

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Transportation Advisory Board held a 45-day public comment period on the draft 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), beginning on June 23 and ending on August 7, 2017. Below is a summary of the comments received during the public comment period with staff response.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (PAGE 4)

Summary of comment: FHWA asked several questions and requested several changes to be made to the text. These changes are summarized on page 4.

Staff response: The final TIP will reflect changes, as summarized in the table on page 4.

2. Metro Transit (PAGE 5)

Summary of comment: Metro Transit stated that Table 13 showed incorrect cost estimates, federal participation and target openings for the Southwest and Bottineau Corridors in Table 13.

Staff response: The final TIP will reflect the corrections provided by Metro Transit.

3. Resident Comments Related to US 169 Interchange at 101st Ave in Brooklyn Park (SP # 110-129-006) (PAGE 6)

Summary of comment: Commenters questioned the need for investing in an interchange in a relatively low-population area.

Staff response: The planned interchange was partially funded by the region's Transportation Advisory Board through its Regional Solicitation. This selection process helps implement the regional goals as articulated in the Transportation Policy Plan. The project provides access to a rapidly developing area that was recently agricultural land (primarily east of Highway 169 between Highway 610 and 109th Avenue). The City of Brooklyn Park is leading this project in order to prepare for additional growth, including a station for the Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension. This interchange will be an important part of the transportation system that brings people and goods into and out of the area as development occurs.

4. Resident Comments Related to Dakota County CSAH 38 (McAndrews Rd) 2-Lane-to-3-Lane Conversion from CSAH 31 (Pilot Knob Rd) in Apple Valley to MN 3 (S. Robert Trail) in Rosemount (SP # 019-638-017) (PAGE 8)

Summary of comments: Commenters questioned the need for this project. Some pointed to a nearby roadway project (County Road 32) in Dakota County as a more needed project.

Staff response: Staff informed the commenters that Dakota County applied through the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), a competitive federal funding source that rates projects on their ability to reduce crashes and that the Council has forwarded the comments to Dakota County so that they have record of the input.

5. Metropolitan Council Grants Manager Comment on Transit Project Costs (PAGE 13)

Summary of comment: Costs of transit projects funded in the 2016 Regional Solicitation should not have been inflated beyond the original cost estimate in the applications.

Staff response: Costs will be changed for the final TIP. Under "Estimating Project Costs," language related to FTA-administered projects in the bottom bullet will be changed.

6. MnDOT Central Office Planning Program (PAGE 14)

Summary of comment: Requested language changes related to a disclaimer, inconsistency in references to Wisconsin, clarification that Wright County is in the maintenance area

Staff response: Changes will be made.

7. MnDOT – Office of Traffic, Safety & Technology (ITS Division) (PAGE 15)

Summary of comment: Requested language be added to acknowledge the role of the Minnesota Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture.

Staff response: Text will be added to acknowledge the role of the Minnesota Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture.

8. Wisconsin DOT (PAGE 16)

Summary of comment: Wisconsin DOT requested a small change to its project funding amounts.

Staff response: Funding amounts will be changed.

9. Resident comment on the Minnesota Valley State Trail (PAGE 17)

Summary of comment: Ten residents commented on this project. Nine of the ten commented against the project, while one was in favor. One commenter against the project discussed general support for the TIP.

Staff response: The project was partially funded by the region's Transportation Advisory Board through its Regional Solicitation. This selection process helps implement the regional goals as articulated in the Transportation Policy Plan. The project provides paved access to an existing trail corridor while maintaining the unpaved portion. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources is leading this project.

10. Minnesota Department of Transportation (Metro District) (PAGE 35)

Summary of comment: MnDOT Metro District requested a number of changes to be made to state and local projects listed in the draft TIP. This reflects end-of-year changes impacting a number of projects. Attached to the letter are several tables listing projects to be deferred, deleted, advanced, or added.

Staff response: The final TIP will reflect these changes.

1. FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

(Location) Comment	Reply
<p>(Summary, Page 1) Will any of the strategies identified in the updated PPP be applied to this iteration of the TIP, expanding outreach beyond the TAB meeting/email lists?</p> <p>(Appendix B, Page 1) What is the process for addressing public comments on the TIP? Is that detailed in the updated PPP?</p>	<p>The updated PPP was not complete until after the conclusion of the public comment period. Outreach occurred beyond the TAB contact list, which includes over 5,000 officials and members of the public that have signed up for updates. Comments are shared with the TAB before it considers approval of the TIP.</p>
<p>(Regional Planning Process, Page 4) Regarding reference to the 2008 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between MnDOT and the Council: “Will the updated MOU be completed in time to be referenced here? If not, it may be worth noting an update is in progress.”</p>	<p>The updated MOU will not be completed in time. Reference to the ongoing update has been added.</p>
<p>(Development and Content of the Transportation Improvement Program, Page 5) Is there a link to the Transportation Air Quality Control Plan?</p>	<p>Removed reference to this plan. It is an older plan and redundant with Appendix B.</p>
<p>(Development and Content of the Transportation Improvement Program, Page 5) Remove comma from “Any inflation rate, effectively increases...”</p>	<p>Changed.</p>
<p>(Estimating Project Costs, Page 9) “Projects beyond the first program year of the TIP will most likely be subjected to inflation.” “Subjected” should be “subject.”</p>	<p>Changed.</p>
<p>(Conformity to the Clean Air Act Requirements, Page 13) A short description of what “limited maintenance” means in relation to a normal maintenance area would be beneficial here.</p>	<p>Brief description (with FHWA web link) added as a footnote.</p>
<p>(Conformity to the Clean Air Act Requirements, Page 13) Defining “hotspot” for the reading public would be beneficial.</p>	<p>CFR Definition added as a footnote</p>
<p>(Processes to Allocate Federal and State Transportation Funds, Page 20) Typo: “New Stars” should be “New Starts.”</p>	<p>Changed</p>
<p>(Resources Available 2018–2021, Page 21) I would add greater clarity that a portion of these funds are discretionary, and should therefore not be assumed 100%. If you’re including the 5309 funds, explain the reasoning – perhaps it’s based on the Met Council’s historic ability to be awarded these funds. However, given the current uncertainty of federal continuation of those discretionary programs, I’d include some sort of disclaimer (in the very least). Separating Table 7 into “Available” and “Requested” would provide even greater clarity on the potential funding future.</p>	<p>This distinction has been made.</p>
<p>(Table 7, Page 24) In the very least, this table needs to label which funding sources are “available” and which are “requested/discretionary”. This table creates an impression that the federal money is assumed.</p>	<p>This distinction has been made.</p>
<p>(Balance of Selected Projects with Available Financial Resources, Page 28) Regarding: “For federal, state, and regional transit funding, federal guidance only requires transit funds match the approved project costs in the TIP’s first year,” this is incorrect. Per 23 CFR 450.326(k), in maintenance areas such as the Twin Cities, projects that are included in the first two years of the TIP shall be limited to funds that are available or committed. Addressing this was also a recommendation in the TMA Certification Review, which the Met Council resolved in February. The Met Council needs to ensure this TIP does not have that same issue again or approval may be delayed.</p>	<p>Sentence corrected.</p>
<p>(Table 12, Page 37) I think the Page 37 reflects what is intended in next STIP update or addendum, if you look at total project cost and southern terminus. Not sure what the table on Page 37 is intending – it seems to be more dollars than what is in current STIP, and is missing southern end. Please make sure the Table 37 information is up to date for its intended purpose.”</p>	<p>Checked with MnDOT, who changed project from design-bid-build to design-build. Southern terminus changed to Cliff Road. Total Cost changed to \$152,675,000.</p>

2. METRO TRANSIT

Please correct the information in Table 13

	Cost estimate	Federal participation	
SWLRT	\$1,858,000,000	\$928,800,000	Engineering, Open 2021
BLRT	\$1,536,000,000	\$752,700,000	Engineering, Open 2022

Table 1: Status of Major Transit Capital Projects

Project Title	Cost Estimate	Federal Participation	Project Status
Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit (METRO Green Line Extension)	\$1,790,000,000	\$895,000,000	Engineering; Target Opening in 2020
Bottineau Corridor Light Rail Transit (METRO Blue Line Extension)	\$1,496,000,000	\$733,000,000	Engineering; Target Opening in 2021
METRO Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit	\$150,700,000	\$82,880,000	Design and Engineering; Target Opening in 2020/2021
C Line (Penn Avenue) Arterial BRT	\$36,000,000	TBD	Design and Engineering; Target Opening in 2019
D Line (Chicago-Fremont) Arterial BRT	\$77,000,000	TBD	Planning; Target Opening in 2020/2021
METRO Gold Line BRT	\$420,000,000	\$189,000,000	Entering Project Development est. 2017, Construction 2021-2024, Target Opening 2024

This may affect other pages such as B-6 – SWLRT may need to be moved from 2020 horizon year...

Let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks!

Robin Caufman
 Assistant Director | Administration, Communication & Outreach
robin.caufman@metrotransit.org
 P. 651.602.1457

STAFF REPLY: Staff made these changes and moved the Southwest LRT extension from Horizon Year 2020 to Horizon Year 2030 in Appendix B. This led to the adjustment of several projects from air quality code A20 to A30. These projects are:

- 110-129-006
- 103-010-018
- 160-010-004
- 070-683-014
- 002-608-012
- TRF-TCMT-21P
- TRF-TCMT-21N
- TRF-TCMT-21L
- 6284-180AC2

3. RESIDENT COMMENTS RELATED TO US 169 INTERCHANGE AT 101ST AVE N IN BROOKLYN PARK (SP # 110-129-006)

First Comment

Project #110-129-006 (interchange at US Highway 169 and 101st) Cost: approximately \$27K

This area has a very low density of people and businesses (the only business I know of in the area is a church) so I question the necessity of building an interchange at the tune of almost \$27K. Unless there is a plan for future expansion for the area around highway 169 and 101st I feel this money could be better spent on other, more important, infrastructure.

Thank you for taking my comment under advisement.

--

Carol Peterson
Champlin resident

Second Comment

I do not believe nor want any changes made to the intersection of 101st and Highway 169. This is a ridiculous amount to spend on something that is absolutely not needed. There are plenty of access and crossings available within a short distance. Slowing down traffic in this area is the last thing residents and commuters need. Please do not continue with this portion of your future plans. Thank you.

John

John Magnus
11305 Preserve Ln N
Champlin, MN 55316
jemag@comcast.net

STAFF REPLY: The planned interchange was partially funded by the region's Transportation Advisory Board through its Regional Solicitation. This selection process helps implement the regional goals as articulated in the Transportation Policy Plan. The project provides access to a rapidly developing area that was recently agricultural land (primarily east of Highway 169 between Highway 610 and 109th Avenue). The City of Brooklyn Park is leading this project in order to prepare for additional growth, including a station for the Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension. This interchange will be an important part of the transportation system that brings people and goods into and out of the area as development occurs.

**TABLE A-3
STPBG-Surface Transportation Program (STP) Projects**

Yr	PRT	Route	Proj Num	Prog	Description	Project Total	FHWA \$	AC \$	State \$	Other \$	Agency:	AQ:
2021	MN 999		880M-ADA-21	SC	DISTRICTWIDE SETASIDE FOR CO ADA PROJECT - FY 2021	3,369,000	2,695,200	0	673,800	0	MNDOT	NC
2021	MN 999		880M-BI-21N	BI	DISTRICTWIDE SETASIDE FOR BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS ON NON-NHS - FY 2021	2,365,000	1,892,000	0	473,000	0	MNDOT	S19
2021	MN 999		880M-BP-21	SC	DISTRICTWIDE SETASIDE FOR BIKE/PED PROJECT - FY 2021	1,106,000	884,800	0	221,200	0	MNDOT	NC
2021	MN 999		880M-IM-21	TM	DISTRICTWIDE SETASIDE-INCIDENT MANAGEMENT PROJECTS - FY 2021	500,000	400,000	0	100,000	0	MNDOT	NC
2021	MN 999		880M-PM-21	PM	DISTRICTWIDE SETASIDE FOR PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROJECTS - FY 2021	5,000,000	4,000,000	0	1,000,000	0	MNDOT	NC
2021	MN 999		880M-TE-21	SC	DISTRICTWIDE SETASIDE FOR TRAFFIC ENGINEERING (\$2.36M), ROADSIDE SAFETY(\$250K), TMS(\$500K) & WRE (\$0) - FY 2021	3,110,000	2,488,000	0	622,000	0	MNDOT	NC
2021	MN 999		880M-TR-21	TM	DISTRICTWIDE SETASIDE FOR TEAM TRANSIT PROJECTS - FY 2021	500,000	400,000	0	100,000	0	MNDOT	NC
2021	MSAS 153		142-153-007AC	RC	**AC**MSAS 153, RIDGEDALE DR FROM 0.2 MI E OF ESSEX RD TO 0.1 MI S OF RIDGEHAVEN LN AND RIDGEHAVEN LN FROM RIDGEDALE DR TO CSAH 61 IN MINNETONKA - RECONSTRUCT RAMPS AT RIDGEHAVEN LN TO FULL ACCESS, TURN LANES, RECONSTRUCT RIDGEDALE DR UNDERPASS, LIGHTING, TRAFFIC SIGNAL, SIDEWALKS (AC PAYBACK 1 OF 1)	4,504,000	4,504,000	0	0	0	MINNETONKA	E1
2021	MSAS 158		164-158-025	BR	MSAS 158, FROM E 7TH ST TO MARKET ST IN ST PAUL - RECONSTRUCT BRIDGE, WALLS, AND APPROACH ROADWAYS	19,393,000	7,000,000	0	0	12,393,000	SAINT PAUL	S19
2021	US 10		103-010-018	MC	US 10 FROM CUTTERS LN TO WEST MAIN ST IN ANOKA-REMOVE SIGNALS, EXTEND WEST MAIN STREET TO CUTTERS GROVE, LENGTHEN RAMPS, AND CONSTRUCT FAIROAK UNDERPASS UNDER US 10	31,400,000	7,000,000	0	0	24,400,000	ANOKA	A30
2021	US 10		7102-135	RC	US 10, FROM XENIA AVE ST TO NORFOLK AVE IN ELK RIVER (EBL & WBL), RECONSTRUCTION	350,000	280,000	0	70,000	0	MNDOT	AQ2
2021	US 169		110-129-006	MC	101ST AVE N AT US 169 IN BROOKLYN PARK- CONSTRUCT INTERCHANGE	26,896,914	7,000,000	0	0	19,896,914	BROOKLYN PARK	A30

4. RESIDENT COMMENTS RELATED TO DAKOTA COUNTY CSAH 38 (McAndrews Rd) 2-LANE-TO-3-LANE CONVERSION FROM CSAH 31 (PILOT KNOB RD) IN APPLE VALLEY TO MN 3 (S. ROBERT TRAIL) IN ROSEMOUNT (SP # 019-638-017)

First Comment

As a Dakota County resident and taxpayer, I am opposed to funding for project #019-638-017 in the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. This project is not supported by the community. There are higher priorities for those funds, including improvements along County Rd. 32, and especially where it intersects with Dodd Road, which is a project that has community support.

I live off of Cliff and Dodd Road and have to cross this intersection multiple times daily. I understand the traffic studies do not support the need for change at this intersection. I would challenge those of you making these decisions to try crossing this intersection at morning and evening rush hour for one week. Better yet if you have any teenage drivers why don't you let them try this. You may have a very different opinion if you try this. It is even more challenging to cross during rush hour at the times of year when sunrise and sunset affect visibility at rush hour.

The issue is complicated by people not knowing the laws of the road, people being to afraid to cross the intersection because they are not sure if the person on the opposite side of the road is going by courtesy of "I was there first" or the person going straight has the right of way. When sitting at the intersection it is not uncommon to have someone pull up in the adjacent lane further blocking your view. To make matters worse the speed limit is 50 MPH and not uncommon for people to be going 60 MPH.

As you are aware Dakota County and Eagan boast about their great parks and bike trails. We appreciate these amenities but our kids are not able to access these as much as we would like. The county has put quite a bit of money into making Lebanon Hills more accessible. For our kids to access this park in a reasonable manner they would need to use Cliff Road. There is not a safe bike lane on Cliff to get to Lebanon Hills. There is one small park geared for younger kids South of Cliff and East of Hwy 3. It is not safe for us to allow our kids to cross Cliff to use the bike trails and to get to other parks.

I also frequently travel County Road 38/ McAndrews and can not believe the County would choose to put money into expanding this road. It is not nearly as dangerous as Cliff Road. The traffic does not compare to Cliff Road.

I hope that the County will reconsider this planned project and realize how Cliff Road is in serious need of change.

Michelle Devereaux
676 McFaddens Trail
Eagan, MN
651-403-9241

Second Comment
Metropolitan Council
390 Robert St. N.
St. Paul, MN 55101

Ben Van Gundy
12525 Dorchester Trail
Apple Valley, MN 55124

To the Metropolitan Council:

I would like to voice my opinion against funding the McAndrews road expansion in Dakota County (project #019-638-017). I believe this project is totally unnecessary and waste of taxpayer dollars. It doesn't appear that this project has much community support. I have lived nearly adjacent to McAndrews for 12 years and just don't see the need to this project.

Sincerely,

Ben Van Gundy

CC: Dakota County Commissioners

Third Comment (Transcribed from voicemail)

Hello. This is Charlene Delany at 12572 Danbury Way; the crossroad of McAndrews, County Road 38, in Rosemount, Minnesota. I'm concerned/distressed regarding the funding for project 019-638-017 in the 2018-2020, I believe, Transportation Improvement Program. I and my fellow neighbors do not support this expansion project.

We believe there are higher priorities for funding including the County Road 32 or Cliff Road projects and feel that there are alternatives for the County Road 38 project, including, for example a study of, and reduced speed limits on the road, enforcement of the speed limits and some minor considerations not requiring the access of properties and destruction of the character of our neighborhood.

If possible, I'd like to speak to Steve Chavez regarding this.

And you may contact me on my land line 651-423-5020 or my mobile phone 651-283-7362.

Thanks.

Fourth Comment

As a Dakota County resident and taxpayer, we are opposed to funding for project #019-638-017 in the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. This road expansion is not supported by the community. There are higher priorities for those funds, including improvements along County Road 32, and especially where it intersects with Dodd Road, which is a project that has community support.

If the project proceeds as planned, we will lose the sound barrier that we have been working so hard to create. We would lose 12 spruce trees (some that are 20+ feet in height) that we planted in 2008 for the purpose of privacy/noise barrier. With the proposed plan, a guard rail will be installed and we will

lose our ability to access a large percentage of our property, which is located on the north side of the pond. This will decrease our property value.

Changing this 2-mile stretch of road into a mini highway, will only promote more speeding, cause more accidents, and lower owners property value. It would be better to lower the speed limit from 55 mph on McAndrews Rd, between Pilot Knob and Hwy 3 (Robert Trail) to 45-50, like the current speed limit is on McAndrews Rd on the west side of Pilot Knob. This would provide a safer road for everyone (traffic and pedestrians), as well as help with noise reduction.

Please feel free to contact us, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

John & Brenda Clemen
612-272-2348
12823 Dover Ct
Apple Valley, MN 55124

Fifth Comment

Dear Met Council,

As a Dakota County resident and taxpayer, I am opposed to funding for project #019-638-017 in the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. This road expansion project is NOT supported by the community. There are higher priorities for those funds, including improvements along County Rd. 32, and especially where it intersects with Dodd Road, which is a project that has community support.

The current expansion project would also widen McAndrews/ County Road 38 into my property and the decades-old trees that serve as a buffer between my home and the street. This would drastically harm the monetary and personal value of my property. I am against expanding the width of this road for safety reasons as well. People already tend to drive way over the posted 55 mile per hour speed limit. I believe expanding this road will cause further speed increases. This road is a residential road! We have pedestrians and bikers using the shoulder. I am extremely against this expansion proposal. McAndrews is not meant to be a mini highway. It is our neighborhood.

Regards,

Rebecca Olson

Sixth Comment

Dear Met Council,

As a Dakota County resident and taxpayer, I am opposed to funding for project #019-638-017 in the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. This road expansion project is not supported by the community. There are higher priorities for those funds, including improvements along County Rd. 32, and especially where it intersects with Dodd Road, which is a project that has community support.

The current expansion project would also widen McAndrews/ County Road 38 into my property and the decades-old trees that serve as a buffer between my home and the street. This would drastically harm the monetary and personal value of my property.

To my knowledge, no accidents have occurred on the stretch of County Road 38 near of my home during the 14 years I have lived here. Therefore, I believe expanding this road should be of low priority and attention should instead be given to roads where more serious accidents have occurred.

Regards,

Rachel Olson

Seventh Comment

Greetings! I live on the corner of McAndrews Road and Danbury Way at 12501 Danbury Way. My name is Les Kasten and I am the property owner. I am aware of the upcoming project and I have serious concerns on four issues.

#1: With the amount of new homes, 14 on the corner and 90 coming in the subdivision, you have serious traffic problems ahead. That's 208 cars coming and going daily..plus school buses, garbage trucks...everything. All this traffic dumping on to McAndrews is a serious problem not addressed in your plans. I recommend a traffic circle at Dodd and McAndrews NOW. People will be killed otherwise.

#2: With no traffic control from Highway 3 to Pilot Knob Road, people speed well in excess of the posted 55 mph. I have trouble pulling out onto McAndrews almost all the time. The hills on McAndrews need to be somewhat leveled out and the speed limit reduced to 45 mph, as it is in Apple Valley once you cross Pilot Knob Road. Try pulling out on to McAndrews from any side street. It's dangerous at best. Apple Valley and Rosemount Police never enforce the speed limits here.

#3: There is no traffic control at the intersection of McAndrews and Shannon Parkway. In 15 years, I have almost been hit 100's of times. Same with my family. We avoid this intersection almost always and we shouldn't have to. Here is another intersection that needs a traffic circle to slow traffic and manage the flow.

#4: Turn lanes are not the solution on McAndrews except onto Dodd Road. Yes it would be easier to turn onto Danbury Way from McAndrews however the main problem remains speeding cars and no traffic control. We have the area for turning right onto Danbury Way however the county has never striped the existing shoulders on McAndrews. NOBODY ever parks on McAndrews unless they are broken down. Right hand by-pass lanes can be made using the existing roadway at all left hand turns and then stripe left hand turn lanes. Turn lanes, although a good idea, would mostly be wasted because of the limited amount of streets and houses served. Right hand turn lanes with correct road stripes would help with little money spent. The problems with McAndrews are stated above. We need reduced speed limits, speed enforcement, leveling of hills cause blind spots and two traffic circles.

Thank you letting me comment on the project. I missed the meeting as I was in the hospital.

Les Kasten
12501 Danbury Way
Rosemount, MN 55068
651-280-9681

STAFF REPLY: The CSAH 38 two-lane-to-three lane conversion was funded through the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), a competitive federal funding source that rates projects on their ability to reduce crashes. Dakota County applied for this project and was fortunate to be selected for funding. The County also applied for a project that would add turn lanes and rumble strips to County Road 32 (Cliff Road) from County Road 43 (Lexington Avenue South) to Minnesota Highway 3 (South Robert Trail). This project did not score well enough to be funded based upon the scoring criteria established for HSIP. The Council has forwarded these comments to Dakota County to provide a record of this input.

Twin Cities Metropolitan Area
2018 - 2021 Transportation Improvement Program

TABLE A-7
Highway Safety Improvement Projects

Yr	PRT	Route	Proj Num	Prog	Description	Project Total	FHWA \$	AC \$	State \$	Other \$	Agency:	AQ:
2018		CSAH 27	070-627-029AC	SH	**AC**CSAH 27 AT CSAH 68 IN CREDIT RIVER TWP- CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUT (AC PAYBACK 1 OF 1)	954,000	954,000	0	0	0	SCOTT COUNTY	E1
2018		CSAH 38	019-638-017	SH	CSAH 38 FROM CSAH 31 IN APPLE VALLEY TO MN 3 IN ROSEMOUNT - CONVERT 2-LANE TO 3-LANE ROAD	2,200,000	1,144,800	0	0	1,055,200	DAKOTA COUNTY	E1
2018		CSAH 48	070-646-008	SH	CSAH 48 AT CSAH 88 IN NEW MARKET TWP- CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUT (ASSOCIATED TO 066-646-009 IN RICE COUNTY/DISTRICT 6)	622,305	300,075	0	0	62,230	SCOTT COUNTY	E1
2018		CSAH 78	002-678-021	SH	CSAH 78 FROM CSAH 1 TO CSAH 14 IN COON RAPIDS - SIGNAL INTERCONNECT (16 SIGNALS)	424,000	381,600	0	0	42,400	ANOKA COUNTY	S7
2018		I 494	2785-423	SH	I494 FROM E BUSH LAKE RD TO W BUSH LAKE RD IN BLOOMINGTON - REPLACE CABLE MEDIAN BARRIER	355,000	319,500	0	35,500	0	MNDOT	S9
2018		LOCAL	141-030-036	SH	6TH ST S, FROM 1ST AVE TO PORTLAND AVE- INSTALL MAST ARMS AT 5 EXISTING SIGNALS (1ST AVE, HENNEPIN AVE, 3RD AVE, 5TH AVE, PORTLAND	1,166,000	1,049,400	0	0	116,600	MINNEAPOLIS	S7
2018		LOCAL	141-030-038	SH	8TH ST AND 11TH AVES, 8TH ST AT 9TH AVE; 8TH ST AT 11TH AVE; 11TH AVE AT 14TH ST IN MPLS - INSTALL MAST ARMS AT 3 EXISTING SIGNALS	1,166,000	1,049,400	0	0	116,600	MINNEAPOLIS	S7
2018		LOCAL	141-030-040	SH	ON COMO AVE FROM 12TH AVETO 15TH AVE AND ON 7TH ST FROM CAREW DRIVE TO 13TH AVE IN MPLS - INSTALL PEDESTRIAN CURB EXTENSIONS (8 INTERSECTIONS)	879,800	791,820	0	0	87,980	MINNEAPOLIS	AQ2
2018		LOCAL	164-141-011	SH	GRAND AVE FROM HAMLINE TO VICTORIA IN ST. PAUL - PEDESTRIAN/BIKE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	742,000	667,800	0	0	74,200	SAINT PAUL	AQ2
2018		LOCAL 99	071-070-038	SH	COUNTYWIDE, RAILROAD CROSSING PAVEMENT MESSAGE ENHANCEMENTS AT SHERBURNE COUNTY ROADS	113,350	102,015	0	0	0	SHERBURNE COUNTY	S1
2018		LOCAL 99	141-030-039	SH	CITY STREETS IN MPLS - INSTALL GREEN THERMOPLASTIC BIKE LANES AND WHITE DASHED POLY-PREFORM AT INTERSECTION APPROACHES	190,800	171,720	0	0	19,080	MINNEAPOLIS	AQ2
2018		MN 36	6212-179	SH	MN36, FROM NB I35E TO EB MN36 RAMP IN LITTLE CANADA - REALIGN RAMP USING CONCRETE PAVEMENT, TMS, LIGHTING	735,000	661,500	0	73,500	0	MNDOT	E3

5. METRO COUNCIL GRANTS MANAGER COMMENT ON TRANSIT PROJECT COSTS

To Whom It May Concern,

Per Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) rules and procedures, proportions of FTA to Other funding must be consistent with the proportions in the Regional Solicitation application cost estimates and subsequent awards. The same proportions must also be shown in the TIP as the basis for a future FTA award application in the Transit Award Management System (TrAMS).

Because of this, I request, on behalf of the transit provider recipients, that the 2016 Regional Solicitation transit projects reflect the associated application cost estimates, thereby reducing the total and local costs shown in the draft 2018-2021 TIP. These projects are:

- TRS-TCMT-18E (\$8,750,000 Total; \$1,750,000 Other)
- TRS-TCMT-18F (\$7,676,950 Total; \$1,535,390 Other)
- TRS-TCMT-18G (\$250,000 Total; \$50,000 Other)
- TRS-TCMT-19D (\$8,750,000 Total; \$1,750,000 Other)
- TRS-TCMT-20A (\$8,750,000 Total; \$1,750,000 Other)
- TRS-TCMT-20B (\$7,004,381 Total; \$1,400,876 Other)
- TRS-TCMT-20C (\$84,000,000 Total; \$77,000,000 Other)
- TRS-TCMT-21A (\$8,750,000 Total; \$1,750,000 Other)
- TRS-TCMT-21B (\$7,653,055 Total; \$1,530,611 Other)

Regional solicitation applications contain estimated costs for the project. If those estimated costs decrease, a scope change will be sought from the Regional Solicitation awarding body and excess funding will be returned to the regional solicitation funding pool. If those estimated costs increase, particularly due to inflation, the Regional Solicitation project budget will be supplemented by other sources of funding. These include, but are not limited to, other federal/FTA formula funding or additional local non-federal match. In every case, the project scope will be completed as indicated in the Regional Solicitation application/award. The Regional Solicitation awards projects are also included in the Metropolitan Council Transit CIP which shows planned funding for the current year and five additional years. Therefore, this document contains the entire estimated cost of all projects and includes inflation.

Respectfully,

Mary A. Gustafson
Mary A. Gustafson
Grants Manager
Metropolitan Council - Metro Transit

Heywood Office
560 Sixth Avenue North
Minneapolis, MN 55411-4398
Telephone: 612-349-7603

STAFF REPLY: Changes are reflected in the final TIP.

6. MnDOT CENTRAL OFFICE PLANNING PROGRAM

(Follow up to FHWA comments)

A few additional points on the 2018-2021 draft TIP:

- Add the disclaimer language identified in section 15.3 of the CPG contract: “The preparation of this report has been funded in part by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. The contents of this document reflect the views of the author who are responsible for the facts or accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views of the U.S. Department of Transportation. The report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation.”
- Consistency in referencing Wisconsin. Some sections state St. Croix County, others state Houlton.
 - Pg 1, first paragraph
 - Pg 2, first paragraph
 - Pg 5, second bullet
- Pg 14 – last sentence of the “Projects Included in TIP Conformity Analysis” section: Clarify that Wright County is also a maintenance area (not a nonattainment area). Earlier paragraphs/sentences discuss the area as a maintenance area, but the last sentence then states nonattainment. Per EPA website, it is maintenance.

Bobbi

Bobbi Retzlaff, AICP

Planning Program Coordinator

Minnesota Department of Transportation

651.366.3793

STAFF REPLY: Disclaimer will be added under the table of contents. Wisconsin references will be changed to Houlton, to reflect historic usage. Wright County reference will be changed to reflect it as a maintenance area.

7. MnDOT – OFFICE OF TRAFFIC, SAFETY & TECHNOLOGY (ITS DIVISION)

Hi,

Please consider my comments/key points for inclusion into Met Council's TIP in regards to the Minnesota Statewide Regional ITS Architecture. [https://metro council.org/Transportation/Publications-And-Resources/Transportation-Planning/Transportation-Improvement-Program-\(TIP\)/CURRENT-TIP/2018-Draft-TIP/2018-Draft-TIP.aspx](https://metro council.org/Transportation/Publications-And-Resources/Transportation-Planning/Transportation-Improvement-Program-(TIP)/CURRENT-TIP/2018-Draft-TIP/2018-Draft-TIP.aspx)

1. Describe the MN Statewide Regional ITS Architecture and 23 CFR 450.306 Scope of Metropolitan Transportation Process into the TIP.
 - Subsection a.
(6) Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
 - Subsection f.
The metropolitan transportation planning process shall (to the maximum extent practicable) be consistent with the development of applicable regional intelligent transportation systems (ITS) architectures, as defined in 23 CFR part 940.
2. The Final Rule also strengthens expectations for including management and operations strategies in the transportation planning process. The Rule states that metropolitan transportation plans shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions, including operational and management strategies that improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods.
3. The Minnesota Statewide Regional ITS Architecture has been adopted by all MPOs in Minnesota
 - Provides MPO with a useful planning tool for managing ITS funding decisions (Volume 9)
 - Improves continuity across the project life cycle, from planning through project development and operations.
 - Meets the intent of 23 CFR 940.9.b
 - Any region that is currently implementing ITS projects shall have a regional architecture.
 - Formal adoption adds credibility to the Regional ITS Architecture
 - By establishing the process, tools, and support for architecture use and maintenance in these plans, the MPO can ensure financial support for these critical activities.

If you have any questions, please contact Jim McCarthy or myself.

Thanks,
Rashmi

Rashmi S. Brewer, P.E.
MnDOT - Office of Traffic, Safety & Technology, ITS
Mail Stop 725, RTMC
1500 West County Road B2
Roseville, MN 55113
Office: (651) 234-7063
Rashmi.Brewer@state.mn.us

STAFF REPLY: Language will be added.

8. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

There was a slight change in the funding. Please see my edits in red in the excel spreadsheet.

2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)										
TIP Number	Project Number	Project Elements	Project Sponsor	Project Description (street name, termini, type of work, length in miles, and funding program)	Phase	Source & Cost Share in millions				
						2018	Total	State	Local*	Total
013-14-001	8110-02	73	WisDOT	St. Croix River Crossing - to 150th Ave in Town of St. Joseph Loop Trail Bridge Replacement - BR 4.89 Mi	Engineering	0	-	0	0	0
					Right-of-Way	0	-	0	0	0
					Construction	4,751	4,751	3,444	1,307	4,751
					TOTAL	4,751	4,751	3,444	1,307	4,751

*Local cost is provided by MnDOT.

3,567 1,354 4,921

STAFF REPLY: The changes will be reflected where requested along with the 2018 and Total columns.

9. RESIDENT COMMENT ON THE MINNESOTA VALLEY STATE TRAIL

See following pages for comment letter from Keith Carlson

STAFF REPLY: The project was partially funded by the region's Transportation Advisory Board through its Regional Solicitation. This selection process helps implement the regional goals as articulated in the Transportation Policy Plan. The project provides paved access to an existing trail corridor while maintaining the unpaved portion. The corridor is part of the Council's Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) as a Tier 2 Bicycle Corridor and will include both natural surface and a paved trail. The environmental review process will take place in the fall and next spring, so the public will continue to have the opportunity to review the project.

August 3, 2017

Keith Carlson
3088 Sandy Hook Dr.
Roseville, MN 55113

Members of the Metropolitan Council Transportation Advisory Board

Dear Sir or Madame:

I am writing to express my concern about the inclusion in the TIP of project number 092-090-060, DNR's \$1,880,000 request for MN Valley State Trail from Crest Ave and Bloomington Ferry Rd to 3815 American Blvd E in Bloomington-Construct Bicycle Trail. I am writing as an occasional user of the area proposed for the paved trail and as a concerned taxpayer.

The proposed trail right of way is already used by an extensive user community of bikers, backcountry cross country skiers, walkers, birders and trail runners. A 65 year old user myself, I can attest to the fact that many of the other users I run into on the existing, natural-surface trail are also senior citizens. The DNR proposal to co-locate a paved trail with the existing natural trail or treadway is simply not possible without:

- harming the unique environment that exists there right now, and
- diminishing its utility and appeal to current users

In addition, it will do little to enhance transportation options for bike commuters because of the unique character of the floodplain in which it is proposed to be located. Its costs are certain to be extraordinary, far higher than the sum the DNR has represented, particularly when measured against actual benefit derived from a paved trail in this location.

The proposed trail is located in a floodplain. As the name suggests, the area is subject to frequent flooding - nine times between 2004 and 2014.



Flora consists of trees and other vegetation, which can tolerate flooding, and backwater marshes.

The portion of the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge proposed for the trail is very narrow corridor between the north bank of the Minnesota River and the backwater marshes.



Shoe horning the proposed 14-foot right of way into this corridor while supposedly preserving the existing natural treadway or trail that already exists is simply not possible. It will require completely removing all the existing trees along many portions of the proposed right of way. This is simply incompatible with the dedication of the refuge to preserving the natural environment.

The marshes are protected wetlands under state and federal law. Any impacts of the trail on those wetlands will have to be mitigated.



To the extent any of the marshes are destroyed to facilitate building of the trail they will have to be replaced at a 2 for 1 ratio at a cost of \$40,000 per acre or more if buying wetland credits from existing wetlands banks is the chosen route of mitigation. The extent of protected wetlands along the proposed right of way and the cost of mitigating any impact has yet to be determined.

Obviously during flood events the trail would be impassable, negating its proposed role as a transportation corridor.



Not only will the floods make the trail inaccessible during such events but it will also require frequent repairs and clearing of silt and debris. Right now that duty for the existing natural treadway or trail falls to the members of the MN Off Road Cyclist, who perform this duty for free. Such will not be the case if a paved trail is located there. Simply just removing post-flood silt has proven challenging for the DNR in the past on the one other paved trail in the lower Minnesota River Valley at Shakopee. After the last flood event there,

the trail remained covered with silt and impassable for more than a year. The flooding challenges are certain to be greater along the proposed right of way because of its lower elevation relative to the river and other factors identified in this article, <http://editions.lib.umn.edu/openrivers/article/why-so-much-sand-in-the-lower-minnesota-river/>.



The MN Valley National Wildlife Refuge is the only wild area accessible by bus or light rail in the Twin Cities area where someone can enjoy the solitude of a large outdoor expanse. It also shares the distinction with Theodore Wirth and Battle Creek parks of being the only mountain bike trails accessible by bus in the Twin Cities area. It is the only one of those three that offers the experience of riding or hiking a point-to-point trail rather than a loop trail system.

In greater Minnesota, the Department of Natural Resources has served multiple trail users – hikers, road bicyclists, mountain bikers, ATV riders, horseback riders, snowmobilers and cross country skiers – with separate, distinct trails. They do not generally co-locate the trails for

different types of users adjacent to each other. The US Fish and Wildlife Service follows the same practice. For example, in the Louisville Swamp Unit of the MN Valley National Wildlife Refuge west of Chaska, the hiking trail is separate from horseback riding, biking and snowmobile trails. Why that practice is being abandoned in the Twin City metropolitan area has not been explained. This is particularly perplexing when an existing, paved bike trail parallels the proposed paved trail immediately across the Minnesota River, between Old Cedar Avenue and 35W.

In conclusion, I implore you to not waste taxpayer money needlessly paving this segment of the Minnesota Valley Trail. It would significantly degrade this uniquely accessible wild space. Paving a segment from the Lyndale Avenue public boat ramp to connect with the existing Nine Mile Creek Trail would provide reasonable access to the disabled and building a bridge where Nine mile Creek enters the Minnesota River would enhance access for others. A paved trail is not needed for any bicyclists. I ride a 30-year-old Schwinn hybrid, a street bike, when I ride the existing natural surface trail. Again, I am 65 years old. If access is not an issue for me, it is not for anybody else willing to make the effort.

Sincerely,

Keith E. Carlson

Second Comment

We are in favor of this project.

Paul & Roisin

Third Comment

I am opposed to the paving project. Nature i.e. flooding will continue on the river bottom. Let's not waste taxpayer money on this project.

Laurie Pappenfus

Fourth Comment

Dear Metropolitan Council Transportation Advisory Board: Please accept these comments (also attached) in conjunction with the 2018-2021 Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which is scheduled for consideration and possible action at the August 16, 2017 meeting of the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Advisory Board (TAB).

GENERAL SUPPORT. There are many very important and useful projects in the TIP. Most have been fully vetted and submitted by local government entities after much public review and input and will help enhance our region.

DNR MN RIVER APPLICATION IS DIFFERENT AND SHOULD BE REMOVED. The TIP includes many worthy projects for which solid applications were submitted. One project, however sticks out - the DNR's application for \$1.88M titled Minnesota Valley State Trail - Bloomington Section - Application 05275 (Application), which, at core, is to develop a 12.5 mile 14' wide paved trail (10' bituminous asphalt, 2' grass on either side) in the Minnesota River Bottoms.

The staff report, Action Transmittal No 2017-03, reflects that the Application was part of the "over-programming" aspect of the TAB's Regional Solicitation and was considered under the "data driven scoring and selection process". The Application was in competition with 37 other applications to fund multiuse trails and bicycle facilities. Through that process, the Application was awarded 770 points, putting it in front of 26 trail projects (some by only one or very few points). All of those other projects were submitted by cities, counties and regional parks districts. Unlike the DNR and this Application, the cities, counties and park districts have an extensive public review and participation process and resulting record which can be relied upon. No such process accompanied the Application.

I urge you to delete this item from the final TIP. First, the Application does not meet the requirements established for the program. Second, even if the Application met the requirements, there is no record basis to support the rankings that led to its inclusion in the TIP. Finally, and most importantly, there has not been adequate underlying public review and comment to support the underlying representations of the Application or to include it in the TIP.

1) THE APPLICATION DOES NOT MEET APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS.

Requirement # 1 Transportation Purpose/Surface Transportation.

The applicable rules and application form itself require that even though qualifying multiuse trails and bicycle facilities may have some recreational uses, they must have a "transportation purpose" and must relate to "surface transportation" which is defined as "primarily serving a commuting purpose ...". (See application form and Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities - Prioritizing Criteria and Measures, May 18, 2016.)

Any public review and process would have produced a record which demonstrated that there is no way the trail would primarily serve a commuting purpose. Almost nobody would use it to commute. It follows a narrow route along a winding river. The record would reflect that it floods nearly every year, sometimes in multiple seasons, and sometimes by 20 feet of water in parts. A public process would also have demonstrated only a mere handful of possible ingress and egress points along the entire proposed 12.5 mile trail route. And the record would reflect that it is not needed for commuting purposes, as there is an extensive network of useful East-West commuting routes within a mile north of the proposed trail - frequently on bike lanes and bike paths along Auto Club Road, Old Shakopee Road and others.

In light of the above, the requirement and criteria related to transportation purpose is not met.

Requirements # 7 & 11 Regarding Costs and Funding.

By responding "yes" to requirements in the All Projects, Section 7 of the application form the DNR asserts that the project (for which \$1.88M is sought from these funds) will not involve additional federal funds and will, in total, cost no more than \$5.5M. By responding "yes" to requirements in the All Projects Section 11 of the application form the DNR asserts that it does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the Regional Solicitation.

There is nothing in the Application or the record to demonstrate how this 12.5 mile paved trail in a flooding river bottoms could possibly be developed and constructed for either the amount sought (\$1.88M plus \$470,000 match), or even the maximum amount of \$5.5M.

Any public review process would have produced a record that demonstrated how utterly implausible the cost estimates are. Public comment would almost certainly reflect that while every trail project is different and has its own economics, one rule of thumb for standard paved trail construction, where few special challenges exist, is \$1M per mile (thus, applied in this case, \$12.5M). The record would also likely reflect the cost of the nearby Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail through Edina which is currently under construction by the Three Rivers Park District, partially with TAB authorized funds. That nearby paved trail project averages a cost in excess of \$3M per mile (thus, applied in this case, \$37.5M).

There are special, very expensive, characteristics to paving a trail in a flooding river bottoms, and there have been no publicly released designs or public process to vet and establish an informed reasonable estimate of the cost, but one thing is certain, whether it is the \$12.5M standard cost, the \$37.5M estimate based on the experience with Nine Mile, or a higher number based on the unusual circumstances - it is not \$5.5M or less.

In light of the above, clearly the requirement and criteria related to cost and funding is not met.

2) EVEN IF THE REQUIREMENTS HAD BEEN MET, THERE IS NO RECORD TO SUPPORT THE POINTS AND RANKING ASSIGNED THE APPLICATION.

The May 16, 2016 document titled "Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facilities - Prioritizing Criteria and Measures" outlines the basis for point allocation that results in TIP project priority rankings. In this DNR Application, with an absence of process and record as is generally afforded such projects by cities, counties and park districts, the TAB was presumably left to simply allocate points based on boxes checked and the applicant's form responses.

This process netted an unsupportable ranking. For example, major point allocations were awarded for transportation, even though a more comprehensive and public review would have demonstrated that the trail will obviously be used primarily for recreation, that it floods regularly and that its route is as winding as the river. Similarly, major points were awarded for equity, presumably because a box was checked, and with no regard to the fact that the two ends of this long 12.5 mile trail have significantly different nearby demographics, a fact that a public review process would have unmasked. Risk assessment/public engagement points were awarded, presumably because the box was checked, or that minimal efforts were undertaken. That disrespects all of the local governments who submitted competing applications after, in fact, assessing environmental risks, undertaking meaningful outreach, and addressing other components of that category.

To the extent there has been any public process at all related to this Application or the trail, it is woefully inadequate for this purpose. The Application included a reference to Bloomington's Minnesota River Valley Strategic Plan (MRVSP) developed by the City from 2014 - 2016. Presumably this is included to suggest that the project has been subject to a normal planning and input process. But that plan process was not at all designed to be about the trail. Indeed, city officials throughout the input process for the MRVSP, and even in the ultimate staff presentation, insisted that the plan was not to be about the trail or paving of the trail. Notwithstanding that, much of the input received in the MRSVP process addressed the trail and in fact the city website summary of input and the MRSVP itself reflects 142 trail-related e-mails, online survey responses and open house comments in the MRSVP process. 124 of the 142 trail-related comments were against paving a trail in the river bottoms. Only 8 were for paving the trail, and 10 really did not address trail surface preferences. Nothing about or included in the MRVSP should suggest or support points for the Application.

3) AT CORE, THE APPLICATION SUFFERS FROM LACK OF THE PLANNING, PUBLIC REVIEW, COMMENT AND RECORD THAT ORDINARILY ATTENDS SIMILAR SUCH PROJECTS. THE APPLICATION SHOULD BE REJECTED AND THE PROJECT NOT INCLUDED IN THE TIP UNLESS AN APPROPRIATE PUBLIC PROCESS IS FIRST UNDERTAKEN.

There is no one way to assure public input, review and a solid decision-making record, but just by way of example, in the 10 years leading up to the Park District project/design approval and submission of the project application to the TAB for the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail project, the Park District and the City of Edina followed a very public process, with dozens of meetings, loads of publicly available plans, and input from hundreds of people.

Here is a description of just some of that Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail process:

Six significant local government master planning processes. Each of these major plans addressed what ultimately became the trail and had a public process and opportunity to review and comment on what ultimately became the trail proposal: First Tier Parks/Trails/Greenways Master Plan, 2006 City of Edina Recreational Needs assessment, 2007 City of Edina Comprehensive Bicycle Plan, 1997 Hennepin County Bicycle Plan & Biannual Map Updates, 2013 City of Edina Comprehensive Plan & the Park District's Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail Master Plan.

In addition, there was the following project-specific process:

Five Park District of City of Edina Trail Design Open Houses to Receive Public Comment. Conducted either by the Park District, the City of Edina, or jointly.

Park District Environmental Assessment. Released Summer 2010 and available for review and comment by the public.

Park District Community Assessment Team Analysis Process (Social, Technical and Economic Assessments). Park District coordinated Community Assessment Team (CAT) comprised of adjacent property owners and representatives from the Park District, Edina, Bike Edina Task Force, Edina Park Board, and Nine Mile Creek Watershed District. A Mid 2010 Report and 30 day public comment period followed this exercise.

September 30, 2010: Park District Board of Commissioners and Edina City Council Joint Workshop, Three options for future consideration were presented. Over 100 public members attended the meeting.

October 12, 2010: Edina Park Board Trail Route Review Recommendation. Edina and Park District staff presented the regional trail planning work, trail recommendation and associated assessments to the Edina Park Board. Public members were invited to address the Board.

December 7, 2010: City Council Public Hearing, Review and Approval Regional Trail Route. The meeting included testimony of over 50 citizens and the Edina City Council approved the trail route with the caveat that the Park District offer adjacent homeowners the option of buffers, fencing, vegetation, etc.

March 17, 2011: Park District Board of Commissioners Approve Regional Trail Route. The meeting was open to the public for comment.

Nine Mile Creek Trail Master Plan. Even after routing and design approvals, public input and local government input was solicited and received in developing a revised trail master plan, which was finalized and released in 2013.

Much like the Minnesota River trail, that Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail project was controversial - but the public process conducted by the Park District and City of Edina netted a community consensus. All had a chance at input. The process was transparent. Representatives made decisions with the benefit public input. And it was all done well before the Park District, with the support of the city of Edina, submitted an application for federal transportation funds through the TAB process.

The current MN River Trail DNR application and process (or lack thereof) could not be more different:

1) No Public Process. Despite public awareness following initial legislative funding of \$2.1M for the general project in 2014, to my knowledge the DNR convened no public meetings or other public sessions at which the public could provide input, hear proposals, or see designs - whether on the broad topic or this specific Application for \$1.88M additional money for a 12.5 mile paved trail.

2) Limited Governmental or Substantive Vetting. The only supportive local government action referenced in the DNR application was a January 2015 Resolution of the Bloomington City Council in general support of the DNR moving forward on the trail. But that City Council Resolution was well in advance of legislation passed in the spring of 2015 mandating that the trail be paved - thereby materially changing the potential character of the trail. (In fact, I think the only public process at all since the 2015 legislation is Bloomington's MN River Master Plan, referenced above, which was not about this trail proposal, but rather, the broader MN River Plan).

For the reasons noted above, I urge the TAB to delete the Minnesota Valley State Trail - Bloomington Section - Application 05275 from the final TIP.

John Gibbs
7601 Auto Club Road
Bloomington, Minnesota 55438
Jfgibbs57@gmail.com

Fifth Comment

This comment relates specifically to project 092-090-060: MN VALLEY STATE TRAIL FROM CREST AVE AND BLOOMINGTON FERRY RD TO 3815 AMERICAN BLVD E IN BLOOMINGTON- CONSTRUCT BICYCLE TRAIL

I have been biking the river bottoms for over 40 years. In preparation for this comment, I biked the length of the State Trail from Mendota to Chaska on August 2, 2017 which includes both natural surface and paved sections.

Summary: The current paved section of State Trail from Bloomington Ferry Bridge Parking Lot (Crest Avenue) to Chaska is in a state of disrepair, and has been that way for years. As good stewards of what resources we have, we should be repairing what we have before adding to a trail system that is broken and will continue to break ever year when the trail is covered with floodwaters.

The proposed section of trail to be paved runs along the MN River and has a yearly history of being under water, sometime 20 feet or more in some sections. It currently is a natural surface trail maintained largely by those of us who use it regularly. When nature covers the trail with tons of silt, or blows down a 20" diameter branch off an old-growth maple, we just move the trail around it. That costs nothing.

As soon as we try to pave the trail in one place, the costs to try to keep it there concern me.

Three areas of the currently paved trail are of concern for this project, as it displays how difficult and expensive it is to maintain a strip of tar laid down on silt in a flood plain. Starting from the Bloomington Ferry Bridge Parking lot heading across the bridge towards Shakopee and then on to Chaska, this is what we find:

1. At 0.9 miles from the parking lot there are two sections of trail, one 32 feet long that gets washed away every year that the river rises above flood stage. Numerous attempts over the last three years at a durable fix have been unsuccessful. At that point, the trail is currently filled with crushed rock and one can observe the chunks of previous pavings in the woods to the left and the rip-rap to the right added a few years ago in an unsuccessful attempt to stabilize the surface.
2. In Shakopee, the bridge from the State Trail to Memorial Park is out. There does not appear to be any money or effort to replace it. There is also a bridge near where the trailer park used to be that was under water (up to the railings) even this year during minor flooding. That one is probably not going to be around much longer either.
3. The paved section from Shakopee to Chaska has a history of being covered with tons of silt each time the river floods. This requires trail closure, barricading, clean-up, and reopening each time which often takes a week or more. When I first starting biking this trail decades ago, there was a bridge over the river to the Chaska dikes which had to be removed due to flood damage and the trail rerouted to the Hwy 41 bridge. The approaches to the old bridge have never been cleaned up. On the Chaska side, barricades need to be maintained to keep people out.

We can learn a lot from exploring our current trail system in the river bottoms. And what we learn is that adding more pavement down there is not a good way to steward our resources.

Sixth Comment

Hello,

I do not support the paving of River Bottoms bike.

project number 092-090-060

-Todd

Seventh Comment

Dear Met Council Members,

My name is Amy Steigauf and I am a 15 year resident of Bloomington. I am emailing you because I have serious concerns regarding the current plan to pave the Minnesota Valley Trail.

Over the past decade I have spent a great deal of time down at the MN River Bottoms. When our boys were younger, My husband and I enjoyed hiking with them in this wild area that was so unbelievably close to our home in Bloomington. It was amazing that we lived in a major metropolitan area but yet, were able to escape to this incredible, beautiful wilderness that was less than 10 minutes from our home.

Most recently for me, the natural trail provides a wonderful surface for running as well as walking my dog several days a week at the River Bottoms. This pristine, untouched, natural beauty is what continues to draw me to this spectacular location time and time again.

When I learned of the City of Bloomington and the DNR's desire to pave this trail I was so disappointed in our city government and the DNR. First of all, I knew there was a petition circulating that exceeded over 5500 signatures of citizens that opposed a paved trail. Many who signed this petition were residents of Bloomington, however In an effort to further their agenda, The City of Bloomington rejected the validity of this petition and continued to pursue the project for paving the trail disregarding the concerns of their constituents. The City, along with the DNR continue to dismiss the concerns of those that favor a natural trail describing this group as only a small number of individuals who only want the natural trail for their own special interests. The reality is very different. This is a multi-use trail that caters to walkers, bikers, birders, hikers, and many who fish the banks of the river. All of these pursuits are accomplished without logging out this area, displacing wildlife, especially our thriving eagle population, and spending millions upon millions of dollars on a trail that cannot be adequately maintained.

Over the last 2 years, I have been vocal about the reasons for NOT building this paved trail. I have monitored social media and responses to news articles that discuss the pros and cons of building this trail. Here are some of the common themes that I have read over and over again that emphasize the reason to not pave the MN Valley Trail:

1. Disruption to natural habitat and concerns over further erosion of this fragile area
2. Only 2.5 M is funded for a trail that is estimated to cost well over 14M.
3. This trail is located in the middle of a major flood plain which floods extensively 8 out of every 10 years in the MN River Valley.
4. DNR trail maintenance cannot keep up with the number of trails they are required to maintain. State wide, they are well over 100+M behind in trail maintenance projects. The effects of this can be seen on parts of the existing paved MN Valley Trail which have still not been fully repaired since the flood of 2014.
5. There are no cost assessments completed by the DNR for repair and maintenance for yet a new paved trail in the MN Valley flood plain.

Last, I understand that the DNR is seeking 1.88M from the Met Council to help fund what they are attempting to frame up as a "commuter trail". Considering most commerce is located on the 494 corridor on the northern edge of Bloomington, it would be extremely unlikely that this meandering trail on the south-side of Bloomington would ever be considered a "commuter trail". Providing financial support under the guise of this being a trail for that purpose would be a misappropriation of funds from the Met Council. I would ask that you thoughtfully consider your decision to aid the DNR in their effort to disrupt this beautiful area and pave this trail. To replace a beautiful, natural trail that does not cost a dime for taxpayers to maintain and pave a trail that will unquestionably be a financial bottomless pit to try to manage is without question, fiscally irresponsible.

Sincerely,

Amy Steigauf
8251 Oregon Rd
Bloomington, MN 55438

Eighth Comment

TO: METROPOLITAN COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

August 7, 2017

RE: THE 2018 – 2021 DRAFT TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

This comment is submitted to the Transportation Advisory Board regarding the funding being requested by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for the Minnesota River Valley State Trail. The Board should decline to fund this project for the following reasons.

First and foremost, there is still NO FINAL PLAN for this project. While a recreational trail has been authorized by the Minnesota Legislature for decades (since 1971), the DNR has yet to complete the underlying work required to construct such a trail. Given that the proposed TIP project segment is routed through a wildlife refuge, much of which is classified as wetlands, it is yet to be determined if a paved trail can even be routed through this area and still respect the various restrictions placed on these fragile natural areas. Further, no plan has been presented to the public for comment, or to various regulatory agencies for approval.

Secondly, the DNR has failed to fulfill its statutory obligation to “cooperate ... with private individuals and groups” in planning the trail project. Minn. Stat. Section 85.015, Subd. 6 (2017). I am on the Board of Directors of the Minnesota Off-Road Cyclists (MORC), a nonprofit organization that has maintained a natural surface trail in the area of the planned project for over two decades. I and others from MORC have been involved with this trail for at least as long. While the DNR initially shared plans for a one mile segment of the paved state trail with our organization, we have never seen subsequent trail section planning documents. This is important to our organization as the DNR and supporters of a paved state trail have represented to MORC that there will in fact be “two trails” constructed in the trail corridor: a paved trail and a natural surface mountain bike trail. Due to the narrowness of the river bank and trail corridor in the area, it is obvious that a paved trail will obliterate much of the current natural trail.

Yes that is right. There is ALREADY a trail in the area slated for this project, which is maintained by volunteers and enjoyed by the public at no cost to taxpayers. You are being asked to fund a new, paved recreational trail in the exact same location. Without any planning documents other than a line on a map.

Interestingly, the legislature has stated that the purpose of the Minnesota River Valley State Trail is purely recreational, like all of the other trails established in the same statute:

The trail shall be developed primarily for riding and hiking. Motorized vehicles are prohibited from that portion of the trail on the north side of the Minnesota River, lying between Fort Snelling State Park and Rice Lake Wayside. That portion of the trail on the north side of the Minnesota River, lying between the Bloomington Ferry Bridge pedestrian crossing and the Cedar Avenue Bridge, must be a paved trail *developed primarily for hiking and bicycling.*

Minn. Stat. Section 85.015, Subd. 6 (emphasis added). This would therefore appear to be the only transportation project ever proposed with a primary purpose of “hiking.” And by the way, the “riding” referred to also includes horseback riding. Yup, horses. A key part of a modern transportation network. http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/state_trails/minnesota_valley/index.html

When viewed in conjunction with the rest of the Minnesota River Valley State Trail, it is clear that the project is in fact purely a recreational trail, like all the other state trails built and managed by the DNR. The trail follows the course of the Minnesota River from Le Sueur to Fort Snelling. That is simply not a viable “transportation” route by any stretch of the imagination. *It doesn't connect anything to anything* that cannot be reached more efficiently and reliably with existing roads and trails on both sides of the river. If this were a needed transportation project, it would have been planned and completed decades ago.

The Board should decline to fund this unplanned, recreational trail project. If the DNR needs funding to build a recreational trail along the winding banks of the Minnesota River (once the plans are actually done) they should seek it from the Legislature that authorized the trail in the first place.

Thank you,

Matt Moore
5344 12th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55417
(612) 824-9506
mmoore@qbp.com

Ninth Comment

I served on the TAB representing Hennepin County. Although that was many years ago, I recall most projects coming before the TAB only after extensive discussion and hearings by local governments. That simply has not happened with this proposal.

About the only record I can find of a local government supporting this is a January 2015 Bloomington City Council resolution --- adopted before this became a plan for a PAVED trail. I seriously question the \$2.35M cost estimate (\$1.88M request plus \$470,000 match). That comes to \$188,000 per mile. I am familiar with the nearby Nine Mile Creek Trail. The cost there was about \$3M per mile.

In addition to the lack of public input and highly questionable cost estimates, I have other concerns.

1. This is a frequently flooded area. I have not reviewed historical annual flood data, and I did not find such information in the record here. But as someone who at one time or another has hiked most of this river bottom area between Chaska and convergence with the Mississippi River, I know that it often floods --- sometimes multiple times in a season. Obviously, this sharply raises maintenance costs for a PAVED trail. And it raises serious questions about whether these large capital and annual expenditures were sufficiently included in the cost estimates.

2. I note that this trail is described as a "commuter" route. This makes no sense and makes the entire recommendation highly suspect. Bicycle commuters would seldom choose a slow, winding, longer trail over the already available bicycle trails above the river bank. (There is a reason that early European settlers followed the lead of Native Americans before them and used a road above the river bank for regular transportation!)

3. Although I am "data driven" in my decisions about public policy, and I believe there is a role for "big data" and "predictive analytics", the point allocation system used here should not drive this public policy decision and expenditure of limited public funds. The allocation of "points" can sometimes force thinking about how to use limited resources, but its weakness is the inherent limitation of "who weights the points and who frames the questions." All too often, the "points allocation" component in a public policy decision making process is simply an effort to try to impose static binary Boolean logic on decisions with too many variables to make it useful. The TAB should skeptically review the point allocations, and it definitely should not drive the decision.

In conclusion, the PAVED Minnesota River bottom trail has not received sufficient public hearing and scrutiny; the cost estimates are highly questionable because of failure to consider frequent flooding; it is preposterous to consider the river bottom trail as a viable commuter trail; and the "point allocation" system has limited if any value in making this decision.

Please feel free to contact me for further information.

Randy Johnson
10224 Wildwood Road
Bloomington, MN 55437
952-835-2646

Tenth Comment

I have lived by the Minn river bottoms for 35 years in Bloomington. We walk our dog daily in the river bottoms, enjoy running the trails and mountain biking. Paving the trail would ruin the experience.

Thanks for your consideration,
Frank Martens

Eleventh Comment

I have been hearing and reading about this project #092-090-060 and would like to give you my comments and opinion.

The present trail that is paved south of this area is in disrepair. And now you are planning on paving more trail that will need even more repairs and upkeep than the present trail.

The area of the new trail floods almost every year and would be damaged severely during the flooding. Parts that are not destroyed in the flooding will be covered with mud.

All these things would create a nightmare of maintenance if this trail is approved and completed in the floodplain.

As a taxpayer, I think that such funds could be used for other trail projects that would not require so much upkeep and maintenance. Or another option would be to not pave it, but to prepare the present trail to a better width and keep it as natural as possible.

Sincerely,
Douglas Kojetin
9851 Harrison Road
Apt. 123
Bloomington, MN 55437

Twelfth Comment

See letter on the next page



BOARD OF HENNEPIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
A-2400 GOVERNMENT CENTER
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55487-0240

August 8, 2017

To Elaine Koutsoukos and the Transit Advisory Board

Re: TIP Comments

I have the following comments regarding project qualifications. I will be focusing my comments on bike trails. I believe there needs to be specific criteria for bike trails, different than the criteria for road and transit projects. Bike trails often follow roads and transit but also are placed in areas where roads and transit do not go. These places where trails go do not follow standard practices for building roads such as placing outside of flood plains. This is one big reason to look at qualifying trail projects differently and especially in the case where bike trails do not specifically align with roads and transit.

These trails outside of the roadway and transit system can be along scenic areas and near water bodies and rivers. The types of trail materials to build trails are numerous and many types of trails can accommodate accessibility. We should look at new criteria of cost effective trail construction materials in different locations, "site specific", and specifically along flood plains. Paved trails in flood plains do not perform well and add significant cost to tax payers in the initial construction, ongoing maintenance. The life of the paved trail in flood plain is significant lower than in non-flood areas. Parts of the paved trail may also end up in the river or water body causing environmental degradation. Accessibility can be obtained with other types of trail materials that are more cost effective and will perform better.

Additionally, on the bike way trail funding, a long term plan of ongoing maintenance should be part of the proposal. Currently, the DNR on the River Bottoms project in Bloomington has serious backlog of funding and cannot meet current maintenance for its' existing trail systems it has jurisdiction over. Trails are different than roads as they are not always traveled daily by the same population and the population supporting the use is much lower than that of roads for commuters or transit. It simply does not have the public outcry when maintenance is deterred. But it is a significant issue and deteriorating trails can be a safety issue. Many jurisdictions may have responsibility for maintenance through agreements. But responsible parties should be asked to show the financial stability and source for maintenance of a 20 years period or the life of the trail. If the DNR cannot address its current maintenance needs then putting in a high maintenance trail is not in the best interest of tax payer dollars. These types of projects (bike trails) need more and different criteria.

Currently the Met Council and MNDOT are concerned about adding any new paved lanes for roads due to the ability to fund upkeep and maintenance. This is responsible governing and should be a model for our bike trail system as well.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Debbie Goettel".

Debbie Goettel, Hennepin County Commissioner, District 5

**TABLE A-2
STPBG-Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Projects**

Yr	PRT	Route	Proj Num	Prog	Description	Project Total	FHWA \$	AC \$	State \$	Other \$	Agency:	AQ:
2020		PED/BIKE	010-591-001	EN	US212 PEDESTRIAN UNDERPASS IN NORWOOD YOUNG AMERICA- CONSTRUCT BOX CULVERT UNDER MN 212, BITUMINOUS TRAIL, ADA CURB RAMPS, DRAINAGE, AND RETAINING WALLS	1,654,236	1,225,360	0	0	428,876	CARVER COUNTY	AQ2
2020		PED/BIKE	019-090-021	EN	RIVER TO RIVER GREENWAY FROM LIVINGSTON AVE AND WENTWORTH AVE E INTERSECTION TO WENTWORTH AVE E 0.07 MI E OF MARTHALER LN IN W ST PAUL-CONSTRUCT MULTI-USE TRAIL	885,600	656,000	0	0	229,600	DAKOTA COUNTY	AQ2
2021		CSAH 32	179-020-043	EN	CSAH 32 (CLIFF RD) FROM MN 13 TO CINNAMON RIDGE TRAIL IN BURNSVILLE- CONSTRUCT TRAIL, CROSSWALK PAVEMENT MARKINGS, RETAINING WALLS, AND ADA-COMPLIANT CURB RAMPS	929,500	676,000	0	0	253,500	BURNSVILLE	AQ2
2021		LOCAL	092-090-060	EN	MN VALLEY STATE TRAIL FROM CREST AVE AND BLOOMINGTON FERRY RD TO 3815 AMERICAN BLVD E IN BLOOMINGTON-CONSTRUCT BICYCLE TRAIL	4,767,000	1,880,000	0	0	2,887,000	MN DNR	AQ2
2021		LOCAL	109-090-002	EN	70TH AVE N FROM CAMDEN AVE N TO WEST RIVER RD IN BROOKLYN CENTER- CONSTRUCT 14-FOOT WIDE PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE OVERPASS	2,616,130	1,902,640	0	0	713,490	BROOKLYN CENTER	AQ2
2021		LOCAL	141-080-051	EN	QUEEN AVE FROM 44TH AVE N TO GLENWOOD AVE IN MPLS-CONSTRUCT BICYCLE BOULEVARD, INCLUDING SIGNING, STRIPING, SPEED HUMPS, TRAFFIC CIRCLES, AND ADA-COMPLIANT PEDESTRIAN RAMPS	1,375,000	1,000,000	0	0	375,000	MINNEAPOLIS	AQ2
2021		LOCAL	164-090-016	EN	FOURTH ST TO SAMUEL H. MORGAN REGIONAL TRAIL IN ST PAUL- CONSTRUCT BRUCE VENTO BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE CONNECTION	17,050,000	5,500,000	0	0	11,550,000	SAINT PAUL	AQ2

August 7, 2017

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

Dear Mr. Hovland:

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has worked closely with the Metropolitan Council, the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) and its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to develop the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the metropolitan transportation planning area.

After submittal of the draft 2018-2021 TIP, some substantive changes have occurred to the list of MnDOT and federally-funded local agency projects. These changes are the result of financial balancing within the TIP years, program adjustments to accommodate project additions or deletions, as well as opportunity to accelerate and enhance some projects. We have also worked with the Council and local project sponsors to make needed corrections to project information.

The attached table identifies changes due to project deferrals, deletions, or advancement as well as new projects added since the draft TIP was prepared. These proposed changes do not affect the air quality conformity analysis of the TIP.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Scott McBride, P.E.
Metro District Engineer

CC: Metro Council – Amy Vennewitz, Carl Ohrn, Steve Peterson, Elaine Koutsoukos, Joe Barbeau
TAB TAC – Steve Albrecht, Lisa Freese, Tim Mayasich
MPCA – Innocent Eyoh
MnDOT – Mark Gieseke, Brian Gage, Cindy Krumsieg, Lynne Bly
FHWA – Kris Riesenberg

PROPOSED CHANGES TO TWIN CITIES DRAFT TIP 2018-2021

August 7, 2017

CHANGES Since the April 2017 Draft TIP

Projects Deferred

Table	Proj. No.	Route	Description	Total Cost	Deferral Year	AQ
A-16	8214-144	MN 36	**MN126** MN36, St Croix River X-ing At Stillwater-(MN)TH 36/(WI) TH 64-Pre Design And Study Of Long Term Rdwy Approach Alternatives To TH 36/SH 64 For St Croix River Crossing (SAFETEA-LU)	289,950	2017 to 2018	NA
A-8	019-090-020	PED/BIKE	Mississippi River Trail-Rosemount East Between Spring Lake Park Reserve And Flint Hills Resources In Rosemount-Construct Ped/Bike Trail, Grade-Separated Crossing And Landscaping (Associated To 019-060-005)	5,500,000	2018 to 2019	AQ2
A-2	019-060-005	LOCAL	**SB**Mississippi River Trail-Rosemount East Between Spring Lake Park Reserve And Flint Hills Resources In Rosemount- Construct Ped/Bike Trail, Grade-Separated Crossing And Landscaping (Associated To 019-090-020)	5,000,000	2018 to 2019	AQ2

Project Deletions

Table	Proj. No.	Route	Description	Total Cost	Deleted From	AQ
A-7	010-596-010	US 212	**AC**US 212 At CSAH 34 In Norwood Young America And CSAH 43 In Dahlgren Twp- Install Rural Intersection Conflict Warning System (RICWS) And Lighting At Both Intersections (AC Project-Payback In FY19)	304,020	2018 Project no longer AC'd and is in FY19	S18
A-9	2750-93	US 169	US169, From 660 Ft N Of Hayden Lake Rd To Mississippi River Bridge In Champlin-Reconstruct, Ped Underpass, Signal, ADA Improvements (Associated To 2750-88 And 193-010-008)	710,000	2018 Combined into SP 2750-88	S19
A-9	1982-183	I35E	I35E, Interchanges At Dakota-CR30 (Diffley Rd) And At Dakota-CR32 (Cliff Rd) In Eagan - Replace Lighting	195,000	2019	S18
A-3	2771-104	MN 610	MN610, On WB MN610 Over The Mississippi River (Br #27239) In Coon Rapids/Brooklyn Park And On West River Road Over MN610 (Br #27244) In Brooklyn Park - Rehab Bridges #27239 And #27244	2,560,000	2021	S10

Advanced Projects

Table	Proj. No.	Route	Description	Total Cost	Advance From	AQ
A-5	1981-124	I35W	**AC**SPP**PoDI**I35W, From Cliff Road Interchange In Burnsville Through 106th St Interchange In Bloomington-Replace Bridge #5983 (New Bridges 27W38 And 27W39), Replace Bridges 9043 And 9044 (New Bridge 27W44) Pavement Reconstruction, Auxilliary Lanes, Retaining Wall, Noisewall, Signing, Lighting, TMS, Trails, Drainage And Guard Rail (AC Project, Payback In FY19 And FY20)	140,000,000	2020 to 2018	A20
A-5	1981-124AC1	I35W	**AC**SPP**PoDI**I35W, From Cliff Road Interchange In Burnsville Through 106th St Interchange In Bloomington-Replace Bridge #5983 (New Bridges 27W38 And 27W39), Replace Bridges 9043 And 9044 (New Bridge 27W44) Pavement Reconstruction, Auxilliary Lanes, Retaining Wall, Noisewall, Signing, Lighting, TMS, Trails, Drainage And Guard Rail (AC Payback 1 Of 2)	20,174,000	2021 TO 2019	A20

Additions – New Projects Added since the Draft 2018-2021 TIP

Proj. No.	Route	Description	Total Cost	Added to
1981-124D	I35W	**COCl**I35W MN River Bridge #5983 Replacement From Cliff Road Interchange In Burnsville To 106th St Interchange In Bloomington-Replace Bridge #5983 (New Bridges 27W38 And 27W39)-Design Build Activities	1,279,000	2018
TRF-TCMT-18AY	MN 36	SECT 5307: Twin Cities Met Council MT-I94 & Manning Park & Ride Construction	2,300,000	2018
002-614-042	CSAH 14	CSAH 14, From Opal St NE In Blaine To 4th Ave In Lino Lakes- Bit Mill And Concrete Overlay	1,200,000	2018
062-636-011	CSAH 36	CSAH 36, Warner Rd Bridge 62531, From 0.95 Mi W Of US61 To 0.42 Mi W Of US61 - Bridge Rehab, Br # 62531	1,000,000	2018
019-642-062	CSAH 42	**AC**CSAH 42, From 0.2 Mi E Of 145th St To 0.7 Mi E Of CSAH 71 In Rosemount - Mill And Overlay (AC Project, Payback In FY19)	1,900,000	2018
2781-496	I94	I94, Pedestrian Br 27003 (Irene Hixon Whitney Memorial) Over I94, Lyndale And Hennepin Ave In Mpls -Paint Bridge, Salvage Wooden Deck Boards, Repair Railing, Misc Grouted Baseplate Repairs	2,500,000	2018
019-642-062AC	CSAH 42	**AC**CSAH 42, From 0.2 Mi E Of 145th St To 0.7 Mi E Of CSAH 71 In Rosemount - Mill And Overlay (AC Payback 1 Of 1)	704,138	2019
019-642-063	CSAH 42	CSAH 42, From 0.1 Mi E Of CSAH 5 To 0.1 Mi W Of CSAH 11 In Burnsville - Mill And Overlay, ADA Improvements	1,800,000	2019
2783-176	I35W	I35W, Under Ped Bridge #27987 At 5th St SE In Mpls - Landscaping	90,000	2019
2785-426	I494	I494, From 394 In Minnetonka To I94/I694 Interchange In Maple Grove- Landscaping	130,000	2019

Proj. No.	Route	Description	Total Cost	Added to
1925-63	MN 77	MN77, Interchanges At Dakota-CR30 (Diffley Rd) And At Dakota-CR32 (Cliff Rd) In Eagan - Replace Lighting	195,000	2019
027-596-009AC	CR 202	**AC**CR 202 (Elm Creek Rd), Over Elm Creek In Dayton-Replace Br L8081 (Payback 1 Of 1)	627,200	2020
1981-124AC2	I35W	**AC**SPP**PoDI**I35W, From Cliff Road Interchange In Burnsville Through 106th St Interchange In Bloomington-Replace Bridge #5983 (New Bridges 27W38 And 27W39), Replace Bridges 9043 And 9044 (New Bridge 27W44) Pavement Reconstruction, Auxilliary Lanes, Retaining Wall, Noisewall, Signing, Lighting, TMS, Trails, Drainage And Guard Rail (AC Payback 2 Of 2)	45,826,000	2020
8286-87	I694	I694, From 0.1 Mi S Of 10th St (CSAH10) To Jct I694/494/94 And I494 From 0.1 M S Tamarack Rd To Jct I694/494/94- Landscaping	200,000	2020
2781-495	I94	I94, From Nicollet Ave In Mpls To Shingle Creek Parkway In Brooklyn Center - Landscaping	190,000	2020
880M-RRS-20	MN 999	District Setaside For MN47 Over BNSF Mainline In Anoka – FY2020	3,000,000	2020
880M-BI-21N	MN 999	Districtwide Setaside For Bridge Improvement Projects On Non-NHS - FY 2021	2,365,000	2021

Staff response: The final TIP will reflect these changes.

Further, MnDOT District 3 made the following changes

Project Deletions

Proj. No.	Route	Description	Total Cost	Deleted From	AQ
071-070-033	LOCAL 999	COUNTYWIDE, 6" WHITE EDGELINE STRIPE ALONG MULTIPLE SHERBURNE COUNTY ROADS	175,000	2018	S-11

Changes

Proj. No.	Route	Description	Total Cost	Year	AQ
086-638-006	CSAH 38	**AC** WRIGHT CSAH 38, FROM MN 101 TO ODEAN AVE IN OTSEGO, RECONSTRUCTION (AC PROJECT, PAYBACK IN 2019)	3,245,530	2018	S10
		AC WRIGHT CSAH 38, FROM MN 101 TO .1 MILES WEST OF ODEAN AVE IN OTSEGO, RECONSTRUCTION (AC PROJECT, PAYBACK IN 2019)	4,500,000		
086-638-006AC	CSAH 38	**AC** WRIGHT CSAH 38, FROM MN 101 TO ODEAN AVE IN OTSEGO, RECONSTRUCTION (AC PAYBACK 1 OF 1)	2,164,965 1,352,342	2019	S10

Additions – New Projects Added since the Draft 2018-2021 TIP

Proj. No.	Route	Description	Total Cost	Added to
8603-09	MN 25	MN 25, FROM CARVER CO CSAH 10A IN WATERTOWN TO 7TH STREET IN MONTROSE, MILL AND OVERLAY; AND ON MN 25, FROM 0.6 MI N OF WRIGHT CR 30 SE, REPLACE BR# 8113 WITH BR# 86X08 OVER CREEK; AND ON US 12, FROM 7TH/OLIVER STREET IN COKATO TO 13TH AVE IN HOWARD LAKE, MILL AND OVERLAY	3,800,000	2018
071-070-038	Local 999	COUNTYWIDE, RAILROAD CROSSING PAVEMENT MESSAGE ENHANCEMENTS AT SHERBURNE COUNTY ROADS	113,350	2018