Application

01967-2014 Roadway Expansion
02004 - CSAH 42 Reconstruction
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Status:
Submitted Date:

Submitted
12/01/2014 12:34 PM

## Primary Contact

| Name:* | Andy |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salutation | First Name | Middle Name | Last Name |
| Title: | Senior |  |  |  |
| Department: |  |  |  |  |
| Email: | ahingeveld@co.scott.mn.us |  |  |  |
| Address: | 600 Country Trail East |  |  |  |
|  | Jordan | Minnesota |  | 55352 |
|  | City | State/Province |  | Postal Code/Zip |
| Phone:* | 952-496-8839 |  |  |  |
|  | Phone |  | Ext. |  |
| Fax: |  |  |  |  |
| What Grant Programs are you most interested in? | Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements |  |  |  |

## Organization Information

Jurisdictional Agency (if different):


## Project Information

Project Name
Primary County where the Project is Located

CSAH 42 Reconstruction
Scott

Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

Brief Project Description (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

The proposed project is the reconstruction of CSAH 42 from east of CSAH 17 to west of CSAH 83. CSAH 42 is an A-Minor Arterial. CSAH 17 (AMinor) will be reconstructed to four lanes in 2015 and CSAH 83 (A-Minor) was reconstructed to four lanes in 2009. The increase in traffic between these two north-south arterials will lead to the need for additional capacity on CSAH 42. Improvements include the expansion of CSAH 42 from a two lane rural roadway to a four lane divided roadway with left and right turn lanes, wider paved shoulders, trails on both sides of CSAH 42 and the reconstruction of local street approaches. The project will improve operations and safety components for the roadway and complete the fourlane highway with bike/ped facilities along the entire CSAH 42 in Scott County.

The reconstruction project will also implement access management recommendations in the adopted 1999 CSAH 42 Corridor Study. Overall spacing in the project area results in just under 1/2mile full access public street spacing on the expander arterial. Changes to access as part of the project include adding left and right turn lanes at Dakotah Parkway and removing direct access of private driveways where possible.

The purpose of this project is to address safety issues, modernize the roadway, and provide additional multi-modal transportation capacity on CSAH 42 to serve the traveling public in northern Scott County by filling a gap in the corridor and expanding a two-lane rural section residing between two north-south four-lane arterials. With the continued development of Shakopee, Prior Lake, and the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community, additional traffic demands will occur as development moves to the west along this
segment. CSAH 42 creates a continuous east-west arterial between TH 169 in Scott County and TH 52 in Dakota County.

Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.
Project Length (Miles)
1.5

Connection to Local Planning:
Reference the name of the appropriate comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study document [studies on trunk highway must be approved by MnDOT and the Metropolitan Council], or other official plan or program of the applicant agency [includes Safe Routes to School Plans] that the project is included in and/or a transportation problem/need that the project addresses. List the applicable documents and pages.

Scott County 2030 Transportation Improvement
Program (Page 48)

Scott County 2030 Comprehensive Plan (Page VI22)

Connection to Local Planning
City of Shakopee Comprehensive Plan (Page 2.2)

City of Prior Lake Comprehensive Plan (Table 5.2)

CSAH 42 Corridor Study (1999)

## Project Funding

| Are you applying for funds from another source(s) to implement this project? | No |
| :---: | :---: |
| If yes, please identify the source(s) |  |
| Federal Amount | \$5,269,600.00 |
| Match Amount | \$1,317,400.00 |
| Minimum of 20\% of project total |  |
| Project Total | \$6,587,000.00 |
| Match Percentage | 20.0\% |
| Minimum of 20\% |  |
| Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total |  |
| Source of Match Funds | Local |
| Preferred Program Year |  |
| Select one: | 2019 |


