

MEETING OF THE FUNDING & PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

Thursday October 21, 2021

Remote Meeting Via Webex# | 1:30 PM

Contact Joe Barbeau (joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us) for access to the video conference.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 16, 2021, meeting of the Funding & Programming Committee

IV. TAB REPORT

V. BUSINESS

1. 2021-48: Federal Funds Redistribution Amount for Metro Transit's I-94 / Manning Avenue Park-and-Ride Lot
2. 2021-49: Allocation of \$20M of CRRSAA federal funds

VI. INFORMATION

1. TIP Amendment to Incorporate Regional Transit Safety Performance Targets

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Minutes of the REGULAR MEETING OF THE TAC FUNDING & PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

Thursday, September 16, 2021

Committee Members Present: Michael Thompson (Chair, Plymouth), Jerry Auge (Anoka County), Angie Stenson (Carver County), Jenna Fabish (Dakota County), Jason Pieper (Hennepin County), John Mazzitello (Ramsey County), Craig Jenson (Scott County), Sara Allen (Washington County), Elaine Koutsoukos (TAB), Steve Peterson (Metropolitan Council), Anna Flintoft (Metro Transit), Molly McCartney (MnDOT Metro District), Colleen Brown (MnDOT Metro District State Aid), Innocent Eyoh (MPCA), Mackenzie Turner Barger (MnDOT Bike & Ped), Nancy Spooner-Mueller (DNR), Aaron Bartling (MVTA), Karl Keel (Bloomington), Paul Oehme (Lakeville), Robert Ellis (Eden Prairie), Ken Ashfeld (Maple Grove), Nathan Koster (Minneapolis), Ann Weber (St. Paul)

Committee Members Absent: Jim Kosluchar (Fridley)

I. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Chair Thompson called the regular meeting of the Funding & Programming Committee to order at 1:33 p.m. on Thursday, September 16, 2021. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held via teleconference.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved without a vote. A vote is only needed if changes are made to the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: It was moved by Koutsoukos and seconded by Auge to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2021, regular meeting of the Funding & Programming Committee. The motion was approved unanimously (with abstentions) via roll call.

IV. TAB REPORT

Koutsoukos reported on the September 15, 2021, TAB meeting.

V. BUSINESS

1. 2021-07: Federal Funds Redistribution Amount for Metro Transit's I-94/Manning Park-and-Ride Lot

Peterson said that Metro Transit requests retention of \$2,775,641 in federal funds from a 2013 CMAQ award in the 2009 Regional Solicitation for the purchase of four buses used for express service in the I-94 East corridor and park-and-ride development expenses. This would result in the return of the remaining \$4,504,359 in federal funds for redistribution. The award was for express service, purchase of buses, and construction of a 550-space park & ride facility near Manning Avenue and I-94 in Woodbury. MnDOT purchased a different number and size of buses for use in the I-94 corridor. Roughly \$500,000 was spent on park-and-ride development. FTA has requested that TAB certify the expenditures to date.

Peterson said that possible outcomes include:

1. Allow Metro Transit to retain the \$2,775,641 already spent on the project, leaving \$4,504,359 to be returned to the region for redistribution. This could also include retention of a lesser amount:
 - a) Retain \$2,235,600 spent on buses, which would result in a return of \$5,044,400.

- b) Retain \$540,041 spent on park-and-ride development expenses, which would result in a return of \$6,739,959.
2. Require that the entire \$7,280,000 be returned to the region for redistribution.

Flintoft said that the park-and-ride lot became less needed, particularly after the Covid-19 pandemic started. In 2009, park-and-ride lot usage was increasing, but demand has since flattened and the current supply of lots is adequate. Harrington and Allen added that Washington County is supportive of the request.

Mazzitello said that the money that comes back should be used for transit.

Keel said that he supports Option 1a, allowing keeping the funding spent on buses but not funding spent on park-and-ride development for a lot that was never built. Oehme expressed agreement. Flintoft said that FTA has told them that retention of the funding spent on development is allowable. She added that FTA is most interested in TAB approval about the buses, but Metro Transit shared all expenses in an effort to be comprehensive. Brown said that for highway projects, funds are returned when projects are not completed.

Ashfeld expressed agreement with Keel, stating that his agency has lost money preparing for projects that did not come to fruition. Ashfeld asked where the funding is now, to which Julie Matthews, Metro Transit, said that the funding is on Metro Transit's books. She added that she confirmed with FTA that it is permissible to not return the funds. Keel said that federal rules allow soft cost, but the Regional Solicitation does not.

Mazzitello asked whether it is appropriate for Metro Transit to lose the funding when the change in terminus was not in its control. Thompson replied that regardless of why a project is not delivered, project funds are returned.

Bartling asked why the number and size of the buses changed, to which Peterson said that prior to the change being reflected in the TIP, there probably should have been a scope change but there is not good information on this process and staff is not certain what occurred.

MOTION: It was moved by Keel and seconded by Ashfeld to recommend that Metro Transit retain \$2,235,600 that it spent on buses and return \$5,044,400. The motion was approved unanimously (with one abstention) via roll call.

VI. INFORMATION

1. Allocation of 20M of CRRSAA Federal Funds

McCartney provided an overview of the distribution of funds from the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act (CRRSAA). The MPO is allocated \$20M of Minnesota's \$162M share of the funding. The funding is available through September 2024.

Peterson said that the committee should provide additional pros and cons for each of three options. The options are: 1) distributing funds to cities and counties based on State Aid funding losses due to the pandemic, 2) provide funding to unfunded applications from the 2020 Regional Solicitation, possibly using the established modal midpoints, and 3) providing funds to projects able to absorb more funding due to having a local match greater than 20%.

Ashfeld asked why the region only received \$20M out of the state's \$162M. Peterson said that \$20M was called out in federal guidance. McCartney said that the \$162M was allocated

to the state and that MPOs that are transportation management areas are to receive an amount that is commensurate with what they would usually receive.

Keel asked whether for Option 1 the money would go into municipal accounts or be held by State Aid, to which Dan Erickson, MnDOT Metro District State Aid, said that while he is not certain, in Greater Minnesota, State Aid works with agencies to determine whether a proposed expenditure is eligible. Keel asked whether smaller cities would have a difficult time spending the money. Erickson said that this would not be a problem.

Keel suggested that a pro for Option 1 is that regional distribution is build in. Pieper added that MnDOT is also projecting a reduced state aid amount for 2022. Keel asked whether funds could be used as local match, to which Erickson said that it is federal money, so it can supplement the project, but cannot replace the minimal local match.

Peterson said that Option 1 will lead to questions about not serving non-roadway modes but that local agencies tend to spend this money on bicycle and pedestrian efforts. Additionally, other similar bills have supported transit.

Ellis said that Options 2 and 3 do not meet the intent of CRRSAA, as they do not offer immediate relief. Thompson suggested that this could be listed as a con for those options.

Stenson said that Option 1 is the best option for equitable distribution across the region and that she does not like the staff-provided con that it does not necessarily address regional goals. Peterson said that this could be removed, as the second bullet, "Council/TAB would not know what funds will be spent on" addresses that. Thompson suggested that that bullet could be re-worded to state that the Council does not control how funds are spent.

Erickson suggested that a pro for Option 1 could be that it respects MnDOT's desire for projects to be closed quickly.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Barbeau said that a poll of members to see whether rescheduling the October 21 meeting was needed due to MEA weekend resulted in very few members being impacted, and that rescheduling the meeting is therefore not warranted.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting.

Joe Barbeau
Recording Secretary

ACTION TRANSMITTAL No. 2021-48

DATE: October 14, 2021

TO: TAC Funding & Programming Committee
Steve Peterson, Mgr of Highway Planning and TAB/TAC Process
(steven.peterson@metc.state.mn.us)

PREPARED BY: Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (joe.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us)
Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator
(elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us)

SUBJECT: Distribution of \$5,044,400 in Unused CMAQ Funding

REQUESTED ACTION: MTS staff requests that the Funding & Programming Committee recommend an option for spending roughly \$5,044,400 in CMAQ funding recently made available.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the TAC Funding & Programming Committee recommend that TAC recommend to TAB distribution of roughly \$5,044,400 in CMAQ funding to transit project(s).

On November 11, 2020, Metro Transit sent a letter to TAB Chair Hovland that the I-94 park-and-ride lot at Manning Avenue is no longer needed and that it will be returning \$4.5M to 5M¹ of CMAQ funding to the region for redistribution. This occurred during the closing weeks of TAB's decision on awarding the over \$200 million Regional Solicitation program, leading TAB to vote to delay any decisions on distribution of these funds after the 2020 Regional Solicitation process was finalized. At its October 6, 2021, meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended to the Transportation Advisory Board that Metro Transit return \$5,044,400 from its 2009 award.²

By federal rule, CMAQ funds are to be spent on projects that directly lead to emissions reduction. The funding the region receives for CMAQ tends to be used on transit projects, travel demand management (TDM), and traffic management technology projects. This returned CMAQ funding comes from a transit expansion project. That said, the attached Federal Funds Reallocation Policy favors spending funds within the same mode.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: The Federal Funds Reallocation Policy provides a process for redistribution, dividing into processes for funds slated for the current program year and funds slated for future program years. Funds that are awarded to Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) projects are far more flexible than Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds in terms of year-of-programming (though less flexible in that advance construction is not an option). Therefore, staff recommends that the funds be treated as future year funds. The below excerpt from the policy shows the first priority as spending funds in a "future TAB solicitation process if at all possible."

¹ The exact amount was unknown because the project had not been closed out and the decision on the amount of federal funding that Metro Transit can retain had not been made.

² TAB is scheduled to decide on the amount at its October 20, 2021, meeting. Should the decision differ from this recommendation, staff will adjust accordingly at the meeting.

“The first priority for use of future-year funds will be to include the funds in a future TAB solicitation process if at all possible. When not possible, TAB should first consider items 1-3 and 5 from the above list. It can also consider other options such as selecting an unfunded project from the most recent solicitation that could be delivered within the required timeframe. Other options could include setting up a special solicitation, depending on the amount of funds and time available, or other measures as TAB deems appropriate to address unique opportunities. TAB will consider the established “Guiding Principles” in making its decisions.”

It is possible to move the funds to the 2022 Regional Solicitation.³ Therefore, a rigid interpretation of the policy would point in that direction. Following that preference, options include using items 1-3 and 5 in the attached policy (see page 4). Items 1-3 are not ideal for transit projects, as there are no projects known to be in need of timing changes. Item 5 (providing funding to projects with federal capacity) is an option.

However, the policy also states that TAB “can also consider other options such as selecting an unfunded project from the most recent Regional Solicitation that could be delivered within the required timeframe. Given that these funds are from a project awarded several years ago, and that this solution is still easily manageable, staff suggests consideration of using this funding on a 2020 Regional Solicitation Project. Tables 1 and 2 show the high-scoring transit projects from the 2020 Regional Solicitation.

Table 1: Transit Expansion Projects

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Funded?	Fed Request	Match	Total Cost	Score
1	Washington Co	I-494 Park & Ride in Woodbury	-	\$7,000,000	\$8,170,946	\$15,170,946	852
2	Metro Transit	Route 17 Service	Funded	\$2,511,123	\$627,781	\$3,138,904	607
3	Metro Transit	Route 54 Service	Funded	\$1,762,070	\$440,518	\$2,202,588	589
4	Metro Transit	New Route 757	Funded	\$4,669,486	\$1,167,372	\$5,836,858	566
5	SouthWest Transit	I-494 N SW Prime Service	-	\$5,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$7,000,000	555

Table 2: Transit Modernization Projects

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Funded?	Fed Request	Match	Total Cost	Score
1	Metro Transit	Gold Line DT St Paul	Funded	\$7,000,000	\$3,500,000	\$10,500,000	721
2	Metro Transit	Farebox Upgrade	Funded	\$7,000,000	\$1,750,000	\$8,750,000	637
3	Dakota Co	140th Red Line Ped/Bike Overpass	-	\$2,400,000	\$600,000	\$3,000,000	610
4	MVTA	Bus Garage	Funded	\$2,800,000	\$700,000	\$3,500,000	604
5	Apple Valley	Apple Valley Red Line BRT 147th St Station Skyway	-	\$3,810,400	\$952,600	\$4,763,000	602
6	SouthWest Transit	Signal Prioritization at East Creek P/R	Funded	\$443,520	\$110,800	\$554,320	582
7	SouthWest Transit	Solar Array at SouthWest Village in Chanhassen	-	\$4,840,000	\$1,210,000	\$6,050,000	436

³ This topic was discussed in January 2021, right after the 2020 Regional Solicitation decision, so this option was not considered. As this issue has been delayed, timing for the 2022 Solicitation has grown more practical.

