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14327 - CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project
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Status:
Submitted Date:
Submitted
05/14/2020 5:26 PM

## Primary Contact



## Organization Information

Name:

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

Organization Website:

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

* | MEDINA | Minnesota | 55340 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | City | State/Province |

County:

Phone:*

Fax:

PeopleSoft Vendor Number

Hennepin
763-745-7600

## Project Information

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

CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project
Hennepin
St. Louis Park

The project includes the reconstruction of the CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) corridor within the City of St. Louis Park. CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) is classified as an A-Minor Arterial that functions as an augmentor. Attachment 2 provides an illustration of the project location.

The project objectives include: improving safety and operations, along with facilitating vehicle, freight, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movements through the area. Photos depicting the roadway's current condition are included in Attachment 3. A potential typical section and concept that aim to achieve the project objectives are included in Attachments 4 and 5, respectively. Staff anticipates that the introduction of of 3-lane section will provide the following benefits:

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

- Improved operations for turning vehicles
- Reduced frequency of crashes, especially rearend, sideswipe, and left-turn related
- Excess space to reallocate to other transportation modes
- Traffic calming to manage vehicle speeds

The project will include, but is not limited to, the following elements. The specific type and location of improvements will be determined as part of the design process based on community input and data analysis.

- Roadway improvements; such as the replacement of deteriorated curb and gutter, storm water structures, and pavement substructure
- Safety improvements; such as the upgrading of traffic signal systems to include dedicated left-turn phasing and adaptive signal timing, enhancing of pedestrian crossings to increase yielding rates, and re-configuring of the roadway to reduce left-turn, rear-end, and sideswipe crashes
- Pedestrian improvements; such as ADA compliant ramps and sidewalk, Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS), high-visibility crosswalk markings, curb extensions, raised medians, and countdown timers.
- Bicycle improvements; such as the conversion of the existing four-lane undivided configuration to improve the biking experience for people crossing and riding along the corridor. Further investigation is needed to determine if dedicated facilities for people biking will be provided as part of the proejct.
- Streetscaping enhancements; such as the introduction of a boulevard and lighting. Additionally, staff will evaluate the potential for burying overhead utilities (in an effort to promote beautification in the corridor) as part of the design process.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
DESCRIPTION - will be used in TIP if the project is selected for funding. See MnDOT's TIP description guidance.

Project Length (Miles)

CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) from the TH 100 NB Ramps to France Ave
0.9

## Project Funding

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

If yes, please identify the source(s)

| Federal Amount | $\$ 7,000,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Match Amount | $\$ 3,357,000.00$ |
| Minimum of 20\% of project total |  |
| Project Total | $\$ 10,357,000.00$ |

For transit projects, the total cost for the application is total cost minus fare revenues.
Match Percentage 32.41\%
Minimum of 20\%
Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total
Source of Match Funds Hennepin County
A minimum of $20 \%$ of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the $20 \%$ minimum can come from other federal sources

Preferred Program Year
Select one:
2024
Select 2022 or 2023 for TDM projects only. For all other applications, select 2024 or 2025.
Additional Program Years:
Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available.

## Project Information-Roadways

| County, City, or Lead Agency | Hennepin County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Class of Road | A-Minor Augmentor |
| Road System | CSAH |
| TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET |  |
| Road/Route No. | 5 |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 | Minnetonka Blvd |
| Name of Road |  |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE | 55416 |
| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | $05 / 17 / 2024$ |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date | $11 / 21 / 2025$ |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date | TH 100 NB Ramps |
| TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work) |  |
| From: |  |
| (Intersection or Address) | France Ave |
| To: |  |
| (Intersection or Address) |  |
| DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION |  |
| Or At |  |


| Miles of Sidewalk (nearest 0.1 miles) | 0.9 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Miles of Trail (nearest 0.1 miles) | 0.9 |
| Miles of Trail on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network <br> (nearest 0.1 miles) | 0 |

Primary Types of Work
Grading, aggregate base, bituminous base \& surface, storm water, sidewalk, ADA, traffic signals, streetscaping, bikeway, and curb

Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF,
SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER,
SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS,
BRIDGE, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.
BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)
Old Bridge/Culvert No.:
New Bridge/Culvert No.:
Structure is Over/Under
(Bridge or culvert name):

## Requirements - All Projects

## All Projects

1.The project must be consistent with the goals and policies in these adopted regional plans: Thrive MSP 2040 (2014), the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (2018), the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2018), and the 2040 Water Resources Policy Plan (2015).

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
2.The project must be consistent with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Reference the 2040 Transportation Plan goals, objectives, and strategies that relate to the project.

Briefly list the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages:

## A) Transportation System Stewardship (P 2.2-2.4)

The reconstruction of Minnetonka Blvd provides a new and structurally adequate roadway that accommodates 2040 forecast traffic volumes and meets multi-modal transportation goals. The project provides a new pavement surface, curb and gutter, sidewalk, bike accommodations (if feasible), and storm water systems.

## B) Safety and Security (P 2.5-2.9)

Improvements such as ADA compliant facilities, Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS), high-visibility crosswalk markings, and countdown timers will improve the safety and comfort of people walking. In addition, the anticipated 3-lane configuration will aim to improve the safety and comfort for all users. Improvements are anticipated to result in an overall crash reduction of $26 \%$.
C) Access to Destinations (P 2.10-2.25)

Minnetonka Blvd serves two Metro Transit routes and is a direct connection to the West Lake St and Beltine Blvd Southwest Light Rail Transit (SWLRT) stations that are currently under construction. Additionally, Minnetonka Blvd serves the growing business community and residential communities of St. Louis Park and Southwest Minneapolis. Furthermore, the east end of the project offers diverse local businesses that generate regular trips through the area.
D) Competitive Economy (P 2.26-2.29)

Minnetonka Blvd is essential to the regional economy as 16,000 employees, including 1,500
related to manufacturing and distribution, are located within 1 mile of this project. Commuters rely heavily on Minnetonka Blvd as it provides a direct connection to the West Lake/Uptown areas and offers full access to TH 100.
E) Healthy and Equitable Communities (P 2.302.34)

The bike/pedestrian enhancements along the corridor provide first/last mile connections. These features aim to provide more choices in transportation, especially as it relates to people accessing the SWLRT stations that are within walking and biking distance of this project. Additionally, modernizing the storm water infrastructure will improve water management during intense weather events, minimizing negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods.
F) Leveraging Transportation Investments to Guide Land Use (P 2.35-2.41)

The multi-modal enhancements made through this project optimize existing and planned infrastructure. The Bais Yaakov Girls High School, located at Lynn Ave, is currently under construction. The Parkway Residences, located just south of this project, are anticipated to receive a number of improvements beginning in 2020. Additionally, Transit Oriented Development is proposed at the Beltline Blvd LRT Station that will include two apartment buildings, one mixed-use building, along with a parking structure.

List the applicable documents and pages:

## 2020-2024 - Hennepin County Transportation Capital Improvement Program (Attachment 6)

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5.Applicants that are not State Aid cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
6.Applicants must not submit an application for the same project elements in more than one funding application category.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
7.The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Funding amounts by application category are listed below.
Strategic Capacity (Roadway Expansion): \$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000
Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Management): \$250,000 to \$3,500,000
Spot Mobility and Safety: \$1,000,000 to \$3,500,000
Bridges Rehabilitation/Replacement: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
8. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

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

The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and has a completed ADA transition plan that covers the public Yes right of way/transportation.

Date plan completed: 08/31/2015

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

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

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

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
12. The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term independent utility means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match. Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
13. The project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
14.The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected state and local units of government prior to submitting the application.

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

## Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

1.All roadway and bridge projects must be identified as a principal arterial (non-freeway facilities only) or A-minor arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Roadway Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility projects only:
2. The project must be designed to meet 10-ton load limit standards.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement and Strategic Capacity projects only:
3.Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a principal arterial freeway must be limited to the federal share of those project costs identified as local (non-MnDOT) cost responsibility using MnDOTs Cost Participation for Cooperative Construction Projects and Maintenance Responsibilities manual. In the case of a federally funded trunk highway project, the policy guidelines should be read as if the funded trunk highway route is under local jurisdiction.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
4. The bridge must carry vehicular traffic. Bridges can carry traffic from multiple modes. However, bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or pedestrian traffic must apply under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities application categories. Rail-only bridges are ineligible for funding.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:
5.The length of the bridge must equal or exceed 20 feet.

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

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

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

## Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

| Specific Roadway Elements |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST | Cost |
| ESTIMATES | $\$ 409,000.00$ |
| Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost) | $\$ 576,000.00$ |
| Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost) | $\$ 468,000.00$ |
| Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) | $\$ 1,097,000.00$ |
| Roadway (aggregates and paving) | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Subgrade Correction (muck) | $\$ 789,000.00$ |
| Storm Sewer | $\$ 0.00$ |

Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) \$114,000.00
Traffic Control \$379,000.00
Striping \$49,000.00
Signing \$41,000.00
Lighting \$360,000.00
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping \$370,000.00
Bridge \$0.00
Retaining Walls
\$173,000.00
Noise Wall (not calculated in cost effectiveness measure) \$0.00
Traffic Signals \$800,000.00
Wetland Mitigation \$0.00
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection \$0.00
RR Crossing \$0.00
Roadway Contingencies \$1,741,000.00
Other Roadway Elements \$180,000.00
Totals
\$7,546,000.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian ElementsCONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COSTESTIMATES
Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... \$58,000.00
Sidewalk Construction ..... \$392,000.00
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... \$252,000.00
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... \$350,000.00
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... \$117,000.00
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... \$360,000.00
Streetscaping ..... \$493,000.00
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... \$625,000.00
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... \$164,000.00
Totals ..... \$2,811,000.00
Specific Transit and TDM Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES
Cost
Fixed Guideway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Stations, Stops, and Terminals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Support Facilities ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, ..... $\$ 0.00$
fare collection, etc.)
Vehicles ..... $\$ 0.00$
Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Transit and TDM Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Operating Costs

Number of Platform hours

Subtotal
$\$ 0.00$
Other Costs - Administration, Overhead,etc.
$\$ 0.00$

## Totals

| Total Cost | $\$ 10,357,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 10,357,000.00$ |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Measure B: Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, and Education

Existing Employment within 1 Mile:
16701
Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile:

1480

Existing Post-Secondary Students within 1 Mile:

Upload Map
1588601981454_2020 RS Map 02 - CSAH 5 (Minnetonka
Blvd) Reconstruction Project - Regional Economy.pdf

Please upload attachment in PDF form.

## Measure C: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

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

Yes

None of the tiers:

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

| Location | East of TH 100, see Attachment 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current AADT Volume | 17900 |


| Existing Transit Routes on the Project | 17, 60 |
| :---: | :---: |
| For New Roadways only, list transit routes that will likely be diverted to the new proposed |  |
| Upload Transit Connections Map | 15885 |
| Please upload attachment in PDF form. |  |
| Response: Current Daily Person Throughput |  |
| Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership | 0 |
| Current Daily Person Throughput | 23270 |
| Measure B: 2040 Forecast ADT |  |
| Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume | Yes |
| If checked, METC Staff will provide Forecast (2040) ADT volume |  |
| OR |  |
| Identify the approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume |  |
| Forecast (2040) ADT volume |  |

## Measure A: Connection to disadvantaged populations and projects benefits, impacts, and mitigation

1.Sub-measure: Equity Population Engagement: A successful project is one that is the result of active engagement of low-income populations, people of color, persons with disabilities, youth and the elderly. Engagement should occur prior to and during a projects development, with the intent to provide direct benefits to, or solve, an expressed transportation issue, while also limiting and mitigating any negative impacts. Describe and map the location of any low-income populations, people of color, disabled populations, youth or the elderly within a $1 / 2$ mile of the proposed project. Describe how these specific populations were engaged and provided outreach to, whether through community planning efforts, project needs identification, or during the project development process. Describe what engagement methods and tools were used and how the input is reflected in the projects purpose and need and design. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach and engagement to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in community engagement related to transportation projects; feedback from these populations identifying potential positive and negative elements of the proposed project through engagement, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

As of May 2020, county staff has not begun any public engagement activities as they relate to this project. The reconstruction project will impact all user groups, therefore, it will be critical to communicate the project impacts, schedule, road closures, and detour routes as part of the public engagement process. The Socio-Economic Equity Map (Attachment 8) identifies sites within the project area that are likely destinations for populations of youth, elderly, and low-income, along with people living with disabilities. Public engagement activities will accommodate an Orthodox Jewish community in the Cedar Lake area, who are required to adhere to Jewish practice which sets specific restrictions on travel behavior.

