety, and to provide better access to future areas of development; and,

WHEREAS, Anoka County and the City of Columbus have worked together in the past to improve the area's transportation system; and,

WHEREAS, the Anoka County Board of Commissioners is aware of and understands the project being submitted, and commits to operate and maintain the facility for its design life and not change the use of any right-of-way acquired without prior approval from MnDOT and the Federal Highway Administration:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Anoka County Highway Department is hereby authorized to submit an application to the Transportation Advisory Board of the Metropolitan Council for 2019-2021 to receive federal transportation funds to make capacity and safety improvements to CSAH 54 (West Freeway Drive) south of CSAH 23 in Columbus.

## STATE OF MINNESOTA)

## COUNTY OF ANOKA , SS

I, Jerry Soma, County Administrator, Anoka County, Minnesota, hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of the resolution of the county board of said county with the original record thereof on file in the Administration Office, Anoka County, Minnesota, as stated in the minutes of the proceedings of said board at a meeting duly held on July 12, 2016, and that the same is a true and correct copy of said original record and of the whole thereof, and that said resolution was duly passed by said board at said meeting.

Witness my hand and seal this 12 th day of July 2016.

|  | YES | NO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DISTRICT \#1 - Look | X |  |
| DISTRICT \#2 - BraAstad | X |  |
| DISTRICT \#3 - West | X |  |
| DISTRICT \#4 - Kordiak | X |  |
| District \#5 - Gamache | X |  |
| District \#6-Sivarajah | X |  |
| DISTRICT \#7- Schulte | X |  |



|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | F |  | $\uparrow$ |  | 「 |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 527 | 0 | 482 | 0 | 122 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Frt } & 0.865 & 0.865 \\ \text { Flt Protected } & & \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Satd. Flow (prot) } & 0 & 1611 & 0 & 1863 & 0 & 1611 \\ \text { Flt Permitted }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1611 | 0 | 1863 | 0 | 1611 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  |  | 30 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 514 |  |  | 530 | 521 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 11.7 |  |  | 12.0 | 11.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Adj. Flow (vph) } \\ \text { Shared Lane Traffic (\%) } & 0 & 573 & 0 & 524 & 0 & 133\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 573 | 0 | 524 | 0 | 133 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(t) | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  |  | 16 | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) |  | 9 | 15 |  | 15 | 9 |
| Sign Control | Yield |  |  | Yield | Yield |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 36.0\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




Project Area

Regional Solicitation
CSAH 54 - Roadway Reconstruction

