

ACTION TRANSMITTAL No. 2018-45

DATE: August 10, 2018

TO: TAC Funding and Programming Committee
Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)

PREPARED BY: Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator (651-602-1717)
Steve Peterson, Manager of Highway Programs and TAB/TAC
Process (651-602-1819)

SUBJECT: 2018 Regional Solicitation Qualifying Review

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Recommendations shown below for each of three proposals.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Metropolitan Council staff reviewed the qualifying criteria and policy consistency for all projects submitted in the 2018 Regional Solicitation. The following pages include notices sent to the contact person for each of the applications that had qualifying issues, along with project information. The Funding and Programming Committee will vote on whether to disqualify those applications that do not meet the requirements of the Qualifying Criteria and General Policies. The qualifying review decision ends with the TAC Funding and Programming Committee and does not continue to TAC.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The following applications have potential qualifying review issues:

ROADWAY EXPANSION

1. Dakota County: CSAH 31 / CSAH 32 Intersection (10906)

Qualifying Issue: The proposed project is for intersection improvements, which should be scored in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility funding application category instead of the Roadway Expansion category where the project applied. The Introduction section of the Regional Solicitation states that if an applicant submits a project in the incorrect category, the application may be disqualified. The application currently lacks the information that would enable one measure, 4B, to be scored if shifted from Roadway Expansion to Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility: Geometric, Structural, or Infrastructure Improvements (100 points). As part of the 2016 Regional Solicitation, the applicant applied in the correct category for this same proposed project and provided a response for 4B.

The County has conveyed that the County Board approved the application with the intent that it be included in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility funding application category and the inclusion in the Roadway Expansion category was an error.

Options:

- A. Disqualify the project.
- B. Allow the project to move to the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility funding category to compete against similar project types. Do not allow new information and give the project 0 out of 100 points for measure 4B.
- C. Allow the project to move to the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility funding category to compete against similar project types and allow the applicant to provide a response to the un-answered measure.

Staff Recommendation: Option C. The applicant made a mistake in submitting the project in the wrong category, which can be easily rectified by shifting the project to the correct roadway category. The applicant submitted information for all scoring measures in initial category, so giving the applicant an opportunity to fill in the one missing scoring measure is fair. The applicant indicated that their 2016 response for the missing scoring measure, 4B, could be used in their 2018 application since the project has not changed.

ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION/MODERNIZATION AND SPOT MOBILITY

2. City of Anoka: TH 10 & Thurston Ave/ Cutters Grove Ave Interchange (10639)

Qualifying Issue: The proposed project would construct an interchange at what is now a signalized intersection. New interchanges are included as an example of the type of project in the Roadway Expansion Category, but this application was submitted in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility category. The Introduction section of the Regional Solicitation states that if an applicant submits a project in the incorrect category, the application may be disqualified. All scoring measures in the Roadway Expansion funding application are also included in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility funding application. Therefore, all necessary information to score the project in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility category is available.

Options:

- A. Disqualify the project.
- B. Allow the project to move to the Roadway Expansion category to compete against similar project types.

Staff Recommendation: Option B. The applicant made a mistake in submitting the project in the wrong category, which can be easily rectified by shifting the project to the correct roadway category.

TRANSIT EXPANSION

3. City of St. Paul: Twin Cities Electric Vehicle Community Mobility Network (11000)

Qualifying Issue: The City, in partnership with HOURCAR, proposes to operate a shared-mobility fleet of automobiles. This is not a transit project and is thus mis-categorized. Per the [Federal Transit Administration's Shared Mobility FAQ](#):

Is car sharing an eligible expense?

It depends on the source and use of funding. Federal public transportation law does not define car sharing as a form of public transportation and funds cannot be used to operate those services. However facilities functionally related to transit may be eligible. For example, parking spaces dedicated for the use of car-sharing at local transit stops.

While FHWA CMAQ funds can be used for carsharing, the proposal does not fit in the Transit Expansion funding category as submitted.