Engagement efforts anticipated for the design stage

Response:
The project team will likely include staff from the county's Communications and Engagement Team to encourage the use of plain language and ensure best practices are followed. In an effort to minimize potential communication barriers, public engagement tools will rely on visualizations and renderings to highlight improvements for people biking, driving, and walking. Engagement efforts at this time will respect prominent religious days, including Saturdays, to maximize attendance from these communities.

## Engagement efforts anticipated for the construction stage

County staff will work with Metro Transit and the City of St. Louis Park to determine anticipated impacts to people biking, people driving, people walking, and people using transit while construction activities are taking place. Engagement efforts will
communicate that construction efforts will not disturb the eruv in the area to continue to allow Jewish community members to move freely while respecting their religious practice. Detailed Temporary Traffic Control Plans for people biking and people walking will be followed to ensure access to local businesses and numerous community resources along the corridor during construction. Construction inspection crews will visit these businesses frequently to ensure that reasonable accommodations are being provided. Temporary impacts to transit services will be communicated with the public during the design and construction phases.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

[^0]The proposed project includes the reconstruction of the CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) corridor from TH 100 to France Ave to improve safety and mobility for multimodal uses. Safe access for people walking and biking is a critical part of this project due to an Orthodox Jewish community in the area, who choose not to drive on Saturdays in observance of Shabbat. A detailed description of how this project will benefit disadvantaged and minority populations is included below. Attachment 8 identifies specific destinations within 0.5 miles of the project area that attract each population group.

Nearby community resource destinations

Twelve community resource destinations were identified within the project area, including: Bass Lake Park, Carpenter Park, Cedar Lake Park, Fern Hill Park, Lilac Park, Sunshine Park, Webster Park, Darchei Noam, Minneapolis Community Kollel, St. George's Episcopal Church, and the St. Louis City Hall and Police Department. The parks attract diverse populations and offer benefits to people of color, people with disabilities, and low-income, youth, and elderly populations. The Darchei Noam, Minneapolis Community Kollel and St. George's Episcopal Church are religious-based community services.

Benefits for populations with disabilities

Five destinations for populations with disabilities were identified within the project area, including: Gigi's Playhouse, Little Flowers Montessori School, Partnership Resources, Professional Hearing Services, and Sora Pediatric Therapy. This project will include a pedestrian boulevard, ADA compliant pedestrian ramps, APS, raised medians, and curb extensions to improve conditions for people walking
and rolling along and across the corridor.

Benefits for elderly populations

Two destinations for elderly populations were identified within the project area, including: Associated Clinic of Psychology and Partnership Resources Inc-Senior Site. Improving mobility and safety is especially important for populations who rely on vehicles, including dial-a-ride services, for their transportation needs.

Benefits for low-income populations

One destination for low-income populations was identified, Menorah Plaza. The introduction of a boulevard and streetscaping elements will improve the safety and comfort of people walking which is especially important for people who do not own a vehicle.

Benefits for Youth

Seven destinations for youth populations were identified; including Baston School, Bais Yaakov High School, Companion Housing Program, Groves Program, Holy Family Academy, Torah Academy, and Yeshiva of Minneapolis. Enhancements to the existing sidewalk and the potential introduction of a bicycle facility will improve the safety and comfort of young people who are not able to drive.
b. Describe any negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly created by the project, along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative impacts that are not adequately mitigated can result in a reduction in points.
Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.
Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
Increased noise.
Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
Increased speed and/or cut-through traffic.
Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
Displacement of residents and businesses.
Mitigation of temporary construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings.
Other

The CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project will avoid any long-term negative impacts as the project is anticipated to be benefit all users. However, the project will likely have short-term negative impacts on users during construction.

The county has a specialized communications team within its Public Works business line who are responsible for phone hotline, project website inquiries during each phase of the project. This team will respond to inquiries made by residents, business owners, community services, and employees who work in the area. Additionally, the project team will develop relationships with nearby education centers to coordinate construction activities with arrival/dismissal operations. Any significant impacts will be communicated with the public using multiple strategies, including a project website, mailings, and social media. A description of how negative impacts will be minimized is included below.

Negative impacts to accessibility

Impacts to existing sidewalk facilities are anticipated during construction activities, specifically when modifications to the sidewalk, curb, drainage, and pavement are taking place. The project contractor will be required to follow the temporary traffic control plans which will provide temporary accommodations and/ or detours for people walking and biking. Access to local retail, service providers, and religious institutions is critical. Staff will coordinate the project schedule (especially potential closures) with nearby businesses to minimize negative impacts during construction.

All modes will be provided with proper signage and pavement markings during construction to ensure clear and safe detour routes. CSAH 25, a parallel east/west route located directly south of CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd), and will be key to managing detour traffic during the entirety of construction activities. Detailed maps will be available to community sites and businesses identifying the timing and location of detour routes.

Negative impacts to transit

Some transit routes may need to be detoured during construction. Staff will coordinate with Metro Transit to publish consistent messaging, notifying transit customers of any changes.

Negative impacts to the environment

Potential storm water impacts during construction will be mitigated through treatments such as silt fencing and inlet protection. Areas susceptible to flooding (near Huntington Ave) will be monitored by staff during rain events. Additionally, the project's storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will ensure that nearby residents aren't put at risk during construction as the roadway currently drains towards local storm water systems away from CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd).
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

## Select one:

3.Sub-measure: Bonus Points Those projects that score at least $80 \%$ of the maximum total points available through sub-measures 1 and 2 will be awarded bonus points based on the geographic location of the project. These points will be assigned as follows, based on the highestscoring geography the project contacts:
a. 25 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50\% or more people of color
b. 20 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty
c. 15 points to projects within census tracts with the percent of population in poverty or population of color above the regional average percent
d. 10 points for all other areas

Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty where 50\%
or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):

Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:
Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:

Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:
(up to $40 \%$ of maximum score )
Upload the "Socio-Economic Conditions" map used for this measure. The second map created for sub measure A1 can be uploaded on the Other Attachments Form, or can be combined with the "Socio-Economic Conditions" map into a single PDF and uploaded here.

Upload Map 1588711594720 _2020 RS Map 03 - CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project - Socio Economic Conditions.pdf

## Measure B: Part 1: Housing Performance Score

|  | Segment Length <br> (For stand-alone <br> projects, enter <br> population from <br> Regional Economy <br> map) within each <br> City/Township | Segment <br> Length/Total <br> Project Length | Score | Housing Score <br> Multiplied by |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.9 | 1.0 | 97.0 |  |
| Segment percent |  |  |  |  |

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length
0.9

Project length entered on the Project Information - General form.

Housing Performance Score
Total Project Length (Miles) or Population 0.9
Total Housing Score 97.0

## Affordable Housing Scoring

## Part 2: Affordable Housing Access

Reference Access to Affordable Housing Guidance located under Regional Solicitation Resources for information on how to respond to this measure and create the map.

If text box is not showing, click Edit or "Add" in top right of page.

The proposed CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd)
Reconstruction project will reallocate space in the corridor to improve accommodations for people biking, driving, walking, and using transit. It is anticipated that the following effective design strategies will be implemented to benefit vulnerable user groups (as determined to be feasible). These project elements will promote choices in transportation which is especially important for individuals who do not have access to a vehicle.

- Sidewalk facilities that are ADA compliant, supplemented with a boulevard, and enhanced with lighting
- Traffic calming elements for people crossing such as raised medians and curb extensions
- Dedicated facilities for people biking to reduce conflicts with people driving and walking

A detailed listing of affordable housing locations is included below; identifying the number of bedrooms, affordability limit based on area median income (AMI), etc. Attachment 9 illustrates specific affordable housing sites within a $1 / 2$ mile of the project location.

Total number of affordable sites within project area: 3

Number of existing sites: 3

Number of sites under construction: 0

Number of planned sites identified: 0

Location 1: Menorah Plaza

Affordable Units: 155

Bedrooms per unit: 0-2
$30 \%$ AMI: 155

Location 2: Park Glen Townhomes

Affordable Units: 34

Bedrooms per unit: 3

60\% AMI: 34

LIHTC

Location 3: Shoreham

Affordable Units: 30

Bedrooms per unit: 0-11

50\% AMI: 30

LIHTC

Upload map:

1589471122245_Attachment 09 - Affordable Housing
Access.pdf

## Measure A: Year of Roadway Construction

Year of Original
Roadway Construction or Most Recent Reconstruction

Segment Length
0.07
141.05

Calculation 2
156.722

| 1976 | 0.26 | 513.76 | 570.844 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1951 | 0.32 | 624.32 | 693.689 |
| 1952 | 0.25 | 488.0 | 542.222 |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 6 7}$ | 1963 |

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length (as entered in "Project Information" form) 0.9

## Average Construction Year

Weighted Year
1963

## Total Segment Length (Miles)

Total Segment Length
0.9

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

[^1]Yes
Overall, the reconstruction of Minnetonka Blvd is needed to ensure access to TH 100 is retained for commercial vehicles. The project team will engage nearby business owners to understand current freight operations as it relates to delivery routing and frequency.

Various design strategies will be introduced to improve freight mobility along the corridor. A 3-lane configuration will improve the left-turning experience for commercial vehicles. Driveway aprons and curb radii will be designed to better accommodate trucks entering/exiting the county roadway.

Additionally, roadway space will be reallocated along the east end to better accommodate deliveries to the commercial businesses.

Improved clear zones or sight lines:

Response:

Yes
The roadway network surrounding Minnetonka Blvd generally follows a grid system, therefore, sight distance is generally adequate. The presence of overhead utilities restricts sight lines at intersections, therefore, the burial or relocation of these utilities will be considered. The proposed locations of fencing, signs, and landscaping features will not obstruct sight lines. The 3-lane section will improve sight distance for turning vehicles and eliminate dual-threat crashes involving people crossing.

Also, on-street parking will be retained along the east of the project, however, curb extensions will be introduced to better define parking areas and preserve intersection sight distance.

Yes

It is anticipated that the 4-lane environment will be modified to a 3-lane configuration to improve access and safety along the corridor. Significant revisions will be introduced at Ottawa Ave; such as dedicated left-turn phasing and improved pedestrian waiting areas.

A bituminous median exists on the east end of the project that will be upgraded to better separate opposing vehicles, manage local access, and improve the crossing experience for people walking.

Minnetonka Blvd has experienced numerous overlays that have extended over the gutter pan; therefore, a full reconstruction is necessary to reestablish the roadway environment, define the roadway extents, and manage drainage needs.
(Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)
Access management enhancements:

Response:

Yes
Minnetonka Blvd is surrounded by residential and commercial land uses, including the City Hall and Police Department, within the project area. The anticipated 3-lane will better accommodate vehicle turning movements along the corridor; reducing the number of rear-end, sideswipe, and left-turn related crashes. An opportunity exists on the project's east end to introduce access management strategies via a raised concrete median.

The anticipated introduction of improved facilities for people walking and biking will promote choices in transportation. This is key in offering community members with new ways to access nearby destinations in lieu of restricted access for people driving.

Vertical/horizontal alignment improvements:

Response:
(Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)
Improved stormwater mitigation:

Yes
The east end of the project includes the relatively unique divergence of the Lake Street alignment that separates into CSAH 25 and CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd). The current number of westbound through lanes increases from two lanes to four lanes as people driving travel from France Ave to Glenhurst Ave. This design causes driver confusion and encourages poor behavior. Therefore, this project presents an opportunity to provide improved lane definition and wayfinding.

Additionally, this project will allow for a consistent roadway design (adequate lane transition lengths and alignments). These features will not only ensure user safety, but also promote driver expectation.

Yes
There is one known area along Minnetonka Blvd that is susceptible to flooding (near Huntington Ave) as identified by MetCouncil's Localized Flood Map Screening Tool. Attachment 10 illustrates this area during a heavy rain event. During design, specific attention will be given to this area to investigate the feasibility of storm water mitigation strategies that are known to be effective.

Additionally, Minnetonka Blvd currently lacks storm water structures as the roadway drains towards the local street system. Staff will work with the city to ensure the design of the local storm water system is adequate, especially during intense rain events, to continue this water collection strategy.

Yes
The project will replace and/or upgrade existing signal systems with the following improvements (but not limited to): flexible left-turn phasing, signal communications, pan/tilt/zoom cameras, and other ITS components. The Ottawa Ave intersection will experience substantial upgrades as the existing system lacks current technologies.

The corridor will be evaluated during design to identify locations for pedestrian crossing enhancements (such as raised medians, curb extensions, and crossing beacons).

Furthermore, the existing lighting is outdated and offers poor illumination. Both roadway and pedestrian scale lighting will be considered in an effort to promote user safety and comfort.
(Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)
Other Improvements

## Measure A: Congestion Reduction/Air Quality

| Total Peak | Total Peak | Total Peak |  |  |  | EXPLANA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour | Hour | Hour |  |  |  |  | TION of |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 158938238 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4894_CSA |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H $005-\mathrm{CP}$ |
| 8.0 | 9.0 | -1 | 1277 | 1126 | -1277 | -1126 | See report | 1681- |
|  |  | -1 | 1277 | 1126 | -1277 | -1126 | See report | CSAH 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | and |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Inglewood |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rd.pdf |

## Vehicle Delay Reduced

Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced

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

| Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions <br> without the Project <br> (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions with <br> the Project (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions <br> Reduced by the Project <br> (Kilograms): |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1.85 | 1.66 |

## Total

Total Emissions Reduced
Upload Synchro Report
0.19

1589382270047_CSAH 005 - CP 1681-CSAH 5 and Inglewood Rd.pdf

# Measure B: Roadway projects that are constructing new roadway segments, but do not include railroad grade-separation elements (for Roadway Expansion applications only): <br> Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions without the Project (Kilograms): <br> Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions with the Project (Kilograms): <br> Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions <br> Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 

## Total Parallel Roadway

Emissions Reduced on Parallel Roadways 0

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

## New Roadway Portion:

Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project: 0
Vehicle miles traveled with the project: 0
Total delay in hours with the project: 0
Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project: 0
Fuel consumption in gallons: 0
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced or 0
Produced on New Roadway (Kilograms):
EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit
1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):
0.0

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

Cruise speed in miles per hour without the project: 0
Vehicle miles traveled without the project: 0

Total delay in hours without the project: 0
Total stops in vehicles per hour without the project: 0
Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project: 0
Vehicle miles traveled with the project: 0

Total delay in hours with the project:
Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project: 0
Fuel consumption in gallons (F1) 0
Fuel consumption in gallons (F2) 0
Fuel consumption in gallons (F3) 0
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):

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

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

Attachment 11 lists reported crashes (2016-2018) along the project, and Attachment 12 lists CMFs applied in the B/C Analysis.

XX - Countermeasure: Crashes Targeted (CMF ID, \% Reduction)

1) LT lanes at signalized intersections: LT (271, 47\%)
2) Install bicycle lanes: BIKE (1719, 35\%)
3) Convert to 3-lane: All (2841, 49\%)
4) Provided TWLTL on CSAH 5: All (3017, 34\%)
5) Install bicycle lanes: All (4656, 5.6\%)
6) Countdown timers: PED (5272, 70\%)
7) Convert perm LT phasing to FYA prot/perm: LT (7684, 40.2\%)
8) Grooved-in high visibility pavement markings: SS (8112, 5.9\%)
9) Resurface pavement: All (9289, 7.1\%)
10) Reduce the number of lanes to cross: RA (CMF N/A, 15\%)

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

The Benefit/Cost Analysis evaluated the project corridor in twelve separate sections (comprised of major intersections and segments) to target crash themes. Up to two (of the ten selected) CMFs were applied to each crash based on the reported crash type, along with the anticipated benefit provided by each safety countermeasure. A maximum of three CMFs were applied to each individual intersection or segment since the project corridor experiences diverse crash types among people biking, driving, and walking.

The expected service life for each improvement ranged from 10 years to 20 years (primarily 20 years). An average service life value was entered into the Benefit/Cost Worksheets whenever applicable. If a service life value was note stated within the guidelines of the 2020 Highway Safety Improvement Program Criteria, then staff identified an expected service life value based on information provided in the 2015 MnDOT Traffic Engineering Manual.

The overall average crash reduction expected from the project is $26 \%$ (based on a $74 \%$ crash modification factor). Approximately $26 \%$ (12) of the total number of reported crashes from the years 2016 to 2018 will be reduced annually through the implementation of various safety countermeasures as part of the project.
\$13,524,412.00
0
1
0
122
Total Fatal (K) Crashes Reduced by Project: ..... 0
Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes Reduced by Project: ..... 0
Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes Reduced by Project: ..... 0Total Crashes Reduced by Project:35
Worksheet Attachment

# Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements: 

Current AADT volume: 0
Average daily trains: 0
Crash Risk Exposure eliminated:

01589461668885_CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction

Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

Response:
Overall, the frequency of crashes involving people walking along this section of CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) is relatively low; as there were only a total of 1 reported crash involving people walking from 2016 to 2018. Therefore, a proactive approach is being applied to maintain relatively low crash rates involving people walking. Attachment 5 illustrates a number of potential improvements that aim to benefit people walking along and across CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd). Additionally, the St. Louis Park City Hall and Police Department are located immediately adjacent to the project. Therefore, an opportunity exists to introduce all 5 E's of pedestrian safety.

Improvements for people walking along the roadway

The existing sidewalk facilities are located immediately adjacent to the roadway creating a feeling of discomfort for people walking as they are within close proximity of people driving. In addition, a number of obstructions are located within the walking path, reducing the Pedestrian Access Route. The proposed project will include a full replacement of the existing sidewalk facilities, introducing a design that meets current ADA design standards. In addition, it is anticipated that a boulevard (complemented with streetscaping and lighting) will be constructed as part of the project. In addition to providing a buffer between transportation modes, a boulevard will provide the necessary space for signs and snow storage. Furthermore, dedicated facilities for people biking (contingent on the design process) will further separate people walking from people driving. These design strategies will are key to accommodating each transportation mode as they operate at significantly different speeds.

Ottawa Ave serves as the only controlled crossing between TH 100 and Inglewood Ave (a distance of approximately 0.7 miles). There are currently 5 uncontrolled pedestrian crossings within this segment that typically experience relatively poor yielding rates due to their proliferation and the existing roadway configuration (four-lane undivided). The anticipated 3-lane section will eliminate the potential for dual-threat related crashes and provide opportunities to construct raised medians at intersections that don't require a dedicated left-turn lane. The project team will evaluate the entire corridor to identify locations that warrant enhanced pedestrian crossings (i.e. raised medians, curb extensions, and/or crossing beacons) to ensure that CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) is not a barrier for people desiring to cross. Furthermore, high-visibility pavement markings (including crosswalks) will be introduced to define crossing areas and encourage appropriate stopping behavior by people driving.

This project will aim to provide benefits for people walking, biking driving, and using transit.
Attachment 13 illustrates existing multimodal connections along or near the project corridor.

Improvements for people biking

It is anticipated that this project will introduce a dedicated bicycle facility as identified in the county's 2040 Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan (hennepin.us//media/hennepinus/residents/transportation/biking/p lanned-bikeway-system-map.pdf) and the City of St. Louis Park's Connect the Park (stlouispark.org/home/showdocument?id=15599). This facility would expand the county's bikeway network east of TH 100 by connecting an RBTN Tier 1 alignment (located west of TH 100) to the Minneapolis Chain of Lakes. If determined to be feasible, the specific bikeway design (i.e. on-road versus off-road) will be guided by community input provided as part of the project development process.

Improvements for people walking

The existing sidewalk facilities along CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) are in relatively poor condition and many areas do not meet current ADA requirements due to steep pedestrian ramps along with the presence of obstructions in the walking paths (such as utility poles). This project will provide significant benefits to people walking along the corridor by upgrading of sidewalk facilities to meet current ADA design, introducing a boulevard to provide space for signs and snow storage, and upgrading lighting to improve illumination. The potential conversion of the 4-lane roadway to a 3lane roadway will eliminate the potential for a dual-
threat crash during instances of people crossing. Also, pedestrian crossing activity will be evaluated as part of the project development process to identify priority locations to implement crossing enhancements such as curb extensions, raised medians, and/or crossing beacons. These crossing enhancements will increase yielding rates by people driving, which will be especially important if the roadway is converted to a 3-lane (which would result in fewer gaps in traffic). Additionally, a consistent design for the pedestrian facilities will be applied along the corridor to promote predictability for people with visual impairments.

Improvements for people using transit

Enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities will provide safe, accessible, and direct walking and biking routes to existing transit services. These non-motorized connections are especially critical ensuring access to the Southwest Light Rail Transit (SWLRT) service that includes two stations (West lake and Beltline) within walking and biking distance of this project. Additionally, the proposed pedestrian crossing improvements will be key to ensuring transit customers feel comfortable during first/last mile connections.

## Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction

If the applicant is completing a transit application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment.
Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.
Check Here if Your Transit Project Does Not Require Construction

## Measure A: Risk Assessment - Construction Projects

1)Layout ( 25 Percent of Points)

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries.
Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)). A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.

## 100\%

Attach Layout
Please upload attachment in PDF form.
Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.

Yes

50\%
Attach Layout
1589494963271_Attachment 05 - Potential Layout.pdf
Please upload attachment in PDF form.
Layout has not been started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
04/29/2022
2)Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 Percent of Points)

No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and Yes project is not located on an identified historic bridge

100\%
There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of no historic properties affected is anticipated.

## $100 \%$

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

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

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

0\%
Project is located on an identified historic bridge
3)Right-of-Way (25 Percent of Points)

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

100\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

50\%

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified

25\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not all identified

0\%
Anticipated date or date of acquisition
12/15/2023
4)Railroad Involvement (15 Percent of Points)

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

100\%

## Signature Page

Please upload attachment in PDF form.
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have
begun
50\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.

0\%
Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement
5) Public Involvement (20 percent of points)

Projects that have been through a public process with residents and other interested public entities are more likely than others to be successful.
The project applicant must indicate that events and/or targeted outreach (e.g., surveys and other web-based input) were held to help identify the transportation problem, how the potential solution was selected instead of other options, and the public involvement completed to date on the project. List Dates of most recent meetings and outreach specific to this project:

Meeting with general public:
Meeting with partner agencies:
03/12/2020
Targeted online/mail outreach:
Number of respondents:
Meetings specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need.

100\%
Targeted outreach to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need.

75\%
At least one meeting specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

50\%
At least one meeting specific to this project with key partner agencies has been used to help identify the project need.

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

25\%
No outreach has led to the selection of this project.
0\%

The CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project was first introduced into the county's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) as part of the 20182022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Shortly thereafter, county staff began meeting with City of St. Louis Park staff to discuss project scope, budget, and schedule. Key themes that resulted from these discussions included the following:

- Importance of introducing a dedicated bikeway to align with recommendations included in the city's Connect the Park Plan (stlouispark.org/home/showdocument?id=15599)
- Desire to convert the 4-lane undivided to a 3-lane section to provide additional space to reallocate for other transportation purposes
- Consideration for the eruv that's observed by the surrounding Orthodox Jewish Community
- Interest in pedestrian crossing enhancements to improve yielding rates by people driving
- Presence of poor ADA conditions as it relates to steep pedestrian ramps, sidewalk obstructions (i.e. utility poles), and uneven driveway aprons
- Opportunity to complement the nearby Beltline Blvd Station as part of the Southwest Light Rail Transit (SWLRT) service that's currently under construction

It is anticipated that the public engagement process will begin approximately 3 years prior to the start of construction (around 2021). The project team will develop a public engagement plan to ensure an inclusive process is followed that is welcoming to all stakeholder groups. Until then, conversations will
continue between county and city staff to share the latest information as it relates to this project.