| County, City, or Lead Agency | Scott County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Class of Road | A-Minor Expander |  |
| Road System | CSAH |  |
| TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET |  |  |
| Name of Road | 140th Street NW |  |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE |  |  |
| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | 55379 |  |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date | 05/01/2019 |  |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date | 12/01/2019 |  |
| LOCATION |  |  |
| From: <br> (Intersection or Address) | CSAH 17 |  |
| Do not include legal description; Include name of roadway if majority of facility runs adjacent to a single corridor. |  |  |
| To: <br> (Intersection or Address) | CSAH 83 |  |
| Type of Work | Grade, Agg Base, Bit Sewer, Lighting, Bike | and Gutter, Storm |
| Examples: grading, aggregate base, bituminous base, bituminous surface, sidewalk, signals, lighting, guardrail, bicycle path, ped ramps, bridge, Park \& Ride, etc.) |  |  |
| Old Bridge/Culvert? | No |  |
| New Bridge/Culvert? | No |  |
| Structure is Over/Under <br> (Bridge or culvert name): | n/a |  |
| Specific Roadway Elements |  |  |
| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES |  |  |
| Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost) |  | \$340,000.00 |
| Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost) |  | \$340,000.00 |
| Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) |  | \$600,000.00 |
| Roadway (aggregates and paving) |  | \$2,949,000.00 |
| Subgrade Correction (muck) |  | \$100,000.00 |
| Storm Sewer |  | \$800,000.00 |
| Ponds |  | \$200,000.00 |
| Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) |  | \$360,000.00 |
| Traffic Control |  | \$150,000.00 |

Striping ..... \$50,000.00
Signing ..... \$30,000.00
Lighting ..... $\$ 0.00$
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bridge ..... $\$ 0.00$
Retaining Walls ..... $\$ 0.00$
Noise Wall ..... $\$ 0.00$
Traffic Signals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wetland Mitigation ..... \$30,000.00
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection ..... $\$ 0.00$
RR Crossing ..... $\$ 0.00$
Roadway Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Roadway Elements ..... $\$ 300,000.00$
Totals ..... \$6,249,000.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST EStimates Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... $\$ 288,000.00$
Sidewalk Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... \$20,000.00
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... \$10,000.00
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... $\$ 0.00$
Streetscaping ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... \$20,000.00
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$338,000.00
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 ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit and TDM Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Transit and TDM Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Operating Costs
OPERATING COSTS Cost
Transit Operating Costs ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$0.00

## Totals

Total Cost
Construction Cost Total
Transit Operating Cost Total
\$6,587,000.00
\$6,587,000.00
$\$ 0.00$

## 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 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (amended 2013), the 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan (amended 2013), and the 2030 Water Resources Management Policy Plan (2005).
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
2.Applicants that are not 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
3.Applicants must not submit an application for the same project in more than one funding sub-category.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
4.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.
Expansion, reconstruction/modernization, and bridges must be between $\$ 1,000,000$ and $\$ 7,000,000$. Roadway system management must be between $\$ 250,000$ and $\$ 7,000,000$.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
6. The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
7.The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project for the useful life of the improvement.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
8. 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
9.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
10.The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed projected to all affected communities and other levels and units of government prior to submitting the application.

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

## Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

## Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization Projects Only

1.The project must be designed to meet 10 -ton load limit standards.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
2.Federal funds are available for roadway construction and reconstruction on new alignments or within existing right-of-way, including associated construction and excavation, bridges, or installation of traffic signals, signs, utilities, bikeway or walkway components and transit components.
The project must exclude costs for right-of-way, studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding unless included as part of a larger project, which is otherwise eligible.

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

## Bridge Projects Only

3.The bridge project 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.
4.Bridges selected in previous Bridge Improvement and Replacement solicitations (1994 2011) are not eligible. A previously selected project is not eligible unless it has been withdrawn or sunset prior to the deadline for proposals in this solicitation.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
5.Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a Principal Arterial of freeway design 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.
6. 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 sub-categories. Rail-only bridges are ineligible for funding.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
7. The length of the bridge must equal or exceed 20 feet.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
8. Project limits for bridge projects are limited from abutment to abutment.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
9.The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, construction engineering, and right-of-way.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Bridge Replacement Projects Only
10. The bridge must have a sufficienty rating less than 50. Additionally, it must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Bridge Rehabilitiation Projects Only
11.The bridge must have a sufficienty rating less than 80. Additionally, it must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

