Application

17071-2022 Roadway Spot Mobility
17571 - CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Status:
Submitted Date:

Submitted
04/12/2022 7:20 PM

## Primary Contact

| Name:* | He/him/his |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pronouns | First Name | Middle Name | Last Name |
| Title: | Transportation Engineer |  |  |  |
| Department: | Hennepin County - Transportation Department |  |  |  |
| Email: | jason.pieper@hennepin.us |  |  |  |
| Address: | 1600 Prairie Drive |  |  |  |
| * | Medina | Mir |  | 53340 |
|  | City |  |  | Postal Code/Zip |
| Phone:* | 612-596-0241 |  |  |  |
|  | Phone |  | Ext. |  |
| Fax: |  |  |  |  |
| What Grant Programs are you most interested in? | Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements |  |  |  |

## Organization Information

Name:

Jurisdictional Agency (if different):
Organization Type: County Government

Organization Website:

| Address: | DPT OF PUBLIC WORKS |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1600 PRAIRIE DR |

* | MEDINA | Minnesota | M5340 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | City | State/Province |

County:

Phone:*
Hennepin
763-745-7600

Fax:

PeopleSoft Vendor Number
0000028004A9

County Government

DPT OF PUBLIC WORKS
1600 PRAIRIE DR

## Project Information

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

CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project
Hennepin
Plymouth

This project will improve mobility and safety at the CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) intersection in the City of Plymouth. CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) is an A-Minor Augmenter, and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) is an A-Minor Reliever. Both roadways are 4-lane divided roadways that include dedicated left-turn lanes, as well as channelized right-turn islands. Attachment 2 includes a map illustrating the project location.

This existing intersection design is relatively wide that not only makes it difficult for nonmotorized users to cross, but also presents an uncomfortable experience as people driving can complete right turns at a higher speed due to the presence of channelized turn islands. It is especially uncomfortable for those using mobility devices and the elderly. With several trails converging at this location, it is expected that this intersection will be used by many people walking, rolling, and biking. This intersection also serves as a secondary crossing for the Medicine Lake Regional Trail; which is a Tier 1 alignment on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN), as well as the trail segment south and west of the intersection. Attachment 3 includes photos of the existing conditions at the intersection.

Between 2019-2021, 40 crashes occurred at this intersection; including a relatively high percentage of left-turn (48\%) and rear-end (43\%) related. A detailed listing of crashes can be found in Attachment 4. Hennepin County's County Road Safety Plan ranks intersections based on their number of risk factors. This intersection is identified as a priority location in both the vehicle related and bike/ped categories. The risk factors for the vehicle related category include traffic control, approach configuration, and adjacent development; and risk
factors for the bike/ped related category include traffic control, adjacent development, and pedestrian crossing type.

The project objectives include improving accessibility, mobility, and safety at the CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) intersection through proven safety countermeasures to specifically target left-turn and rear-end related crashes. Changes that are anticipated as part of this project may include the following; as illustrated in the potential concept in Attachment 5:

- Elimination of four channelized right-turn islands to introduce a more compact intersection design and slow right-turning vehicles
- Improve the alignment of the left-turn lanes along CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) to reduce negative offset
- Replace and upgrade the traffic signal system to the latest technologies
- Upgrade ADA accommodations to current design standards; including pedestrian ramps, landings, and APS
- Modify the trail alignments on each approach (as necessary)

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) DESCRIPTION - will be used in TIP if the project is selected for funding. See MnDOT's TIP description guidance.

CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) in the City of Plymouth

## Project Funding

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

If yes, please identify the source(s)
Federal Amount \$1,624,000.00
Match Amount \$406,000.00
Minimum of $20 \%$ of project total
Project Total \$2,030,000.00
For transit projects, the total cost for the application is total cost minus fare revenues.
Match Percentage 20.0\%
Minimum of 20\%
Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total
Source of Match Funds
Hennepin County
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:
2026
Select 2024 or 2025 for TDM and Unique projects only. For all other applications, select 2026 or 2027.
Additional Program Years:
Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available.

## Project Information: Roadway Projects

County, City, or Lead Agency

Functional Class of Road

Road System
TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET
Road/Route No.
i.e., 53 for CSAH 53

Name of Road
Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE
Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed

## Hennepin

CSAH 9 - A-Minor Arterial (Augmenter)

CSAH 61 - A-Minor Arterial (Reliever)
CSAH

9

Rockford Rd

55441
(Approximate) End Construction Date 10/30/2026

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
CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd)
Miles of Sidewalk (nearest 0.1 miles)
0
Miles of Trail (nearest 0.1 miles)
0
Miles of Trail on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles)

Primary Types of Work
REMOVE CHANNELIZED RIGHT TURN ISLANDS, REPLACE SIGNAL SYSTEM, BIKE/PED/ADA IMPROVEMENTS

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.:
Structure is Over/Under
(Bridge or culvert name):

## 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 (2018), the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2018), 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 goals, objectives, and strategies that relate to the project.
A) Transportation System Stewardship (p 2.2-2.4)

## Objectives A \& B; Strategies A1 \& A2


#### Abstract

The project represents a strategic investment to address safety concerns and promote transportation alternatives at the CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) intersection. The project will resurface multiuse trail facilities at the intersection to improve connections with existing regional trail networks.


B) Safety and Security (p 2.5-2.9)

Objectives A \& B; Strategies B1, B3, B4, B6

The project will address safety concerns due to the existing intersection geometry. Channelized rightturn island removal, pedestrian ramp upgrades, APS installation, and trail resurfacing are anticipated.

The intersection has experienced a relatively high frequency of crashes when compared to similar intersections throughout Hennepin County; specifically rear-end and left-turn related. Deferring improvements will likely result in continued high crash rates at an intersection located immediately adjacent to the Medicine Lake Regional Trail.
C) Access to Destinations (p 2.10-2.25)

Objectives A, B, C, D, and E; Strategies C1, C2, C3, C4, C8, C9, C15, C16, C17

The project will enhance connections to the

Medicine Lake Regional Trail for people walking and biking. CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) currently includes multi-use trails that connect to major commercial and employment destinations. CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) south of intersection also includes multi-use trails that connect to Abbott Northwestern WestHealth, a major healthcare destination.
D) Competitive Economy (p2.26-2.29)

Objectives A, B \& C; Strategies D1, D3, D4, D5

The intersection provides regional connections to commercial developments and employment centers along CSAH 130 (Elm Creek Blvd) in Maple Grove and TH 55 in Plymouth. The project will improve user mobility and safety at a key intersection immediately east of I-494, a Tier 1 Regional Truck Corridor.
E) Healthy and Equitable Communities (p 2.302.34)

Objectives A, B, C, D; Strategies E1, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7

This project provides an opportunity to improve safety for the vulnerable road users through upgrades to pedestrian ramps, medians, and boulevards. Safety improvements will expand active transportation opportunities and connections to the Medicine Lake Regional Trail.
F) Leveraging Transportation Investments to Guide Lane Use (p 2.35-2.41)

> Complete streets design elements, such as the elimination of channelized right-turn islands, will promote walking and biking in the area; complementing the nearby Medicine Lake Regional Trail. Increased user comfort will promote alternative transportation options for nodes of employment concentrations in areas such as retail, light manufacturing, and healthcare.

Limit 2,800 characters, approximately 400 words
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: Unique projects are exempt from this qualifying requirement because of their innovative nature.

1. Hennepin Country Board Resolution 22-0109Regional Solicitation (Attachment 6)
2. Hennepin County - County Road Safety Plan (Attachment 7)

- Ranked \#633 for priority locations involving people driving at urban intersections (Page 1 of 2)
- Ranked \#802 for priority locations involving people walking and biking at urban intersections (Page 2 of 2)

3. Hennepin County 2040 Transportation Plan (pages 2-11-2-18)

URL: hennepin.us/-/media/hennepinus/your-government/projects-initiatives/2040-comprehensive-plan/comp-plan-2040-2transportation.pdf
4. Hennepin County Climate Action Plan (pages 5054)

URL: hennepin.us/climate-action//media/climateaction/ hennepin-county-climate-action-plan-final.pdf
5. Hennepin County Complete Streets Policy

URL: hennepin.us/completestreets
6.Hennepin County Bike Plan (page 36)

URL: hennepin.us/-
/media/hennepinus/residents/transportation/biking/b

## icyc

## le-transportation-plan.pdf

# 7.Hennepin County Pedestrian Plan (page 8) 

URL: hennepin.us/-<br>/media/hennepinus/residents/transportation/docum ents/

pedestrian-plan.pdf

Limit 2,800 characters, approximately 400 words
4. The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project, which is otherwise eligible. Unique project costs are limited to those that are federally eligible.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5.Applicant is a public agency (e.g., county, city, tribal government, transit provider, etc.) or non-profit organization (TDM and Unique Projects applicants only). Applicants that are not State Aid 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 in Table 1. For unique projects, the minimum award is $\$ 500,000$ and the maximum award is the total amount available each funding cycle (approximately $\$ 4,000,000$ for the 2022 funding cycle).
Strategic Capacity (Roadway Expansion): \$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000
Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Management): \$500,000 to \$3,500,000
Spot Mobility and Safety: \$1,000,000 to \$3,500,000
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 (ADA).

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
9.In order for a selected project to be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and approved by USDOT, the public agency sponsor must either have a current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) self-evaluation or transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation, as required under Title II of the ADA. The plan must be completed by the local agency before the Regional Solicitation application deadline. For the 2022 Regional Solicitation funding cycle, this requirement may include that the plan is updated within the past five years.

The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and has a completed ADA transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation.
(TDM and Unique Project Applicants Only) The applicant is not a public agency subject to the self-evaluation requirements in Title Il of the ADA.

Date plan completed:
08/31/2015

Link to plan:
hennepin.us/-
/media/hennepinus/residents/transportation/docum ents/ada-sidewalk-transition-plan.pdf

The applicant is a public agency that employs fewer than 50 people and has a completed ADA self-evaluation that covers the public right of way/transportation.