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | $\$ 10,357,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | $\$ 10,357,000.00$ |
| Enter amount of any outside, competitive funding: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Attach documentation of award: |  |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attachment 00 - List of Attachments.pdf | Attachment 00 - List of Attachments | 54 KB |
| Attachment 01 - Project Narrative.pdf | Attachment 01 - Project Narrative | 115 KB |
| Attachment 02 - Project Location Map.pdf | Attachment 02 - Project Location Map | 282 KB |
| Attachment 03 - Existing Roadway Condition Photos.pdf | Attachment 03 - Existing Roadway Condition Photos | 520 KB |
| Attachment 04 - Potential Typical Section.pdf | Attachment 04 - Potential Typical Section | 44 KB |
| Attachment 05 - Potential Layout.pdf | Attachment 05 - Potential Layout | 1.3 MB |
| Attachment 06-2020-2024 Hennepin County Transportation Capital Improvement Program.pdf | Attachment 06-2020-2024 Hennepin County Transportation Capital Improvement Program | 312 KB |
| Attachment 07 - MnDOT 50 Series Map.pdf | Attachment 07 - MnDOT 50 Series Map | 4.8 MB |
| Attachment 08 - Socio Economic Equity Map.pdf | Attachment 08 - Socio Economic Equity Map | 504 KB |
| Attachment 09 - Affordable Housing Access.pdf | Attachment 09 - Affordable Housing Access | 580 KB |
| Attachment 10 - Intense Rain Event Example at Huntington Ave.pdf | Attachment 10 - Intense Rain Event Example at Huntington Ave | 922 KB |
| Attachment 11-Crash Map and Detail Listing.pdf | Attachment 11-Crash Map and Detail Listing | 1.0 MB |
| Attachment 12 - Crash Modification Factors.pdf | Attachment 12-Crash Modification Factors | 1.0 MB |
| Attachment 13 - Multimodal Connections Map.pdf | Attachment 13 - Multimodal Connections Map | 591 KB |
| Attachment 14-City of St. Louis Park Support Letter.pdf | Attachment 14 - City of St. Louis Park Support Letter | 31 KB |

## Regional Economy

Results
WITHIN ONE MI of project:
Postsecondary Students: 82
Totals by City:
Edina
Population: 3211
Employment: 536
Mfg and Dist Employment: 45
Golden Valley
Population: 1109
Employment: 97
Mfg and Dist Employment: 8
Minneapolis
Population: 5758
Employment: 2640
Mfg and Dist Employment: 68

## St. Louis Park

Population: 16336
Employment: 13428
Mfg and Dist Employment: 1359
Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project: CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project | Map ID: 15\$834


Project Points


Postsecondary Education Centers $\square$ Job Concentration Centers
Manfacturing/Distribution Centers

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


## Socio-Economic Conditions

Project census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:
(0 to 18 Points)
Tracts within half-mile:
227002280122802
2290123000106500
109100


Points
Lines
Area of Concentrated Povertry $>50 \%$ residents of color

For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
http://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissite/notice.aspx

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 09 | Affordable Housing Access Map


| Key |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Location |  |
| Construction Status |  |
| - Complete |  |
| - Planned |  |
| Affordable Units |  |
| - 0-50 |  |
| - 51-100 |  |
| - 101-150 |  |
| - 151-200 |  |
| - 201-1500 |  |
| Groups Served |  |
| $\square$ People with Disabilities |  |
| - Elderly |  |
| - Family |  |
| - Homeless |  |
| - Single People |  |
| II Multiple Groups |  |
| - No Information |  |
| 0.225 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.45 \\ & \text { Miles } \end{aligned}$ |

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: 5/1/2020


CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project
438: CSAH 5 \& Inglewood Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1277 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 8 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.30 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.25 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.30 |

## Proposed Conditions (PM Peak)

CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project
438: CSAH 5 \& Inglewood Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1126 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 9 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.16 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.23 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.27 |

Given the existing traffic volumes along CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd), the potential four to three lane conversion will likely result in traffic diversion to CSAH 25. Staff estimates that approximately 1,500 vehicles per day will elect to travel along CSAH 25 instead of CSAH 5 . This assumption results in approximately 135 vehicles diverting from CSAH 5 to CSAH 25 in the morning peak hour and 150 vehicles diverting from CSAH 5 to CSAH 25 in the afternoon peak hour.

Staff believes this assumption to be both reasonable and acceptable for the following reasons:
-CSAH 25 is also classified as an A-Minor Arterial; therefore, it also serves a regional purpose in the overall roadway network
-CSAH 25 is also under the jurisdiction of Hennepin County; therefore, this traffic diversion would not cause burden to other jurisdictions
-CSAH 25 provides similar access to TH 100 and is located approximately 0.25 miles south


| Phase Number | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Movement | NBTL | EBTL | SBTL | EBL | WBTL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  | Lead | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 23.5 | 36.5 | 23.5 | 13 | 23.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | $39.2 \%$ | $60.8 \%$ | $39.2 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $39.2 \%$ |
| Minimum Split (s) | 23.5 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 13 | 23.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7 | 7 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 11 | 11 |  |  |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 23.5 | 0 | 23.5 | 36.5 |
| End Time (s) | 23.5 | 0 | 23.5 | 36.5 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 18 | 54.5 | 18 | 31 | 54.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 18 | 43.5 | 7 | 31 | 54.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 23.5 | 0 | 23.5 | 36.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 18 | 54.5 | 18 | 31 | 54.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 18 | 43.5 | 7 | 31 | 54.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |


| Cycle Length | 60 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Type | Actuated-Uncoordinated |
| Natural Cycle | 60 |

Splits and Phases: 438: CSAH 5 \& Inglewood Rd



Splits and Phases: 438: CSAH 5 \& Inglewood Rd


CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project
438: CSAH 5 \& Inglewood Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1277 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 8 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.30 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.25 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.30 |

## Proposed Conditions (PM Peak)

CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project
438: CSAH 5 \& Inglewood Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1126 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 9 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.16 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.23 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.27 |

Given the existing traffic volumes along CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd), the potential four to three lane conversion will likely result in traffic diversion to CSAH 25. Staff estimates that approximately 1,500 vehicles per day will elect to travel along CSAH 25 instead of CSAH 5 . This assumption results in approximately 135 vehicles diverting from CSAH 5 to CSAH 25 in the morning peak hour and 150 vehicles diverting from CSAH 5 to CSAH 25 in the afternoon peak hour.

Staff believes this assumption to be both reasonable and acceptable for the following reasons:
-CSAH 25 is also classified as an A-Minor Arterial; therefore, it also serves a regional purpose in the overall roadway network
-CSAH 25 is also under the jurisdiction of Hennepin County; therefore, this traffic diversion would not cause burden to other jurisdictions
-CSAH 25 provides similar access to TH 100 and is located approximately 0.25 miles south


| Phase Number | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Movement | NBTL | EBTL | SBTL | EBL | WBTL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  | Lead | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 23.5 | 36.5 | 23.5 | 13 | 23.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | $39.2 \%$ | $60.8 \%$ | $39.2 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $39.2 \%$ |
| Minimum Split (s) | 23.5 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 13 | 23.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7 | 7 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 11 | 11 |  |  |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 23.5 | 0 | 23.5 | 36.5 |
| End Time (s) | 23.5 | 0 | 23.5 | 36.5 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 18 | 54.5 | 18 | 31 | 54.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 18 | 43.5 | 7 | 31 | 54.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 23.5 | 0 | 23.5 | 36.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 18 | 54.5 | 18 | 31 | 54.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 18 | 43.5 | 7 | 31 | 54.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |


| Cycle Length | 60 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Type | Actuated-Uncoordinated |
| Natural Cycle | 60 |

Splits and Phases: 438: CSAH 5 \& Inglewood Rd



Splits and Phases: 438: CSAH 5 \& Inglewood Rd


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

## m <br> DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 7.85 | End RP | 7.91 | Miles | 0.06 |
| Location | At TH 100 NB Ramps |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work <br> Project Cost* | No CMFs proposed - Interchange rebuilt in 2015 as part of the TH 100 Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$10,357,000 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth F | 0.5\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

C. Crash Modification Factor

| Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sorious Injury (A) Crashes CMFs proposed |  |
| Moderate Injury (B) Crashes |  |
| Possible Injury (C) Crashes | Crash Type |
| Property Damage Only Crashes |  |
|  |  |

D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)

| Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | No CMFs proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
| Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type |  |
| Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |  |
| Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

E. Crash Data

| Begin Date | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Source | MnCMAT Version 2.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity |  | No CMFs proposed | No CMFs proposed |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes |  |  |  |
|  | B crashes |  |  |  |
|  | C crashes |  |  |  |
|  | PDO crashes |  |  |  |


| F. Benefit-Cost Calculation |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| $\$ 0$ | Benefit (present value) |
| $\$ 10,357,000$ | Cost |
|  | Proposed project expected to reduce o crashes annually, o of which involving fatality or serious injury. |


| F. Analysis Assumptions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity | Crash Cost | Link: mndot.go | lanning/program/appendix_a.html |
| K crashes | \$1,360,000 |  |  |
| A crashes | \$680,000 | Real Discount Rate Traffic Growth Rate Project Service Life | 1.2\% <br> 0.5\% <br> 20 years |
| B crashes | \$210,000 |  |  |
| C crashes | \$110,000 |  |  |
| PDO crashes | \$12,000 |  |  |
| G. Annual Benefit |  |  |  |
| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$0 |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$0 |
| B crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$0 |
| C crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$0 |
| PDO crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$0 |
|  |  |  | \$0 |

H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$0 | \$0 | Total = \$0 |
| 2025 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2026 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2027 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2028 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2029 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2030 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2031 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2032 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2033 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2034 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2035 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2036 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2037 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2038 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2039 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2040 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2041 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2042 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 2043 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

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

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 7.91 | End RP | 8.18 | Miles | 0.27 |
| Location | From TH 100 NB Ramps to Ottawa Ave |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work <br> Project Cost* | CSAH 5: Convert 4-lane roadway to 3-lane roadway and introduce bicycle facility |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$10,357,000 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth F | 0.5\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

C. Crash Modification Factor

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | CMF 2841: Convert from 4-lane to 3-lane (47\% reduction) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
| 0.53 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes |  | CMF 2841: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes involv EB/EB veh |
| 0.53 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes | Cras |  |
| 0.53 | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)


| F. Benefit-Cost Calculation |  | Benefit (present value) |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 4,443,332$ | Cost | B/C Ratio $=\mathbf{0 . 4 3}$ |
| $\$ 10,357,000$ | Proposed project expected to reduce 4 crashes annually, o of which involving fatality or serious injury. |  |

F. Analysis Assumptions

| Crash Severity | Crash Cost | mndot.gov/planning/program/appendix_a.html |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | \$1,360,000 |  |  |
| A crashes | \$680,000 | Real Discount Rate | 1.2\% |
| B crashes | \$210,000 |  |  |
| C crashes | \$110,000 | Traffic Growth Rate | 0.5\% |
| PDO crashes | \$12,000 | Project Service Life | 20 years |

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| B crashes | 1.41 | 0.47 | $\$ 98,700$ |
| C crashes | 3.01 | 1.00 | $\$ 110,220$ |
| PDO crashes | 7.05 | 2.35 | $\$ 28,200$ |

H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$237,120 | \$237,120 | Total = \$4,443,332 |
| 2025 | \$238,306 | \$235,480 |  |
| 2026 | \$239,497 | \$233,851 |  |
| 2027 | \$240,695 | \$232,233 |  |
| 2028 | \$241,898 | \$230,627 |  |
| 2029 | \$243,108 | \$229,032 |  |
| 2030 | \$244,323 | \$227,448 |  |
| 2031 | \$245,545 | \$225,874 |  |
| 2032 | \$246,772 | \$224,312 |  |
| 2033 | \$248,006 | \$222,760 |  |
| 2034 | \$249,246 | \$221,220 |  |
| 2035 | \$250,493 | \$219,689 |  |
| 2036 | \$251,745 | \$218,170 |  |
| 2037 | \$253,004 | \$216,661 |  |
| 2038 | \$254,269 | \$215,162 |  |
| 2039 | \$255,540 | \$213,674 |  |
| 2040 | \$256,818 | \$212,196 |  |
| 2041 | \$258,102 | \$210,728 |  |
| 2042 | \$259,392 | \$209,271 |  |
| 2043 | \$260,689 | \$207,823 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