The Transit Expansion Criteria and Measures define the category and provide examples as shown below.

Definition: A transit project that provides new or expanded transit service/facilities with the intent of attracting new transit riders to the system. Expansion projects may also benefit existing or future riders, but the projects will be scored primarily on the ability to attract new riders. Routine facility maintenance and upkeep is not eligible. If a project includes both expansion and modernization elements, it is the applicant's discretion to choose which application category the project would best fit. However, an application can be disqualified if it is submitted to the wrong category. It is suggested that applicants contact Council staff for consultation before the application deadline to determine eligibility.

Examples of Transit Expansion Projects:

- Operating funds for new or expanded transit service
- Transit vehicles for new or expanded service
- Customer facilities for new or expanded service, new transit centers or stations, along a route
- Park-and-ride facilities or expansions

The project is a better fit in the Travel Demand Management (TDM) category, which specifically lists carsharing as an eligible project type. The TDM Criteria and Measures define the category and provide examples as shown below.

Definition: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) provides residents/commuters of the Twin Cities Metro Area with greater choices and options regarding how to travel in and throughout the region. Projects should reduce the congestion and emissions during the peak period. Similar to past Regional Solicitations, base-level TDM funding for the Transportation Management Organizations (TMOs) and Metro Transit will be not part of the competitive process.

Examples of TDM Projects:

- Bikesharing
- Carsharing
- Telework strategies
- Carpooling
- Parking management
- Managed lane components

Options:

- A. Disqualify the application.
- B. Allow the application to compete in the Transit Expansion category.
- C. Allow the project to move to the TDM category to compete against similar project types. This shift would reduce the potential federal maximum award from \$7,000,000 (Transit Expansion) to \$500,000 (TDM) and require the applicant to provide new responses to seven out of ten scoring measures.

Staff Recommendation: Option A or C. Consider disqualifying the application or allowing the project sponsor to provide missing information that would enable it to compete in the Travel Demand Management category. Given that the project is not a transit project, allowing it to compete in the Transit Expansion category is not recommended.

ROADWAY EXPANSION

Dakota County: CSAH 31 (Pilot Knob Rd) at CSAH 32 (Cliff Rd) Intersection in Eagan

Qualifying Issue: The proposed project is for intersection improvements, which should be scored in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility funding application category instead of the Roadway Expansion category where the project applied. The Introduction section of the Regional Solicitation states that if an applicant submits a project in the incorrect category, the application may be disqualified. The application currently lacks the information that would enable one measure, 4B, to be scored if shifted from Roadway Expansion to Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility: Geometric, Structural, or Infrastructure Improvements (100 points). As part of the 2016 Regional Solicitation, the applicant applied in the correct category for this same proposed project and provided a response for 4B.

Transportation Advisory Board

of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities

James Hovland
Chair

County Commissioners

Matt Look
Anoka County
Randy Maluchnik
Carver County
Kathleen Gaylord
Dakota County
Jan Callison
Hennepin County
Mary Jo McGuire
Ramsey County

Jon Ulrich
Scott County
Stan Karwoski
Washington County

Municipal Officials

Mary Hamann-Roland
Mayor of Apple Valley
Dick Swanson
Blaine City Council
Denny Laufenburger
Chanhassen City Council
Gary Hanson
Eagan City Council
James Hovland
Mayor of Edina
Becky Petryk
Hugo City Council
Kevin Reich
Minneapolis City Council
Bruce Gorecki
Rogers City Council
Chris Tolbert
St. Paul City Council
Mary Giuliani Stephens
Mayor of Woodbury

Citizen Members - Precinct

Doug Anderson - A
Brad Tabke - B
Suzanne Sandahl - C
Jamez Staples - D
Sam Villella - E
Rolf Parsons - F
Carrie Christensen - G
Peter Dugan - H

Agency Representatives

Katie Rodriguez
Metropolitan Council
Scott McBride
Minnesota DOT
Carl Crimmins
M.A.C.
David Thornton
M.P.C.A.

Jeff Wosje
STA

Modal Representatives

Mathews Hollinshead
Transit
Amity Foster
Transit
William Goins
Freight
Ethan Fawley
Non-motorized

August 7, 2018

Bobby Kuennen
Dakota County Transportation Department
14955 Galaxie Avenue
Apple Valley, MN 55124

Dear Mr. Kuennen,

Thank you for your Regional Solicitation application for the Pilot Knob Rd and Cliff Rd intersection project (10906). Based on Council staff's understanding of the project, it would include intersection improvements, which should be scored in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility funding application category instead of the Roadway Expansion category where the project applied. The Introduction section of the Regional Solicitation states that if an applicant submits a project in the incorrect category, the application may be disqualified.

On Thursday, August 16, at 1:30 PM, the TAC Funding & Programming Committee will meet to discuss the staff review of the qualifying criteria for all projects submitted in the 2018 Regional Solicitation and vote to either qualify or disqualify each project in question. Staff will present comments to the committee and you are invited to attend and answer questions or provide clarification to support the eligibility of your application. You can provide information in response to the qualifying criteria by Thursday, August 9, it will be forwarded to the committee. A meeting agenda will be sent to you on August 10, 2018.

Staff will be recommending that the project be shifted from Roadway Expansion to Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization, so that it can be fairly scored against similar project types.

If you wish to discuss this, please contact me at 651-602-1717 or elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us.

Sincerely,

Elaine Koutsoukos
TAB Coordinator

From: [Kuennen, Robert](#)
To: [Peterson, Steven](#)
Subject: Cliff & Pilot Intersection Improvement Shift
Date: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 4:45:27 PM

Hi Steve-

Following up on our discussion last week, yes the county is interested in shifting the regional solicitation application for the Cliff & Pilot Intersection improvements from expansion to reconstruction/modernization. The language submitted from Holly Anderson in the 2016 application is still consistent with the proposed improvements and that language could be used in the 2018 application.

I'd be happy to re-submit that language first thing in the morning if you wish for me to do so?

I appreciate the heads up on this decision and fully agree with the decision to shift categories. Let me know if you have any further questions!

Thanks

Bobby Kuennen
Project Manager
Dakota County Transportation | 14955 Galaxie Avenue | Apple Valley, MN 55124
Phone: 952.891.7028



Note: This email and its attachments may contain information protected by state or federal law or that may not otherwise be disclosed. If you received this in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this email and its attachments from all devices.

Brief Project Description (Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.)

The project improves safety and mobility at the intersection of County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 31 (Pilot Knob Rd) and CSAH 32 (Cliff Rd) in the City of Eagan. CSAH 31 is a four-lane divided, A-Minor Expander roadway. The northbound/southbound approach geometrics consist of an exclusive left turn lane, two through lanes, and a right turn lane. The 2016 (2030) Average Annual Daily Traffic AADT is 19,000 (28,000) north of CSAH 32 and 20,500 (32,000) to the south. The current speed limit is 45 miles per hour.

CSAH 32 (Cliff Rd) is a four-lane divided, A-Minor Expander roadway. The eastbound/westbound approach geometrics consist of an exclusive left turn lane, two through lanes, and a right turn lane. The 2016 (2030) Average Annual Daily Traffic AADT is 15,600 (23,000) west of CSAH 31 and 13,500 (20,000) to the east. The current speed limit is 50 miles per hour.

This is a heavily traveled intersection providing regional access westerly to I-35E (1.7 miles); TH 77 (2.7 miles); TH 13 (3.7 miles) and I-35 (6.2 miles); and access northerly to I-35E (2.7 miles); I-494 (4.9 miles) and TH 55 (5.9 miles).

The project includes the following elements: 10-Ton pavement design; Intersection improvements, including dual left turn lanes on all four approaches; Replacement of aged Traffic Signal, median, ADA compliant ramps, turn lanes and lighting. Installation of the required ADA compliant crossing elements at the intersection, examples of crossing elements include: pedestrian ramps, countdown timers, median islands, accessible pedestrian signals; Replacement of curb & gutter, sidewalks, storm sewer and lighting. This includes removal of identified sidewalk/trail obstructions currently located within the pedestrian access route.

The project objectives are to improve safety and operations, and facilitate transit, bicycle and pedestrian movements through the area. The CSAH 31 and CSAH 32 corridors are both identified on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) Corridors as Tier I (CSAH 31) and Tier II (CSAH 32). The project area trails connect users to recreational opportunities (Lebanon Hills Regional Park & various city parks), commercial, business and industrial areas.

Dakota County is committed to operating and maintaining this facility for its useful life of the improvement.

ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION/MODERNIZATION AND SPOT MOBILITY

City of Anoka: Highway 10 & Thurston Ave/Cutters Grove Ave Interchange Project

Qualifying Issue: The proposed project would construct an interchange at what is now a signalized intersection. New interchanges are included as an example of the type of project in the Roadway Expansion Category, but this application was submitted in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility category. The Introduction section of the Regional Solicitation states that if an applicant submits a project in the incorrect category, the application may be disqualified. All scoring measures in the Roadway Expansion funding application are also included in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility funding application. Therefore, all necessary information to score the project in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility category is available.

Transportation Advisory Board

of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities

James Hovland
Chair

County Commissioners

Matt Look
Anoka County
Randy Maluchnik
Carver County
Kathleen Gaylord
Dakota County
Jan Callison
Hennepin County
Mary Jo McGuire
Ramsey County

Jon Ulrich
Scott County
Stan Karwoski
Washington County

Municipal Officials

Mary Hamann-Roland
Mayor of Apple Valley
Dick Swanson
Blaine City Council
Denny Laufenburger
Chanhassen City Council
Gary Hanson
Eagan City Council
James Hovland
Mayor of Edina
Becky Petryk
Hugo City Council
Kevin Reich
Minneapolis City Council
Bruce Gorecki
Rogers City Council
Chris Tolbert
St. Paul City Council
Mary Giuliani Stephens
Mayor of Woodbury

Citizen Members - Precinct

Doug Anderson - A
Brad Tabke - B
Suzanne Sandahl - C
Jamez Staples - D
Sam Vilella - E
Rolf Parsons - F
Carrie Christensen - G
Peter Dugan - H

Agency Representatives

Katie Rodriguez
Metropolitan Council
Scott McBride
Minnesota DOT
Carl Crimmins
M.A.C.
David Thornton
M.P.C.A.

Jeff Wosje
STA

Modal Representatives

Mathews Hollinshead
Transit
Amity Foster
Transit
William Goins
Freight
Ethan Fawley
Non-motorized

August 7, 2018

Ben Nelson
Engineering
City of Anoka
2015 First Avenue
Anoka, MN 55303

Dear Mr. Nelson,

Thank you for your Regional Solicitation application for the US 10/Thurston Ave interchange project (10639). Based on Council staff's understanding of the project, the proposed project would construct an interchange at what is now a signalized intersection. "New interchanges" is included as an example project in the Roadway Expansion Category. The Introduction section of the Regional Solicitation states that if an applicant submits a project in the incorrect category, the application may be disqualified.

On Thursday, August 16, at 1:30 PM, the TAC Funding & Programming Committee will meet to discuss the staff review of the qualifying criteria for all projects submitted in the 2018 Regional Solicitation and vote to either qualify or disqualify each project in question. Staff will present comments to the committee and you are invited to attend and answer questions or provide clarification to support the eligibility of your application. You can provide information in response to the qualifying criteria by Thursday, August 9, it will be forwarded to the committee. A meeting agenda will be sent to you on August 10, 2018.

Staff will be recommending that the project be shifted from Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization to Roadway Expansion, so that it can be fairly scored against similar project types.

If you wish to discuss this, please contact me at 651-602-1717 or elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us.

Sincerely,

Elaine Koutsoukos
TAB Coordinator

ANOKA

REAL. CLASSIC.

Public Services – Engineering

August 9, 2018

Elaine Koustoukos
Metropolitan Council
Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator
E-mail: elaine.koustoukos@metc.state.mn.us

RE: US 10/Thurston Ave Interchange Project - Regional Solicitation Application

Dear Ms. Koustoukos:

This letter is in response to your correspondence dated August 7, 2018, regarding the Regional Solicitation application for the US 10/Thurston Avenue Interchange Project (10639). The City of Anoka understands that the Council's staff believes this application should have been submitted under the Roadway Expansion Application Category rather than the Roadway the Modernization/Reconstruction Application Category. We agree that this shift will allow the Council to fairly score our project against similar project types.

The City has compared the requirements of the application categories (see attached). Based on this comparison, we believe that the content from the submitted application could be easily transferred to an Expansion Application. There is little substantive difference in the required content between these applications.

The proposed Highway 10/169 improvements will improve the safety and reliability allowing more efficient movement of people, goods, and services thus positively impacting our community and those that travel through it. We look forward to providing the Council with any assistance or information for this transfer to occur and for the application to be evaluated within the Expansion Category.

Sincerely,



Ben Nelson, Engineering
City of Anoka



Comparison of Roadway Expansion and Roadway Reconstruction Modernization Applications Types

		<u>Measures</u>		<u>Total Pts Available</u>		
Highlighted text indicates substantive differences between applications.		<u>Roadway Expansion</u>	<u>Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization</u>	<u>Roadway Expansion</u>	<u>Roadway Modernization</u>	<u>Comparison of Roadway Expansion vs. Modernization</u>
<u>1. Role in the Regional Transportation System & Economy</u>	A. Congestion on adjacent Parallel Routes	Congestion on adjacent parallel routes	Congestion on adjacent parallel routes	80	65	Modernization considers Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV
		Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study	Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study			
		N/A	Congestion Management & Safety Plan IV			
	B. Regional Economy	Existing employment and students within 1 mile	Existing employment and students within 1 mile	50	40	Same info requested, though scored differently
C. Truck Hwy Corridor Study	Assigned Tier 1, 2, or 3	Assigned Tier 1, 2, or 3	80	65	Same info requested, though scored differently	
<u>Total Pts Available</u>				210	170	
<u>2. Usage</u>	A. Current daily person and vehicle throughput	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location • Current AADT volume • Existing transit routes • Transit routes likely to be diverted (if applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location • Current AADT volume • Existing transit routes 	110	110	Expansion requires providing transit routes that would be diverted. For TH 10/169 project, this would be none.
	B. 2040 AADT	2040 ADT	2040 ADT	65	65	Response would be the same for both
<u>Total Pts Available</u>				175	175	
<u>3. Equity and Housing Performance</u>	A. Socio-Economic Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrated poverty • Engagement • Benefits to low-income • Negative externalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrated poverty • Engagement • Benefits to low-income • Negative externalities 	30	30	Same measures and points
	B. 2017 Housing Performance Score	Online calculation based on City, length of project, and 1-mile buffer	Online calculation based on City, length of project, and 1-mile buffer	70	70	Same measures and points

		<u>Measures</u>		<u>Total Pts Available</u>		
Highlighted text indicates substantive differences between applications.		<u>Roadway Expansion</u>	<u>Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization</u>	<u>Roadway Expansion</u>	<u>Roadway Modernization</u>	<u>Comparison of Roadway Expansion vs. Modernization</u>
Total Pts Available					100	
4. <u>Infrastructure Age</u>	A. Year of original construction or reconstruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year of original road construction or reconstruction • Segment length • Average age (online calc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year of original road construction or reconstruction • Locations 	40	50	Different measures; different points
	B. Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freight • Clear zones, sight lines • Roadway geometrics • Access management • Vertical/horizontal alignment • Stormwater mitigation • Signals/lighting • other 	0	100	Modernization considers deficiencies; expansion does not
Total Pts Available				40	150	
5. <u>Infrastructure</u>	A. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle without Project (Seconds/Vehicle) • Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle with Project (Seconds/Vehicle) • Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle Reduced by Project (Seconds/Vehicle) (auto calc) • Volume (Vehicles Per Hour) • Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced by Project (Seconds) (auto calc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle without Project (Seconds/Vehicle) • Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle with Project (Seconds/Vehicle) • Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle Reduced by Project (Seconds/Vehicle) (auto calc) • Volume (Vehicles Per Hour) • Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced by Project (Seconds) (auto calc) 	100	50	Same info requested, scored differently
	B. Emissions Reduction (kg)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced (Kilograms)= Total Peak Hour Emissions without the project – Total Peak Hour Emissions with the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced (Kilograms)= Total Peak Hour Emissions without the project – Total Peak Hour Emissions with the Project 	50	30	Same info requested, though scored differently (would use Roadway projects that do not include new

		<u>Measures</u>		<u>Total Pts Available</u>		
Highlighted text indicates substantive differences between applications.		<u>Roadway Expansion</u>	<u>Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization</u>	<u>Roadway Expansion</u>	<u>Roadway Modernization</u>	<u>Comparison of Roadway Expansion vs. Modernization</u>
						roadway segments or railroad grade-separation elements)
Total Pts Available				150	80	
6. Safety	A. Roadway projects that do not include railroad grade-separation elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crash Modification Factor Used Rationale for Crash Modifications Selected Project Benefit (\$) from B/C ratio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crash Modification Factor Used Rationale for Crash Modifications Selected Project Benefit (\$) from B/C ratio Explanation of Methodology 	150	150	Same measures though modernization requires explanation of methodology
Total Pts Available				150	150	
7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	A. Affects to multimodal system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bicycle, pedestrian or transit elements in project Positive affect on RBTN or regional trail Enhancements to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bicycle, pedestrian or transit elements in project Positive affect on RBTN or regional trail Enhancements to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections 	100	100	Same info requested, same scoring
Total Pts Available				100	100	
8. Risk Assessment	Checklist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Layout status Section 106 Review status ROW status RR involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Layout status Section 106 Review status ROW status RR involvement 	75	75	Same info requested, same scoring
Total Pts Available				75	75	
9. Cost Effectiveness	Cost Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total Project Cost Enter amount of Noise Walls Points Awarded in Previous Criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total Project Cost Enter amount of Noise Walls Points Awarded in Previous Criteria 	100	100	Same info requested, same scoring
Total Pts Available				100	100	
TOTAL:				1,100	1,100	

Brief Project Description (Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.)

Within the City of Anoka, Highway 10 transitions from a suburban freeway to a signalized expressway east of this project area, at Fairoak Avenue. The transition of highway type contributes to traffic back-ups and congestion that result in significant travel delays during morning and afternoon peak travel periods. This intersection experiences more crashes than expected on similar roadway types.

Thurston Avenue provides the only grade-separated crossing of the BNSF railroad within 5 miles and provides a key connection from Highway 10 to numerous businesses, including the Anoka Enterprise Industrial Park and Anoka Technical College. Given these land uses, Thurston Avenue and Highway 10 accommodate a high level of truck traffic.

A closely spaced all-way stop on Thurston Avenue, located less than 500 feet north of the intersection with Highway 10 restricts vehicle flow causing significant queuing numerous hours of the day. Traffic traveling south on Thurston Avenue oftentimes experience long delays to turn left onto Highway 10 from this all-way stop and the traffic signal at Highway 10.

This project will remove the traffic signal at Highway 10 and Thurston Avenue and replace it with a grade-separated, full-access, roundabout interchange. The all-way stop on Thurston Avenue to the north of Highway 10 will be moved approximately 500 feet to the north and also replaced with a roundabout. The project will also provide a bike and pedestrian trail way/sidewalk connection along Thurston Avenue to the south frontage road. These improvements will improve capacity, mobility, reliability, safety, local connectivity, and walkability along Highway 10 and Thurston Avenue.

In 2014, the MnDOT Highway 10 Access Planning Study identified high priority/right-sized improvements and has received support from MnDOT, Metropolitan Council, Anoka County and the cities of Anoka and Ramsey. Converting the Highway 10 and Thurston Avenue traffic signal to an interchange was identified as a top priority. The City of Anoka continued to refine the overall vision of Highway 10 through the city in partnership with MnDOT and Anoka County.

In January 2017, the Metropolitan Council awarded \$7M of Regional Solicitation federal funding for improvements to Highway 10/169 at Fairoak Avenue. This application is for improvements just to the west of the previous Fairoak Avenue project on Highway 10 at Thurston Avenue. This project, as submitted, is consistent with the Highway 10 Access Planning Study and all subsequent planning efforts.

As implemented, the project will address safety and congestion issues while yielding a strong return on investment.

TRANSIT EXPANSION

City of St. Paul: Twin Cities Electric Vehicle Community Mobility Network

Qualifying Issue: The City in, partnership with HOURCAR, proposes to operate a shared-mobility fleet of automobiles. This is not a transit project and is thus mis-categorized. Per the [Federal Transit Administration's Shared Mobility FAQ](#):

Is car sharing an eligible expense?

It depends on the source and use of funding. Federal public transportation law does not define car sharing as a form of public transportation and funds cannot be used to operate those services. However facilities functionally related to transit may be eligible. For example, parking spaces dedicated for the use of car-sharing at local transit stops.

While FHWA funds can be used for carsharing, the proposal does not fit in the Transit Expansion funding category as submitted.

The Transit Expansion Criteria and Measures define the category and provide examples as shown below.

Definition: A transit project that provides new or expanded transit service/facilities with the intent of attracting new transit riders to the system. Expansion projects may also benefit existing or future riders, but the projects will be scored primarily on the ability to attract new riders. Routine facility maintenance and upkeep is not eligible. If a project includes both expansion and modernization elements, it is the applicant's discretion to choose which application category the project would best fit. However, an application can be disqualified if it is submitted to the wrong category. It is suggested that applicants contact Council staff for consultation before the application deadline to determine eligibility.

Examples of Transit Expansion Projects:

- Operating funds for new or expanded transit service
- Transit vehicles for new or expanded service
- Customer facilities for new or expanded service, new transit centers or stations, along a route
- Park-and-ride facilities or expansions

The project is a better fit in the Travel Demand Management (TDM) category, which specifically lists carsharing as an eligible project type. The TDM Criteria and Measures define the category and provide examples as shown below.

Definition: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) provides residents/commuters of the Twin Cities Metro Area with greater choices and options regarding how to travel in and throughout the region. Projects should reduce the congestion and emissions during the peak period. Similar to past Regional Solicitations, base-level TDM funding for the Transportation Management Organizations (TMOs) and Metro Transit will be not part of the competitive process.

Examples of TDM Projects:

- Bikesharing
- Carsharing
- Telework strategies
- Carpooling
- Parking management
- Managed lane components

Transportation Advisory Board

of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities

James Hovland
Chair

County Commissioners

Matt Look
Anoka County
Randy Maluchnik
Carver County
Kathleen Gaylord
Dakota County
Jan Callison
Hennepin County
Mary Jo McGuire
Ramsey County

Jon Ulrich
Scott County
Stan Karwoski
Washington County

Municipal Officials

Mary Hamann-Roland
Mayor of Apple Valley
Dick Swanson
Blaine City Council
Denny Laufenburger
Chanhassen City Council
Gary Hanson
Eagan City Council
James Hovland
Mayor of Edina
Becky Petryk
Hugo City Council
Kevin Reich
Minneapolis City Council
Bruce Gorecki
Rogers City Council
Chris Tolbert
St. Paul City Council
Mary Giuliani Stephens
Mayor of Woodbury

Citizen Members - Precinct

Doug Anderson - A
Brad Tabke - B
Suzanne Sandahl - C
Jamez Staples - D
Sam Villella - E
Rolf Parsons - F
Carrie Christensen - G
Peter Dugan - H

Agency Representatives

Katie Rodriguez
Metropolitan Council
Scott McBride
Minnesota DOT
Carl Crimmins
M.A.C.
David Thornton
M.P.C.A.

Jeff Wosje
STA

Modal Representatives

Mathews Hollinshead
Transit
Amity Foster
Transit
William Goins
Freight
Ethan Fawley
Non-motorized

August 8, 2018

Paul Kurtz
St. Paul Public Works
800 City Hall Annex
25 West 4th Street
St. Paul, MN 55102

Dear Mr. Kurtz,

Thank you for your Regional Solicitation application for the Twin Cities EV Community Mobility Network (11000). Based on Council staff's understanding of the project, a stand-alone car sharing project is not eligible to accept federal funds through the Regional Solicitation and therefore the project does not qualify. This assertion was confirmed by staff at the Federal Highway Administration-Minnesota Division. In addition, it is questionable whether a car sharing project should be considered a transit project that is eligible in the Transit Expansion Category. The Introduction section of the Regional Solicitation states that if an applicant submits a project in the incorrect category, the application may be disqualified.

On Thursday, August 16, at 1:30 PM, the TAC Funding & Programming Committee will meet to discuss the staff review of the qualifying criteria for all projects submitted in the 2018 Regional Solicitation and vote to either qualify or disqualify each project in question. Staff will present comments to the committee and you are invited to attend and answer questions or provide clarification to support the eligibility of your application. You can provide information in response to the qualifying criteria by Thursday, August 9, it will be forwarded to the committee. A meeting agenda will be sent to you on August 10, 2018.

If you wish to discuss this, please contact me at 651-602-1717 or elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us.

Sincerely,

Elaine Koutsoukos
TAB Coordinator

Brief Project Description (Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.)

This project will create 70 mobility hubs in St. Paul and Minneapolis. Each mobility hub will have 4 Level 2 EVSE chargers for battery electric vehicles (BEVs). A subset of these hubs (up to 20) will also have Level 3 DCFC fast chargers, which will be community-facing and available for use by the public. The mobility hubs will support a fleet of 150 BEVs that will be purchased for this project.

Make-ready construction for the project will be undertaken by Xcel Energy. Make-ready service encompasses all electrical infrastructure up to the charging equipment used to power electric vehicles, including line extensions, transformer upgrades, conduit, cabling, cuts, trenching, and sidewalk restoration.

The City plans to contract with HOURCAR, our partner on the project, to operate the shared mobility fleet. HOURCAR is a St. Paul-based nonprofit carsharing company that currently operates in both St. Paul and Minneapolis, as well as serving as the exclusive carsharing provider for the University of Minnesota, Macalester College, St Katherine University, and Augsburg University.

We have estimated the length of the project by measuring the shortest driving distance between its farthest points: 500 State Street in St. Paul and 1900 West Broadway Avenue in Minneapolis, a total of 15 miles. Because our project is not fixed-route, this is a conservative estimate, given that users of the service are able to travel far beyond the service area.

This project is eligible for CMAQ funding under the provisions of the FAST Act and MAP-21. According to federal guidance, Carsharing (#10) is an eligible activity. Portions of the project are also eligible under Alternative Fuels and Vehicles (#14), in particular the charging infrastructure and EVSE. This project meets the CMAQ requirement of reducing mobile source emissions. In addition to reducing VMT by providing flexible, shared-use vehicles that encourage multimodal transit, our project has the additional benefit of using zero-emission BEVs. This constitutes a substantial emissions reduction over and above the automated calculation in the proposal.

The automated VMT-based emission reduction does not account for another important benefit: BEVs have no local emissions. Our low-income and non-white populations are disproportionately exposed to higher levels of local air pollution due to proximity to corridors(1). This program will reduce emissions in precisely the neighborhoods where air quality improvements are most needed.

References:

(1) MPCA, Air Quality in Minnesota 2015 Report to the Legislature
www.leg.state.mn.us/docs/2015/mandated/150152.pdf