Date self-evaluation completed:
Link to plan:
Upload plan or self-evaluation if there is no link
Upload as PDF
10.The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
11.The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project year-round for the useful life of the improvement, per FHWA direction established 8/27/2008 and updated 6/27/2017. Unique projects are exempt from this qualifying requirement.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
12.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
13. 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
14.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 Strategic Capacity and Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility 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 and Strategic Capacity 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.
Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:
5.The length of the bridge clear span must exceed 20 feet.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
6. The bridge must have a National Bridge Inventory Rating of 6 or less for rehabilitation projects and 4 or less for replacement projects.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Roadway Expansion, Reconstruction/Modernization, and Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:
7. All roadway projects that involve the construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps must have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal. Please contact Michael Corbett at MnDOT ( Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us or 651-234-7793) to determine whether your project needs to go through this process as described in Appendix F of the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

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

## Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

## Specific Roadway Elements

CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES
Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost) ..... \$68,000.00
Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost) ..... \$68,000.00
Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) ..... \$55,000.00
Roadway (aggregates and paving) ..... \$133,000.00
Subgrade Correction (muck) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Storm Sewer ..... \$152,000.00
Ponds ..... $\$ 0.00$
Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) ..... \$187,000.00
Traffic Control\$68,000.00
Striping ..... \$8,000.00
Signing ..... \$5,000.00
Lighting ..... \$50,000.00
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping ..... $\$ 25,000.00$
Bridge ..... $\$ 0.00$
Retaining Walls ..... $\$ 0.00$
Noise Wall (not calculated in cost effectiveness measure) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Traffic Signals ..... \$540,000.00
Wetland Mitigation ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection ..... $\$ 0.00$
RR Crossing ..... $\$ 0.00$
Roadway Contingencies ..... \$407,000.00
Other Roadway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$1,766,000.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... $\$ 113,000.00$
Sidewalk Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... \$20,000.00
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... \$5,000.00
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... $\$ 0.00$
Streetscaping ..... \$25,000.00
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... \$61,000.00
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... \$40,000.00
Totals ..... \$264,000.00
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, | $\$ 0.00$ |
| fare collection, etc.) | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Vehicles | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Contingencies | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Right-of-Way | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Other Transit and TDM Elements | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Transit Operating Costs

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

## Totals

| Total Cost | $\$ 2,030,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 2,030,000.00$ |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Congestion within Project Area:

Free-Flow Travel Speed:
46
The free-flow travel speed is the black number
Peak Hour Travel Speed:
31
The peak hour travel speed is the red number
Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to
Free-Flow (calculation):
32.61\%

Upload the "Level of Congestion" map:
1649076762673_2022 RS Map 01 - CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd)
Spot Mobility and Safety Project - Level of Congestion.pdf

## Congestion on adjacent Parallel Routes:

Adjacent Parallel Corridor
Adjacent Parallel Corridor Start and End Points:
Start Point:

Hwy 169

CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd)

| End Point: | CSAH 10 (Bass Lake Rd) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Free-Flow Travel Speed: | 64 |
| The Free-Flow Travel Speed is black number. |  |
| Peak Hour Travel Speed: | 51 |
| The Peak-Hour Travel Speed is red number. |  |
| Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to  <br> Free-Flow (calculation): $20.31 \%$ <br> Upload the "Level of Congestion" map: 1649076762665 _2022 RS Map 01 - CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) <br>  Spot Mobility and Safety Project - Level of Congestionv2.pdf |  |

## Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study:

Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a High Priority Intersection:
(70 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection:
(65 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection:
(60 Points)
Not listed as a priority in the study: Yes
(0 Points)

## Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV:

Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a CMSP opportunity area:
(70 Points)
Not listed as a CMSP priority location:
Yes
(0 Points)

## Measure C: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

RESPONSE: Select one for your project, based on the updated 2021 Regional Truck Corridor Study:
Along Tier 1:
Miles:
0
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
Along Tier 2:
Miles:
0
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
Along Tier 3:
Miles:
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
The project provides a direct and immediate connection (i.e., intersects) with either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor:

None of the tiers:
Yes

## Measure A: Engagement

i.Describe any Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, disabled populations, youth, or older adults within a $1 / 2$ mile of the proposed project. Describe how these populations relate to regional context. Location of affordable housing will be addressed in Measure C.
ii.Describe how Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing were engaged, whether through community planning efforts, project needs identification, or during the project development process.
iii.Describe the progression of engagement activities in this project. A full response should answer these questions:

According to 2020 Census data, the share of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) populations for census tracts within 0.5 miles of the CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) intersection range from 13.7\% (Census Tract 27053026509) to 20\% (Census Tract 27053026515). Utilizing 2014-2018 5-year American Community Survey data, the population under the federal poverty level ranges from $2.3 \%$ to $7.2 \%$, and the population of those with disabilities of any kind range from $5.2 \%$ to $9.5 \%$ within 0.5 miles of the project area. In addition, within 0.5 miles of the project area, $16 \%$ to $21.2 \%$ of the population are under 18 years of age, and $12.7 \%$ to $20.9 \%$ are over 65 years of age.

Response:
While Hennepin County has not yet begun formal public engagement activities related to this project, if funding is awarded, public engagement strategies will target residents appropriately, including BIPOC. Since the project will impact all users groups, it will be critical to communicate project impacts during construction, including: project schedule, road closures, and detour routes. As appropriate, public engagement will include maintaining communication with key user groups and stakeholders such as the City of Plymouth, Three Rivers Park District, local business owners, and users of the Medicine Lake Regional Trail. Public engagement strategies will also include staff from the county's Communications and Engagement Team to encourage use of plain language and best practices throughout the design and construction process.

Describe the projects benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, Iow-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Benefits could relate to:
This is not an exhaustive list. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to Equity populations residing or engaged in activities near the project area, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting Equity populations specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.
Acknowledge and describe any negative project impacts to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, Iow-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Describe measures to mitigate these impacts. Unidentified or unmitigated negative impacts may result in a reduction in points.
Below is a list of potential negative impacts. This is not an exhaustive list.

The CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety project will provide benefit to Black, Indigenous, People of Color, Iow-income populations, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults through design strategies that improve user accessibility, mobility, and safety; including conditions for people walking and biking.

The proposed project aims to remove four channelized right-turn islands; creating a more compact intersection geometry which reduces crossing distances, slows vehicle speeds and creates greater visibility for people walking and biking. Those with limited mobility and vision impairments will particularly benefit from this change, as the existing channelized right-turn islands include relatively poor ADA accommodations due to the absence of truncated domes and poor ramp/landing placement and orientation. As part of the design process, the existing raised medians will be evaluated to determine if they can be modified to provide pedestrian crossing refuge; benefiting those who may need additional time to cross the intersection. The project will also resurface existing trails at the intersection approaches to retain connections to the Medicine Lake Regional Trail.

The project will especially benefit households with children under 18 as the Medicine Lake Regional Trail (a 20-mile paved multiuse trail maintained by Three Rivers Park District) and French Regional Park are located immediately east of the intersection. Both represent significant recreational assets which draw pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Improving safety and comfort for those walking and biking at the CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) intersection will ensure that those households who choose not to drive are provided
equal access to active transportation and recreation opportunities.

> Outside of the Medicine Lake Regional Trail, the proposed project is tied into a significant network of off-street bicycle infrastructure along CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd). These facilities offer safe and comfortable access to employment and daily needs at multiple commercial developments along the corridor; particularly for low-income populations. These destinations include schools, parks, places of worship, and healthcare facilities as outlined in the Socio-Economic Equity Map (see Attachment 8). Overall, the project will make significant improvements to the pedestrian and bicyclist environment by addressing a busy intersection that experiences heavy turning movements.

Increased noise and impacts to the roadway, sidewalks, and trails are anticipated during construction. The contractor will be required to follow temporary traffic control plans which provide instructions on detours routes for all people traveling through the corridor.

## Measure C: Affordable Housing Access

Describe any affordable housing developmentsexisting, under construction, or plannedwithin $1 / 2$ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the number of existing subsidized units, which will be provided on the Socio-Economic Conditions map. Applicants can also describe other types of affordable housing (e.g., naturally-occurring affordable housing, manufactured housing) and under construction or planned affordable housing that is within a half mile of the project. If applicable, the applicant can provide self-generated PDF maps to support these additions. Applicants are encouraged to provide a self-generated PDF map describing how a project connects affordable housing residents to destinations (e.g., childcare, grocery stores, schools, places of worship).
Describe the projects benefits to current and future affordable housing residents within $1 / 2$ mile of the project. Benefits must relate to affordable housing residents. Examples may include:
This is not an exhaustive list. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to residents of affordable housing, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting residents of affordable housing specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

Response:
As identified in the Met Council-generated SocioEconomic Conditions map, 180 subsidized affordable housing units exist in census tracts within 0.5 miles of the project. While data available for staff analysis did not identify large affordable housing developments within 0.5 miles of the project area, two significant housing developments are approximately two miles west of the project, Vicksburg Crossing (96 units) and Plymouth Towne Square (99 units). While these developments are not within the immediate project area, both are connected to off-street bicycle infrastructure which extends the length of CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd)/CSAH 24 from CSAH 101 in Medina to TH 169 in Plymouth. For those walking, rolling, and cycling from the two developments referred to above, CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) serves as the primary eastwest corridor as TH 55 to the south does not provide dedicated facilities for people walking and biking. Attachment 9 provides a geographic overview of these existing subsidized housing units outside of the 0.5 -mile buffer of the project area.

Medicine Lake Regional Trail, a 20-mile paved trail maintained by the Three Rivers Park District which provides connections to Elm Creek Park Reserve, Fish Lake, and French Regional Parks, is located approximately 200' west of the project location. Directly northwest of the intersection is Rockford Road Plaza, which offers daily necessities and employment opportunities. Abbott Northwestern WestHealth Hospital is a major regional healthcare destination that provides both health services and employment opportunities that can be accessed via multiuse trails along CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd). Other community assets that may be accessed via the project location includes French Regional Park, the Mount Olivet Lutheran Church of Plymouth, and Zachary Lane Elementary School. The proposed project
would provide direct benefit to residents of affordable housing who live along CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) through traffic calming design strategies, accessible crossings for people walking and biking, and compliant ADA ramps at all intersection quadrants.

## Measure D: BONUS POINTS

Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty:
Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color (Regional Environmental Justice Area):

Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color Yes (Regional Environmental Justice Area):

Upload the Socio-Economic Conditions map used for this measure.

1648733488083_2022 RS Map 03 - CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd)
Spot Mobility and Safety Project - Socio Economic
Conditions.pdf

## Measure A: Congestion Reduction/Air Quality

| Total Peak |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour | Total Peak | Total Peak |  |  |
| Delay Per | Hour | Hour | Volume | Volume |
| Vehicle | Delay Per | Delay Per | without | with the |
| Without | Vehicle | Vehicle | the Project | Project |
| The | With The | Reduced | (Vehicles | (Vehicles |
| Project | Project | by Project | per hour) | Per Hour): |
| (Seconds/ | (Seconds/ | (Seconds/ |  |  |
| Vehicle) |  |  |  |  |

EXPLANA TION of
Total Peak Total Peak methodolo

| Hour | Hour | gy used to | Synchro |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Delay | Delay | calculate | or HCM <br> Reduced |
| Reduced | railroad | Reports |  |
| by the | by the | crossing <br> Project: | Project: | | delay, if |
| :---: |
| applicable. |



## Vehicle Delay Reduced

| Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced | 5992.0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced | 5992.0 |

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

| Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions <br> without the Project <br> (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions with <br> the Project (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions <br> Reduced by the Project <br> (Kilograms): |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 4.82 | 4.75 | 0.07 |
|  | 5 | 5 |

## Total

Total Emissions Reduced:

Upload Synchro Report
0.07

1649517270948_CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility Project Synchro Report for Emissions.pdf

Please upload attachment in PDF form. (Save Form, then click 'Edit' in top right to upload file.)

## 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, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions with the Project (Kilograms):

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

## Total Parallel Roadway

Emissions Reduced on Parallel Roadways
Upload Synchro Report
Please upload attachment in PDF form. (Save Form, then click 'Edit' in top right to upload file.)

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): ..... 0 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): ..... 0.0
Measure B:Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements
Cruise speed in miles per hour without the project: ..... 0
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): ..... 0EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
Measure A: Benefit of Crash Reduction

Attachment 4 lists reported crashes (2019-2021) along the project, and Attachment 10 lists CMFs applied in the B/C Analysis.
XX) Countermeasure: Crashes Targeted (CMF ID, \% Reduction)

## Crash Modification Factor Used:

1) Install additional primary signal head: LT \& RA crashes (CMF 1414, 28\% reduction)
2) Improve offset for LT lanes: LT crashes along CSAH 9 (CMF 6097, 38\% reduction)
3) Improve angle of channelized RT lane: RE crashes involving right-turning vehicles (CMF 8428, 44.2\% reduction)

The Benefit/Cost Analysis evaluated each of the crashes to target crash themes. Up to two (of the three selected) CMFs were applied to each crash based on the reported crash type, along with the anticipated benefit provided by each safety countermeasure. Three CMFs were considered at the intersection since the project area experiences diverse crash types among people walking, biking, and driving.

Rationale for Crash Modification Selected:
(Limit 1400 Characters; approximately 200 words)
Project Benefit (\$) from B/C Ratio
Total Fatal (K) Crashes:
Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes:
Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes:
Total Crashes:
Total Fatal (K) Crashes Reduced by Project:
Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes Reduced by Project:
Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes Reduced by Project:

Total Crashes Reduced by Project: 11

Worksheet Attachment
1649782594563_CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project - BC Analysis Worksheets.pdf

## Measure A: Pedestrian Safety

Determine if these measures do not apply to your project. Does the project match either of the following descriptions?
If either of the items are checked yes, then score for entire pedestrian safety measure is zero. Applicant does not need to respond to the sub-measures and can proceed to the next section.

Project is primarily a freeway (or transitioning to a freeway) and does not provide safe and comfortable pedestrian facilities and No crossings.

Existing location lacks any pedestrian facilities (e.g., sidewalks, marked crossings, wide shoulders in rural contexts) and project does not add pedestrian elements (e.g., reconstruction of a No roadway without sidewalks, that doesnt also add pedestrian crossings and sidewalk or sidepath on one or both sides).

SUB-MEASURE 1: Project-Based Pedestrian Safety Enhancements and Risk Elements
To receive maximum points in this category, pedestrian safety countermeasures selected for implementation in projects should be, to the greatest extent feasible, consistent with the countermeasure recommendations in the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and state and national best practices. Links to resources are provided on the Regional Solicitation Resources web page.
Please answer the following two questions with as much detail as possible based on the known attributes of the proposed design. If any aspect referenced in this section is not yet determined, describe the range of options being considered, to the greatest extent available. If there are project elements that may increase pedestrian risk, describe how these risks are being mitigated.

1. Describe how this project will address the safety needs of people crossing the street at signalized intersections, unsignalized intersections, midblock locations, and roundabouts.
Treatments and countermeasures should be well-matched to the roadways context (e.g., appropriate for the speed, volume, crossing distance, and other location attributes). Refer to the Regional Solicitation Resources web page for guidance links.

The intersection of CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) \& CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) operates under signalized control and includes 4-lane divided configuration on all four approaches. Each leg of the intersection includes both dedicated left-turn lanes and channelized right-turn islands. The free-right turn lanes create four 'porkchop islands' at each intersection quadrant, which have pedestrian ramps that do not meet current ADA design standards. In addition, the dedicated left-turn lanes along CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) include negative offsets that limit sight lines for queued vehicles waiting to complete a left-turn during permissive signal operation.

The proposed project is anticipated to improve safety for those crossing at this signalized intersection; primarily through the removal of the channelized right-turn islands to create a more compact intersection design with tighter turning radii. Also, raised median designs will be evaluated during project development to determine whether the introduction of a pedestrian refuge is feasible. In addition, the existing alignment of eastbound and westbound dedicated left-turn lanes will be adjusted to improve their offset for better sightlines. Furthermore, ADA accommodations will be upgraded to meet current ADA design standards in terms of ramp placement and orientation; along with the installation of APS.

The proposed project also presents an opportunity to replace and upgrade the existing traffic signal system to the latest technologies. The existing signal system already includes some effective design elements (such as flashing yellow arrows, video detection, and countdown timers) that will be replaced/upgraded as part of the project. In addition, the following design elements are anticipated to be included as well:

- Installation of additional primary signal heads along the CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) to improve signal visibility
- Addition of luminaires in intersection quadrants where they don't currently exist
- Upgraded conduit, wiring, and handholes to minimize on-going maintenance costs
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
Is the distance in between signalized intersections increasing (e.g., removing a signal)?
Select one:
No
If yes, describe what measures are being used to fill the gap between protected crossing opportunities for pedestrians (e.g., adding HighIntensity Activated Crosswalk beacons to help motorists yield and help pedestrians find a suitable gap for crossing, turning signal into a roundabout to slow motorist speed, etc.).

Response:
As the project is primarily focused on improvements to the signalized CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) intersection, it is not anticipated that distance between signalized intersections will increase.
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
Will your design increase the crossing distance or crossing time across any leg of an intersection? (e.g., by adding turn or through lanes, widening lanes, using a multi-phase crossing, prohibiting crossing on any leg of an intersection, pedestrian bridge requiring length detour, etc.). This does not include any increases to crossing distances solely due to the addition of bike lanes (i.e., no other through or turn lanes being added or widened).

Select one: No
If yes,
How many intersections will likely be affected?
Response:
0
Describe what measures are being used to reduce exposure and delay for pedestrians (e.g., median crossing islands, curb bulb-outs, etc.)


#### Abstract

Although contingent on the project development process, the removal of 4 free-right turns and associated "porkchops" will create a more compact intersection design, that not only reduces pedestrian crossing distances, but also improves pedestrian visibility for right turning vehicles.


Response:

Although contingent on the project development process, no new grade separated pedestrian crossings are anticipated to be introduced as part
Response: of the CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project. However, it should be noted that the existing regional trail crosses under CSAH 9200 ft east of the intersection.
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
If mid-block crossings are restricted or blocked, explain why this is necessary and how pedestrian crossing needs and safety are supported in other ways (e.g., nearest protected or enhanced crossing opportunity)

Response:
As the project is focusing primarily on the signalized intersection of CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd), no mid-block crossings are anticipated to be prohibited. This intersection will serve as the crossing for the Medicine Lake Regional Trail approximately 200 ft to the east of this intersection. This intersection serves as a secondary crossing for the trail.
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
2. Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, both for through traffic and turning movements. Describe any project-related factors that may affect speed directly or indirectly, even if speed is not the intended outcome (e.g., wider lanes and turning radii to facilitate freight movements, adding turn lanes to alleviate peak hour congestion, etc.). Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower (e.g., visual narrowing, narrow lanes, truck aprons to mitigate wide turning radii, etc.) or protect pedestrians if increasing motorist speed (e.g., buffers or other separation from moving vehicles, crossing treatments appropriate for higher speed roadways, etc.).

The CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project will introduce proven design strategies to promote uniform, safe, and reasonable speeds for people driving through the intersection. It is anticipated that the intersection will be evaluated for the removal of four existing free-right turns to create a more compact intersection design, which will encourage slower speeds for people driving. The eastbound and westbound left turn lanes will be realigned, if feasible, to provide a positive offset, increasing sightlines and decreasing the likelihood that a driver fails to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk.

The current post speed limit along CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) is 40 mph for eastbound traffic and 45 mph for westbound traffic. The current posted speed limit along CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) is 45 mph.

The proposed design speed limit(s) will be determined as part of the project development process based on data analysis, stakeholder input, and environmental review. At this time, no changes to the existing speed limit(s) are anticipated as a result of this project that is primarily focused at one intersection. However, this project won't preclude a lower speed limit along CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) or CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) should corridor-wide improvements be implemented in the future.
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
SUB-MEASURE 2: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Risk Factors
These factors are based on based on trends and patterns observed in pedestrian crash analysis done for the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Check off how many of the following factors are present. Applicants receive more points if more risk factors are present.

Existing road configuration is a One-way, $3+$ through lanes
or
Existing road configuration is a Two-way, 4+ through lanes Yes
Existing road has a design speed, posted speed limit, or speed study/data showing 85th percentile travel speeds in excess of 30 Yes MPH or more

Existing road has AADT of greater than 15,000 vehicles per day
Yes
List the AADT
20800

## SUB-MEASURE 3: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Exposure Factors

These factors are based on based on trends and patterns observed in pedestrian crash analysis done for the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Check off how many of the following existing location exposure factors are present. Applicants receive more points if more risk factors are present.

Existing road has transit running on or across it with 1+ transit stops in the project area (If flag-stop route with no fixed stops, then 1+ locations in the project area where roadside stops are allowed. Do not count portions of transit routes with no stops, such as non-stop freeway sections of express or limited-stop routes. If service was temporarily reduced for the pandemic but is expected to return to 2019 levels, consider 2019 service for this item.)

Existing road has high-frequency transit running on or across it and 1+ high-frequency stops in the project area (high-frequency defined as service at least every 15 minutes from 6am to 7pm weekdays and 9am to 6pm Saturdays. If service frequency was temporarily reduced for the pandemic but is expected to return to 2019 levels, consider 2019 frequency for this item.)

Existing road is within 500 of $1+$ shopping, dining, or entertainment destinations (e.g., grocery store, restaurant)

If checked, please describe:

Yes
The CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61
(Northwest Blvd) is directly southwest of Rockford Road Plaza, a significant concentration of shopping and dining. While the development is home to grocery stores, pharmacies and restaurants, the following are within 500' of the proposed intersection:
-Anytime Fitness (Gym)
-Homegoods (Shopping)
-Petsmart (Shopping)
-Banfield Pet Hospital (Veterinarian)
-TopLine Federal Credit Union (Financial Services)

In addition to the commercial destinations at Rockford Road Plaza, the project is approximately 200' west of access to the Medicine Lake Regional Trail. Maintained by Three Rivers Park District, the Medicine Lake Regional Trail is a 20 -mile paved multi-use trail which connects to Elm Creek Park Reserve, Fish Lake and French Regional Parks, as well as other local and regional trail facilities.

Existing road is within 500 of other known pedestrian generators (e.g., school, civic/community center, senior housing, multifamily Yes housing, regulatorily-designated affordable housing)

If checked, please describe:
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
While the CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) corridors are home to a number of civic and residential developments which are connected via county-owned off-street bicycle facilities, the project location is in a suburban context generally farther than 500' away from local destinations. As previously mentioned, the Medicine Lake Regional Trail connects to a number of community facilities throughout the corridor. Within the 500' buffer area from the proposed intersection, St. Joseph Catholic Community provides religious services and organizes community events such as food drives and support groups. French Lake Regional Park directly abuts the project area to the southwest, and provides miles of recreational trails, picnic areas, playgrounds, fishing, as well as a field operations center for Three Rivers Park District.

## Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

This project will improve conditions for people walking, biking, and using mobility devices by eliminating four free-right turn lanes. The reduced turning radii will slow motor vehicle traffic and improve visibility between motor vehicle users and people crossing.. The project will include multiuse trail in all four quadrants and connect to the existing trails. Multimodal connections near the project area are illustrated in Attachment 11.

The intersection's ramps and signals are identified as deficient in Hennepin County's ADA transition plan. The location of signal poles and corresponding handholes present obstructions for people with limited mobility. The signals will be updated to include accessible pedestrian signals and new pedestrian ramps will replace the existing noncompliant pedestrian ramps. Drainage also will be improved so water does not pool in the pedestrian ramps as it does today.

The western, southern, and eastern intersection legs are Regional Bicycle Transportation Network Tier 1 corridors. Improving this intersection will create a more direct and visible crossing for people biking this route, resulting in improved safety. People biking will benefit from the improved intersection with connections to Medicine Lake Regional Trail less than 200 feet to the east.

The intersection currently does not carry regular fixed route transit. It is, however, within 0.25 mile of Plymouth Metrolink Route 777 that includes a station at the nearby CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd)/Vinewood Ln intersection. In addition, the Nathan Ln Park and Ride is about 2 miles from the project location. The proposed crossing improvements at this intersection will facilitate

## Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction

If the applicant is completing a transit 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 - Construction Projects

## 1.Public Involvement (20 Percent of Points)

Projects that have been through a public process with residents and other interested public entities are more likely than others to be successful. The project applicant must indicate that events and/or targeted outreach (e.g., surveys and other web-based input) were held to help identify the transportation problem, how the potential solution was selected instead of other options, and the public involvement completed to date on the project. The focus of this section is on the opportunity for public input as opposed to the quality of input. NOTE: A written response is required and failure to respond will result in zero points.

Multiple types of targeted outreach efforts (such as meetings or online/mail outreach) specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need.

100\%
At least one meeting specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

50\%
At least online/mail outreach effort specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

50\%
No meeting or outreach specific to this project was conducted, but the project was identified through meetings and/or outreach related to a larger planning effort.

25\%
No outreach has led to the selection of this project.
Yes
0\%
Describe the type(s) of outreach selected for this project (i.e., online or in-person meetings, surveys, demonstration projects), the method(s) used to announce outreach opportunities, and how many people participated. Include any public website links to outreach opportunities.

The CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project was selected for pursuit of Regional Solicitation funding based on the recent crash rate experienced at the intersection when compared to similar locations countywide.

At this time, county staff have not begun public engagement specific to the project. However, county staff worked closely with MnDOT and transportation safety professionals in the development of the County Road Safety Plan. The CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) intersection includes a number of design deficiencies that have shown to create the potential for high crash frequencies.

If funded, Hennepin County will coordinate with the City of Plymouth and Three Rivers Park District to determine an appropriate plan for moving forward with engagement, which would likely include engaging nearby residents, people who frequently travel through the intersection, and users of the Medicine Lake Regional Trail.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
2.Layout (25 Percent of Points)

Layout includes proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries. A basic layout should include a base map (north arrow; scale; legend;* city and/or county limits; existing ROW, labeled; existing signals;* and bridge numbers*) and design data (proposed alignments; bike and/or roadway lane widths; shoulder width;* proposed signals;* and proposed ROW). An aerial photograph with a line showing the projects termini does not suffice and will be awarded zero points. *If applicable

Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties/MnDOT. If a MnDOT trunk highway is impacted, approval by MnDOT must have occurred to receive full points. A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.
$100 \%$
A layout does not apply (signal replacement/signal timing, standalone streetscaping, minor intersection improvements). Applicants that are not certain whether a layout is required should contact Colleen Brown at MnDOT Metro State Aid colleen.brown@state.mn.us.

For projects where MnDOT trunk highways are impacted and a MnDOT Staff Approved layout is required. Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted local jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties), and layout review and approval by MnDOT is pending. A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.

75\%
Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.

50\%
Layout has been started but is not complete. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.

25\%
Layout has not been started
0\%
Attach Layout
1649774079801_Attachment 05 - Potential Concept.pdf
Please upload attachment in PDF form.
Additional Attachments
Please upload attachment in PDF form.
3.Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 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\%
There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of no historic properties affected is anticipated.

## 100\%

Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of no adverse effect anticipated

80\%
Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of adverse effect anticipated

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

0\%
Project is located on an identified historic bridge

## 4.Right-of-Way (25 Percent of Points)

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit either not required or all have been acquired

100\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - parcels identified

25\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - parcels not all identified

0\%
5.Railroad Involvement (15 Percent of Points)

No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way Yes agreement is executed (include signature page, if applicable)

100\%
Signature Page
Please upload attachment in PDF form.
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

50\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.

0\%

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | $\$ 2,030,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | $\$ 2,030,000.00$ |
| Enter amount of any outside, competitive funding: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Attach documentation of award: |  |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attachment 00 - List of Attachments.pdf | Attachment 00 - List of Attachments | 79 KB |
| Attachment 01 - Project Narrative.pdf | Attachment 01 - Project Narrative | 214 KB |
| Attachment 02 - Project Location Map.pdf | Attachment 02 - Project Location Map | 613 KB |
| Attachment 03 - Existing Roadway Condition Photos.pdf | Attachment 03 - Existing Roadway Condition Photos | 1.3 MB |
| Attachment 04 - Crash Map and Detail Listing.pdf | Attachment 04 - Crash Map and Detail Listing | 622 KB |
| Attachment 05 - Potential Concept.pdf | Attachment 05 - Potential Concept | 1.3 MB |
| Attachment 06 - Hennepin County Board Resolution 22-0109.pdf | Attachment 06 - Hennepin County Board Resolution 22-0109 | 518 KB |
| Attachment 07-CRSP Intersection Risk Factors.pdf | Attachment 07-CRSP Intersection Risk Factors | 40 KB |
| Attachment 08 - Socio-Economic Equity Map.pdf | Attachment 08 - Socio-Economic Equity Map | 496 KB |
| Attachment 09-Affordable Housing Access Map.pdf | Attachment 09 - Affordable Housing Access Map | 1.0 MB |
| Attachment 10-Crash Modification Factors.pdf | Attachment 10-Crash Modification Factors | 613 KB |
| Attachment 11 - Multimodal Connections Map.pdf | Attachment 11-Multimodal Connections Map | 720 KB |
| Attachment 12 - City of Plymouth Support Letter.pdf | Attachment 12 - City of Plymouth Support Letter | 274 KB |

## Level of Congestion

Roadway Spot Mobility \& Safety Project: CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project | Map ID: 1646858389566


- Project Points

A Minor Arterials
A Minor Arterials Planned
Principal Arterials Principal Arterials Planned
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit https://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissite/notice.aspx

## Level of Congestion

Roadway Spot Mobility \& Safety Project: CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project | Map ID: 1649076562990


- Project Points

A Minor Arterials
A Minor Arterials Planned
Principal Arterials Principal Arterials Planned
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit https://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissite/notice.aspx

## Socio-Economic Conditions

Roadway Spot Mobility \& Safety Project: CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project | Map ID: 1646858389566

## Results

Total of publicly subsidized rental housing units in census tracts within $1 / 2$ mile: 180

Project located in census tracts that are BELOW the regional average for population in poverty or population of color.


Regional Environmental Justice Area
Area of Concentrated Poverty

For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit hor complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visiswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissite/notice.aspx

## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project

Synchro Report - Congestion Reduction

Existing conditions (PM Peak)

| Rockford RS <br> Existing PM |  | 04/03/2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 3: Northwest Blvd \& Rockford Rd |  |  |
| Direction | All |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2996 |  |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 28 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.38 |  |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.66 |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.78 |  |

Proposed conditions (PM Peak)

|  |  | $04 / 03 / 2022$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Rockford RS |  |  |
| Build PM |  |  |
| 3: Northwest Blvd \& Rockford Rd |  |  |
| Dill |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2996 | 26 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 3.33 | 0.65 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.77 |  |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ |  |  |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Rockford RS
Existing PM

|  | 4 |  | 7 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | （ | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 1 | 中4 | ${ }^{7}$ | 1 | 中4 | ${ }^{\text {T }}$ | 1 | 中4 | ${ }^{7}$ | \％ | 4＊ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 116 | 834 | 85 | 142 | 754 | 96 | 94 | 299 | 278 | 75 | 145 | 77 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 116 | 834 | 86 | 142 | 754 | 96 | 94 | 299 | 278 | 75 | 145 | 77 |
| Tum Type | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | pmipt | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | custom |
| Protected Phases | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 6 |  | 6 | 2 |  | 2 | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  | 7 |
| Detector Phase | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 7 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Inital（ $s$ ） | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 120 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 12.5 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 12.5 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 12.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 |
| Total Split（s） | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 18.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 32.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 |
| Total Split（\％） | 14．5\％ | 27．7\％ | 27．7\％ | 11．9\％ | 27．1\％ | 27．1\％ | 21．1\％ | 32．3\％ | 32．3\％ | 26．1\％ | 26．1\％ | 26．1\％ |
| Yellow Time（ $s$ ） | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 5.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lead／lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| Act Effict Green（s） | 45.8 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 48.9 | 36.9 | 36.9 | 28.0 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 33.7 | 21.5 | 12.3 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.46 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.49 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.28 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.34 | 0.22 | 0.12 |
| wlc Ratio | 0.39 | 0.72 | 0.14 | 0.50 | 0.62 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.53 | 0.72 | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.30 |
| Control Delay | 16.7 | 32.3 | 2.2 | 19.0 | 28.9 | 3.0 | 22.9 | 40.6 | 26.6 | 23.2 | 33.0 | 9.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 16.7 | 32.3 | 2.2 | 19.0 | 28.9 | 3.0 | 22.9 | 40.6 | 26.6 | 23.2 | 33.0 | 9.2 |
| LOS | B | C | A | B | C | A | C | D | C | C | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 28.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 32.3 |  |  | 24.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length： 151.5
Actuated Cycle Length： 98.9
Natural Cycle： 135
Control Type：Actuated－Uncoordinated
Maximum vic Ratio： 0.72
Intersection Signal Delay． 27.6
Intersection Capacity Utilization 70．1\％
Intersection LOS：C
Analysis Period（min） 15
Spilts and Phases：3：Northwest Blved \＆Rockford Rd


Rockford RS
Build PM 3: Northwest Blvd \& Rockford Rd


## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility and Safety Project

Synchro Report - Emission Reduction

Existing conditions (PM Peak)

| Rockford RS <br> Existing PM |  | 04/03/2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 3: Northwest Blvd \& Rockford Rd |  |  |
| Direction | All |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2996 |  |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 28 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.38 |  |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.66 |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.78 |  |

Proposed conditions (PM Peak)

|  |  | $04 / 03 / 2022$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Rockford RS |  |  |
| Build PM |  |  |
| 3: Northwest Blvd \& Rockford Rd |  |  |
| Dill |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2996 | 26 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 3.33 | 0.65 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.77 |  |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ |  |  |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Rockford RS
Existing PM

|  | 4 |  | 7 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | （ | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 1 | 中4 | ${ }^{7}$ | 1 | 中4 | ${ }^{\text {T }}$ | 1 | 中4 | ${ }^{7}$ | \％ | 4＊ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 116 | 834 | 85 | 142 | 754 | 96 | 94 | 299 | 278 | 75 | 145 | 77 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 116 | 834 | 86 | 142 | 754 | 96 | 94 | 299 | 278 | 75 | 145 | 77 |
| Tum Type | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | pmipt | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | custom |
| Protected Phases | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 6 |  | 6 | 2 |  | 2 | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  | 7 |
| Detector Phase | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 7 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Inital（ $s$ ） | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 120 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 12.5 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 12.5 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 12.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 |
| Total Split（s） | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 18.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 32.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 |
| Total Split（\％） | 14．5\％ | 27．7\％ | 27．7\％ | 11．9\％ | 27．1\％ | 27．1\％ | 21．1\％ | 32．3\％ | 32．3\％ | 26．1\％ | 26．1\％ | 26．1\％ |
| Yellow Time（ $s$ ） | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 5.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lead／lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| Act Effict Green（s） | 45.8 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 48.9 | 36.9 | 36.9 | 28.0 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 33.7 | 21.5 | 12.3 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.46 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.49 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.28 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.34 | 0.22 | 0.12 |
| wlc Ratio | 0.39 | 0.72 | 0.14 | 0.50 | 0.62 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.53 | 0.72 | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.30 |
| Control Delay | 16.7 | 32.3 | 2.2 | 19.0 | 28.9 | 3.0 | 22.9 | 40.6 | 26.6 | 23.2 | 33.0 | 9.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 16.7 | 32.3 | 2.2 | 19.0 | 28.9 | 3.0 | 22.9 | 40.6 | 26.6 | 23.2 | 33.0 | 9.2 |
| LOS | B | C | A | B | C | A | C | D | C | C | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 28.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 32.3 |  |  | 24.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length： 151.5
Actuated Cycle Length： 98.9
Natural Cycle： 135
Control Type：Actuated－Uncoordinated
Maximum vic Ratio： 0.72
Intersection Signal Delay． 27.6
Intersection Capacity Utilization 70．1\％
Intersection LOS：C
Analysis Period（min） 15
Spilts and Phases：3：Northwest Blved \＆Rockford Rd


Rockford RS
Build PM 3: Northwest Blvd \& Rockford Rd


Traffic Safety Benefit-Cost Calculation
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Reactive Project

F. Analysis Assumptions

| Crash Severity | Crash Cost |
| :--- | :---: |
| K crashes | $\$ 1,500,000$ |
| A crashes | $\$ 750,000$ |
| B crashes | $\$ 230,000$ |
| C crashes | $\$ 120,000$ |
| PDO crashes | $\$ 13,000$ |

Link: mndot.gov/planning/program/appendix_a.html

| Real Discount Rate | $0.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Traffic Growth Rate | $0.5 \%$ |
| Project Service Life | 20 years |

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.28 | 0.09 | $\$ 70,000$ |
| B crashes | 1.98 | 0.66 | $\$ 151,800$ |
| C crashes | 3.52 | 1.17 | $\$ 140,960$ |
| PDO crashes | 5.70 | 1.90 | $\$ 24,717$ |


| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026 | \$387,477 | \$387,477 | Total $=$ \$7,605,057 |
| 2027 | \$389,415 | \$386,708 |  |
| 2028 | \$391,362 | \$385,940 |  |
| 2029 | \$393,319 | \$385,173 |  |
| 2030 | \$395,285 | \$384,408 |  |
| 2031 | \$397,262 | \$383,645 |  |
| 2032 | \$399,248 | \$382,883 |  |
| 2033 | \$401,244 | \$382,122 |  |
| 2034 | \$403,250 | \$381,363 |  |
| 2035 | \$405,267 | \$380,606 |  |
| 2036 | \$407,293 | \$379,850 |  |
| 2037 | \$409,329 | \$379,096 |  |
| 2038 | \$411,376 | \$378,343 |  |
| 2039 | \$413,433 | \$377,591 |  |
| 2040 | \$415,500 | \$376,841 |  |
| 2041 | \$417,578 | \$376,093 |  |
| 2042 | \$419,666 | \$375,346 |  |
| 2043 | \$421,764 | \$374,600 |  |
| 2044 | \$423,873 | \$373,857 |  |
| 2045 | \$425,992 | \$373,114 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
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Attachment 01 | Project Narrative

## Project Name

CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project
City(ies)
Plymouth
Commissioner District(s)
27
Capital Project Number
CP 2220400
Scoping Manager
Emily Buell

Project Category<br>Safety<br>Scoping Form Revision Dates<br>4/9/2022

## Project Summary

Safety improvements at the intersection of Rockford Road (CSAH 9) and Northwest Boulevard (CSAH 61) in the City of Plymouth.

## Roadway History

The existing intersection of Rockford Road (CSAH 9) at Northwest Boulevard (CSAH 61) experiences a relatively high number of crashes when compared to similar intersections throughout the county. The predominant crash types at this intersection are left-turn and rear-end related. The existing design includes channelized right-turn islands in all four quadrants that present sight distance challenges for right-turning vehicles. In addition, relatively long crossing distances are required for people walking and biking through the intersection since both Rockford Road (CSAH 9) and Northwest Boulevard (CSAH 61) are 4lane roadways; creating a sense of discomfort for multimodal users.

## Project Description and Benefits

The proposed project will improve accessibility, mobility, and safety by implementing the following project elements that aim to address crash themes.

- Elimination of channelized right-turn islands
- Improved alignment of the left-turn lanes along Rockford Road (CSAH 9)
- Replacement and upgrading of the existing traffic signal system

Upgrading of ADA accommodations to current design stands

- Modification to trail alignments on each approach (as necessary)


## Project Risks \& Uncertainties

## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project

Attachment 02 | Project Location Map

$0 \quad 0.25$ 0.5
Miles

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: 3/23/2022


## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project

## Attachment 03 | Existing Roadway Condition Photos



View from the southwest intersection quadrant.


Aging Accessible Pedestrian Signal, southwest intersection quadrant.


Aging pedestrian ramps lacking truncated domes at the southwest porkchop.


Southern pedestrian crossing across CSAH 61.


# CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project Attachment 03 | Existing Roadway Condition Photos 



Eastern pedestrian crossing across
CSAH 9.


Eastern signal leg, originally constructed in 1987.


CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project
Attachment 04 | Crash Map and Detail Listing


Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: 4/8/2022


## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project

Attachment 04 | Crash Map and Detail Listing

Intersection A I At CSAH 61 (Northwest Boulevard)

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Number K's | Number of Veh | Contributing Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00760397 | ROCKFORD RD | 11 | 6 | 2019 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 70 | 45.02869 | -93.4451475 |
| 00724591 | ROCKFORD RD | 5 | 17 | 2019 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 70 | 45.02869 | -93.4451314 |
| 00842801 | ROCKFORD RD | 9 | 25 | 2020 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 45.02879 | -93.4448906 |
| 00772671 | ROCKFORD RD | 12 | 18 | 2019 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 45.02881 | -93.4448365 |
| 00866056 | ROCKFORD RD | 12 | 1 | 2020 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02882 | -93.4448136 |
| 00730257 | ROCKFORD RD | 6 | 29 | 2019 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02883 | -93.4447965 |
| 00804869 | ROCKFORD RD | 3 | 21 | 2020 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 99 | 45.02883 | -93.4447985 |
| 00688391 | ROCKFORD RD | 2 | 14 | 2019 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02884 | -93.4447784 |
| 00739676 | ROCKFORD RD | 8 | 11 | 2019 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02884 | -93.4447712 |
| 00817132 | ROCKFORD RD | 6 | 30 | 2020 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02882 | -93.4448167 |
| 00699356 | ROCKFORD RD | 3 | 14 | 2019 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 99 | 45.02884 | -93.4447577 |
| 00813008 | ROCKFORD RD | 6 | 4 | 2020 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 45.02884 | -93.4447656 |
| 00865240 | ROCKFORD RD | 11 | 25 | 2020 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 63 | 45.02886 | -93.4447077 |
| 00966899 | ROCKFORD RD | 10 | 14 | 2021 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 45.02887 | -93.4446962 |
| 00763972 | ROCKFORD RD | 11 | 20 | 2019 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02889 | -93.444647 |
| 00933979 | ROCKFORD RD | 8 | 13 | 2021 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 45.0289 | -93.4446274 |
| 00973800 | ROCKFORD RD | 11 | 15 | 2021 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02907 | -93.4449621 |
| 00747535 | ROCKFORD RD | 9 | 15 | 2019 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02891 | -93.4446096 |
| 00775450 | ROCKFORD RD | 12 | 30 | 2019 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 45.02909 | -93.4449311 |
| 00977953 | ROCKFORD RD | 12 | 6 | 2021 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02893 | -93.4445413 |
| 00702660 | ROCKFORD RD | 4 | 10 | 2019 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 90 | 45.02912 | -93.4448513 |
| 00867169 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 12 | 8 | 2020 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.0285 | -93.4448078 |
| 00759506 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 10 | 28 | 2019 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 45.02867 | -93.4449112 |
| 00745857 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 9 | 8 | 2019 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02873 | -93.4449489 |
| 00749475 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 9 | 23 | 2019 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02874 | -93.4449561 |
| 00976466 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 11 | 30 | 2021 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 45.02876 | -93.4449569 |
| 00762714 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 11 | 13 | 2019 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 45.02879 | -93.444984 |
| 00841112 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 9 | 16 | 2020 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 45.02871 | -93.4445703 |
| 00936252 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 8 | 24 | 2021 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 45.02871 | -93.4445666 |
| 00784917 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 2 | 1 | 2020 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02877 | -93.4446006 |
| 00738143 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 8 | 4 | 2019 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02878 | -93.4446022 |
| 00773660 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 12 | 22 | 2019 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02896 | -93.4450826 |
| 00759711 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 11 | 5 | 2019 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 70 | 45.02886 | -93.4446489 |
| 00972445 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 11 | 10 | 2021 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 45.02887 | -93.444655 |
| 00937524 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 8 | 30 | 2021 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.0291 | -93.4451612 |
| 00770528 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 12 | 12 | 2019 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02898 | -93.444719 |
| 00734255 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 7 | 17 | 2019 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02901 | -93.444741 |
| 00733974 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 7 | 16 | 2019 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 45.02908 | -93.4447845 |
| 00727783 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 6 | 18 | 2019 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 45.02914 | -93.4448282 |
| 00945863 | NORTHWEST BLVD | 10 | 8 | 2021 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 45.02921 | -93.4448709 |
|  | Subtotal: | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project Total: $\quad 40$
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# HENNEPIN COUNTY minnesota <br> Hennepin County, Board of Commissioners <br> RESOLUTION 22-0109 

2022

The following resolution was moved by Commissioner Angela Conley and seconded by Commissioner Debbie Goettel:

BE IT RESOLVED, that Hennepin County be authorized to apply for federal funding through the Regional Solicitation for the following projects (separated by category) on various County State Aid Highways (CSAHs) throughout the county:

## Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization

Projects programmed in the 2022-2026 CIP:

- Franklin Avenue (CSAH 5) from Lyndale Avenue (CSAH 22) to Blaisdell Avenue in Minneapolis
- Dayton River Road (CSAH 12) from Colburn Street to North Diamond Lake Road (CSAH 144) in Dayton and Champlin
- Lyndale Avenue (CSAH 22) from the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA) bridge to Franklin Avenue (CSAH 5) in Minneapolis

Projects identified in the county's 10-year work-plan, but not programmed in the 2022-2026 CIP:

- Penn Avenue (CSAH 32) from 75th Street to the Trunk Highway 62 South Ramp in Richfield
- Cedar Avenue (CSAH 152) from Lake Street (CSAH 3) to 24 th Street in Minneapolis


## Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement

Project programmed in the 2022-2026 CIP:

- Bass Lake Road (CSAH 10) bridge over the Twin Lakes Inlet in Brooklyn Center and Crystal

Projects identified in the county's 10-year work-plan, but not programmed in the 2022-2026 CIP:

- Pioneer Trail (CSAH 1) bridge over the HCRRA corridor in Eden Prairie
- Eden Prairie Road (CSAH 4) bridge over Twin Cities and Western Railroad in Eden Prairie


## Multiuse Trails/Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities (sidewalks, streetscaping and improved accessibility)

Project partially programmed in the 2022-2026 CIP:

- Lake Street (CSAH 3) from Dupont Avenue to the Mississippi River

Project identified in the county's 10-year work-plan, but not programmed in the 2022-2026 CIP:

- Marshall Street NE (CSAH 23) from Third Avenue NE to Lowry Avenue NE (CSAH 153).

Project not currently identified in the county's 2022-2026 CIP or 10-year work-plan:

- Park Avenue (CSAH 33) and Portland Avenue (CSAH 35) from Lake Street (CSAH 3) to the I-94/I-35W Bridge in Minneapolis

Mobility and Safety
Projects not currently identified in the county's 10-year work-plan or 5-year CIP:

- Rockford Road (CSAH 9) and Northwest Boulevard (CSAH 61) in Plymouth
- Hemlock Lane (CSAH 61) and Elm Creek Boulevard (CSAH 130) in Maple Grove

The question was on the adoption of the resolution and there were $\underline{\underline{Z}}$ YEAS and $\underline{0}$ NAYS, as follows:


CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project
Attachment 7 | CRSP Intersection Risk Factors

| Urba | n Inter | rsedion | Priorit | tizatio | n Hennep | qpin County - VEHICLE RELATED |  |  |  | Risk Factors |  |  |  | Tiebreaker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { List } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | County Rank | County ID | Route System | Route No. | County | Description | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Traffic Control | Entering <br> ADT OR <br> Cross <br> Product | Leg Configuration | Adjacent Development | Major <br> Approach <br> Left Turn <br> Phasing | Total Stars | Crash cost |
| 823 | 599 | 66008 | NV | 66 | Hennepin | County Road 66 at Monroe Stred Northeest |  | $\star$ |  | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$2,223,600 |
| 763 | 600 | 60090 | NV | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 61at State Highway 7 |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$2,10,800 |
| 897 | 601 | 880001 | NV | 88 | Hennepin | County Road 88 at Interstate 35W Northbound Ramps |  | * |  | * |  | * | * * $\star$ | \$2,058,400 |
| 389 | 602 | 220066 | nv | 22 | Hennepin | County Road 22 at 26th Street West | * | * | * |  |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$2,002,600 |
| 661 | 603 | 520042 | n | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 at American Boulevard West / American Boulevard East |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$195,000 |
| 805 | 604 | 620035 | nv | 62 | Hennepin | County Road 62 at Interstate 494 Southbound Ramps |  | $\star$ | * | * |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1886,400 |
| 281 | 605 | 140020 | n | 14 | Hennepin | County Road if at CSAH 109 (85th Avenue North) |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1841000 |
| 1089 | 606 | 520299 | NV | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 at 68th Avenue North |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1818,200 |
| 880 | 607 | 81083 | NV | 81 | Hennepin | County Road 81才 CSAH 8 (West Broadway) |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1713,400 |
| 1095 | 608 | 520328 | NV | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 at Kentucky Avenue North |  | * |  | * | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1732,400 |
| 60 | 609 | 20086 | NV | 2 | Hennepin | County Road 2 at 42nd Avenue North |  | $\star$ |  | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$1703,000 |
| 72 | 60 | 30078 | NV | 3 | Hennepin | County Road 3 at $\mathbb{T}$ h Avenue South | $\star$ | * |  | * |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1670,000 |
| 1050 | 611 | 52008 | NV | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 at 2nd Avenue South | * | * |  | * |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1667,800 |
| 285 | 62 | 140032 | NV | 14 | Hennepin | County Road lh at CSAH 30 (93rd Avenue North) |  | $\star$ |  | * | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1661000 |
| 439 | 6B | 300044 | NV | 30 | Hennepin | County Road 30 at Dunkirk Lane North / Maple Grove Parkway North | * | * |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1608,000 |
| 822 | 64 | 66000 | NV | 66 | Hennepin | County Road 66 at Washington Street Northeest |  | $\star$ |  | * |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$1604,200 |
| 727 | 65 | 600008 | nv | 60 | Hennepin | County Road 60 at CSAH 39 (Valley View Road) |  | $\star$ |  | * |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$1599,400 |
| 620 | 616 | 460018 | nv | 46 | Hennepin | County Road 46 at Stevens Avenue South |  | $\star$ |  | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$1594,600 |
| 926 | 61 | 10168 | nv | D1 | Hennepin | County Road D1at State Highway 55 (East Junction) / Peony Lane N |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$157600 |
| 874 | 68 | 810066 | nv | 81 | Hennepin | County Road 81at Corvalis Avenue North / 5tt Avenue North |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1492,400 |
| B0 | 61 | 4000 | nv | 4 | Hennepin | County Road 4 at CSAH 1 (Pioneer Trail) |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$1439,800 |
| 885 | 620 | 81090 | nv | 81 | Hennepin | County Road 81at CSAH 109 (85th Avenue North) |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1433,400 |
| 247 | 621 | D0206 | NV | D | Hennepin | County Road D t Xeres Avenue North |  | $\star$ |  | * | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1406,200 |
| 882 | 622 | 81086 | NV | 81 | Hennepin | County Road 81at 79th Avenue North |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$1392,200 |
| 1092 | 623 | 520308 | N | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 at Regent Avenue North |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1386,600 |
| 67 | 624 | 50252 | NV | 5 | Hennepin | County Road 5 at Bth Avenue South | * |  | $\star$ |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1347,600 |
| 842 | 625 | 730028 | nv | 73 | Hennepin | County Road 73 at Cedar Lake Road |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1340,400 |
| 873 | 626 | 80062 | NV | 81 | Hennepin | County Road 81at 47th Avenue North |  | * | * | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1323,000 |
| 386 | 627 | 220056 | NV | 22 | Hennepin | County Road 22 at 32nd Street West | * |  |  | $\star$ | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1320,800 |
| 760 | 628 | 60070 | NV | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 61at CSAH 3 (Excessior Boulevard) |  | $\star$ |  | * | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$131400 |
| 964 | 629 | 190003 | nv | 09 | Hennepin | County Road 199 at 83rd Way North |  | $\star$ |  | * | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1277,800 |
| 25 | 630 | DD9 | NV | 1 | Hennepin | County Road 1at Xeres Avenue South |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | * |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1275,000 |
| 80 | 631 | 30142 | NV | 3 | Hennepin | County Road 3 at Wooddde Avenue | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1272,800 |
| 578 | 632 | 370006 | nv | 37 | Hennepin | County Road 37 at 7th Avenue Southeest |  | $\star$ |  | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$180,400 |
| 787 | 633 | 60224 | NV | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 61at CSAH 9 (Rodford Road) |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$176,400 |
| 1000 | 634 | B00064 | NV | B0 | Hennepin | County Road BO at 73rd Avenue North |  | * |  | * |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$127,000 |
| 208 | 635 | 90058 | NV | 9 | Hennepin | County Road 9 at Hampshire Avenue Norh | * |  | * | * |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$113,800 |
| 326 | 636 | 70054 | NV | 7 | Hennepin | County Road D at 70th Street West | $\star$ | * |  |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1073,800 |
| 363 | 637 | 20018 | N | 21 | Hennepin | County Road 21at Upton Avenue South |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$1071800 |
| 97 | 638 | D10094 | NV | D1 | Hennepin | County Road Dlat Wayzata Boulevard East / Central Avenue South |  | * |  | * | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1033,800 |
| 61 | 639 | 20090 | N | 2 | Hennepin | County Road 2 at CSAH 52 (44th Avenue North) |  | * |  |  | * | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$109,800 |
| 826 | 640 | 66014 | NV | 66 | Hennepin | County Road 66 at Buchanan Street Northeest |  |  | * | * |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$109,800 |
| 659 | 641 | 520032 | NV | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 a 84th Street West / 84th Street Eat |  | * |  | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$1000,400 |
| 889 | 642 | 801m | NV | 81 | Hennepin | County Road 81at Em Creak Boulevard North |  | * |  | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$991800 |
| 962 | 643 | 190001 | NV | 09 | Hennepin | County Road 09 at Interstate 94 Eatbound Ramp |  | * |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$984,600 |
| 965 | 644 | 190004 | NV | D9 | Hennepin | County Road 199 at Vinewood Lane North |  | * |  |  | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$982,800 |


| Urban Intersection Prioritization for Hennepin County - PED/BIKE RELATED |  |  |  |  |  |  | Risk Fators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tiebreker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { List } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { County } \\ \text { Rank } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CRSP 2 ID | Route System | Route No. | County | Desaription | Traffic Control | Entering ADT | Adjacent Development | Max Number of Lanes Crossed | Presence of Refuge Island | Pedestrian Crossing Type | Presence of Transit Stop | Total Stars | Crash Cost |
| 1079 | 801 | 520272 | NV | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 at 5kt Avenue North |  | * |  | * | $\star$ |  |  | * * ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | \$197,600 |
| 787 | 802 | 60224 | NV | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 6lat CSAH 9 (Rodford Road) | $\star$ |  | * |  |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$176,40C |
| D51 | 803 | 62010 | nv | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 a Marquette Avenue | $\star$ |  | * | $\star$ |  |  |  | $\star$ * $\star$ | \$155,600 |
| 841 | 804 | 730026 | nv | 73 | Hennepin | County Road 73 at Cedar Ponte Drive North / Greenbrier Road |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$1099,000 |
| 109 | 805 | Б30070 | nv | 63 | Hennepin | County Road 53 at 4th Street Northeest |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1078,600 |
| 326 | 806 | 70054 | NV | ग | Hennepin | County Road D at 70th Street West | * |  | * | * |  |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$1073,800 |
| 560 | 807 | 3501/2 | nv | 35 | Hennepin | County Road 35 at 84th Street Eat |  |  |  | $\star$ | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$999,800 |
| 889 | 808 | 8017 | nv | 81 | Hennepin | County Road 81at Elm Creek Boulevard North | * |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$991800 |
| 937 | 809 | 1020022 | nv | 102 | Hennepin | County Road 102 at Sandburg Road |  |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$980,800 |
| 867 | 80 | 81052 | NV | 81 | Hennepin | County Road 81at 36th Avenue North | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$99,400 |
| 256 | 871 | 2000 | nv | D | Hennepin | County Road D at 93rd Avenue North |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | * |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$905,000 |
| 242 | 8 8 | D012 | nv | 0 | Hennepin | County Road D at Sherburne Avenue North | $\star$ |  | * |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$880,400 |
| 19 | 8 B | 1072 | nv | 1 | Hennepin | County Road lat Highway 69 Southbound Ramps | * |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$870,400 |
| 568 | 84 | 36000 | nv | 36 | Hennepin | County Road 36 at 17th Avenue Southeet | $\star$ |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$859,800 |
| 711 | 85 | 60164 | NV | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 61a Ridgedde Drive | * |  | ᄎ |  |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$805,200 |
| 644 | 86 | 480044 | NV | 48 | Hennepin | County Road 48 at 3tt Street Eat |  |  | * |  | * |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$730,800 |
| 220 | 87 | 10080 | nv | D | Hennepin | County Road D at Wedgwood Road North / 63rd Avenue North | * |  | * |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$72,000 |
| 749 | 8 B | 60039 | nv | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 61at CSAH 39 (Valley View Road) / Prairie Center Drive | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$72,000 |
| 51 | 81 | 20040 | NV | 2 | Hennepin | County Road 2 at 16th Avenue North (North Junction) | $\star$ |  |  |  | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$78,200 |
| 713 | 820 | 60168 | NV | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 61at Ridgedde Lane/ Interstae 394 Eastbound Ramps | * |  | $\star$ | * |  |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$78,000 |
| 976 | 821 | 090027 | nv | D9 | Hennepin | County Road 10 at Wsoming Avenue North |  |  | * | * | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$71400 |
| 493 | 822 | 330022 | NV | 33 | Hennepin | County Road 33 at 35th Stred East | $\star$ |  |  |  | * | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$675,000 |
| 758 | 823 | 60062 | nv | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 61at Dominick Drive/ Smetana Road | $\star$ |  |  | * |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$655,600 |
| 1021 | 824 | 520032 | nv | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 62 at 40th Street East | * |  |  |  |  | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$647,800 |
| 974 | 825 | 190024 | nv | 09 | Hennepin | County Road D9 at Highway 69 Northbound Ramps | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$623,400 |
| 200 | 826 | 140052 | NV | 14 | Hennepin | County Road 14 at Oxbow Creek Drive North | * |  |  | * |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$608,800 |
| 56 | 827 | 340016 | nv | 34 | Hennepin | County Road 34 a 94th Street West / Poplar Bridge Road | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$607,800 |
| 360 | 828 | 20004 | NV | 21 | Hennepin | County Road 21at Chowen Avenue South | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$603,800 |
| 280 | 829 | hoor | NV | 14 | Hennepin | County Road 14 at Candlewood Drive North |  |  |  | $\star$ | * |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$588,200 |
| 452 | 830 | 30008 | NV | 31 | Hennepin | County Road 31a Parkawn Avenue |  |  | * | * |  |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$560,800 |
| गо | 831 | 6006 | nv | 6 | Hennepin | County Road 6 at Vidstourg Lane North | * | $\star$ |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$549,200 |
| 656 | 832 | 520004 | nv | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 at 95th Street |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$541200 |
| 662 | 833 | 520044 | nv | 52 | Hennepin | County Road 52 at interstate 494 Eatbound Ramps | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$520,800 |
| 191 | 834 | 90004 | nv | 9 | Hennepin | County Road 9 at Vidstourg Lane North | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$484,400 |
| 708 | 835 | 530052 | NV | 53 | Hennepin | County Road 53 at it Avenue South |  |  | $\star$ | * | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$470,000 |
| 343 | 836 | тово | NV | ग | Hennepin | County Road D at 39th Stret West |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$453,200 |
| ID3 | 837 | 560024 | NV | 56 | Hennepin | County Road 56 at Duluth Street |  |  |  |  | * | $\star$ | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$450,400 |
| 982 | 838 | 1990072 | nv | 09 | Hennepin | County Road 19 at Edinbrook Parkway North | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$450,400 |
| 278 | 839 | 90096 | NV | 9 | Hennepin | County Road 9 at Indiana Avenue North (East Junction) | * |  |  |  | * |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$431,000 |
| 369 | 840 | 220000 | NV | 22 | Hennepin | County Road 22 at 58th Street West | * |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$422,000 |
| 474 | 841 | 320056 | nv | 32 | Hennepin | County Road 32 a 82 nd Street West (North Junction) |  |  | * |  |  | $\star$ | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$40,400 |
| 230 | 842 | 10083 | NV | D | Hennepin | County Road D at Interstate 494 Southbound Ramps | * |  | * |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$409,200 |
| 603 | 843 | 40008 | NV | 40 | Hennepin | County Road 40 at Royalston Avenue North / Dth Street North | * |  | * |  |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$406,400 |
| 192 | 844 | 90006 | NV | 9 | Hennepin | County Road 9 at Plymouth Boulevard |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$406,400 |
| 3 | 845 | 205 | NV | 1 | Hennepin | County Road lat Dall Road | $\star$ |  |  | * | * |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$402,600 |
| 739 | 846 | 60074 | nv | 61 | Hennepin | County Road 61at College View Drive | * |  |  | * |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$398,600 |
| 27 | 847 | 90080 | nv | 9 | Hennepin | County Road 9 at Regent Avenue North |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$383,000 |
| 949 | 848 | D30002 | NV | D3 | Hennepin | County Road $\mathrm{D3}$ a Candlewood Drive North |  |  |  | * | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | ᄎ $\star \star$ | \$383,000 |
| 243 | 849 | 1014 | NV | 0 | Hennepin | County Road D at Elmhurst Avenue North |  |  | $\star$ |  |  | * | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$379,200 |
| 282 | 850 | 140024 | NV | 4 | Hennepin | County Road 14 at Creekview Lane North / Edinbrook Terrace North |  |  | $\star$ | * |  |  | * | $\star \star \star$ | \$375,200 |

## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project



Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: $3 / 22 / 2022$


## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project

Attachment 09 | Affordable Housing Access Map

| Key |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Location |
| Population Served |
| Family |
| Elderly |
| People with Disabilities |
| Multiple |
| Homeless |
| No Information |
| Affordable Units |
| 1-25 |
| 26-50 |
| 51-75 |
| 76-100 |
| Construction Status |
| Existing Affordable Housing |
| Under Construction |
| 0.25 |

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: 3/7/2022


## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project Attachment 10 | Crash M odification Factors <br> CMF / CRF DETAILS

CMFID: 1414

ADD SIGNAL (ADDITIONAL PRIMARY HEAD)
DESCRIPTION:
PRIOR CONDITION: INTERSECTION HAS ONE PRIMARY SIGNAL HEAD PER APPROACH
CAIEGORY:INTERSECTIONTRAFFIC CONTROL
STUDY: SAFETY BENEFITS OF ADDITIONAL PRIMARY SIGNAL HEADS, FELIPE ET AL., 1998

Star Quality Rating: CANNOT BE RATED (INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION)

Rating Points Total:

## Crash Modification Factor (CMF)

Value: 0.72

## Adjusted Standard Error:

## Unadjusted Standard Error:

Crash Reduction Factor (CRF)
Value: 28 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes)

Adjusted Standard Error:

Unadjusted Standard Error:

## Applicability

| Crash Type: | All |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Urban |
| Traffic Volume: |  |


| Intersection Type: | Roadway/roadway (not interchange related) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Traffic Control: | Signalized |
| Major Road Traffic Volume: |  |
| Minor Road Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Major Road Volume : |  |

## Development Details

|  | Date Range of Data Used: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Municipality: | Richmond, British Columbia |  |
| State: |  |  |
| Country: | Canada |  |
|  |  |  |
| Type of Methodology Used: | 2 |  |

## Other Details

| Included in Highway Safety Manual? | No |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Added to Clearinghouse: | Dec-01-2009 |
| Comments: | The authors state that "three year of data were used for this analysis" (p. 7). This statement does not indicate if the bl <br> was 3 years, the after period was 3 years, both were 3 years, or the total time period was 3 years (i.e. 1.5 years for bet <br> and 1.5 years for after period). |

[^0]
## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project

Attachment 10 | Crash M odification Factors

## CMF / CRF DETAILS

CMFID: 6091

## IMPROVE LEFT-TURN LANE OFFSET TO CREATE POSITIVE OFFSET

DESCRIPTION: IMPROVE LEFT-TURN LANE OFFSET TO MAKE THE LEFT-TURN LANES WITH POSITIVE OFFSET
PRIOR CONDITION: LEFT-TURN LANES WITH NEGATIVE OFFSET
CATEGORY:INTERSECTION GEOMETRY

STUDY: SAFETY EVALUATION OF OFFSET IMPROVEMENTS FOR LEFT-TURN LANES, PERSAUD ET AL., 2009

IMAGE: VIEW THE COUNTERMEASURE IMAGE.

Star Quality Rating: [VIEW SCORE DETAILS]

Rating Points Total: 80

Crash Modification Factor (CMF)

Value: 0.62
Adjusted Standard Error:

Unadjusted Standard Error: 0.089

## Crash Reduction Factor (CRF)

Value: 38 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes)

## Adjusted Standard Error:

## Unadjusted Standard Error: 8.9

## Applicability

| Crash Type: | Left turn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Not specified |
| Traffic Volume: |  |

## If countermeasure is intersection-based

| Intersection Type: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Geometry: | 4-leg |
| Traffic Control: |  |
| Major Road Traffic Volume: | Minimum of 7,150 to Maximum of 29,200 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |
| Minor Road Traffic Volume: | Minimum of 2,200 to Maximum of 13,350 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |
| Average Major Road Volume : | 18,892 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |
| Average Minor Road Volume : | 6,668 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |
|  | Development Details |
| Date Range of Data Used: | 1983 to 2005 |
| Municipality: |  |
| State: | WI |
| Country: |  |
| Type of Methodology Used: | 2 |
| Sample Size (crashes): | 287 crashes before, 59 crashes after |
| Sample Size (sites): | 12 sites before, 12 sites after |
| Sample Size (site-years): | 87 site-years before, 33 site-years after |

## Other Details



## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project Attachment 10 | Crash M odification Factors <br> CMF / CRF DETAILS

CMFID: 8428

## IMPROVE ANGLE OF CHANNELIZED RIGHT TURNLANE

DESCRIPTION: CHANGES MADE TO THE STUDY APPROACHES INCLUDE: SHARPENING THE FLAT APPROACH ANGLE TYPICAL IN TRADITIONAL DESIGNS, REDUCING THE RADIUS, ADJUSTING THESTOP BAR POSITION, AND MODIFYING THE CO INCREASE THE LINE OF SIGHT OF APPROACHING THROUGH TRAFFIC.

PRIOR CONDITION: VARIED DEPENDING ON INTERSECTION
CATEGORY: INTERSECTION GEOMETRY
STUDY: SAFETY IMPACTS OF A MODIFIED RIGHT TURN LANE DESIGN AT INTERSECTIONS, SCHATTLER AND HANSON, 2016

Star Quality Rating: [VIEW SCORE DETAILS]

Rating Points Total: 110

Crash Modification Factor (CMF)
Value: 0.558

Adjusted Standard Error:
Unadjusted Standard Error: 0.114

Crash Reduction Factor (CRF)
Value: 44.2 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes)
Adjusted Standard Error:

Unadjusted Standard Error: 11.4

Applicability

| Crash Type: | All |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: | 1 to 3 |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Not specified |
| Traffic Volume: |  |

Average Traffic Volume:
Time of Day: All

|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |
| :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Type: | Roadway/roadway (not interchange related) |
| Intersection Geometry: | Not specified |
| Traffic Control: | Other |
| Major Road Traffic Volume: |  |
| Minor Road Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Major Road Volume : |  |
| Average Minor Road Volume : |  |
|  | Development Details |
| Date Range of Data Used: | 2003 to 2016 |
| Municipality: | Peoria |
| State: | IL |
| Country: | USA |
| Type of Methodology Used: | 2 |
| Sample Size (crashes): | 274 crashes before, 161 crashes after |
| Sample Size (sites): | 7 sites before, 7 sites after |
| Sample Size (site-years): | 21 site-years before, 21 site-years after |

## Other Details

## Included in Highway Safety Manual? No

Date Added to Clearinghouse: Jan-17-2017

Comments: Total intersection AADT ranged from 3300 to 41300. Group of intersections analyzed included both signalized and s controlled intersections.

## For more information, contact Karen Scurry at karen.scurry@dot.gov

The information contained in the Crash Modification Factors (CMF) Clearinghouse is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability or the use of the information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse. The information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation, nor is it a substitute for sound engineering judgment.

## CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Spot Mobility \& Safety Project

Attachment 11 | Multimodal Connections Map


Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss


March 21, 2022

Ms. Carla Stueve, PE<br>Director and County Highway Engineer<br>Hennepin County Transportation Project Delivery<br>1600 Prairie Drive<br>Medina, MN 5534

RE: Letter of Support for Hennepin County's 2022 Regional Solicitation Grant Application: CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) and CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) Safety Project in Plymouth

Dear Ms. Stueve:

The City of Plymouth fully supports Hennepin County's Regional Solicitation federal funding application for proposed safety improvements at the intersection of CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) \& CSAH 61 (Northwest Blvd) in Plymouth.

Over the past five years, this intersection has reported the fifth highest number of crashes of any intersection within the City of Plymouth and ranks the highest of any intersection fully under Hennepin County jurisdiction. We understand that this project will involve safety improvements at the intersection, which may include the replacement of the existing traffic signal, modification of the channelized right turn islands, adjustments to lane configurations, and upgrades to existing ADA accommodations. Not only will this project address a top crash location in Hennepin County and the City of Plymouth, but we're confident that providing additional accessibility and mobility for people walking, using transit, biking, and driving, will enhance the livability and quality of life for Plymouth and Hennepin County residents.

Thank you for making us aware of this application and providing the City of Plymouth an opportunity to write a letter of support. We hope that the Transportation Advisory Board gives this their full consideration and support.

Sincerely,


Chris LaBounty, PE
Deputy Public Works Director/City Engineer


[^0]:    The information contained in the Crash Modification Factors (CMF) Clearinghouse is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse. The information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation, nor is it a substitute for sound engineering judgment.