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

## m <br> DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 8.18 | End RP | 8.24 | Miles | 0.06 |
| Location | At Ottawa Ave |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work <br> Project Cost* | CSAH 5: Install LT lanes (via a 4 to 3 lane conversion) \& implement FYA LT phasing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$10,357,000 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth F | 0.5\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

C. Crash Modification Factor

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | CMF 0271: Install LT lanes on major approaches (42\% reduction) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  | CMF 7684: Implement FYA LT phasing (40.2\% reduction) |
| 0.58 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes |  | CMF 0271: LT, RE, \& SS crashes involving EB/WB vehicles |
| 0.49 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  | CMF 7684: LT crashes involving EB/WB vehicles |
| 0.47 | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)

| Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
| Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type |  |
| Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |  |
| Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

E. Crash Data

| Begin Date | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Source | MnC |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity | CMF 0271: LT, RE, \& SS involving EB/WB veh CMF 7684: LT involving EB/WB veh | No CMFs proposed |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes |  |  |  |
|  | B crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | C crashes | 5 |  |  |
|  | PDO crashes | 17 |  |  |

F. Benefit-Cost Calculation

| $\$ 2,993,740$ | Benefit (present value) | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 10,357,000$ | Proposed project expected to reduce 5 crashes annually, o of which involving fatality or serious injury. |  |

F. Analysis Assumptions

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| B crashes | 0.42 | 0.14 | $\$ 29,400$ |
| C crashes | 2.57 | 0.86 | $\$ 94,050$ |
| PDO crashes | 9.08 | 3.03 | $\$ 36,312$ |

H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$159,762 | \$159,762 | Total = \$2,993,740 |
| 2025 | \$160,561 | \$158,657 |  |
| 2026 | \$161,364 | \$157,559 |  |
| 2027 | \$162,170 | \$156,470 |  |
| 2028 | \$162,981 | \$155,387 |  |
| 2029 | \$163,796 | \$154,313 |  |
| 2030 | \$164,615 | \$153,245 |  |
| 2031 | \$165,438 | \$152,185 |  |
| 2032 | \$166,265 | \$151,133 |  |
| 2033 | \$167,097 | \$150,087 |  |
| 2034 | \$167,932 | \$149,049 |  |
| 2035 | \$168,772 | \$148,018 |  |
| 2036 | \$169,616 | \$146,994 |  |
| 2037 | \$170,464 | \$145,977 |  |
| 2038 | \$171,316 | \$144,968 |  |
| 2039 | \$172,173 | \$143,965 |  |
| 2040 | \$173,034 | \$142,969 |  |
| 2041 | \$173,899 | \$141,980 |  |
| 2042 | \$174,768 | \$140,998 |  |
| 2043 | \$175,642 | \$140,023 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

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

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 8.24 | End RP | 8.39 | Miles | 0.15 |
| Location | From Ottawa Ave to Lynn Ave |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work <br> Project Cost* | CSAH 5: Convert 4-lane roadway to 3-lane roadway and introduce bicycle facility |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$10,357,000 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth F | 0.5\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

C. Crash Modification Factor

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | CMF 2841: Convert from 4-lane to 3-lane (47\% reduction) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
| 0.53 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes |  | CMF 2841: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes involv EB/EB veh |
| 0.53 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes | Cras |  |
| 0.53 | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | CMF 2841: Convert from 4-lane to 3-lane (47\% reduction) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  | CMF 1719: Install bicycle lanes (35\% reduction) |
|  | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type | CMF 2841: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes involv EB/EB veh |
| 0.34 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  | CMF 1719: BIKE crashes |
|  | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

E. Crash Data

| Begin Date | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Source | MnCMAT Version 2.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity CMF 2841: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes |  | CMF 2841: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes CMF 1719: BIKE crashes |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes |  |  |  |
|  | B crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | C crashes | 2 | 1 |  |
|  | PDO crashes | 2 |  |  |


| F. Benefit-Cost Calculation |  | Benefit (present value) |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 1,783,554$ | Cost | B/C Ratio $=\mathbf{0 . 1 8}$ |
| $\$ 10,357,000$ | Proposed project expected to reduce 2 crashes annually, o of which involving fatality or serious injury. |  |

F. Analysis Assumptions

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| B crashes | 0.47 | 0.16 | $\$ 32,900$ |
| C crashes | 1.60 | 0.53 | $\$ 58,520$ |
| PDO crashes | 0.94 | 0.31 | $\$ 3,760$ |

H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$95,180 | \$95,180 | Total = \$1,783,554 |
| 2025 | \$95,656 | \$94,522 |  |
| 2026 | \$96,134 | \$93,868 |  |
| 2027 | \$96,615 | \$93,219 |  |
| 2028 | \$97,098 | \$92,574 |  |
| 2029 | \$97,583 | \$91,933 |  |
| 2030 | \$98,071 | \$91,298 |  |
| 2031 | \$98,562 | \$90,666 |  |
| 2032 | \$99,054 | \$90,039 |  |
| 2033 | \$99,550 | \$89,416 |  |
| 2034 | \$100,048 | \$88,798 |  |
| 2035 | \$100,548 | \$88,183 |  |
| 2036 | \$101,050 | \$87,573 |  |
| 2037 | \$101,556 | \$86,968 |  |
| 2038 | \$102,064 | \$86,366 |  |
| 2039 | \$102,574 | \$85,769 |  |
| 2040 | \$103,087 | \$85,175 |  |
| 2041 | \$103,602 | \$84,586 |  |
| 2042 | \$104,120 | \$84,001 |  |
| 2043 | \$104,641 | \$83,420 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

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

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Henn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 8.42 | End RP | 8.59 | Miles | 0.17 |
| Location | From Ly | wood A |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work | CSAH 5: Provid | and introduce | faci |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Cost* | \$10,357,000 | Installation Year  <br> Traffic Growth Factor 2024 |  |
| Project Service Life | 20 years |  |  |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

C. Crash Modification Factor

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | CMF 3017: Provide TWLTL along CSAH 5 (34\% reduction) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
| 0.66 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes |  | CMF 3017: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes involv EB/WB veh |
| 0.66 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes | Cras |  |
| 0.66 | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)

E. Crash Data

| Begin Date | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Source | MnCMAT Version 2.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity CMF 3017: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes |  | CMF 3017: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes CMF 1719: BIKE crashes |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes |  |  |  |
|  | B crashes | 2 |  |  |
|  | C crashes | 5 | 1 |  |
|  | PDO crashes | 12 |  |  |

F. Benefit-Cost Calculation

| $\$ 2,758,156$ | Benefit (present value) | Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 10,357,000$ | Proposed project expected to reduce 3 crashes annually, o of which involving fatality or serious injury. |  |

F. Analysis Assumptions

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| B crashes | 0.68 | 0.23 | $\$ 47,600$ |
| C crashes | 2.27 | 0.76 | $\$ 83,270$ |
| PDO crashes | 4.08 | 1.36 | $\$ 16,320$ |

H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$147,190 | \$147,190 | Total $=\mathbf{\$ 2 , 7 5 8 , 1 5 6}$ |
| 2025 | \$147,926 | \$146,172 |  |
| 2026 | \$148,666 | \$145,161 |  |
| 2027 | \$149,409 | \$144,157 |  |
| 2028 | \$150,156 | \$143,160 |  |
| 2029 | \$150,907 | \$142,169 |  |
| 2030 | \$151,661 | \$141,186 |  |
| 2031 | \$152,420 | \$140,209 |  |
| 2032 | \$153,182 | \$139,240 |  |
| 2033 | \$153,948 | \$138,276 |  |
| 2034 | \$154,717 | \$137,320 |  |
| 2035 | \$155,491 | \$136,370 |  |
| 2036 | \$156,268 | \$135,427 |  |
| 2037 | \$157,050 | \$134,490 |  |
| 2038 | \$157,835 | \$133,560 |  |
| 2039 | \$158,624 | \$132,636 |  |
| 2040 | \$159,417 | \$131,719 |  |
| 2041 | \$160,214 | \$130,807 |  |
| 2042 | \$161,015 | \$129,903 |  |
| 2043 | \$161,820 | \$129,004 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

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

## m <br> DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 8.56 | End RP | 8.62 | Miles | 0.06 |
| Location | At Inglewood Ave |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description


C. Crash Modification Factor

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | CMF ID 4656: Install bicycle lanes (5.6\% reduction) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
| 0.94 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes |  | CMF ID 4656: OR crashes involving EB/WB vehicles |
| 0.94 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |  |
|  | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |
| D. Crash | Modification Factor (optiona | cond CMF) |  |
|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference |  |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
|  | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type |  |
|  | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |  |
|  | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

E. Crash Data

| Begin Date | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Source | MnCMAT Version 2.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity |  | CMF ID 4656: OR crashes inv EB/WB veh | No CMFs proposed |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes |  |  |  |
|  | B crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | C crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | PDO crashes |  |  |  |


| F. Benefit-Cost Calculation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$111,933 | Benefit (present value) |  |
| \$10,357,000 | Cost |  |

F. Analysis Assumptions

| Crash Cost |  |  | Crash Severity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes |  |  |  |  |

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| B crashes | 0.06 | 0.02 | $\$ 3,920$ |
| C crashes | 0.06 | 0.02 | $\$ 2,053$ |
| PDO crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |

H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$5,973 | \$5,973 | Total $=$ \$111,933 |
| 2025 | \$6,003 | \$5,932 |  |
| 2026 | \$6,033 | \$5,891 |  |
| 2027 | \$6,063 | \$5,850 |  |
| 2028 | \$6,094 | \$5,810 |  |
| 2029 | \$6,124 | \$5,770 |  |
| 2030 | \$6,155 | \$5,730 |  |
| 2031 | \$6,186 | \$5,690 |  |
| 2032 | \$6,216 | \$5,651 |  |
| 2033 | \$6,248 | \$5,612 |  |
| 2034 | \$6,279 | \$5,573 |  |
| 2035 | \$6,310 | \$5,534 |  |
| 2036 | \$6,342 | \$5,496 |  |
| 2037 | \$6,373 | \$5,458 |  |
| 2038 | \$6,405 | \$5,420 |  |
| 2039 | \$6,437 | \$5,383 |  |
| 2040 | \$6,470 | \$5,345 |  |
| 2041 | \$6,502 | \$5,308 |  |
| 2042 | \$6,534 | \$5,272 |  |
| 2043 | \$6,567 | \$5,235 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

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

## m <br> DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 8.62 | End RP | 8.68 | Miles | 0.06 |
| Location | At Huntington Ave |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work <br> Project Cost* | CSAH 5: Resurface pavement and install grooved-in pavement markings |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$10,357,000 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 10 years | Traffic Growth F | 0.5\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

C. Crash Modification Factor

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | CMF ID 9289: Resurface pavement (7.1\% reduction) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  | CMF ID 8112: Install grooved-in pavement markings (5.9\% reduction) |
|  | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes |  | CMF ID 9289: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO crashes involving EB/WB vehicles |
|  | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  | CMF ID 8112: SS crashes involving EB/WB vehicles |
| 0.90 | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |
|  | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type |
|  |  |  |
|  | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |

E. Crash Data

| Begin Date | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Source | MnCl |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity | CMF ID 9289: OR, SS, RE, LT, RA, \& HO CMF ID 8112: SS crashes involv EB/WB veh | No CMFs proposed |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes |  |  |  |
|  | B crashes |  |  |  |
|  | C crashes |  |  |  |
|  | PDO crashes | 2 |  |  |


| F. Benefit-Cost Calculation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$7,678 | Benefit (present value) |  |
| \$10,357,000 | Cost | 1 |


H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$792 | \$792 | Total = \$7,678 |
| 2025 | \$796 | \$787 |  |
| 2026 | \$800 | \$781 |  |
| 2027 | \$804 | \$776 |  |
| 2028 | \$808 | \$770 |  |
| 2029 | \$812 | \$765 |  |
| 2030 | \$816 | \$760 |  |
| 2031 | \$820 | \$754 |  |
| 2032 | \$824 | \$749 |  |
| 2033 | \$828 | \$744 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

Traffic Safety Benefit-Cost Calculation
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Reactive Project
A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 8.68 | End RP | 8.74 | Miles | 0.06 |
| Location | At Glenhurst Ave |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work <br> Project Cost* | CSAH 5: Reduce the number of lanes to cross from 4 to 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$10,357,000 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth F | 0.5\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

C. Crash Modification Factor

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | No CMF ID: Reduce lanes to cross from 4 to 3 (15\% reduction) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
| 0.85 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes |  | No CMF ID: RA crashes involving NB/SB vehicles crossing CSAH 5 |
| 0.85 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes | e |  |
| 0.85 | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |
|  | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type |
|  |  |  |
|  | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |
|  |  |  |

E. Crash Data

| Begin Date | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Source | MnCMAT Version 2.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity |  | RA crashes involving veh crossing CSAH 5 | No CMFs proposed |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes |  |  |  |
|  | B crashes | 2 |  |  |
|  | C crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | PDO crashes | 1 |  |  |


| F. Benefit-Cost Calculation |  | Benefit (present value) |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 507,820$ | Cost | B/C Ratio $=\mathbf{0 . 0 5}$ |
| $\$ 10,357,000$ |  | Proposed project expected to reduce 1 crashes annually, o of which involving fatality or serious injury. |

F. Analysis Assumptions

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| B crashes | 0.30 | 0.10 | $\$ 21,000$ |
| C crashes | 0.15 | 0.05 | $\$ 5,500$ |
| PDO crashes | 0.15 | 0.05 | $\$ 600$ |

H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$27,100 | \$27,100 | Total $=$ \$507,820 |
| 2025 | \$27,236 | \$26,913 |  |
| 2026 | \$27,372 | \$26,726 |  |
| 2027 | \$27,509 | \$26,542 |  |
| 2028 | \$27,646 | \$26,358 |  |
| 2029 | \$27,784 | \$26,176 |  |
| 2030 | \$27,923 | \$25,995 |  |
| 2031 | \$28,063 | \$25,815 |  |
| 2032 | \$28,203 | \$25,636 |  |
| 2033 | \$28,344 | \$25,459 |  |
| 2034 | \$28,486 | \$25,283 |  |
| 2035 | \$28,628 | \$25,108 |  |
| 2036 | \$28,771 | \$24,934 |  |
| 2037 | \$28,915 | \$24,762 |  |
| 2038 | \$29,060 | \$24,590 |  |
| 2039 | \$29,205 | \$24,420 |  |
| 2040 | \$29,351 | \$24,251 |  |
| 2041 | \$29,498 | \$24,084 |  |
| 2042 | \$29,645 | \$23,917 |  |
| 2043 | \$29,794 | \$23,752 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

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

## m <br> DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | CSAH 5 | District | Metro | County | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP | 8.74 | End RP | 8.80 | Miles | 0.06 |
| Location | At France Ave |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work <br> Project Cost* | Intersection: Install Pedestrian Countdown Timers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$10,357,000 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth | 0.5\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

C. Crash Modification Factor

E. Crash Data

| Begin Date | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Source | MnCMAT Version 2.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity |  | CMF 5272: PED crashes | No CMFs proposed |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes |  |  |  |
|  | B crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | C crashes |  |  |  |
|  | PDO crashes |  |  |  |


| F. Benefit-Cost Calculation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$918,199 | Benefit (present value) |  |
| \$10,357,000 | Cost | 9 |

F. Analysis Assumptions

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| B crashes | 0.70 | 0.23 | $\$ 49,000$ |
| C crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| PDO crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |

H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$49,000 | \$49,000 | Total = \$918,199 |
| 2025 | \$49,245 | \$48,661 |  |
| 2026 | \$49,491 | \$48,324 |  |
| 2027 | \$49,739 | \$47,990 |  |
| 2028 | \$49,987 | \$47,658 |  |
| 2029 | \$50,237 | \$47,329 |  |
| 2030 | \$50,488 | \$47,001 |  |
| 2031 | \$50,741 | \$46,676 |  |
| 2032 | \$50,995 | \$46,353 |  |
| 2033 | \$51,250 | \$46,033 |  |
| 2034 | \$51,506 | \$45,714 |  |
| 2035 | \$51,763 | \$45,398 |  |
| 2036 | \$52,022 | \$45,084 |  |
| 2037 | \$52,282 | \$44,772 |  |
| 2038 | \$52,544 | \$44,462 |  |
| 2039 | \$52,806 | \$44,155 |  |
| 2040 | \$53,070 | \$43,850 |  |
| 2041 | \$53,336 | \$43,546 |  |
| 2042 | \$53,603 | \$43,245 |  |
| 2043 | \$53,871 | \$42,946 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
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Attachment 01 | Project Narrative

## Project Name

CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

## City(ies)

St. Louis Park
N/A
N/A
N/A

## Commisioner Districts

3 N/A N/A
Capital Project Number 2168100

## Scoping Manager

Jason Pieper

## Project Category

Reconstruction
Scoping Form Revision Dates
5/3/2020

## Project Summary

Reconstruct Minnetonka Boulevard (CSAH 5) from TH 100 to France Avenue in the City of St. Louis Park.


## Project Timeline

Scoping: 2018-2020
Design: 2021-2023
R/W Acquisition: 2022-2023
Bid Advertisement: Q1 2024
Construction: Q2 2024-Q4 2025

## Project Delivery Responsibilities

Preliminary Design: Consultant
Final Design: Hennepin County
Construction Services: Hennepin County

| Project Budget - | Project Level |
| ---: | ---: |
| Construction: $\$$ | $7,990,000$ |
| Cost Estimate Year: | 2020 |
| Construction Year: | 2024 |
| Annual Inflation Rate: | $3.0 \%$ |
| Inflated Construction: | $\$$ |
| Design Services: | $\$$ |
| R/W Acquisition: | $\$$ |
| Other (Utility Burial): | $\$$ |
| Construction Services: | $\$$ |
| Contingency: | $\mathbf{7 2 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Total Project Budget: | - |

## Project Risks \& Uncertainities

- Additional right of way needed for the project
- Traffic volumes relatively high for a 3-lane conversion
- Eastbound vehicle taper lengths are less than ideal near Salem Ave


## Funding Notes

- Initial cost estimate developed Q2 2020 Eligible for federal funding throiugh the Metropolitan Council's Regional Solicitation given the functional classification of CSAH 5 (A-Minor Arterial)
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Attachment 05 - Potential Layout
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Attachment 05 - Potential Layout


## ON STREET PARKING
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Attachment 05 - Potential Layout
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## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 06 | 2020-2024 Hennepin County Transportation Capital Improvement Program

| Project Name: | 2168100 CSAH 5 - Reconst Mntka Blvd fr TH 100 to France Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Major Program: | Public Works |

Funding Start: 2019 Funding Completion: Beyond 2024


This project will complement the proposed Southwest Light Rail Transit (SWLRT) Project as it is located within proximity to the Beltine Boulevard and West Lake Street LRT Stations.

| REVENUE | Budget To-Date | 12/31/19 Act \& Enc | Balance | 2020 Budget | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Beyond 2024 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mn/DOT State Aid - Regular | 300,000 |  | 300,000 |  |  | 600,000 | 1,500,000 | 7,200,000 | 2,400,000 | 12,000,000 |
| St Louis Park |  |  |  |  |  | 400,000 | 900,000 | 1,800,000 | 600,000 | 3,700,000 |
| Total | 300,000 |  | 300,000 |  |  | 1,000,000 | 2,400,000 | 9,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 15,700,000 |
| EXPENSE | Budget To-Date | 12/31/19 Act \& Enc | Balance | 2020 Budget | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Beyond 2024 | Total |
| Right of Way |  |  |  |  |  | 600,000 | 1,400,000 |  |  | 2,000,000 |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,000,000 | 2,500,000 | 9,500,000 |
| Consulting | 300,000 |  | 300,000 |  |  | 200,000 |  |  |  | 500,000 |
| Contingency |  |  |  |  |  | 200,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 500,000 | 3,700,000 |
| Total | 300,000 |  | 300,000 |  |  | 1,000,000 | 2,400,000 | 9,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 15,700,000 |

BOARD APPROVED: 2020 CAPITAL BUDGET AND 2020-2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

| Project Name: 2168100 CSAH 5 -Reco <br> Major Program: Public Works <br> Department: Transportation Roads \& B | Mntka Blvd fr TH 100 es | to France Ave |  |  | Fundin Fundin | rt: <br> mpletion: | $19$ <br> yond 2024 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Year's CIP Process Summary | Budget To-Date | 2020 Budget | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Beyond 2024 | Total |
| Department Requested | 300,000 |  |  | 1,000,000 | 2,400,000 | 9,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 15,700,000 |
| Administrator Proposed | 300,000 |  |  | 1,000,000 | 2,400,000 | 9,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 15,700,000 |
| CBTF Recommended | 300,000 |  |  | 1,000,000 | 2,400,000 | 9,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 15,700,000 |
| Board Approved Final | 300,000 |  |  | 1,000,000 | 2,400,000 | 9,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 15,700,000 |
| Scheduling Milestones (major phases only): |  |  | Board Resolutions / Supplemental Information: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity <br> Anticipated Timeframe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planning <br> Design $\begin{aligned} & 2016-2019 \\ & \text { Q1 } 2020-\text { TBD } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bid Advertisement TBD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction TBD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completion TBD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project's Effect on Annual Operating Budget: <br> Additional planning and design work is required to determine the impact to Transportation Department staff or annual operating costs anticipated by this project. <br> Environmental Impacts and Initiatives: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Changes from Prior CIP: <br> - Postponed construction activities to PY 2024 based on availability of funding. <br> - Project Budget decreased by $\$ 0.3$ million from $\$ 16.0$ million to $\$ 15.7$ million based on revised Engineer's Estimate. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Last Year's CIP Process Summary | Budget To-Date | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | Beyond 2023 | Total |
| Department Requested |  |  | 2,000,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 4,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 16,000,000 |
| Administrator Proposed |  | 300,000 | 1,700,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 4,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 16,000,000 |
| CBTF Recommended |  | 300,000 | 1,700,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 4,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 16,000,000 |
| Board Approved Final |  | 300,000 | 1,700,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 4,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 16,000,000 |



## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 08 | Socio-Economic Equity Map


| Key |
| :---: |
| Category |
| Project Location |
| Community Resource |
| Disability |
| Elderly |
| Low-Income |
| Youth |


| 0 | 0.15 | 0.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Miles |

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: 5/5/2020


## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 09 | Affordable Housing Access Map


| Key |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Location |  |
| Construction Status |  |
| - Complete |  |
| - Planned |  |
| Affordable Units |  |
| - 0-50 |  |
| - 51-100 |  |
| - 101-150 |  |
| - 151-200 |  |
| - 201-1500 |  |
| Groups Served |  |
| $\square$ People with Disabilities |  |
| - Elderly |  |
| - Family |  |
| - Homeless |  |
| - Single People |  |
| II Multiple Groups |  |
| - No Information |  |
| 0.225 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.45 \\ & \text { Miles } \end{aligned}$ |

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: 5/1/2020


## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 10 | Intense Rain Event Example at Huntington Ave


## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 11 | Crash Map and Detail Listing


| Key |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Major Intersection |  |
| Crash Segment |  |
| 0 | 0.15 |