Staff provides the following options for use of this funding:

1. Moving the \$5,044,400 to the 2022 Regional Solicitation, increasing the midpoint of the transit amount by that amount.
2. Providing funding to existing Regional Solicitation Projects with capacity to accept federal funding. The recently approved TIP shows three transit projects with a total capacity of \$2.7M (non-transit CMAQ projects could also accept funds).
3. Funding a project(s) from the 2020 Regional Solicitation.
 - i) Providing the entire amount to the Washington County I-494 parking structure in Woodbury. This project was easily the top-rated project in the Transit Expansion funding category, scoring 245 more points than the second-ranked project. It was not funded because the top-rated project in the Transit Modernization category was on the same corridor (the Gold Line). Solicitation rules dictate that two projects along the same transitway corridor cannot be funded. The rules also do not allow more than \$7M along BRT corridors (beyond the F-Line), which had been met. It could be interpreted that these rules do not apply to this reallocation funding, as this money was not part of the 2020 Regional Solicitation and was originally awarded in 2009.
 - ii) Proportionally fund the top transit projects in each category that were skipped. Assuming \$5,044,400 available, this approach would fund just over 50% of each request. It would result in funding the top transit expansion project, the Washington County parking structure, at \$3.76M award (\$7M requested) and the Dakota County 140th Street Red Line Pedestrian/Bicycle Overpass in Apple Valley at \$1.29M (\$2.4M requested). The Dakota County project was the third-highest scoring transit modernization project and was also skipped over due to the rule limiting awarding to BRT projects. This approach would also provide funding to Dakota County, where only 4% of the total Regional Solicitation funding was provided, while 14% of the region's population resides there.
 - iii) Fully fund the Dakota County project (#3 on Table 2). The remaining \$2,644,400 could be allocated either to the Washington County project (#1 on Table 1) or the Apple Valley project (#5 on Table 2)
 - iv) Provide the entire amount to the fifth-ranked Transit Expansion project, the SouthWest Transit's I-494 Prime Service project, which requested \$5.6M. This option treats this funding as a continuation of the 2020 Regional Solicitation, retaining the rule of a maximum of \$7M for BRT corridors (i.e., the top-ranked project in Transit Expansion should continue to be skipped over for funding as a result).

ROUTING

TO	ACTION REQUESTED	DATE SCHEDULED/COMPLETED
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	10/21/2021
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	11/3/2021
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Approve	11/17/2021

Federal Funds Reallocation Policy

Projects awarded federal funds by the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) as part of the Regional Solicitation or Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) can be advanced or deferred based on TAB policy, project deliverability and funding availability, provided fiscal balance is maintained. The process assumes some projects will be deferred, withdrawn, or advanced. This process establishes policy and priority in assigning alternative uses for federal transportation funds when TAB-selected projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are deferred, withdrawn, or advanced. This process also addresses the distribution of the limited amount of federal funds available to the region at the end of the fiscal year, known as “August Redistribution.” This process does **not** address how to distribute new federal dollars available through larger, specific programs. TAB will make separate decisions specific to those kinds of programs and timing.

Current Program Year Funds

For funding that is available due to project deferrals or withdrawals, the funds shall be reallocated as shown in the below priority order. When there is insufficient time to go through the TAB committee process, TAB authorizes staff (Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Metro District State Aid or Metropolitan Council Grants Department, as appropriate), working with the TAB Coordinator, to reallocate funds to projects that have been selected through the regional solicitation per the below priorities on TAB’s behalf.

Reallocation priorities¹ for available funding programmed for the current fiscal year:

1. Regionally selected projects in the same mode slated for advanced construction/advanced construction authority (AC/ACA)² payback that have already advanced because sponsors were able to complete them sooner. If more than one project is slated for AC/ACA payback, the projects using the smallest amount of federal funding will be funded first. Partial AC/ACA payback can be paid on a project up to available levels of funds.
2. Projects in the same mode slated for AC/ACA payback that have been moved due to previous deferrals. If more than one project is slated for AC/ACA payback, the projects using the smallest amount of federal funding will be funded first. Partial AC/ACA payback can be paid on a project up to available levels of funds.
3. Regionally selected projects in the same mode that are able to be advanced.
4. Regionally-selected project(s) from another mode to pay back or advance using steps 1-3 above. Should this action be used, TAB shall consider the amount when addressing modal distribution in programming the next regional solicitation.
5. Regionally-selected projects programmed in the current program year in the same mode up to the federally allowed maximum. If more than one project can accept additional federal funds, the project needing the smallest amount of funds to achieve full federal participation³ based on the latest engineer’s estimate will be funded first up to the federal

¹ Regional Solicitation and HSIP funds should be considered separately for purposes of this policy.

² Note: Advanced construction (AC) is used for Federal Highway Administration-funded projects. Federal Transit Administration-funded projects use advanced construction authority (ACA).

³ Up to 80% of eligible project costs paid for with the federal funds, except in the case of HSIP, which funds up to 90% of eligible costs with federal funds.

maximum, followed by the project needing the second smallest amount of federal funds, and so on.

Future Program Year Funds

While history shows that most deferrals and withdrawals will be in the current program year, even current year withdrawals can affect future year funding by advancing a project from a future year into the current year. For future-year funds, the TAB Coordinator will work with MnDOT Metro State Aid and/or Metro Transit Grants staff, Metropolitan Council staff and project sponsors to provide a set of options to be considered by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Funding & Programming Committee, TAC, and TAB.

The first priority for use of future-year funds will be to include the funds in a future TAB solicitation process if at all possible. When not possible, TAB should first consider items 1-3 and 5 from the above list. It can also consider other options such as selecting an unfunded project from the most recent solicitation⁴ that could be delivered within the required timeframe. Other options could include setting up a special solicitation, depending on the amount of funds and time available, or other measures as TAB deems appropriate to address unique opportunities. TAB will consider the established “Guiding Principles” in making its decisions.

⁴ Note that projects must be selected prior to December 1 of the program year.

ACTION TRANSMITTAL No. 2021-49

DATE: October 14, 2021

TO: TAC Funding & Programming Committee
Steve Peterson, Manager of Highway Planning and TAB/TAC Process (steven.peterson@metc.state.mn.us)

PREPARED BY: Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (joe.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us)

SUBJECT: Distribution of \$20M of Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act federal funding

REQUESTED ACTION: MTS staff requests that the Funding & Programming Committee recommend an option for spending \$20M of federal funding.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the TAC Funding & Programming Committee recommend that TAC recommend to TAB distribution of \$20M of Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act federal funding to State Aid communities to cover transportation revenue loss (Option 1)

As part of the December 2020 federal Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act (CRRSAA), the Metropolitan Council was allocated \$20M by the federal government. The intent of the funding was to provide emergency assistance and health care response for individuals, families, and businesses affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Funds must be authorized before September 30, 2024.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: The distribution of new, special funding such as the CRRSAA funds is not covered by any TAB policy. The USDOT has approved a limited number of uses to date, such as:

1. Transportation revenue losses incurred as a result of the pandemic:
2. New projects
3. More fully fund existing projects

Option 1: Transportation Revenue Loss (State-Aid)

In Greater Minnesota, lost transportation revenue was documented from County State Aid Highway (CSAH) and Municipal State Aid Street (MSAS) funds and then CRRSAA funds were distributed via the state-aid formula. State and city recipients are being asked to indicate how they plan to use the allocation and then also complete year-end reporting to MnDOT State-Aid on how the funding was used.

A similar approach could be used for the \$20M allocated to the Metropolitan Council. Attached is the potential distribution of funding using the state-aid formula. This approach meets the stated intent of CRRSAA. MnDOT State-Aid also suggests that this process would distribute the funding in a shorter amount of time than applying it to projects. If used, this approach would be a one-time allocation of resources and not the normal course of action for distributing federal funding through the MPO.

Option 2: New Projects from 2020 Funding Cycle

One approach used in the past when new federal money became available was for TAB to fund the next highest-scoring projects on the last Regional Solicitation scoring list. One challenge with this approach is that the projects must be for 2024 program year (or earlier). If TAB would like to select more projects, Council staff would need to inquire with project sponsors regarding whether the timeline would work before awarding the funds. There are several options to explore if TAB would like to go to the project list:

- Split the funding based on the midpoints of their modal ranges as approved in the Regional Solicitation and look to the attached project lists to fund additional projects.
- Use the money for a special purpose such as funding as many multiuse trail projects as possible or funding unique projects.
- Fund additional unfunded projects from the 2020 HSIP solicitation (see attached list).

Option 3: More Fully Fund Existing Projects

Another possible option is to split the funding among already-selected projects that are not funded at 80% federal share of the total project cost, thereby reducing local financial burdens caused by COVID. Based on the numbers shown in the draft TIP, a preliminary estimate (see attachment) shows the federal funding would go to 41 different projects, usually in modest amounts, using the methodology described in TAB's Federal Funds Reallocation Policy.

RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL POLICY: The Metropolitan Council, as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Twin Cities metropolitan area, was provided \$20M and therefore is tasked with providing direction on how to distribute the funding.

STAFF ANALYSIS: At their respective September 16, October 6, and October 20 meetings, the Funding & Programming Committee, TAC, and TAB reviewed these three options. TAB's input is still pending as of the release of this agenda. Members of the Funding & Programming Committee and TAC overwhelmingly voiced support for Option 1, primarily because it addresses the CRRSAA's purpose of recovering lost revenue due to COVID-19. Members showed no support for the other options. The only point of contention is that Option 1 does not consider addition of funds to parks agencies, though cities and counties could pay for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and/or maintenance for these multimodal facilities.

At each technical committee, members contributed to the pros and cons in each option shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Pros and Cons of Each CRRSAA Funding Option

Option	Pros	Cons
1. Transportation Revenue Loss (State Aid)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets intent of CRRSAA • Consistent with Greater Minnesota approach • Ease of implementation • Built in geographic distribution • Local flexibility in spending • Addresses MnDOT's desire for projects to be closed quickly • Gets money to local agencies quickly • Maintenance can be funded (retroactive to Jan, 2020) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council/TAB would not play a role in what funds will be spent on
2. New Projects from 2020 Funding Cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds projects from a competitive 2020 Solicitation • Regional prioritization and projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short program year window (2024) • Does not meet intent of CRRSAA
3. More Fully Fund Existing Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better assurance of Regional Solicitation project completion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new projects and somewhat random geographic distribution • Indirectly meets intent of CRRSAA

ROUTING

TO	ACTION REQUESTED	DATE SCHEDULED/COMPLETED
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	10/21/2021
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	11/3/2021
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Recommend	11/17/2021
Metropolitan Council Transportation Committee	Review & Recommend	12/6/2021
Metropolitan Council	Review & Adopt	12/22/2021



Metro District
1500 West County Road B2
Roseville, MN 55113

September 9, 2021

James Hovland, Chair
Transportation Advisory Board (TAB)
Metropolitan Council
390 North Robert Street Saint Paul, MN 55101

Greetings Chair Hovland,

This letter outlines guidance and decision-making related to the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act (CRRSAA) funding to the seven-county metropolitan area.

The State of Minnesota received \$161,773,894 in highway funding from CRRSAA. In the legislation, \$19,820,941 was designated to the Twin Cities urban area to be distributed by the Metropolitan Council, the region's metropolitan planning organization (MPO). Direction from state leadership was to split the funding between the state and local partners, rounding up to \$20,000,000 for Metropolitan Council distribution, \$20,000,000 to counties and cities in Greater Minnesota, and \$121,773,894 to Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT). MnDOT-Metro District is receiving CRRSAA funds and will coordinate with the Metropolitan Council and TAB in the fall on criteria and projects in the district. CRRSAA funding is to be encumbered by the end of federal fiscal year 2024 (September 30, 2024).

The guidance from FHWA/USDOT for CRRSAA allocated to the Metropolitan Council may be used for any mechanism eligible under the law. MnDOT worked with FHWA on various eligible mechanisms and, in addition to use on projects, has received approval to use these funds for revenue losses that have been documented to the CSAH and MSAS funds. The funding may be provided by formula to the counties and cities for lost revenue from the County State Aid Highway (CSAH) and Municipal State Aid Streets (MSAS) funds. The funding may also be allocated through a project solicitation process. Funds using the revenue losses and distributed through a formula can be used on activities normally eligible through the CSAH and MSAS funds or a project(s) identified through a new selection process or to more fully fund the federal eligible share of a project that is already in the STIP. At this time, FHWA does not recommend splitting the funds between a formula distribution and new project selection, as this would require more communication and coordination with FHWA Headquarters in Washington DC needing approval and possible impact the development and delivery window of September 30, 2024.

MnDOT's Office of State Aid led discussion with Greater Minnesota counties and cities that resulted in the decision that the funding would be brought in through revenue losses to the CSAH and MSAS fund and allocated to the counties and cities by the current formula for CSAH and MSAS funds. Counties and cities have to provide where they plan to spend their share on eligible activities under the CSAH and MSAS funds and provide a report at the end of the year on how they actually spent their share of the funds.

Projects using CRRSAA funding will be added or modified to the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Minnesota State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). CRRSAA funds must be authorized by September 30, 2024.

Sincerely,

Michael Barnes
MnDOT-Metro District Engineer

CC: Amy Vennewitz, Steve Peterson – Metropolitan Council
Jon Solberg, TAC Chair, Michael Thompson TAC-Funding and Programming Chair

Option 1

Distribution via State-Aid Formulas

Anoka Co	\$ 1,534,718	Carver Co	\$ 650,421	Dakota Co	\$ 1,459,383	Hennepin Co	\$ 3,427,468	Ramsey Co	\$ 1,543,115	Scott Co	\$ 775,373	Washington Co	\$ 900,639
Andover	\$ 119,090	Chanassen	\$ 88,720	Apple Valley	\$ 170,287	Bloomington	\$ 327,192	Arden Hills	\$ 28,822	Belle Plain	\$ 28,859	Cottage Grove	\$ 132,934
Anoka	\$ 63,580	Chaska	\$ 88,952	Burnsville	\$ 204,517	Brooklyn Ctr	\$ 100,735	Falcon Hts	\$ 14,626	Jordan	\$ 22,066	Forest Lake	\$ 88,727
Blaine	\$ 218,503	Victoria	\$ 31,179	Eagan	\$ 223,739	Brooklyn Park	\$ 261,167	Little Canada	\$ 36,618	Prior Lake	\$ 85,420	Hugo	\$ 59,701
Circle Pines	\$ 14,315	<u>Waconia</u>	\$ <u>48,609</u>	Farmington	\$ 68,649	Champlin	\$ 79,328	Maplewood	\$ 140,244	Savage	\$ 103,936	Lake Elmo	\$ 48,716
Columbia Heights	\$ 57,713	TOTAL	\$ 907,881	Hastings	\$ 81,487	Corcoran	\$ 31,899	Moundsview	\$ 40,532	<u>Shakopee</u>	\$ <u>144,355</u>	Mahtomedi	\$ 28,066
Coon Rapids	\$ 207,720	% of \$20M	5%	Inver Grove Hts	\$ 122,430	Crystal	\$ 68,366	New Brighton	\$ 64,580	TOTAL	\$ 1,160,009	Oakdale	\$ 86,934
East Bethel	\$ 58,694			Lakeville	\$ 240,464	Dayton	\$ 25,842	N. St. Paul	\$ 39,564	% of \$20M	6%	St. Paul Park	\$ 20,542
Fridley	\$ 90,246			Mendota Hts	\$ 45,964	Eden Prairie	\$ 215,512	Roseville	\$ 115,495			Stillwater	\$ 66,637
Ham Lake	\$ 74,352			Rosemount	\$ 93,226	Edina	\$ 182,486	St. Paul	\$ 988,992			Woodbury	\$ 248,393
Lino Lakes	\$ 73,333			S. St. Paul	\$ 64,920	Golden Valley	\$ 85,814	Shoreview	\$ 79,084			TOTAL	\$ 1,681,289
Oak Grove	\$ 50,642			W. St. Paul	\$ 61,181	Hopkins	\$ 55,094	Vadnais Hts	\$ 38,387			% of \$20M	8%
Ramsey	\$ 102,316			TOTAL	\$ 2,836,247	Maple Grove	\$ 233,154	White Bear Lake	\$ 79,723				
Spring Lake Park	\$ 21,533			% of \$20M	14%	Medina	\$ 29,196	TOTAL	\$ 3,209,782				
St. Francis	\$ 34,533					Minneapolis	\$ 1,299,458	% of \$20M	16%				
TOTAL	\$ 2,721,288					Minnnetonka	\$ 187,023						
% of \$20M	14%					Minnetrستا	\$ 31,459						
						Mound	\$ 29,340						
						New Hope	\$ 63,641						
						Orono	\$ 30,725						
						Plymouth	\$ 276,653						
						Richfield	\$ 121,485						
						Robbinsdale	\$ 43,790						
						Rogers	\$ 60,258						
						Shorewood	\$ 28,903						
						St. Anthony	\$ 27,957						
						St. Louis Park	\$ 159,559						
						TOTAL	\$ 7,483,504						
						% of \$20M	37%						

2020 APPROVED FUNDING SCENARIO
ROADWAY PROJECTS INCLUDING MULTIMODAL ELEMENTS

Option 2

Traffic Management Technologies

Rank	ID	Applicant	County	City	Project Name	Funct Class	Funded (Orange)	Federal Requested	Local Match	Total Proj Cost	Federal Cumulative	Total Scores
1	14361	Minneapolis	Hennepin	Minneapolis	Minneapolis City-Wide Signal Retiming	Augmentor		\$2,500,000	\$625,000	\$3,125,000	\$2,500,000	817
2	14083	St. Paul	Ramsey	St. Paul	Dale Street Traffic Signal Modernization	Reliever, Augmentor	\$4,500,800	\$2,000,800	\$500,200	\$2,501,000	\$4,500,800	811
3	14090	Minneapolis	Hennepin	Minneapolis	City of Minneapolis ITS Upgrades and Enhancements	Augmentor		\$3,000,000	\$750,000	\$3,750,000	\$7,500,800	807
4	14027	Carver Co	Carver	4 Cities; 1 Township	Carver County Traffic Signal Tech and ITS Enhancements	Expanders, Con		\$1,580,000	\$395,000	\$1,975,000	\$9,080,800	776
5	14126	Ramsey Co	Ramsey	Mounds View	Mounds View Blvd Traffic Management Tech.	Reliever		\$2,536,085	\$634,021	\$3,170,106	\$11,616,885	630

Spot Mobility and Safety

Rank	ID	Applicant	County	City	Project Name	Funct Class	Funded (Orange)	Federal Requested	Local Match	Total Proj Cost	Federal Cumulative	Total Scores
1	14059	Minneapolis	Hennepin	Minneapolis	Johnson St. NE/ I-35W South Ramps Intersection Improvements	Augmentor		\$1,497,200	\$374,300	\$1,871,500	\$1,497,200	630
2*	14067	Hennepin Co	Hennepin	Minneapolis	Hi/Lake Safety Project	Augmentor		\$3,500,000	\$2,159,400	\$5,659,400	\$4,997,200	592
3	14050	Carver Co	Carver	Benton Township	US 212 & CSAH 51 Intersection Safety Project	PA		\$3,500,000	\$4,763,000	\$8,263,000	\$8,497,200	590
4	14198	Dakota Co	Dakota	Burnsville	Dakota Co Project 11-27: Roundabout - CSAH 11 & Burnsville Pkwy	Expander, Reliever	\$9,897,200	\$1,400,000	\$350,000	\$1,750,000	\$9,897,200	586
5	14346	Carver Co	Carver	Laketown Township	Highway 11 Intersection Improvement Project	Connector		\$2,937,600	\$734,400	\$3,672,000	\$12,834,800	575
6	14368	Woodbury	Washington	Woodbury	Lake Road and Pioneer Drive Intersection Improvement Project	Expander		\$2,057,591	\$514,398	\$2,571,989	\$14,892,391	496
7	14292	Rogers	Hennepin	Rogers, Dayton	CSAH 144 and CSAH 13 Signal & Intersection Geometric Improvements	Expander, Connector		\$1,747,512	\$436,878	\$2,184,390	\$16,639,903	483
8	14023	Ramsey Co	Ramsey	Maplewood, St. Paul	Larpenteur Avenue (CSAH 30)/White Bear Avenue (CSAH 650/North St. Paul Road (CSAH 29) Safety and Mobility Project	Augmentor		\$3,500,000	\$3,816,771	\$7,316,771	\$20,139,903	368
9	14164	Hennepin Co	Hennepin	Corcoran, Greenfield, Rogers	CSAH 19 Spot Mobility & Safety Project	Connector		\$2,712,000	\$678,000	\$3,390,000	\$22,851,903	337
10	14291	Rogers	Hennepin	Rogers	CSAH 116 and CSAH 150 Roundabout	Connector, Expander		\$1,245,120	\$311,280	\$1,556,400	\$24,097,023	291

Strategic Capacity

Rank	ID	Applicant	County	City	Project Name	Funct Class	Funded (Orange)	Federal Requested	Local Match	Total Proj Cost	Federal Cumulative	Total Scores
1	14030	Brooklyn Park	Hennepin	Brooklyn Park	TH 252/Brookdale Drive Interchange	PA		\$10,000,000	\$23,215,015	\$33,215,015	\$10,000,000	830
2	14165	Blaine	Anoka	Blaine	TH 65 at 99th Ave NE Grade Separation	PA		\$10,000,000	\$19,800,000	\$29,800,000	\$20,000,000	686
3**	14139	Anoka Co	Anoka	Ramsey, Dayton	CSAH 56 (Ramsey Blvd) & Highway 10 Interchange	PA, Expander		\$10,000,000	\$19,300,000	\$29,300,000	\$30,000,000	616
4-T	14324	Washington Co	Washington	Grant, Lake Elmo	CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Ave) & TH 36 Interchange	PA, Connector		\$10,000,000	\$24,733,130	\$34,733,130	\$40,000,000	572
4-T	14347	Carver Co	Carver	Chanhassen, Victoria	Highway 5 Arboretum Area Mobility and Access Project	Expander	\$50,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$3,440,000	\$13,440,000	\$50,000,000	572
6	14345	Carver Co	Carver	Chaska	Highway 41 and CSAH 10 Mobility and Access Improvement	PA, Expander	Overprogram	\$9,049,600	\$2,262,400	\$11,312,000	\$59,049,600	542
7	14015	Scott Co	Scott	Jordan	TH 169, TH 282 and CSAH 9 Interchange	PA, Connector	Overprogram	\$10,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$24,000,000	\$69,049,600	541
8	14375	Washington Co	Washington	Mahtomedi, White Bear Lake	TH 120 (Century Avenue) Expansion	Expander		\$6,601,884	\$1,650,471	\$8,252,355	\$75,651,484	500
9	14074	Coon Rapids	Anoka	Coon Rapids	TH 610 & East River Road Interchange Reconstruction	Expander		\$9,752,000	\$2,438,000	\$12,190,000	\$85,403,484	459
10	14018	Ramsey Co	Ramsey	White Bear Twp, Lino Lakes, North Oaks	I-35E/County Road J Interchange	Expander		\$8,618,210	\$2,154,553	\$10,772,763	\$94,021,694	437

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization

Rank	ID	Applicant	County	City	Project Name	Funct Class	Funded (Orange)	Federal Requested	Local Match	Total Proj Cost	Federal Cumulative	Total Scores
1	13970	Hennepin Co	Hennepin	Minneapolis	CSAH 5 (Franklin Ave) Reconstruction Project	Reliever		\$7,000,000	\$6,782,000	\$13,782,000	\$7,000,000	912
2	14012	Hennepin Co	Hennepin	Minneapolis	CSAH 153 (Lowry Ave NE) Reconstruction Project	Augmentor		\$7,000,000	\$2,022,600	\$9,022,600	\$14,000,000	716
3	14013	St. Paul	Ramsey	St. Paul	Robert Street Reconstruction	Reliever		\$7,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$18,000,000	\$21,000,000	699
4	14327	Hennepin Co	Hennepin	St. Louis Park	CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project	Augmentor	\$28,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$3,357,000	\$10,357,000	\$28,000,000	683
5	14071	Maple Grove	Hennepin	Maple Grove, Brooklyn Park, Osseo	Highway 169 and County Road 130 Interchange Reconstruction	Reliever		\$7,000,000	\$6,795,000	\$13,795,000	\$35,000,000	610
6	14303	Dakota Co	Dakota	Eagan	Reconstruction of CSAH 32 from CSAH 43 to 0.2 miles east of Dodd Road in Eagan	Expander		\$7,000,000	\$3,900,000	\$10,900,000	\$42,000,000	588
7	14396	Anoka (City)	Anoka	Anoka	TH 47 Corridor Improvements Project	Connector		\$4,152,000	\$1,038,000	\$5,190,000	\$46,152,000	585
8	14141	Anoka Co	Anoka	Coon Rapids	Anoka CSAH 11 (Northdale Boulevard NW) Reconstruction Project	Expander		\$5,214,400	\$1,303,600	\$6,518,000	\$51,366,400	583

Bridges

Rank	ID	Applicant	County	City	Project Name	Funct Class	Funded (Orange)	Federal Requested	Local Match	Total Proj Cost	Federal Cumulative	Total Scores
1-T	14061	Hennepin Co	Hennepin	Plymouth, New Hope	CSAH 9 (Rockford Rd) Bridge Replacement Project	Augmenter		\$6,888,000	\$1,722,000	\$8,610,000	\$6,888,000	778
1-T	14087	St. Paul	Ramsey	St. Paul	Replacement of Kellogg-Third Street Bridge No. 62080 & 62080A	Reliever	\$13,888,000	\$7,000,000	\$56,903,000	\$63,903,000	\$13,888,000	778
3	14138	Ramsey Co	Ramsey	New Brighton	Replacement of Bridge 4533, Old Highway 8 (CSAH 77) over the Minnesota Commercial Railroad	Reliever		\$1,937,365	\$484,341	\$2,421,706	\$15,825,365	728
4	14042	Hennepin Co	Hennepin	Minneapolis, Robbinsdale, Crystal, Brooklyn Center	CSAH 152 (Washington Ave N) Bridge Replacement Project	Reliever		\$2,848,000	\$712,000	\$3,560,000	\$18,673,365	723
5	14332	Hennepin Co	Hennepin	Minneapolis	CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Rehabilitation Project	Reliever		\$2,738,400	\$684,600	\$3,423,000	\$21,411,765	615
6	14117	Ramsey Co	Ramsey	Roseville	Replacement of Bridge No. 62519, Count Road C over BNSF RR	Augmenter		\$5,000,000	\$6,098,829	\$11,098,829	\$26,411,765	597
7	14359	Minneapolis	Hennepin	Minneapolis	Nicollet Avenue South over Minnehaha Creek	Reliever		\$7,000,000	\$13,500,000	\$20,500,000	\$33,411,765	577

2020 APPROVED FUNDING SCENARIO
TRANSIT AND TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

Transit Expansion

Rank	ID	Applicant	County	City	BRT	New Mkt	Project Name	Funded (Orange)	Federal Requested	Local Match	Total Proj Cost	Federal Cumulative	Total Scores
1*	14365	Washington Co	Washington	Woodbury	✓	✓	I-494 Park & Ride Structure in Woodbury	Skip due to	\$7,000,000	\$8,170,946	\$15,170,946	\$7,000,000	852
2	14176	Metro Transit	Hennepin	Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Hopkins			Route 17 Service Improvement in Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, and Hopkins		\$2,511,123	\$627,781	\$3,138,904	\$9,511,123	607
3	14173	Metro Transit	Hennepin, Ramsey	Bloomington, St. Paul		✓	Route 54 Service Improvement in St. Paul and Bloomington		\$1,762,070	\$440,518	\$2,202,588	\$11,273,193	589
4	14298	Metro Transit	Hennepin	Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Plymouth		✓	New Route 757 Limited Stop in Minneapolis, Golden Valley, and Plymouth	\$8,942,679	\$4,669,486	\$1,167,372	\$5,836,858	\$15,942,679	566
5	14024	SouthWest Transit	Hennepin	Eden Prairie, Maple Grove, Plymouth, Minnetonka		✓	I-494 North SW Prime Service in Eden Prairie, Minnetonka, Plymouth, and Maple Grove		\$5,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$7,000,000	\$21,542,679	555
6	14340	MVTA	Hennepin, Dakota	Minneapolis, Mendota Heights, Eagan		✓	Route 436 Expansion - Viking Lakes in Eagan, Mendota Heights, and Minneapolis		\$2,600,000	\$650,000	\$3,250,000	\$24,142,679	495
7	14146	Metro Transit	Washington, Hennepin	Stillwater		✓	New Route 274 Express in Stillwater and Minneapolis		\$1,321,553	\$330,388	\$1,651,941	\$25,464,232	453
8	14296	Metro Transit	Hennepin, Ramsey	Minneapolis, St. Paul			Route 23 Service Improvement in Minneapolis and St. Paul		\$3,018,668	\$754,667	\$3,773,336	\$28,482,901	337
9	14178	Metro Transit	Ramsey, Washington	7 Cities		✓	Route 219 Service Improvement in Maplewood, White Bear Lake, Mahtomedi, North St. Paul, Oakdale, Landfall, and St. Paul		\$1,750,320	\$437,580	\$2,187,900	\$30,233,221	328
10	14330	SouthWest Transit	Hennepin, Carver	Eden Prairie, Chaska, Chanhassen, Carver, Victoria		✓	SouthWest Transit Golden Triangle Mobility Hub in Eden Prairie, Chaska, Chanhassen, Carver, Victoria		\$4,055,200	\$1,013,800	\$5,069,000	\$34,288,421	295

\$34,288,421 \$14,993,052 \$49,281,473

Transit Modernization

Rank	ID	Applicant	County	City	BRT	New Mkt	Project Name	Funded (Orange)	Federal Requested	Local Match	Total Proj Cost	Federal Cumulative	Total Scores
1*	14392	Metro Transit	Ramsey	St. Paul	✓		Gold Line Ramsey Washington Saint Paul Downtown Modernization		\$7,000,000	\$3,500,000	\$10,500,000	\$7,000,000	721
2	14357	Metro Transit	Regional	Regional			Bus Farebox Upgrade for All Regional Transit Providers		\$7,000,000	\$1,750,000	\$8,750,000	\$14,000,000	637
3	14078	Dakota Co	Dakota	Apple Valley	✓	✓	140th Red Line Pedestrian Bicycle Overpass in Apple Valley	Skip due to	\$2,400,000	\$600,000	\$3,000,000	\$16,400,000	610
4	14171	MVTA	Dakota	7 Cities		✓	Burnsville Bus Garage (BBG) Modernization		\$2,800,000	\$700,000	\$3,500,000	\$19,200,000	604
5	14084	Apple Valley	Dakota	Apple Valley	✓	✓	Apple Valley Red Line BRT 147th Street Station Skyway	Skip due to	\$3,810,400	\$952,600	\$4,763,000	\$23,010,400	602
6	14191	SouthWest Transit	Carver	Chaska		✓	Signal Prioritization at East Creek Park and Ride in Chaska	\$17,243,520	\$443,520	\$110,800	\$554,320	\$23,453,920	582
7	14076	SouthWest Transit	Carver	Chanhassen		✓	Solar Array at SouthWest Village in Chanhassen		\$4,840,000	\$1,210,000	\$6,050,000	\$28,293,920	436
8	14190	MVTA	Dakota, Hennepin, Scott	7 Cities		✓	Burnsville Transit Station (BTS) Modernization-Elevator Installation		\$656,000	\$164,000	\$820,000	\$28,949,920	411
9	14295	MVTA	Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey	7 Cities		✓	Eagan Transit Station (ETS) Modernization-Elevator Installation		\$440,000	\$110,000	\$550,000	\$29,389,920	247

* Gold Line BRT projects are top scores in both transit categories. Gold Line project partners indicated preference for Transit Modernization project if only one can be funded.

2020 APPROVED FUNDING SCENARIO

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

Rank	ID	Applicant	County	City	Project Name	Funded (Orange)	Federal Requested	Local Match	Total Proj Cost	Federal Cumulative	Total Scores
1	14160	Minneapolis	Hennepin	Minneapolis	Hennepin/Dunwoody Protected Bikeway & Multiuse Trail		\$3,760,000	\$940,000	\$4,700,000	\$3,760,000	943
2	14112	St Paul	Ramsey	St. Paul	Samuel Morgan Regional Trail Segments 1 & 4 Reconstruction		\$4,956,800	\$1,239,200	\$6,196,000	\$8,716,800	883
3	14335	St Paul	Ramsey	St. Paul	Kellogg Blvd Capital City Bikeway - St. Peter to 7th St		\$5,500,000	\$1,444,759	\$6,944,759	\$14,216,800	870
4	14115	Burnsville	Dakota	Burnsville	I-35W Frontage Trail /I-35W Minnesota River Crossing		\$388,000	\$97,000	\$485,000	\$14,604,800	804
5	13983	Three Rivers PD	Hennepin	Golden Valley	Bassett Creek Reg Trail Gap / Duluth St		\$2,561,876	\$640,469	\$3,202,345	\$17,166,676	786
6-T	14302	Brooklyn Park	Hennepin	Brooklyn Park	63rd Avenue Multiuse Trail		\$744,000	\$186,000	\$930,000	\$17,910,676	783
6-T	14350	Washington Co	Washington	Oakdale	Century-Greenway Trail		\$825,865	\$206,466	\$1,032,331	\$18,736,541	783
8	14131	West St Paul	Dakota	West St Paul	CSAH 73 Oakdale Multiuse Trail		\$1,785,600	\$446,400	\$2,232,000	\$20,522,141	779
9	14026	Coon Rapids	Anoka	Coon Rapids	Coon Creek Reg Trail and Bridge over Coon Rapids Blvd		\$2,400,000	\$2,350,000	\$4,750,000	\$22,922,141	775
10	14287	Chaska	Carver	Chaska	Circle the Brick Trail Connection	\$24,167,773	\$1,245,632	\$315,408	\$1,561,040	\$24,167,773	750
11	14062	Minnetonka	Hennepin	Minnetonka	Hopkins Crossroad Multi-Use Trail	Overprogram	\$2,364,700	\$591,100	\$2,955,800	\$26,532,473	731
12	14113	St Paul	Ramsey	St Paul	Point Douglas Regional Trail Phase 1 Construction		\$5,040,930	\$1,260,233	\$6,301,163	\$31,573,403	726
13	14092	Ramsey Co	Ramsey	White Bear Lake, Vadnais Hts, White Bear Twp	Bruce Vento Regional Trail Extension		\$4,688,000	\$1,172,000	\$5,860,000	\$36,261,403	725
14-T	14097	Burnsville	Dakota	Burnsville	Multiuse Trail Along Nicollet Avenue Between Trunk Highway 13 and CSAH 32 (Cliff Road)		\$760,000	\$190,000	\$950,000	\$37,021,403	723
14-T	14367	Woodbury	Washington	Woodbury	Woodbury Gold Line Station Trail & Pedestrian Connections		\$1,113,500	\$278,375	\$1,391,875	\$38,134,903	723
16	14322	Anoka (City)	Anoka	Anoka	City of Anoka T.H. 169/Ferry Street Underpass		\$1,440,000	\$360,000	\$1,800,000	\$39,574,903	711
17	14341	Inver Grove Hts	Dakota	Inver Grove Hts	Inver Grove Heights Babcock Trail		\$383,040	\$95,760	\$478,800	\$39,957,943	710
18	14389	Washington Co	Washington	Woodbury	Valley Creek Road Multiuse Trail Project		\$508,000	\$127,000	\$635,000	\$40,465,943	701
19	13971	Dakota Co	Dakota	Eagan	MN River Regional Greenway - Ft Snelling State Park UP Rail Overpass		\$3,777,940	\$944,485	\$4,722,425	\$44,243,883	694
20	14057	Fridley	Anoka	Fridley	53rd Avenue Trail and Sidewalk		\$1,843,313	\$460,829	\$2,304,142	\$46,087,196	684
21	14073	Dakota Co	Dakota	Mendota Heights	TH 149 Trail and Underpass		\$2,104,100	\$526,025	\$2,630,125	\$48,191,296	669

2024 / 2025 HSIP Projects (Proactive)

The projects down to red line are FUNDED:

Project #	Submitting Agency	Roadway	Location	Project Description	Original HSIP Amount Requested	HSIP FUNDING				Local Match (10%)	TOTAL PROJECT COST	POINTS						TOTAL POINTS (1,000)	Project #
						2022 HSIP \$ Awarded	2023 HSIP \$ Awarded	2024 HSIP \$ Awarded	2025 HSIP \$ Awarded			Connection to SHSP (100)	Cost per exposure (300)	Correctable F and A Crashes (100)	Crash Modification Factor (200)	Part of a Plan (200)	Ped and Bike Safety (100)		
P2	Bloomington	3 locations	98th St at Xerxes Ave, Lyndale Ave at 96th St, Old Shakopee Road at 3rd Ave	Ped safety improvements, refuge island, bump outs, overhead mast arms, RRFB's, LED lighting, ADA upgrades	\$331,200			\$331,200		\$36,800	\$368,000	100	300	14	171	200	100	885	P2
P21	Washington County	CSAH 15	from CSAH 12 to 240th Street	Install centerline rumble strips and wet reflective striping	\$111,657	\$111,657				\$12,406	\$124,063	100	300	74	20	200	75	769	P21
P20	MnDOT	TH 212	from TH 62 to TH 5	Install continuous lighting	\$450,000	\$450,000				\$50,000	\$500,000	75	199	34	152	200	50	710	P20
P3	Carver County	County Wide	Multiple locations	Install 56 miles (page 16) of enhanced pavement markings	\$785,570		\$785,570			\$87,285	\$872,855	100	73	47	193	200	50	663	P3
P15	MnDOT	TH 13	from Lynn Ave to Nicollet Ave in Savage	Install cable median barrier	\$425,250			\$425,250		\$47,250	\$472,500	100	275	14	92	150	0	631	P15
P13	MnDOT	TH 8	at Hazel Ave and 250th St in Wyoming Twp	Construct left turn lane at Hazel Ave Close 250th Street	\$544,500			\$544,500		\$60,500	\$605,000	25	275	0	105	200	25	630	P13
P5	Carver County	CSAH 40	between TH 25 and CSAH 52	Shoulder widening, safety edge, mumble strips, wet reflective ground in pavement markings	\$2,000,000			\$2,000,000		\$2,274,600	\$4,274,600	75	1	100	145	200	75	596	P5
P10	Hennepin County	3 locations	CSAH 52 at 67th St CSAH 66 at Noble Ave CSAH 66 at Hidden Lakes Pkwy	Install FYA's, ped ramps, APS, countdown timers	\$1,737,000			\$1,737,000		\$193,000	\$1,930,000	50	189	7	79	200	50	575	P10
P1	Andover	CSAH 18 (Crosstown Blvd)	at Nightingale Street	Construct roundabout	\$1,902,600			\$1,902,600		\$211,400	\$2,114,000	50	59	0	193	200	50	552	P1
P11	Minneapolis	26th Street 28th Street	at Dupont Ave, 26th St, Emerson Av at Dupont Ave, 28th St, Emerson Av, 3rd Av, 18th St	Ped ramp upgrades, traffic visibility improvements	\$1,620,000			\$1,620,000		\$180,000	\$1,800,000	50	91	0	163	180	40	524	P11
P12	MnDOT	TH 3	at 142nd Street in Rosemount	Construct roundabout	\$1,107,000			\$1,107,000		\$123,000	\$1,230,000	25	122	0	193	150	25	515	P12
P24	Blaine	99th Ave	at Baltimore Street	Construct roundabout	\$1,530,000	\$1,530,000				\$170,000	\$1,700,000	25	58	7	193	200	25	508	P24
P4	Carver County	CSAH 10	at Waconia Parkway	Construct a turbo roundabout	\$1,759,895			\$1,759,895		\$195,544	\$1,955,439	25	53	0	193	200	25	496	P4
P14	MnDOT	TH 13	at Wachtler Ave in Mendota Heights	Construct roundabout	\$1,152,000			\$1,152,000		\$128,000	\$1,280,000	25	89	0	193	150	25	482	P14

The projects below are NOT funded:

P8	Hennepin County	CSAH 19	at 109th Ave (CR 117)	Reconstruct intersection, raised medians for ped refuge, upgrad bike connections, ADA, lighting	\$2,000,000					\$1,390,000	\$3,390,000	50	29	7	200	150	25	461	P8
P7	Dakota County	CSAH 54	at CSAH 68	Construct roundabout	\$1,395,000					\$155,000	\$1,550,000	20	45	14	180	200	0	459	P7
P16	MnDOT (Hennepin)	TH 55	from Old Rockford Road to General Mills Blvd	Construct RCI's at Old Rockford Road, Urbandale, 18th Ave, Larch Lane, Ives lane, Goldenrod Lane, Evergreen Lane	\$1,070,820					\$118,980	\$1,189,800	75	121	7	105	150	0	458	P16
P17	MnDOT (Anoka)	TH 65	from Bunker Lake Blvd to 237th Ave	Install cable median barrier	\$2,000,000					\$306,062	\$2,306,062	75	116	20	92	150	0	453	P17
P22	Washington County	CSAH 19	80th Street	Construct roundabout	\$2,000,000					\$1,103,000	\$3,103,000	25	70	0	180	100	25	400	P22
P6	Carver County	TH 25	at CSAH 20	Realign intersection to remove skew, widen shoulders, add turn lanes, improve sight lines	\$1,073,700					\$119,300	\$1,193,000	40	29	0	84	200	0	353	P6
P19	MnDOT (Carver)	TH 212	From west jct TH 5 to east jct TH 5 in Norwood Young America	Install cable median barrier. Construct RCI intersections at CSAH 131, Wells Ave, CSAH 31, and Railroad Street	\$1,216,329					\$135,148	\$1,351,477	75	18	0	92	150	0	335	P19
P18	MnDOT	TH 95	at 392nd (301st Ave) in North Branch	Construct left turn lane	\$1,280,064					\$142,229	\$1,422,293	50	2	14	105	150	0	321	P18
P23	Washington County	CSAH 19	at CSAH 10	Construct roundabout	\$2,000,000					\$1,638,000	\$3,638,000	25	28	0	193	0	25	271	P23
P9	Hennepin County	CSAH 3	from 22nd Ave to Snelling Ave	Widen sidewalk, crossing improvements, signal upgrades, ADA, lane configuration	\$2,000,000					\$3,659,000	\$5,659,000	50	39	27	132	200	50	498	P9

\$31,492,585 \$2,091,657 \$785,570 \$3,951,200 \$8,628,245 \$12,536,504 \$44,029,089

2024 / 2025 HSIP Projects (Reactive)

12/3/2020

The projects down to red line are FUNDED:

HSIP FUNDING

POINTS

Project #	Submitting Agency	Roadway	Location	Project Description	Original HSIP Amount Requested	HSIP FUNDING				Local Match (10%)	TOTAL PROJECT COST	POINTS				TOTAL POINTS (1,000)	Project #
						2022 HSIP \$ Awarded	2023 HSIP \$ Awarded	2024 HSIP \$ Awarded	2025 HSIP \$ Awarded			B / C Points (600)	Meets Intent of HSIP Program Points (200)	Correctable F and A crashes Points (100)	Ped and Bike Safety Points (100)		
R12	Fridley	TH 47 (University Ave)	from 53rd Ave to 85th Ave	Enhanced lighting at ped crossings, lighting at bus stops, concrete sidewalk at bus stop NE corner at Osborne Rd	\$1,947,240			\$1,947,240		\$216,360	\$2,163,600	600	200	100	63	963	R12
R20	Ramsey County	University Ave	at Simpson St, at Albert St, at Syndicate St, at Arundel St	Install RRFB's, APS, reconstruct ped ramps	\$504,000	\$504,000				\$56,000	\$560,000	530	184	4	70	788	R20
R13	Hennepin County	CSAH 52 (Hennepin Ave)	from 10th Ave to 11th Ave (over I-35W)	Modifying intersections, reduce conflicting vehicle and ped speeds, traffic signal mods, ADA upgrades	\$1,368,000			\$1,368,000		\$152,000	\$1,520,000	400	128	10	83	621	R13
R15	Minneapolis	3 locations	Lake St at 28th Ave Franklin Ave btwn 13th and 14th Ave Cedar Ave at 6th Street	Rebuild signals, add OH mast arms, ped count down timers, APS, yellow reflective back plates, upgrade 8" to 12" signal heads, convert to LED lighting, video detection, curb ramps, curb extensions	\$1,080,000	\$1,080,000				\$120,000	\$1,200,000	370	112	16	90	588	R15
R16	Minneapolis	LaSalle Ave Nicollet Ave	at Grant St, at 15th St, at Groveland Ave at Grant St, at 15th St, at 18th St	Rebuild signals, add OH mast arms, ped count down timers, APS, yellow reflective back plates, upgrade 8" to 12" signal heads, convert to LED lighting, video detection, curb ramps, curb extensions	\$1,800,000			\$1,800,000		\$200,000	\$2,000,000	339	120	19	90	568	R16
R23	Scott County	CSAH 78	at CSAH / CR 69	Construct roundabout	\$1,595,700			\$1,595,700		\$177,300	\$1,773,000	234	176	10	90	510	R23
R17	Minneapolis	Lyndale Ave	at 18th Ave, 24th Ave, 29th Ave, 36th Ave	Rebuild signals, add OH mast arms, ped count down timers, APS, yellow reflective back plates, upgrade 8" to 12" signal heads, convert to LED lighting, video detection, curb ramps, curb extensions	\$1,260,000			\$1,260,000		\$140,000	\$1,400,000	274	120	7	90	491	R17
R11	Dakota County	CR 6 (Thompson Ave)	at CSAH 73 (Oakdale Ave)	Construct roundabout	\$1,395,000		\$1,395,000			\$155,000	\$1,550,000	245	144	4	87	480	R11
R6	Anoka County	CSAH 22 (Viking Blvd)	at CSAH 7 (Rum River Road)	Construct roundabout	\$1,350,000			\$1,350,000		\$150,000	\$1,500,000	245	144	7	80	476	R6
R14	Minneapolis	Broadway Street	at Washington St, Monroe St, Filmore St, Buchanan St	Rebuild signals, add OH mast arms, ped count down timers, APS, yellow reflective back plates, upgrade 8" to 12" signal heads, convert to LED lighting, video detection, curb ramps, curb extensions	\$1,170,000		\$1,170,000			\$130,000	\$1,300,000	223	128	16	73	440	R14
R18	MnDOT	I-35W	from TH 13 to I-35E	Install continuous lighting	\$720,000			\$720,000		\$80,000	\$800,000	229	136	7	33	405	R18
R21	Ramsey County	Dale Street	from Como Ave to North TH 36 ramps	Construct 4 lane to 3 lane conversion	\$2,000,000			\$2,000,000		\$1,525,048	\$3,525,048	132	152	13	97	394	R21
R26	Woodbury	Lake Road	from Woodlane Drive to Pioneer Drive	Reconstruct from 4 lane to 3 lane conversion	\$1,620,000			\$1,620,000		\$180,000	\$1,800,000	141	144	13	93	391	R26

The projects below are NOT funded:

R19	MnDOT (Dakota)	I-494	from Minnesota River to TH 3	Install continuous lighting	\$1,710,000					\$190,000	\$1,900,000	163	144	16	33	356	R19
R8	Anoka County	CSAH 34 (Birch Street)	at CSAH 54 (20th Ave)	Construct roundabout	\$1,170,000					\$130,000	\$1,300,000	110	152	4	80	346	R8
R9	Anoka County	CSAH 52 (Radisson Road)	at Cloud Drive	Construct a Traffic Signal, widen side street approaches to develop two lanes of approach.	\$540,000					\$60,000	\$600,000	133	128	0	77	338	R9
R24	Shakopee	Marystown Road	from Vierling Drive to CSAH 16 (17th Ave)	Construct 4 roundabouts (at Vierling Dr, N 169 ramps, S 169 ramps, 17th Av), and install ped/bike shared use paths and sidewalks	\$2,000,000					\$5,380,500	\$7,380,500	39	168	7	100	314	R24
R2	Anoka County	CSAH 6 (Mississippi St)	from TH 65 to CSAH 35	Construct 4 to 3 lane conversion with mini roundabout at CSAH 35 (Old Central Ave)	\$954,000					\$106,000	\$1,060,000	73	136	0	97	306	R2
R4	Anoka County	CSAH 22 (Viking Blvd)	at CR 66 (Cleary Road)	Construct roundabout	\$1,440,000					\$160,000	\$1,600,000	72	144	4	80	300	R4
R1	Anoka County	CSAH 6 (Mississippi St)	from TH 47 to TH 65	Construct 4 to 3 lane conversion with mini roundabouts at 7th St and Monroe intersections	\$1,922,400					\$213,600	\$2,136,000	50	144	7	97	298	R1
R25	Woodbury	Lake Road	from Blue Ridge Drive to Cherry Lane	Reconstruct from 4 lane to 3 lane conversion	\$2,000,000					\$970,520	\$2,970,520	58	136	4	93	291	R25
R7	Anoka County	CSAH 34 (Birch Street)	at CSAH 21 (Centerville Road)	Construct roundabout	\$1,440,000					\$160,000	\$1,600,000	68	128	4	80	280	R7
R3	Anoka County	CSAH 9 (Lake George Blvd)	at 221st Ave	Construct roundabout	\$1,350,000					\$150,000	\$1,500,000	60	128	0	80	268	R3
R5	Anoka County	CSAH 22 (Viking Blvd)	at CSAH 5 (Nowthen Blvd)	Construct roundabout	\$1,440,000					\$160,000	\$1,600,000	53	120	4	80	257	R5
R22	St. Paul	4 locations	Cretin / St. Clair, Cretin / Randolph, East 7th / Forest, Hamline / Thomas	Replace signals, full mast arms, ADA, red light confirmation, ped count down timers, ped ramp improvements	\$1,296,000					\$144,000	\$1,440,000	78	112	0	60	250	R22

\$33,125,100 \$1,584,000 \$2,565,000 \$11,050,940 \$2,610,000 \$10,889,968 \$44,015,068

Existing Projects with Capacity for Federal Funds (Per 2022-2025 TIP)

Route	Projnum	Year	Agency	Activity	Federal	Project Total	Federal Capacity	Cumulative
999	178-030-001	2024	INVER GROVE HEIGHTS	Reconstruct Curb Ramps to ADA	\$ 250,240	\$ 337,824	\$ 20,019	\$ 20,019
CSAH 12	082-612-025	2024	WASHINGTON COUNTY	Bike Trail	\$ 256,800	\$ 346,680	\$ 20,544	\$ 40,563
Local Street	219-591-001	2024	MAHTOMEDI	Sidewalks, meidan	\$ 335,583	\$ 453,037	\$ 26,847	\$ 67,410
Local Street	107-591-006	2023	BLOOMINGTON	SRTS (Olson Elementary and Middle School)	\$ 301,782	\$ 414,950	\$ 30,178	\$ 97,588
MSAS 236	185-236-003	2024	OAKDALE	Greenway Ave Trail	\$ 400,000	\$ 540,000	\$ 32,000	\$ 129,588
Local Street	173-591-004	2023	WEST SAINT PAUL	Bidwell St. Sidewalk, ADA	\$ 640,000	\$ 848,000	\$ 38,400	\$ 167,988
Local Street	113-591-001	2024	COLUMBIA HEIGHTS	49th Avenue pedestrain project	\$ 484,400	\$ 653,940	\$ 38,752	\$ 206,740
MSAS 312	127-312-002	2022	FRIDLEY	7th St and 57th Ave Trail	\$ 516,120	\$ 696,762	\$ 41,290	\$ 248,029
CSAH 38	082-638-015	2023	WASHINGTON COUNTY	Sidewalk, trail	\$ 460,800	\$ 633,600	\$ 46,080	\$ 294,109
Local Street	110-090-004	2024	BROOKLYN PARK	63rd Ave sidewalk, trail	\$ 744,000	\$ 1,004,400	\$ 59,520	\$ 353,629
MN 41	196-591-001	2024	CHASKA	Pedestrian underpass	\$ 933,360	\$ 1,260,036	\$ 74,669	\$ 428,298
Local Street	141-591-013	2022	MINNEAPOLIS	16th Ave Traffic Calming	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 508,298
MSAS 216	164-216-021	2024	SAINT PAUL	Sidewalk, ADA	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 588,298
MSAS 342	141-342-007	2022	MINNEAPOLIS	Pedestrian, signals	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 668,298
Local Street	164-591-004	2023	SAINT PAUL	SRTS (Bruce Vento Elementary School)	\$ 842,528	\$ 1,158,476	\$ 84,253	\$ 752,551
CSAH 40	027-640-008	2024	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Ped ramps and accessible signals	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,366,200	\$ 92,960	\$ 845,511
CSAH 61	196-090-002	2024	CHASKA	Trail	\$ 1,245,632	\$ 1,685,923	\$ 103,106	\$ 948,617
Local Street	027-090-026	2023	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Trail	\$ 1,120,000	\$ 1,540,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 1,060,617
CSAH 11	019-611-013	2024	DAKOTA COUNTY	Roundabout	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,890,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 1,172,617
CSAH 38	019-638-020	2022	DAKOTA COUNTY	Traffic Management Tech	\$ 1,440,000	\$ 1,944,000	\$ 115,200	\$ 1,287,817
MSAS 183	141-183-014	2024	MINNEAPOLIS	Turn lanes, intersecion, bike/ped	\$ 1,497,200	\$ 2,021,220	\$ 119,776	\$ 1,407,593
CSAH 51	062-651-067	2022	RAMSEY COUNTY	Lexington Parkway Extension	\$ 1,535,420	\$ 2,072,817	\$ 122,834	\$ 1,530,427
CSAH 73	173-090-001	2024	WEST SAINT PAUL	Multi-use Trail	\$ 1,785,600	\$ 2,410,560	\$ 142,848	\$ 1,673,275
CSAH 73	142-090-004	2024	MINNETONKA	Trail	\$ 2,364,700	\$ 3,192,264	\$ 189,111	\$ 1,862,386
Local Street	164-090-017	2023	SAINT PAUL	Ped/Bike Trail	\$ 2,216,800	\$ 3,048,100	\$ 221,680	\$ 2,084,066
NA	090-595-016	2022	MET COUNCIL	Travel Behavior Inventory	\$ 1,170,000	\$ 1,755,000	\$ 234,000	\$ 2,318,066
Transit	TRS-TCMT-22F	2022	MET COUNCIL-MT	Southwest Transit Mobility Hub	\$ 3,672,800	\$ 4,958,280	\$ 293,824	\$ 2,611,890
Local Street	141-090-040	2024	MINNEAPOLIS	Protected bike facility	\$ 3,760,000	\$ 5,076,000	\$ 300,800	\$ 2,912,690
999	141-030-054	2024	MINNEAPOLIS	Pedestrian/intersecion upgrades	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,736,640	\$ 389,312	\$ 3,302,002
Local Street	164-090-018	2024	SAINT PAUL	Trail reconstruction	\$ 4,956,800	\$ 6,691,680	\$ 396,544	\$ 3,698,546
MSAS 158	164-158-026	2023	SAINT PAUL	Protected bike facility	\$ 5,312,000	\$ 7,304,000	\$ 531,200	\$ 4,229,746
Local Street	019-090-023	2022	DAKOTA COUNTY	Trail and bridge	\$ 480,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 4,949,746
Local Street	141-591-015	2024	MINNEAPOLIS	improvements	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 2,150,280	\$ 720,224	\$ 5,669,970
TRANSIT	TRS-TCMT-23A	2023	MET COUNCIL-MT	Buses and Transit stations	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 8,750,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 6,669,970
CSAH 158	027-758-006	2023	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Roadway approaches, signal modifications, ADA	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 10,065,000	\$ 1,052,000	\$ 7,721,970
CSAH 42	019-642-066	2022	DAKOTA COUNTY	Trail and grade-separated crossing	\$ 1,256,000	\$ 2,908,498	\$ 1,070,798	\$ 8,792,769
CSAH 3	027-603-075	2024	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Sidewalk and other pedestrian improvements	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 6,112,152	\$ 1,389,722	\$ 10,182,490
TRANSIT	TRS-TCMT-24B	2024	MET COUNCIL-MT	Gold Line Stations	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 10,500,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 11,582,490
CSAH 52	027-652-042	2023	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Bikeway and intersecion crossing improvements	\$ 5,500,000	\$ 8,659,735	\$ 1,427,788	\$ 13,010,278
Local Street	114-090-002	2024	COON RAPIDS	Pedestrian bridge	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 5,130,000	\$ 1,704,000	\$ 14,714,278
CSAH 5	027-605-033	2024	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Reconstruct	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 11,185,560	\$ 1,948,448	\$ 16,662,726
CSAH 153	027-753-020	2023	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Reconstruct	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 11,539,000	\$ 2,231,200	\$ 18,893,926
CSAH 36	027-636-012	2022	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Bikeway enhancements, pavement marking, ADA	\$ 5,500,000	\$10,341,158	\$ 2,772,926	\$ 21,666,853
CSAH 10	010-610-056	2024	CARVER COUNTY	Reconstruction	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 12,216,960	\$ 2,773,568	\$ 24,440,421
Local Street	062-090-003	2024	RAMSEY COUNTY	Replace pedestrian bridge	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,246,640	\$ 3,197,312	\$ 27,637,733
MN 13	070-596-015	2022	SCOTT COUNTY	Interchange	\$ 5,750,000	\$ 13,130,000	\$ 4,754,000	\$ 32,391,733
CSAH 152	027-752-035	2022	HENNEPIN COUNTY	Reconstruction	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 11,500,000	\$ 7,200,000	\$ 39,591,733
MSAS 425	141-425-008	2023	MINNEAPOLIS	Reconstruction	\$ 7,550,000	\$ 26,350,900	\$ 13,530,720	\$ 53,122,453
US 10	0215-76	2022	MNDOT	Bridge Replacement	\$ 36,415,000	\$ 62,842,000	\$ 13,858,600	\$ 66,981,053
MN 65	106-010-020	2024	BLAINE	Grade Separation	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 32,184,000	\$ 15,747,200	\$ 82,728,253

DATE: October 14, 2021
TO: TAC Funding and Planning Committee
FROM: Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Regional Transit Safety Performance Targets – TIP Amendment

Performance Measures in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Pursuant to 23 CFR 490, all Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) must set and adopt system performance targets in order to monitor progress. As part of this suite of federally required transportation performance measures, the MPO is required to set regional transit safety performance targets. The purpose of this action is to adopt regional transit safety performance targets for the MPO Planning Area. Additionally, per federal law, the Council is required to include the adopted transit safety performance targets into the 2022-2025 TIP.

At its October 14, 2021, meeting the TAC Planning Committee recommended approval of Regional Transit Safety Performance Targets along with an amendment to the 2022-25 TIP incorporating this. Shown below is the current TIP Performance Measures and Targets language with changes tracked to reflect the amendment that is in process. Note that the 2022-25 TIP still has not been approved by the USDOT. The amendment will be brought TAC and TAB in November but will not be added to Transportation Committee or Metropolitan Council agendas until after federal approval.

3. FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGETS

Pursuant to Title 23, Section 450.326(d) of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), the Metropolitan Council is required to incorporate a performance-based planning approach when developing the TIP. This includes an analysis of the anticipated effect the TIP may have towards achieving the performance targets adopted for the Council's MPO planning area. Specifically, the regulation states: *The TIP shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the metropolitan transportation plan, linking investment priorities to those performance targets.*

This approach was first established in 2012 with the federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), which established performance-based planning and identified the federal performance measures for safety, pavement and bridge condition, reliability, freight, congestion mitigation and air quality improvement (CMAQ), and transit asset management. [Regional Transit safety performance measures-targets](#) will be adopted by the MPO in 2021 and included in the ~~2023-2026 TIP~~ [TIP following that action](#). The requirements continue through the federal Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, signed into law in 2015. The following are the four broad performance measure categories that must be included in the 2022-2025 TIP:

- Highway Safety Performance Measure (PM1)
- Pavement and Bridge Performance Measure (PM2)
- System Performance Measures and CMAQ (PM3)
- [Transit Asset Management \(TAM\)](#)
- [Transit Safety Performance](#)

Highway Safety Performance Measure (PM1)

Council Activities and Progress

The Transportation Policy Plan (TPP), which serves as the MTP for the Council, includes an overarching goal related to safety—the Safety and Security Goal, as well as objectives and strategies (actions) the Council will employ to ensure that the desired safety outcomes are met. In addition, the five federally required safety performance measures and targets are included in the TPP in the Performance Outcomes chapter.

The region has implemented a number of proactive and reactive strategies to improve the safety for users of all modes within the metro area. These include a commitment to aggressively reduce the number of crashes involving fatalities and serious injuries annually, with the ultimate aspirational goal of achieving zero fatalities and serious injuries. Pursuant to federal requirements, the Council must annually adopt safety performance targets for the region. 2021 targets were adopted in coordination with the Council’s Safety Advisory Work Group. This group, which is comprised of city and county representatives along with MnDOT staff, was formed in 2020 to help guide the region in setting short-term safety targets.

Table 2 shows the adopted targets for 2021.

Table 1: Adopted Safety Targets for 2021

Measure	2021 Target
Number of Traffic Fatalities	106
Fatality Rate (per 100 million VMT)	0.36
Number of Serious Injuries	738
Serious Injury Rate (per 100 million VMT)	2.49
Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries	181

In addition to the TPP, the Council and its regional partners have completed several studies that directly address safety issues and propose strategies to improve safety in the metro area. These studies and plans include the [Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan](#); the [Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV](#); the [Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study](#); and applicable modal and county-produced safety plans. In early 2022, the Council will complete a regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan.

Efforts like [Towards Zero Deaths](#) and [Vision Zero](#) strive to achieve the long-term goal of eliminating fatalities and serious injuries on the transportation network. The Council supports these goals and will consistently work towards reducing fatalities and serious injuries.

Anticipated Effect of the Safety Performance Measures

The 2022-2025 TIP is anticipated to have a positive effect towards meeting the region’s established safety performance targets. The TIP reflects \$78.8 million in FHWA Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds, in addition to state and local match funding of \$3.4 million and \$16.1 million, respectively. These projects address both existing high-incident locations (reactive projects) and the design of newer projects (proactive projects) that pre-emptively address safety in their design. Further, safety is a key scoring criterion for the strategic capacity, spot mobility/safety, roadway reconstruction/modernization, traffic management technology, multiuse trails and bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and Safe Routes to School funding categories in the biennial Regional Solicitation for Transportation Projects. In addition to federal funding sources, the region has used a number of

other revenue sources to improve transportation safety in the metro area. Examples include a number of county- and city-funded safety projects as well as MnDOT’s CMSP funding set aside each year.

MPO Investment Priorities

The Council has adopted objectives and strategies intended to improve transportation safety. As outlined in the Transportation Policy Plan, a key objective is to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes and improve safety and security for all modes of passenger travel and freight transport.

Specific strategies the Council and its partners will use and implement to meet the safety objective include:

- Regional transportation partners will incorporate safety and security considerations for all modes and users throughout the processes of planning, funding, construction, and operation.
- Regional transportation partners should monitor and routinely analyze safety and security data by mode, severity, and location to identify priorities and progress.
- Regional transportation partners will support the state’s vision of moving toward zero traffic fatalities and serious injuries, which includes supporting educational and enforcement programs to increase awareness of regional safety issues, shared responsibility, and safe behavior.
- The Metropolitan Council and regional transit providers will provide transit police services and coordinate with public safety agencies to provide a collaborative approach to safety and security.
- Regional transportation partners will use best practices to provide and improve facilities for safe walking and bicycling, since pedestrians and bicyclists are the most vulnerable users of the transportation system.
- The Council and its regional transportation partners will work to ensure that police and public safety agency enforcement programs and actions on the region’s transportation system do not create or perpetuate racial inequities.

Pavement/Bridge Performance Measures (PM2)

Council Activities and Progress

The Council reviewed and adopted PM2 targets for the first time in early 2021. As an MPO, the Council has the option to either plan and program to support the adopted MnDOT statewide targets or chose to adopt targets specific to the region. Due to the difference in urban and rural areas, the Council chose to adopt metro-specific targets for non-interstate NHS pavement in good and poor condition. Table 3 depicts the existing metro area performance as well as the adopted statewide and regional targets.

Table 2: Existing Conditions and Adopted Condition Targets

Measure	Existing Performance	MnDOT Target	Council Target
Bridges			
1. % of bridges by deck area in good condition	32.7	35%	35%
2. % of bridges by deck area in poor condition	4.8%	4%	4%
Pavement			
1. % of interstate pavement in good condition	58.5%	55%	55%
2. % of interstate pavement in poor condition	1.6%	2%	2%
3. % of non-interstate NHS pavement in good condition	56%	50%	53%
4. % of non-interstate NHS pavement in poor condition	1%	4%	3%

Anticipated Effect of the Pavement/Bridge Performance Measures

The 2022-2025 TIP is anticipated to have a positive effect on the pavement and bridge performance measures, as there are projects programmed specifically for the purpose of improving bridge and pavement conditions. While both interstate and non-interstate NHS pavement conditions within the metro area is performing at a level greater than the targets, resources must be provided to ensure they continue to meet the needs of the region.

Currently, the metro area is not meeting the adopted target for the percent of bridges by deck area in good condition. Moving forward, the Council will continue to monitor bridge deck condition and explore mechanisms to ensure the future targets are met. Projects in the TIP that will help address bridge needs include:

- MN 65 over Mississippi River in Minneapolis (2710-42)
- Kellogg Avenue Bridge in St. Paul (164-158-025)
- Kellogg Avenue / 3rd Street Bridge in St. Paul (164-158-028)
- US 10 in Anoka (0215-76)
- CSAH 158 over CP Railroad in Edina (027-758-006)
- CSAH 9 Bridge replacement in Plymouth (027-609-042)
- Rehabilitation of ten bridges on I-94 and I-35E in St. Paul (6283-247 and 6283-255)
- MN 41 in Chaska (1008-87 and 1008-47A)
- MN 55 and MN 62 in Minneapolis and Inver Grove Heights (1909-99)
- MN 55 in Minneapolis (2724-124)
- US 952A near Downtown Minneapolis (2770-05)
- I-494 Bridge replacement (six bridges) in Bloomington, Richfield, and Edina (2785-424)
- I-494 in Bloomington (2785-433)
- I-94 on Plymouth Avenue in Minneapolis (2781-485)
- MN 55 over Minnesota River (1909-106)
- MN 65 at CSAH 10 in Spring Lake Park (0207-120)
- Shepard Road in St. Paul (164-194-033)
- US 169 in Plymouth (2772-115)
- US 212 in Cologne (1013-101)
- I-494 at Mississippi River in Newport and South St. Paul (8285-109)
- I-94 over St. Croix river (8281-06)
- MN 65 in Ham and East Bethel (0208-165)
- US 169 at 36th Avenue in New Hope and Plymouth (2772-125)
- I-35W in Burnsville (1981-140)
- I-94 in St. Paul (6280-391)
- MN 13 in Burnsville (1901-175)
- MN 13 in Savage (070-596-015, 070-596-015F, 7001-128, 7001-128A, 7001-128R)
- Randolph Ave in St. Paul (164-597-001)
- Pillsbury Avenue South in Minneapolis (141-597-001)
- MN 3 in Farmington (1921-110 and 1921-90)
- US 169 in Brooklyn Park and Maple Grove (2772-124)
- US 169 in Elk River (7106-87)

System Performance Measures and Congestion CMAQ (PM3)

Council Activities and Progress

The Council adopted both the initial system reliability (shown on Table 4) and congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ) (Table 5) targets for the region during in early 2021. All of the targets associated with these measures are specific to the metro area.

Because almost all congestion within the State of Minnesota occurs within the Metro Area, the Council adopted targets specific to the region that differed from the state-wide targets. The existing metro area performance for the percent of reliable person-miles traveled on the interstate system is approximately 69.5%. MnDOT established a state-wide target of greater than 80%, which would likely be unattainable within the metro area. Instead, the Council has adopted a target of greater than 70%. This target is appropriate in that it still aspires to be better than current conditions, but better fits the urban context than does the statewide target of 80%.

The Council has also elected to adopt targets that are different than MnDOT’s for the truck travel time reliability index measure. This is because truck travel reliability is less in the metro area than in Greater Minnesota as a whole. The adopted MnDOT target truck travel time reliability of less than 1.5 would be very difficult to attain given the increased traffic in the metro area compared to greater Minnesota.

All of the adopted reliability targets aim for improvement over the existing conditions, and as such may be considered aspirational given recent trends. There is, however, no consequence to the Council for not meeting these targets, and the State of Minnesota as a whole is likely to meet their adopted targets. The Council has chosen these targets as a mechanism to aim for improvement in reliability in the immediate future and prioritize highway projects integrated within the TIP thusly.

Table 3: Existing Conditions and Adopted System Reliability Targets

Measure	Existing Performance	MnDOT Target	2022 Target
% of reliable person-miles traveled on the Interstate	69.5%	>80%	>70%
% of reliable person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS	79.6%	>90%	>80%
Truck travel time reliability index	2.32	<1.5	<2.20

Table 4: Existing Conditions and Adopted CMAQ Targets

Measure	Existing Performance	Adopted Target
On-road mobile source emissions – sum of emissions reductions of pollutants, in kilograms per day, for all projects funded with CMAQ funds	2,648	2,647
% of non-single occupancy vehicles	23.9%	25%
Peak hour excessive delay – annual hours of delay per capita (delay is travel at less than 20 MPH or 60% of the posted speed)	8.5	8.5

Anticipated Effect of the System Reliability and Congestion Reduction Performance Measures
 In total, there is over \$130 million in CMAQ funding programmed for projects in the 2022-2025 TIP. The net benefit these projects are meant to help achieve, as shown in Table 5, is a reduction of approximately 2,647 kg/day of mobile source pollution. The CMAQ projects include the purchase of a number of transit vehicles; activities to market and incentive the use of carpools, vanpools, and ride matching programs; and projects aimed at retiming and optimizing traffic signal coordination.

The 2022-2025 TIP also includes projects that are anticipated to have a positive effect on mobility and system reliability. This includes a number of spot mobility enhancements as well as large set-asides for future mobility projects. Two examples include construction of a reduced conflict intersection in at US 212 and CSAH 51 in Carver County (010-596-013) and construction of a roundabout at CSAH 11 and Burnsville Parkway in Burnsville (019-611-013).

Transit Asset Management (TAM) Performance Targets

Transit asset management (TAM), a best practice and a requirement under federal law, is a business model that prioritizes funding decisions based on the condition of transit assets. Transit providers are required to assess, track, and report on their assets to FTA, and develop annual targets for asset management to ensure a state of good repair. Transit providers also develop transit asset management plans that document the implementation actions for asset management within their transit systems. TAM plans must be coordinated with the Council, which is the region’s MPO. The four FTA-required performance measures for transit asset management are:

- Rolling stock (buses and train used for serving customers): The percentage of revenue vehicles (by type) that exceed the useful life benchmark.
- Equipment (vehicles used in a support role): The percentage of non-revenue service vehicles (by type) that exceed the useful life benchmark.
- Facilities: The percentage of facilities (by group) that are rated less than 3.0 on the [Transit Economic Requirements Model \(TERM\) Scale](#).
- Infrastructure: The percentage of rail track segments (by mode) that have performance restrictions. Track segments are measured to the nearest one-hundredth of a mile.

The region’s transit operators established regional performance targets in 2018 and will use them through 2022. Table 6 summarizes the adopted targets:

Table 5: Adopted Transit Asset Management Targets

Measure	Target
Rolling Stock: % exceeding useful life	
Articulated Bus	8%
Over-the-Road Bus	0%
Bus	2.4%
Cutaway	14%
Light Rail Vehicle	0%
Commuter Rail Locomotive	0%
Commuter Rail Passenger Coach	0%
Equipment: % exceeding useful life	
Automobiles	42%
Trucks/other Rubber Tire Vehicles	38%
Facility: % rated below 3 on condition scale	
Passenger/Parking Facilities	0%
Administrative/Maintenance Facilities	0%
Infrastructure: % of track with performance restrictions	
Light Rail	1%

Transit Investment Priorities

The Council's Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) outlines the goals, objectives, and strategies that are used to set transit investment priorities for the region. These factors, in turn, directly guide the investment plan and transit projects programmed within the TIP. The TPP guides transit investments through the following objectives and strategies:

- Efficiently preserve and maintain the regional transit system in a state of good repair;
- Manage the regional transit network and respond to demand as deemed appropriate based on the Transit Market Area;
- Provide transit police services and coordinate with other public safety agencies to ensure the safety and security of the transit system;
- Promote alternatives to single occupant vehicles and ensure transit services reach major job and commercial activity centers;
- Expand and modernize transit service, facilities, systems, and technology to meet demand, improve customer experience, and increase transit access to destinations.

In 2019, over \$33 million in federal funds was spent on the purchase of replacement vehicles. The Region's commitment to vehicle replacement supports efforts to achieve the rolling stock target goals.

The Council's [Fleet Management Procedures](#) provide guidance for minimum vehicle life and inform the TAM performance targets established by the region's transit providers. This document outlines the conditions used to determine if the replacement of assets is necessary or can be deferred, including the point at which fleet vehicles are eligible for mid-life rehab procedures. The Fleet Management Procedures also set the principles used for determining the end vehicle's useful life, a preventative maintenance schedule, and the process for the purchase of new vehicles.

A key pool of funds used to replace aging assets is FTA Sections 5337 and 5339, which are prioritized via the Regional Transit Capital Improvement Program (CIP), developed by Metro Transit and the suburban transit providers.

Transit Safety Performance Measures Targets

Measures Overview

[In order to reflect the broad and varied nature of public transportation, the FTA has identified standard Safety Performance Measures that can be applied to all modes of public transportation and are based on data currently submitted to the National Transit Database.](#)

[As part of transit provider ASPs, the FTA requires transit providers to establish, by mode, safety performance targets in four Safety Performance Measure categories, shown in Table 7.](#)

Table 7: Safety Performance Categories and Measures

<u>Safety Performance Measure Category</u>	<u>Safety Performance Measure</u>
<u>Fatalities</u>	<u>Total number of reportable fatalities</u>
<u>Fatalities</u>	<u>Fatality rate per total vehicle revenue miles</u>
<u>Injuries</u>	<u>Total number of reportable injuries</u>
<u>Injuries</u>	<u>Injury rate per total vehicle revenue miles</u>
<u>Safety Events</u>	<u>Total number of reportable safety events</u>
<u>Safety Events</u>	<u>Rate of safety events per total vehicle revenue miles</u>
<u>System Reliability</u>	<u>Mean distance between major mechanical failures</u>

The FTA provides the following definitions for safety performance measures in the National Transit Database:

- **Reportable fatalities:** These are fatalities reported to the NTD (deaths confirmed within 30 days) excluding deaths in or on transit property that are a result of illness or other natural causes. These include deaths due to collision, derailment, fire, hazardous material spill, acts of God, system or personal security event, or other safety event.
- **Reportable injuries:** These include instances of damage or harm to persons that require immediate medical attention away from the scene because of a reportable transit safety event. Serious, injuries which are defined based on severity, are always reportable, even if a person was not immediately transported from the scene for medical attention. This excludes injuries from assaults and other crimes.
- **Reportable safety events:** These include incidents (including accidents and derailments) meeting NTD major reporting thresholds for transit rail, bus and paratransit. These events may occur on transit right-of-way or infrastructure, or at a transit revenue facility, maintenance facility, or rail yard. They may take place during a transit-related maintenance activity or otherwise involve a transit revenue vehicle. Examples of these events include:
 - Collisions
 - Fires
 - Derailments (mainline and yard), including non-revenue vehicles
 - Hazardous materials spills
 - Acts of God¹
- **Major mechanical failures:** The NTD defines major mechanical failures as “a failure of some mechanical element of the revenue vehicle that prevents the vehicle from completing a scheduled revenue trip or from starting the next scheduled revenue trip because actual

¹ FTA. *National Transit Database Safety and Security Policy Manual*. January 2020. Accessed March 29, 2021 at <https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/ntd/146986/2020-ntd-safety-and-security-policy-manual.pdf>, pg. 18.

movement is limited or because of safety concerns. Examples of major mechanical failures include breakdowns of brakes, doors, engine cooling systems, steering, axles and suspension.

Targets Overview

The Federal Transit Administration has requirements and provides some guidance for transit providers in setting their Safety Performance Targets (SPTs). Transit agencies are required to set SPTs by mode. Agencies are allowed to set targets for mode categories as broad as “fixed-route bus,” “non-fixed-route bus,” and “rail” when setting SPTs. Each of these mode categories corresponds to the variety of modes reported to the NTD.

Transit agencies are required to set targets for total number of incidents and rates of incidents. When establishing SPTs for total numbers of incidents, transit providers may consider the total number of incidents they expect to experience per year as they define it. They may choose calendar, fiscal or NTD reporting year. When defining rates for SPTs, agencies may base rates on per vehicle revenue mile, or any multiple thereof, such as per 100,000 or million vehicle revenue miles.

When establishing SPTs, transit providers may choose to set aspirational SPTs or targets that represent improvement over current safety performance levels, among other options. To the extent possible, the FTA recommends that transit providers set realistic SPTs that consider relevant safety goals and objectives. While transit providers may select SPTs that reflect an improvement in safety performance, they do not necessarily have to do so and could focus on maintaining current safety performance.

Transit providers are not required to report their SPTs to the FTA at this time, however, the FTA will ensure that transit agencies comply with the PTASP regulation by reviewing safety plans through the existing Triennial Reviews and State Management Reviews. The FTA has not established and does not impose penalties for transit providers that do not meet the SPTs they set.

MPO Responsibilities

The PTASP rule requires that transit provider make their SPTs available to states and MPOs. These providers must also coordinate with states and MPOs as the MPO sets the regional transit safety performance targets. MPOs must incorporate regional transit SPTs into their planning process and documents, as is required for targets for all federal performance areas. In general, the Metropolitan Council can consider how the projects and programs it selects to receive federal funding improve transit safety outcomes. The Metropolitan Council would also have to incorporate regional transit safety performance targets into the Transportation Policy Plan. The Metropolitan Council would also have to incorporate the regional TSPs into the Transportation Improvement Program and “to the maximum extent practicable, provide a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the metropolitan transportation plan”, with the intent of linking investment priorities to regional transit safety performance targets.

Regional Transit Agency Safety Targets

Metro Transit

Metro Transit monitor performance and sets federally required targets for rail and fixed-route bus service. The Strategic Initiatives department of Metro Transit works with data collected from many sources to identify significant risk factors and trends in accidents and injuries, leading to informed recommendations for accident reduction programs and more efficient use of limited resources.

Table 8 - Metro Transit Bus and Light Rail Safety Performance Targets

<u>Performance Target</u>	<u>Bus</u>	<u>Light Rail</u>
<u>Collisions</u>	<u>3.8 per 100k Vehicle Miles</u>	<u>0.6 per 100k Vehicle Miles</u>
<u>Annual Fatalities from Vehicle Operations</u>	<u>0 per 100k Vehicle Miles</u>	<u>0 per 100k Vehicle Miles</u>
<u>Annual Injuries from Vehicle Operations</u>	<u>175 per Calendar Year</u>	<u>145 per Calendar Year</u>
<u>System Reliability – Vehicle mean distance between failures (MDBF)</u>	<u>7,731 miles MDBF</u>	<u>25,000 miles MDBF</u>

Metropolitan Transportation Services Contracted Services

The Metropolitan Council's Metropolitan Transportation Services Contracted Services arrived at their transit safety performance targets in the development of their Agency Safety Plan. Safety performance targets are based on past performance of each mode that MTS Contracted Service operates.

Table9 - Metropolitan Transportation Services Fixed-Route, Demand Response, and Vanpool Safety Performance Targets

<u>Performance Target</u>	<u>Fixed-Route</u>	<u>Demand Response</u>	<u>Vanpool</u>
<u>Estimated Annual Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM) (2021)</u>	<u>3,400,000</u>	<u>26,000,000</u>	<u>895,000</u>
<u>Annual Fatalities</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Fatalities per 100k VRM</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Annual Injuries</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Injuries per 100k VRM</u>	<u>0.097</u>	<u>0.19</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Annual Safety Events</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Safety Events per 100k VRM</u>	<u>1.47</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Annual Major Mechanical Failures</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>450</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>System Reliability – Miles Between Major Mechanical Failures</u>	<u>26,154</u>	<u>57,777</u>	<u>0</u>

Minnesota Valley Transit Authority

MVTA's transit safety performance targets are based on the five-year average of performance metrics submitted to the National Transit Database. Performance metrics that formed the base line for the agency's performance metrics were gathered from annual reports submitted between 2015 and 2019.

Table 10 - Minnesota Valley Transit Authority Transit Safety Performance Targets

<u>Performance Target</u>	<u>Fixed-Route Bus</u>
<u>Fatalities (Total)</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Fatalities (per 100 thousand VRM)</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Injuries (total)</u>	<u>8.4</u>
<u>Injuries (per 100 thousand VRM)</u>	<u>0.236</u>
<u>Safety Events (total)</u>	<u>11.6</u>
<u>Safety Events (per 100 thousand VRM)</u>	<u>0.326</u>
<u>System Reliability (VRM/failures)</u>	<u>9.000</u>

Southwest Transit

Southwest Transit's transit safety performance targets are based on the five-year average of performance metrics submitted to the National Transit Database. Performance metrics that formed the base line for the agency's performance metrics were gathered from annual reports submitted between 2015 and 2019.

Table 11 - Southwest Transit Fixed-Route and Demand Response Safety Performance Targets

<u>Performance Target</u>	<u>Fixed-Route</u>	<u>Demand Response</u>
<u>Annual Fatalities</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Fatalities per 100k VRM</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Annual Injuries</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Injuries per 100k VRM</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Annual Safety Events</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Safety Events per 100k VRM</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>System Reliability (VRM / Failures)</u>	<u>25,000</u>	<u>53,000</u>

The Council supports the efforts to move towards a performance-based planning approach, and will continue to work closely with regional, state, and federal partners to proactively establish and monitor both the required federal and the regionally adopted performance measures over time. Moving forward, the Council will continue to devote substantial resources to this effort and work closely with stakeholders to assess the federal targets and the regional performance measures and adjust to changes in the performance of the system by shifting regional investment priorities.