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

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2004 Scott Co HSIP.pdf | Crash B/C | 33 KB |
| Preliminary Layout 11-14-2014 (Reduced <br> Size).pdf | Project Layout | 818 KB |
| Prior Lake Letter of Support-CH 42.pdf | Letter of Support - City of Prior Lake | 34 KB |
| Scott County Resolution.pdf | Scott County Resolution | 82 KB |
| Shakopee Letter of Support-CH 42.pdf | Letter of Support - City of Shakopee | 228 KB |

## Reliever: Freeway Facility or

Facility being relieved
Number of hours per day volume exceeds capacity (based on the Congestion Report)

## Reliever: Non-Freeway Facility or

Facility being relieved
Number of hours per day volume exceeds capacity (based on the table below)

## Non-Freeway Facility Volume/Capacity Table

| Hour | NB/EB Volume | SB/WB Volume | Capacity | Volume exceeds capacity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00am-1:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 1:00am-2:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 2:00am-3:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 3:00am-4:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 4:00am-5:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 5:00am-6:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 6:00am-7:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 7:00am-8:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 8:00am-9:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 9:00am-10:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 10:00am - 11:00am |  |  | 0 |  |
| 11:00am-12:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 12:00pm-1:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 1:00pm-2:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 2:00pm-3:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 3:00pm - 4:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 4:00pm - 5:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 5:00pm -6:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 6:00pm-7:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 7:00pm - 8:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 8:00pm -9:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 9:00pm-10:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 10:00pm - 11:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 11:00pm-12:00am |  |  | 0 |  |

## Expander/Augmentor/Non-Freeway Principal Arterial

Select one:
Area
Project Length
Average Distance

Expander
9.3
1.5
6.2

## Measure B: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

| Location | CSAH 42 and Dakota Parkway |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume | 1120.0 |

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

Select all that apply
Direct connection to or within a mile of a Job Concentration
Direct connection to or within a mile of a
Manufacturing/Distribution Location
Direct connection to or within a mile of an Educational Institution
Project provides a direct connection to or within a mile of an existing local activity center identified in an adopted county or Yes city plan

County or City Plan Reference (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Upload Map

The project is within a mile of the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community and Mystic Lake Resort and Casino. This is a major activity center, and the largest employment center in the county. The Scott County 2030 Comprehensive Plan identifies this as a local activity center.

CH 42 Economy Map.pdf

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

Location
Current AADT Volume
Existing Transit Routes on the Project

CSAH 42 and Dakota Parkway
6900.0

490, 491

## Response: Current Daily Person Throughput

| Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership | 737.0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current Daily Person Throughput | 9707.0 |

## Measure B: $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ Forecast ADT

Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2030) ADT volume

## OR

Approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2030) ADT volume

Yes

Forecast (2030) ADT volume 14100.0

## Measure A: Project Location and Impact to Disadvantaged Populations

Select one:
Project located in Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty
Project located in Concentrated Area of 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.

Response (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

Upload Map

The CSAH 42 project is located in an area above the regional average for race or poverty.
Approximately 25 percent of Shakopees population is non-white. Between 2000-2010, $46 \%$ of new residents were people of color (the largest percentage for suburban edge communities). The diversity of the community is continuing to increase, and it is especially noticeable in the schools and the youth population. There are a number of older rural residential homes located in the vicinity of this project that contributes to the affordable rental housing stock.

Scott County is home to a large Native American community. This project abuts land owned by the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community. The project will reduce congestion and improve air quality for this community and its workers.

The project will provide trails on both sides of CSAH 42. The trail will improve the quality of life for not only the SMSC residents but improve the quality of life for residents of Shakopee and Prior Lake. The trails allow for a place to walk or bike where there is no opportunity to do so today.

The project is not anticipated to negatively impact low-income populations, populations of color, or the elderly. All facilities will be upgraded to current ADA standards to improve access for people with disabilities.

CH 42 Socio Economic Map.pdf

## Measure B: Affordable Housing

City/Township

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length 1.5

## Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

| City/TownshipSegment <br> Length (Miles) | Total Length <br> (Miles) | Score | Segment <br> Length/Total <br> Length | Housing Score <br> Multiplied by <br> Segment <br> percent |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Shakopee | 1.2 | 1.5 | 60.0 | 0.8 | 48.0 |
| Prior Lake | 0.3 | 1.5 | 52.0 | 0.2 | 10.4 |
|  |  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | 58 |

## Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

Total Project Length (Miles)
1.5

Total Housing Score
58.4

## Measure A: Year of Roadway Construction

Year of Original

| Roadway Construction <br> or Most Recent <br> Reconstruction | Roadway Segment <br> Length (Miles) | Calculation | Calculation 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1977.0 | 1.5 | 2965.5 | 1977.0 |
|  | 2 | 2966 | 1977 |

## Average Construction Year

Weighted Year
1977.0

Total Segment Length (Miles)
Total Segment Length

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness of Vehicle Delay Reduction

| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay Without The Project | 1506.0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay With The Project | 5271.0 |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay Reduced by Project | -3765 |
| Cost Effectiveness | $(\$ 1,749.54)$ |
| Synchro or HCM Reports | CH42-Dakotah Synchro Report.pdf |

## Measure B: Cost Effectiveness of Emissions Reduction

Total Project Cost from Cost Sheet
Total Peak Hour Kilograms Reduced by Project
Cost Effectiveness
Synchro or HCM Reports
\$6,587,000.00
$-0.5$
(\$13,174,000.00)
CH42-Dakotah Synchro Report.pdf

## Measure A: Benefit/Cost of Crash Reduction

Project Benefit/Cost Ratio

Worksheet Attachment
42 Expansion benefitcostworksheet.xls

## Measure A: Transit Connections

Existing Routes Directly Connected to the Project
490, 491
Planned Transitways directly connected to the project (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP)

Upload Map

CH 42 Transit Connections Map.pdf

## Response

Met Council Staff Data Entry Only
Route Ridership
185574.0

Transitway Ridership
0

Measure B: Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections

Response (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

The project will provide bike/ped facilities that connect to the trail system along entire length of CSAH 42 in Shakopee, Prior Lake and Savage, including the community commercial district at CSAH 42 and TH 13. Along the project area, access will be improved to planned residential and commercial areas in Shakopee, Prior Lake, and tribal lands and residential neighborhoods that are part of the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community. At each end of the project, the eastwest trail connection will connect to two major north-south trail routes (CSAH 17 and CSAH 83), extending into employment centers at Marschall Road and Canterbury Road.

CSAH 42 is identified as a Tier 2 Defined Alignment Corridor in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN). This project includes bike/ped facilities and paved shoulders on both sides of CSAH 42. These improvements will complete the facilities for the regional bicycle network and provide a connection to the Scott West Regional Trail which follows CSAH 17 north to Shakopee (to be completed in 2015) and south to Prior Lake (planned connection). Along CSAH 42, the facilities will create a nearly continuous connection into Dakota Countys trail system, a total distance of 8.5 miles.

## Measure C: Multimodal Facilities

There are currently no pedestrian or bicycle facilities on this segment of CSAH 42. The current rural design with narrow shoulders makes it hazardous and uninviting for pedestrians and bicycles to travel this corridor. This project will significantly improve safety conditions by providing paved shoulders and separated sidewalk/trail facilities on both sides of CSAH 42 for pedestrian and bicycle use. The trails will connect into the existing north-south trail systems along CSAH 17 and CSAH 83, and the Scott West Regional Trail between Shakopee and Prior Lake.

Response (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
The project area is within the 490 and 491 transit service routes. Additional transit opportunities may increase with the merger of Minnesota Valley Transit Agency into Shakopee and Prior Lake. The Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community offers a bus service for its employees and clientele from Mystic Lake Casino across the metro. Upgraded facilities on this segment of CSAH 42 may see an increased demand in transit service to connect to the bus shoulders installed on CSAH 17 north to TH 169 and the Marschall Road Transit Station located approximately two miles north of the project limits. The transit station includes bike lockers and is the only heated and air conditioned transit station in Scott County.

## Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction

If the applicant is completing a transit or TDM application, only Park-and-Ride and other construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below. Check the box below if the project does not require the Risk Assessment fields, and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment.

Check Here if Your Transit Project Does Not Require Construction

## Measure A: Risk Assessment

1)Project Scope (5 Percent of Points)

Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred
Yes
100\%

Stakeholders have been identified
40\%
Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted
0\%
2)Layout or Preliminary Plan (5 Percent of Points)

Layout or Preliminary Plan completed
100\%
Layout or Preliminary Plan started Yes
50\%
Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
10/30/2014
3)Environmental Documentation (10 Percent of Points)

EIS
EA
Yes
PM

Document Status:

Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)

Document submitted to State Aid for review

Document in progress; environmental impacts identified
50\%
Document not started
Yes
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion/approval
4)Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 Percent of Points)

No known potential for archaeological resources, no historic resources known to be eligible for/listed on the National Register of Historic Places located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge

100\%
Historic/archeological review under way; determination of no
historic properties affected or no adverse effect anticipated
80\%
Historic/archaeological review under way; determination of adverse effect anticipated

40\%
Unknown impacts to historic/archaeological resources
Yes
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review:

12/01/2016

Project is located on an identified historic bridge
5)Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (15 Percent of Points)
(4f is publicly owned parks, recreation areas, historic sites, wildlife or waterfowl refuges; $6 f$ is outdoor recreation lands where Land and Water Conservation Funds were used for planning, acquisition, or development of the property)

No Section 4f/6f resources located in the project area
Yes
100\%
Project is an independent bikeway/walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement; letter of support received

100\%
Section 4 f resources present within the project area, but no known adverse effects

80\%
Adverse effects (land conversion) to Section 4f/6f resources likely

30\%
Unknown impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area
$0 \%$
6)Right-of-Way (15 Percent of Points)

Right-of-way or easements not required
100\%
Right-of-way or easements has/have been acquired
100\%
Right-of-way or easements required, offers made
75\%
Right-of-way or easements required, appraisals made
50\%
Right-of-way or easements required, parcels identified
Yes
25\%
Right-of-way or easements required, parcels not identified
0\%
Right-of-way or easements identification has not been completed
0\%
Anticipated date or date of acquisition

No railroad involvement on project
100\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature page)

Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated

60\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

40\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations not begun

0\%
Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement
8)Construction Documents/Plan (10 Percent of Points)

Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)

100\%
Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review
75\%
Construction plans in progress; at least $30 \%$ completion
50\%
Construction plans have not been started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
9)Letting

Anticipated Letting Date

Yes

Yes

10/01/2018

02/15/2019



November 24, 2014

Craig Jenson
Transportation Planner
Scott County Highway Department
600 Country Trail East
Jordan, MN 55352

Re: CSAH 42 Expansion

Dear Mr. Jenson:

The City of Prior Lake is aware Scott County is applying for funding through the Regional Solicitation for roadway expansion to a 4 -lane of CSAH 42 from CSAH 17 to CSAH 83, under the Roadway Expansion category. These improvements are endorsed by the City of Prior Lake and we are supportive of the Regional Solicitation application.

Please let me know if there is any additional information you need from us regarding this funding application.

Sincerely,


Larry Poppler
City Engineer/Inspections Director
City of Prior Lake

## BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA

| Date: | November 18, 2014 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Resolution No.: | $2014-204$ |
| Motion by Commissioner: | Ulrich |
| Seconded by Commissioner: | Menden |

## RESOLUTION NO. 2014-204; AUTHORIZING SUBMITTAL OF TRANSPORTATION

 PROJECTS TO THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD (TAB) FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE 2014 REGIONAL SOLICITATION PROCESSWHEREAS, the TAB is requesting project submittals for federal funding under Surface Transportation Program (STP), Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and Congestions Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ); and

WHEREAS, funding is available in the 2017-2019 federal fiscal years; and
WHEREAS, funding provides up to 80 percent of project construction costs; and
WHEREAS, this federal funding of projects reduces the burden on local taxpayers for regional improvements; and

WHEREAS, Scott County has identified projects that improve the safety and transportation system of the region; and

WHEREAS, the Scott County Board of Commissioners desires to support these projects.

# BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA 

| Date: | November 18, 2014 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Resolution No.: | $2014-204$ |
| Motion by Commissioner: | Ulrich |
| Seconded by Commissioner: | Menden |

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Scott County Board of Commissioners hereby supports the submittal of the following projects to the Transportation Advisory Board for consideration in the 2014 Regional Solicitation process:

1. $\mathrm{CH} 21 / \mathrm{TH} 13$ Intersection Improvements
2. $\mathrm{CH} 42 / \mathrm{TH} 13$ Intersection Improvements
3. CH 8 Reconstruction from CH 27 to CH 91
4. CH 16 Expansion from CH 83 to CH 21
5. CH 27 Expansion from CH 44 to CH 21
6. CH 42 Expansion from CH 17 to CH 83
7. TH $169 / \mathrm{TH} 41 / 78$ Interchange
8. TH 169 System Management
9. TH 169 Connector Transit Service


## State of Minnesota) <br> County of Scott

I, Gary L. Shelton, duly appointed qualified County Administrator for the County of Scott, State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of a resolution with the original minutes of the proceedings of the Board of County Commissioners, Scott County, Minnesota, at their session held on the 18th day of November, 2014 now on file in my office, and have found the same to be a true and correct copy thereof.
Witness my hand and official seal at Shakopee, Minnesota, this18th day of Novémber, 2014.

November 7, 2014

Craig Jenson
Transportation Planner
Scott County Highway Department
600 Country Trail East
Jordan, MN 55352
Re: CSAH 42 Expansion

Dear Mr. Jenson:

The City of Shakopee is aware Scott County is applying for funding through the Regional Solicitation for roadway expansion to a 4-lane of CSAH 42 from CSAH 17 to CSAH 83, under the Roadway Expansion category. The local match is expected to come from a combination of City and Country sources. These improvements are endorsed by the City of Shakopee and we are supportive of the Regional Solicitation application.

Please let me know if there is any additional information you need from us regarding this funding application.

Sincerely,


Public Works Director

## Roadway Area Definition

## Results

Project Length: 1.509 miles
Project Area: 9.286 sq mi


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


Regional Economy Roadway Expansion Project: CSAH 42 Reconstruction \| Map ID: 1414763781092

Results

Project NOT IN area of Job Concentration.
Project NOT IN to area of
Manufacturing and Distribution.
Project NOT CONNECTED to area of Education Institutions.


## Project

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


Socio-Economic Conditions Roadway Expansion Project: CSAH 42 Reconstruction IMap ID: 1414763781092

Results
Project IN area of above average concentration of race or poverty.

$\square$ Racially concentrated area of poverty $\square$ Above reg'l avg conc of race/poverty Concentrated area of poverty

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

## Existing Conditions

3: Dakotah Parkway \& CH 42

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 753 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 2 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.40 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.08 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.09 |

3: Dakotah Parkway \& CH 42

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 753 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 7 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.75 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.15 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.17 |

## Existing Conditions

3: Dakotah Parkway \& CH 42

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 753 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 2 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.40 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.08 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.09 |

3: Dakotah Parkway \& CH 42

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 753 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 7 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.75 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.15 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.17 |

Transit Connections Roadway Expansion Project: CSAH 42 Reconstruction | Map ID: 1414763781092

Results
Transit with a Direct Connection to project: 490491
*indicates Planned Alignments


## Project Planned Alignments

BRT, Orange Line
Project Area
Arterial BRT
Light Rail, Green Line Extension
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
htp://giswebsite.metc. state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx