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: 5/13/2020


## Intersection A I At TH 100 Ramp NB

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of Ks | Number of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 395677 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 11 | 18 | 2016 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 44.9485909 | -93.3473012 |
| 597999 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 5 | 17 | 2018 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 44.94859113 | -93.3472275 |
| 656348 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 11 | 2 | 2018 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 44.94859797 | -93.3472342 |
| 669776 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 12 | 20 | 2018 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 44.94859426 | -93.3472373 |
| 587635 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 4 | 3 | 2018 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 44.94861045 | -93.3471404 |
| 501560 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 9 | 15 | 2017 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94859584 | -93.3469317 |
| 369237 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 8 | 5 | 2016 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 44.94859363 | -93.3469049 |
| 537253 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 1 | 16 | 2018 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 44.94860173 | -93.346872 |
| 342540 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 4 | 14 | 2016 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94860277 | -93.3468452 |
| 623404 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 7 | 25 | 2018 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94836486 | -93.34732 |
| 428777 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 3 | 13 | 2017 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94863052 | -93.3468051 |
| 514846 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 11 | 5 | 2017 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 44.94840871 | -93.3470251 |
| 399862 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 12 | 3 | 2016 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94852879 | -93.3457916 |
| 663269 | RAMP998 | 11 | 28 | 2018 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94837902 | -93.3472232 |
| 627087 | RAMP999 | 8 | 11 | 2018 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 44.94859591 | -93.3472208 |
| 339947 | RAMP651 | 4 | 3 | 2016 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.9484206 | -93.3469112 |
| 351362 | TOLEDO AVE S | 5 | 23 | 2016 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 70 | 44.94818586 | -93.347064 |

## Subtotal: 16

## Segment B I - E of Toledo to W of Ottawa Ave S

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of Ks | Number of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 608330 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 7 | 2 | 2018 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 74 | 44.94853854 | -93.3457178 |
| 331411 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 2 | 23 | 2016 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 44.94849225 | -93.3455283 |
| 648827 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 10 | 2 | 2018 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94848205 | -93.3453714 |
| 332587 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 2 | 28 | 2016 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 44.94855162 | -93.3452216 |
| 383977 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 10 | 3 | 2016 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94850419 | -93.3451828 |
| 327378 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 2 | 8 | 2016 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94848089 | -93.3448841 |
| 585927 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 3 | 27 | 2018 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 70 | 44.94846498 | -93.3448386 |
| 370741 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 8 | 11 | 2016 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94851276 | -93.344792 |
| 362096 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 7 | 7 | 2016 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94848232 | -93.3443357 |
| 472528 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 6 | 25 | 2017 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 74 | 44.9484758 | -93.3442477 |
| 354888 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 6 | 7 | 2016 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 44.94848995 | -93.3433832 |
| 543539 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 2 | 6 | 2018 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 44.9485042 | -93.3430483 |
| 666597 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 12 | 8 | 2018 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.9484359 | -93.3409435 |
| 636436 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 9 | 21 | 2018 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94849904 | -93.3429673 |
| 341554 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 4 | 11 | 2016 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 44.94848889 | -93.3429438 |
| 337333 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 3 | 22 | 2016 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 99 | 44.94848453 | -93.3424341 |
| 363149 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 7 | 11 | 2016 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.9484824 | -93.3420459 |
| 511940 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 10 | 27 | 2017 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94847604 | -93.3416658 |
| 603064 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 6 | 9 | 2018 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 90 | 44.94851419 | -93.3416526 |
| 387553 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 10 | 18 | 2016 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 99 | 44.94846487 | -93.3416407 |
| 425961 | SALEM AVE S | 3 | 1 | 2017 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 70 | 44.9483949 | -93.3455828 |
| 379974 | SALEM AVE S | 9 | 18 | 2016 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94842259 | -93.3456402 |
| 537737 | SALEM AVE S | 1 | 17 | 2018 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 44.94850066 | -93.3455087 |
| 497485 | RALEIGH AVE S | 8 | 29 | 2017 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 44.94852101 | -93.3442549 |
| 347476 | QUENTIN AVE S | 5 | 6 | 2016 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 90 | 44.9485285 | -93.3429809 |
| 359925 | PRINCETON AVE S | 6 | 28 | 2016 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94848593 | -93.3416595 |
| 541515 | RALEIGH AVE S | 1 | 31 | 2018 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94824724 | -93.3438767 |

## Intersection C I At Ottawa Ave S

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of Ks | Number of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 635617 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 9 | 17 | 2018 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 44.94846724 | -93.3409933 |
| 538237 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 1 | 17 | 2018 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94841324 | -93.3407468 |
| 343255 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 4 | 19 | 2016 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 44.94844886 | -93.3406724 |
| 472359 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 6 | 24 | 2017 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 44.94845865 | -93.3405991 |
| 458678 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 6 | 10 | 2017 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94843516 | -93.3404917 |
| 369603 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 8 | 7 | 2016 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94844951 | -93.3404716 |
| 522676 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 12 | 6 | 2017 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 44.94843854 | -93.3404447 |
| 425089 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 2 | 24 | 2017 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94843901 | -93.3404295 |
| 600664 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 5 | 29 | 2018 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94843681 | -93.3404381 |
| 348139 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 5 | 10 | 2016 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 44.94843246 | -93.3404241 |
| 379898 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 9 | 17 | 2016 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 99 | 44.94843548 | -93.3403844 |
| 449438 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 5 | 3 | 2017 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94844178 | -93.3403777 |
| 472928 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 6 | 27 | 2017 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 70 | 44.94843399 | -93.3403709 |
| 490526 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 7 | 30 | 2017 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 74 | 44.94843062 | -93.3403462 |
| 568152 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 2 | 22 | 2018 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.9484406 | -93.3402636 |
| 339081 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 3 | 30 | 2016 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 44.94844562 | -93.3401765 |
| 324263 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 1 | 28 | 2016 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 44.94847343 | -93.3401189 |
| 584946 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 3 | 21 | 2018 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.9484465 | -93.3398813 |
| 329764 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 2 | 15 | 2016 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 44.94845774 | -93.3389503 |
| 368734 | OTTAWA AVE | 8 | 3 | 2016 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |  | 44.94817326 | -93.3404566 |
| 351268 | OTTAWA AVE | 5 | 24 | 2016 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 |  | 44.94836587 | -93.3403902 |
| 323122 | OTTAWA AVE | 1 | 21 | 2016 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94841918 | -93.3403567 |
| 607444 | OTTAWA AVE | 6 | 28 | 2018 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94841646 | -93.3403708 |
| 333625 | OTTAWA AVE S | 3 | 5 | 2016 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 44.94843667 | -93.3403702 |
| 363260 | OTTAWA AVE S | 7 | 12 | 2016 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94844689 | -93.3403773 |
| 385851 | OTTAWA AVE S | 10 | 11 | 2016 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 44.94844812 | -93.3403822 |
| 667202 | OTTAWA AVE S | 12 | 10 | 2018 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94844182 | -93.3403643 |
| 355174 | OTTAWA AVE S | 6 | 8 | 2016 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94845943 | -93.3403375 |
| 432617 | OTTAWA AVE S | 3 | 31 | 2017 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 44.9484498 | -93.3403791 |
| 504299 | OTTAWA AVE S | 9 | 27 | 2017 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94851091 | -93.3402789 |
| 503099 | OTTAWA AVE S | 9 | 21 | 2017 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 99 | 44.94861174 | -93.3403787 |

## Subtotal: 31

## Segment D I - E of Ottawa Ave S to W of Lynn Ave S

| Incident <br> ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of <br> Ks | Number <br> of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing <br> Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 506793 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 10 | 6 | 2017 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 44.9484284 | -93.3392708 |
| 606523 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 6 | 24 | 2018 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 44.94848602 | -93.3383635 |
| 627790 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 8 | 14 | 2018 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94844572 | -93.3362187 |
| 583315 | MINNETONKA BLVD AN | 3 | 13 | 2018 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 44.94842624 | -93.3361516 |
| 609733 | NATCHEZ AVE S | 7 | 9 | 2018 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94840211 | -93.3390795 |
| 664851 | NATCHEZ AVE S | 12 | 1 | 2018 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.9484361 | -93.3390864 |
| 600681 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 5 | 25 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |  | 44.94850273 | -93.3356891 |

## Subtotal: 6

## Segment E I - E of Lynn Ave S to W of Inglewood Ave S

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of Ks | Number of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing <br> Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 389678 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 10 | 26 | 2016 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.9483994 | -93.3348635 |
| 383069 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 9 | 30 | 2016 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94853549 | -93.3339385 |
| 427906 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 3 | 9 | 2017 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94856426 | -93.3338716 |
| 448355 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 4 | 28 | 2017 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94856583 | -93.3338582 |
| 535176 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 1 | 12 | 2018 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94856434 | -93.3338448 |
| 492957 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 8 | 9 | 2017 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94835305 | -93.3340939 |
| 343961 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 4 | 22 | 2016 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94836359 | -93.3340784 |
| 340242 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 4 | 5 | 2016 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 44.94858418 | -93.3335766 |
| 411221 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 1 | 4 | 2017 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94833534 | -93.3339642 |
| 620538 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 7 | 13 | 2018 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94835912 | -93.3339778 |
| 634037 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 9 | 11 | 2018 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94835634 | -93.3339276 |
| 666070 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 12 | 5 | 2018 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 68 | 44.94854346 | -93.3329357 |
| 367133 | JOPPA AVE S | 7 | 28 | 2016 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |  | 44.94818748 | -93.3339198 |
| 651981 | JOPPA AVE S | 10 | 15 | 2018 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94828762 | -93.3339352 |
| 502479 | JOPPA AVE S | 9 | 19 | 2017 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 99 | 44.9483164 | -93.3339239 |
| 620442 | JOPPA AVE S | 7 | 12 | 2018 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94832433 | -93.3339507 |
| 532350 | JOPPA AVE S | 1 | 3 | 2018 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 90 | 2 | 44.94833679 | -93.333929 |
| 380210 | JOPPA AVE S | 9 | 19 | 2016 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94845937 | -93.3339046 |
| 369764 | JOPPA AVE S | 8 | 7 | 2016 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 44.94855466 | -93.3338984 |
| 497624 | JOPPA AVE S | 8 | 29 | 2017 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 90 | 2 | 44.94857606 | -93.3339086 |
| 520549 | JOPPA AVE S | 11 | 29 | 2017 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 44.94859269 | -93.3339255 |
| 317390 | JOPPA AVE S | 1 | 6 | 2016 | 23 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 44.94861332 | -93.3339081 |
| 657348 | JOPPA AVE S | 11 | 5 | 2018 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94866569 | -93.3339158 |

## Subtotal: 22

Intersection F I At Inglewood Ave S

| Incident <br> ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of <br> Ks | Number <br> of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing <br> Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 631831 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 9 | 1 | 2018 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94853948 | -93.3325701 |
| 384181 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 10 | 5 | 2016 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 70 | 44.94836868 | -93.332596 |
| 391057 | INGLEWOOD AVE S | 11 | 1 | 2016 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 44.94861324 | -93.3327133 |
| 454650 | INGLEWOOD AVE S | 5 | 24 | 2017 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 70 | 44.94863444 | -93.332678 |
| 534032 | INGLEWOOD AVE S | 1 | 9 | 2018 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 44.94866302 | -93.3326782 |

## Subtotal: 5

## Intersection G I At CSAH 25 WB

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of Ks | Number of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 419582 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 1 | 30 | 2017 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94822488 | -93.3318252 |
| 417167 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 1 | 20 | 2017 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94820897 | -93.3316858 |
| 497771 | CSAH 25 | 8 | 30 | 2017 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94832257 | -93.3306952 |

## Intersection H I CSAH 25 EB At CSAH 5

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of Ks | Number of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 510026 | CSAH 25 | 10 | 19 | 2017 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94790799 | -93.3310404 |
| 343804 | CSAH 25 | 4 | 21 | 2016 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.9479159 | -93.3310371 |
| 343768 | CSAH 25 | 4 | 21 | 2016 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94794413 | -93.3308964 |
| 589289 | CSAH 25 | 4 | 8 | 2018 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 44.94806296 | -93.3303713 |

Intersection I I At Huntington Ave S

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of Ks | Number of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 582024 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 3 | 7 | 2018 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |  | 44.94848521 | -93.3317007 |
| 319667 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 1 | 13 | 2016 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 44.94845183 | -93.3308675 |

## Intersection J I At Glenhurst Ave

| Incident ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of Ks | Number of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing <br> Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 389332 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 10 | 25 | 2016 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94854837 | -93.3311586 |
| 471092 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 6 | 20 | 2017 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 99 | 44.94839416 | -93.3309057 |
| 365868 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 7 | 23 | 2016 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94847141 | -93.330289 |
| 657184 | MINNETONKA BLVD | 11 | 6 | 2018 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94842382 | -93.3302725 |
| 608845 | CSAH 25 | 7 | 4 | 2018 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 44.94840105 | -93.3305033 |
| 665127 | CSAH 25 | 12 | 2 | 2018 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44.94842181 | -93.3301579 |
| 593037 | CSAH 25 | 4 | 23 | 2018 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 44.94842248 | -93.3301076 |
| 444317 | CSAH 25 | 4 | 10 | 2017 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 44.94842533 | -93.3300781 |
| 337607 | GLENHURST AVE | 3 | 23 | 2016 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 44.94844167 | -93.3301614 |

## Subtotal: 8

## Intersection K I At France Ave S

| Incident <br> ID | Roadway | Month | Day | Year | Hour | Sev | Num of <br> Ks | Number <br> of Veh | Basic <br> Type | Contributing <br> Factor | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 585399 | CSAH 25 | 3 | 25 | 2018 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 62 | 44.94828878 | -93.329888 |
| 593837 | GLENHURST AVE | 4 | 27 | 2018 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 90 | 44.94793794 | -93.3301753 |
| 589907 | CSAH 25 | 4 | 10 | 2018 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94824567 | -93.3293944 |
| 524250 | CSAH 25 | 12 | 10 | 2017 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.94831341 | -93.3290723 |
| 389319 | CSAH 25 | 10 | 25 | 2016 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 44.9484688 | -93.3289981 |
| 656245 | CSAH 25 | 11 | 1 | 2018 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 44.94833933 | -93.328875 |
| 378243 | W LAKE ST | 9 | 10 | 2016 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 99 | 44.94847063 | -93.3287977 |
| 381417 | FRANCE AVE S | 9 | 23 | 2016 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10 |  | 63 | 44.94835264 |
| 408313 | FRANCE AVE S | 12 | 23 | 2016 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 44.94848836 |
| 517249 | FRANCE AVE S | 11 | 15 | 2017 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 |  | 90 | 44.94851252 |

## Subtotal: 8

Project Total: 122

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

## CMF ID: 271

## PROVIDE A LEFT-TURN LANE ON BOTH MAJOR-ROAD APPROACHES

DESCRIPTION:
PRIOR CONDITION: NO PRIOR CONDIIION(S)
CATEGORY: INTERSECTION GEOMETRY
STUDY: SAFETY EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERSECTION LEFT- AND RIGHT-TURN LANES, HARWOOD ET AL., 2002

| Star Quality Rating: | Stemicicre |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.58 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: | 0.04 |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.03 |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 42 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: | 4 |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 3 |


| Applicability |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Type: | All |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not Specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Urban |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: |  |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

## RF DETAILS

## CMF ID: 1119

## PROVIDE BIKE LANES

DESCRIPTION:
PRIOR CONDITION: NO PRIOR CONDITION(S)
CATEGORY: BICYCLISTS

STUDY: SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: INFORMATIONAL GUIDE, RODEGERDTS ET AL., 2004

| Star Quality Rating: | [VIEW SCORE DETAILS] |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.65 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.2 |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 35 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 20.3 |


|  | Applicability |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Type: | Vehicle/bicycle |
| Crash Severity: | K (fatal), A (serious injury), B (minor injury), C (possible injury) |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: |  |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: |  |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

## CMFID:2841

## CONVERTING FOUR-LANE ROADWAYS TO THREE-LANE ROADWAYS WITH CENTER TURN LANE (ROAD DIET)

## DESCRIPTION: CONVERSION OF ROAD SEGMENTS FROM A FOUR-LANE TO A THREE-LANE CROSS-SECTION WITH TWO-WAY LEFT-TURN LANES (ALSO KNOWN AS ROAD DIETS).

PRIOR CONDITION: FOUR-LANE UNDIVIDED ROADWAY
CATEGORY: ROADWAY

STUDY: COMPARISON OF EMPIRICAL BAYES AND FULL BAYES APPROACHES FOR BEFORE-AFTER ROAD SAFETY EVALUATIONS, PERSAUD ET. AL, 2010

| Star Quality Rating: | Surinile [VIEW SCOREDETAILS] |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.53 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.02 |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 47 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 2 |
|  | Applicability |
| Crash Type: | All |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not Specified |
| Number of Lanes: | 4 |
| Road Division Type: | Undivided |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Suburban |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: | All |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

## CMF ID: 3017

ADD TWO-WAY-LEFT-TURN-LANE (TWLTL) TO THE MAJOR APPROACH OF AN UNSIGNALIZED 4-LEG INTERSECTION
description: add two-way-left-turn-Lane (twitil) to themajor approach of an unsignalized 4-legintersection
PRIOR CONDITION: UNSIGNALIZED 4-LEG INTERSECTION WITH NOTWO-WAY LEFT-TURN LANE ON MAJOR ROAD
CATEGORY: ACCESS MANAGEMENT
STUDY: THE GROUP LEAST ABSOLUTE SHRINKAGE AND SELECTION OPERATOR "GLASSO" TECHNIQUE: APPLICATION IN VARIABLE SELECTION AND CRASH PREDICTION AT UNSIG INTERSECTIONS, HALEEM AND ABDEL-ATY, 2010

| Star Quality Rating: | (herine [VIEW SCORE DETAILS] |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.66 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: |  |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 34 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: |  |


ww.cmfclearinghouse.org/detail.cfm?facid=3017

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

CMFID: 4656

## INSTALL BICYCLE LANES

DESCRIPTION:
PRIOR CONDITION: NO BICYCLELANE ALONG THE ROADWAY SEGMENT.
CATEGORY: BICYCLISTS
STUDY: EVALUATING THE SAFETY EFFECTS OF BICYCLE LANES IN NEW YORK CITY, CHEN ET AL., 2012

| Star Quality Rating: | Sticiras [VIEW SCORE DETAILS] |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.944 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.101 |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 5.6 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 10.1 |


|  | Applicability |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Type: | All |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: | 1-5+ |
| Road Division Type: | All |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Urban |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: | All |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

CMFID: 5272
INSTALL PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN TIMER
DESCRIPTION: INSTALL PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN TIMER
PRIOR CONDITION: UNKNOWN
CATEGORY: INTERSECTION TRAFFIC CONTROL
STUDY: EVALUATING PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS, VAN HOUTEN ET AL., 2012

| Star Quality Rating: | SVIEW SCORE DETAILS] |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.3 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: |  |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 70 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: |  |


|  | Applicability |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Type: | Vehicle/pedestrian |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Not specified |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: |  |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

CMFID: 1684

## CHANGE FROM PERMISSIVE ONLY TO FLASHING YELLOW ARROW PROTECTED/PERMISSIVE LEFT TURN

DESCRIPTION: CHANGE FROM PERMISSIVE ONLY TO FYA - PROTECTED/PERMISSIVE LEFT TURN
PRIOR CONDITION: PERMISSIVE PHASING
CATEGORY: INTERSECTION TRAFFIC CONTROL

STUDY: SAFETY EFFECTIVENESS OF FLASHING YELLOW ARROW: EVALUATION OF 222 SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA, SIMPSON AND TROY, 2015


|  | Applicability |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Type: | Left turn |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: | 35-55 |
| Area Type: | Not specified |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: |  |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |

## 

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

CMFID: 8112

## UPGRADE EXISTING MARKINGS TO WET-REFLECTIVE PAVEMENT MARKINGS

DESCRIPTION: THIS STRATEGY INVOLVES UPGRADING EXISTING MARKINGS FROM STANDARD MARKING MATERIALSTO WET-REFLECTIVE MARKINGS APPLIED AS PAINT, TAPE, OR THERMOPLASTIC MATERIAL.
PRIOR CONDITION: STANDARD PAVEMENT MARKINGS
CATEGORY: DELINEATION
STUDY: SAFETY EVALUATION OF WET REFLECTIVE PAVEMENT MARKERS, LYON ET AL., 2015


Crash Reduction Factor (CRF)
Value: $\quad 5.9$ (This value indicates a decrease in crashes)

Adjusted Standard Error:

Unadjusted Standard Error:
11.5

|  | Applicability |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Type: | Sideswipe |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: | multilane |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: |  |
| Traffic Volume: | Minimum of 1353 to Maximum of 25381 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |
| Average Traffic Volume: | 7274 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |
| Time of Day: |  |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |

ww.cmfclearinghouse.org/detail.cfm?facid=8112

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project

Attachment 12 | Crash Modification Factors

CMF ID: 9289
RESURFACE PAVEMENT
DESCRIPTION:
PRIOR CONDITION: NO PRIOR CONDIIION(S)
CATEGORY: ROADWAY
STUDY: TIME SERIES TRENDS OF THE SAFETY EFFECTS OF PAVEMENT RESURFACING, PARK ET AL., 2017

| Star Quality Rating: | Stinite [VIEW SCORE DETAILS] |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.929 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.04 |

Crash Reduction Factor (CRF)
Value: $\quad 7.1$ (This value indicates a decrease in crashes)
Adjusted Standard Error:

Unadjusted Standard Error:
4

|  | Applicability |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Type: | All |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Principal Arterial Other |
| Number of Lanes: | 1-4 |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: | 25 mph to 65 mph |
| Area Type: | Urban |
| Traffic Volume: | Minimum of 2100 to Maximum of 40500 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |
| Average Traffic Volume: | 8659 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |
| Time of Day: | Not specified |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based |

## CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project



Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.
Published date: 5/7/2020

Hennepin

# CSAH 5 (Minnetonka Blvd) Reconstruction Project 

Attachment 14 | City of St. Louis Park Support Letter

## /// St. Louis Park <br> MINNESOTA

Esperience LIFE in the Park

May 1, 2020

Carla Stueve, P.E., P.T.O.E.
Director and County Highway Engineer
Hennepin County Transportation Project Delivery
7009 York Avenue South
Edina, MN 55435
RE: Support for Regional Solicitation Application M innetonka Blvd (CSAH 5) Roadway Reconstruction Project - TH 100 to France Ave

Dear M s. Stueve:
The City of St. Louis Park hereby expresses its support for the Hennepin County regional solicitation federal funding application for the proposed reconstruction project on CSAH 5 (M innetonka Boulevard) from TH 100 to France Avenue.

M innetonka Boulevard between Trunk Highway (TH) 169 and France Avenue is a Hennepin County road and is one of the few continuous west-to-east roadway connections in the City of St. Louis Park. The M innetonka Boulevard bridge over TH 100 was reconstructed in 2015 and includes bicycle, pedestrian and intersection improvements that have greatly increased the efficiency and safety in this segment of the corridor. Reconstructing the road to the east of the new bridge will ensure that it accommodates the best facility for pedestrians, bicycles, and motorists.

This project will involve the reconstruction of the existing roadway and will include, but is not limited to, the following elements: new pavement, curb, stormwater structures, sidewalk, ADA accommodations, and traffic signals. As proposed, this project will bring about mobility and safety improvements for people biking, driving, walking, and using transit. The roadway design will also take into account the future CSAH 25 improvements near this corridor.

We understand that the city will likely be required to cost participate in this project as outlined in the county's cost participation policy. Specific details regarding cost participation and maintenance responsibilities of project elements are anticipated to be finalized during the design process as project development is advanced. The city has included the estimated costs for this project in our 10 year Capital Improvement Plan and we look forward to partnering with the county on these much needed improvements.

Thank you for making us aware of this application effort and the opportunity to provide support. The city looks forward to working with you on this project.

CC: Tom Harmening, City M anager
Jason Pieper, Transportation Engineer


[^0]:    2.Sub-measure: Equity Population Benefits and Impacts: A successful project is one that has been designed to provide direct benefits to lowincome populations, people of color, persons with disabilities, youth and the elderly. All projects must mitigate potential negative benefits as required under federal law. Projects that are designed to provide benefits go beyond the mitigation requirement to proactively provide transportation benefits and solve transportation issues experienced by Equity populations.
    a.Describe the projects benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements; public health benefits; direct access improvements for residents or improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care or other; travel time improvements; gap closures; new transportation services or modal options, leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community connection and cohesion improvements. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

[^1]:    Improved roadway to better accommodate freight movements:

