

Application

| 04774 - 2016 Roadway Modernization | | |
|--|--------------------|--|
| 05162 - Tedesco Roadway Modernization | | |
| Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements | | |
| Status: | Submitted | |
| Submitted Date: | 07/15/2016 9:46 AM | |
| | | |

Primary Contact

| Name:* | Salutation | Jesse First Name | Paul Middle Name | Farrell Last Name |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Title: | Project Manager | | | |
| Department: | | | | |
| Email: | jesse.farrell@ci.stpaul.mn.us | | | |
| Address: | 25 W 4th St | | | |
| | 900 CHA | | | |
| | | | | |
| * | Saint Paul | Minneso | ta | 55102 |
| | City | State/Provinc | e | Postal Code/Zip |
| Phone:* | 651-266-6155 | | | |
| | Phone | | Ext. | |
| Fax: | | | | |
| What Grant Programs are you most interested in? | Regional Solic Elements | itation - Roadwa | ays Includin | g Multimodal |

Organization Information

Name:

Jurisdictional Agency (if different):

| Organization Type: | City | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Organization Website: | | | |
| Address: | DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS-CITY HALL ANNEX | | |
| | 25 W 4TH ST #1500 | | |
| | | | |
| * | ST PAUL | Minnesota | 55101 |
| | City | State/Province | Postal Code/Zip |
| County: | Ramsey | | |
| Phone:* | 651-266-9700 | | |
| Thone. | | Ext. | |
| Fax: | | | |
| PeopleSoft Vendor Number | 0000003222A22 | | |
| | | | |

Project Information

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

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

Tedesco Roadway Modernization Ramsey

The project limits are Tedesco Street starting at Payne Avenue (CSAH 58) and continuing west approximately 0.25 miles until Tedesco Street becomes Lafayette Road. The project ends at the intersection of Otsego Street. The intersections of Otsego Street, Desoto Street, Lafayette Road and Tedesco Street will be improved. The project entails a full reconstruction of the infrastructure in the public right-of-way. This includes addressing utilities such as water main and water services, sanitary sewer and services and storm sewer, including stormwater management improvements. Construction of the sidewalks, curb and gutter and pavement section would be performed. Additional improvements include traffic signals with accessible pedestrian signals, signs, striping, bicycle lanes, pedestrian-scale lighting, trees, and sod boulevards.

| TIP Description Guidance (will be used in TIP if the project is | |
|---|--|
| selected for funding) | |
| Project Length (Miles) | |

TEDESCO STREET AND LAFAYETTE ROAD, SAINT PAUL, FROM CSAH 58 TO OTSEGO STREET, 0.2 MILES, RECONSTRUCT

0.25

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 | \$2,029,600.00 |
| Match Amount | \$507,400.00 |
| Minimum of 20% of project total | |
| Project Total | \$2,537,000.00 |
| Match Percentage | 20.0% |
| Minimum of 20% Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total | 1 |
| Source of Match Funds | MSA and/or SIB |
| A minimum of 20% of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; sources | additional match funds over the 20% minimum can come from other federal |
| Preferred Program Year | |
| Select one: | 2020 |
| For TDM projects, select 2018 or 2019. For Roadway, Transit, or Trail/Pedestrian | n projects, select 2020 or 2021. |
| Additional Program Years: | 2019 |
| Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available. | |

Specific Roadway Elements

| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES | Cost |
|--|--------------|
| Mobilization (approx. 5% of total cost) | \$110,000.00 |
| Removals (approx. 5% of total cost) | \$397,000.00 |
| Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) | \$69,000.00 |
| Roadway (aggregates and paving) | \$320,000.00 |
| Subgrade Correction (muck) | \$94,000.00 |
| Storm Sewer | \$280,000.00 |
| Ponds | \$0.00 |
| Concrete Items (curb & gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) | \$117,000.00 |
| Traffic Control | \$40,000.00 |
| | |

| Striping | \$63,000.00 |
|---|----------------|
| Signing | \$40,500.00 |
| Lighting | \$75,000.00 |
| Turf - Erosion & Landscaping | \$70,000.00 |
| Bridge | \$0.00 |
| Retaining Walls | \$10,000.00 |
| Noise Wall (do not include in cost effectiveness measure) | \$0.00 |
| Traffic Signals | \$247,500.00 |
| Wetland Mitigation | \$0.00 |
| Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection | \$5,000.00 |
| RR Crossing | \$0.00 |
| Roadway Contingencies | \$200,000.00 |
| Other Roadway Elements | \$10,000.00 |
| Totals | \$2,148,000.00 |
| | |

Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements

| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES | Cost |
|--|--------------|
| Path/Trail Construction | \$0.00 |
| Sidewalk Construction | \$91,000.00 |
| On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction | \$120,000.00 |
| Right-of-Way | \$0.00 |
| Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) | \$31,000.00 |
| Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) | \$27,500.00 |
| Pedestrian-scale Lighting | \$75,000.00 |
| Streetscaping | \$10,000.00 |
| Wayfinding | \$4,500.00 |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies | \$20,000.00 |
| Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements | \$10,000.00 |
| Totals | \$389,000.00 |

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, fare collection, etc.) | \$0.00 |
| 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 | 0 |
|--|--------|
| Cost Per Platform hour (full loaded Cost) | \$0.00 |
| Substotal | \$0.00 |
| Other Costs - Administration, Overhead, etc. | \$0.00 |

| Totals | |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| Total Cost | \$2,537,000.00 |
| Construction Cost Total | \$2,537,000.00 |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | \$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 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2015), 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 objectives and strategies that relate to the project.

| List the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages: | The project would provide better facilities for |
|---|---|
| | bicyclists. By providing in-street bike lanes, |
| | completing sidewalks where there are gaps, and |
| | updating pedestrian ramps, both pedestrians and |
| | bicyclists would have better access. |

3. The project or the transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document. 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 the Minnesota Department of Transportation 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:

Applicable planning documents include the City of Saint Paul Bike Plan (SPBP). On March 18, 2015, the City Council adopted the SPBP as an addendum to the Comprehensive Plan. The SPBP will guide the development of a safe, effective, and well-connected network of bicycle facilities to encourage and facilitate bicycle transportation. The primary objective of the SPBP is to designate corridors throughout the city for future development of bikeways. This project seeks to incorporate instreet bike lanes as depicted in the SPBP on pages 53 and 54. This link is of particular importance as it traverses a significant barrier (Railroad Tracks) in an impoverished area of the City. The vision established in the SPBP will more than double the mileage of bicycle facilities throughout Saint Paul over the next several decades.

4. The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of bicycle/pedestrian projects, 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 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.

Roadway Expansion: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000

Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000

Roadway System Management \$250,000 to \$7,000,000

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.

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

9. The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

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

10. 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

11. 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

12. 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

13. 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 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 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 <u>are exclusively</u> 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.

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 sufficiency rating less than 80 for rehabilitation projects and less than 50 for replacement projects. Additionally, the bridge must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

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

Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Project Information-Roadways

| County, City, or Lead Agency | SAINT PAUL |
|--|---|
| Functional Class of Road | A MINOR ARTERIAL |
| Road System | MSAS |
| TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET | |
| Road/Route No. | |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 | |
| Name of Road | TEDESCO |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE | |
| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | 55130 |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date | 05/04/2020 |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date | 10/30/2020 |
| TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any wo | rk) |
| From: (Intersection or Address) | Payne Avenue and Tedesco Street Intersection |
| To: (Intersection or Address) | Otsego Street and Tedesco Street Intersection |
| DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION | |
| Or At | |
| Primary Types of Work | GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, |
| 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): | |

Expander/Augmentor/Connector/Non-Freeway Principal Arterial

| Select one: | Non-Freeway Principal Arterial |
|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Area | 0.134 |
| Project Length | 0.21 |

Reliever: Relieves a Principal Arterial that is a Freeway Facility

Facility being relieved

Number of hours per day volume exceeds capacity (based on the Congestion Report) 0

Reliever: Relieves a Principal Arterial that is a Non-Freeway Facility

Facility being relieved

Number of hours per day volume exceeds capacity (based on the table below) 0

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 |
| | |

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

| Existing Employment within 1 Mile: | 55652 |
|--|--|
| Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile: | 3293 |
| Existing Students: | 12267 |
| Upload Map | 1468520423546_Tedesco - Regional Economy.pdf |

Measure C: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

| Location: | Tedesco Street near Otsego Street |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume: | 405 |
| Date heavy commercial count taken: | 7/1/2012 |

Measure D: Freight Elements

| | Tedesco Street is a truck route. Local freight traffic |
|--|--|
| | uses Tedesco to access local manufacturing, retail |
| | and other similar businesses. The presence of truck |
| Response (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words) | traffic makes designating space for bikes essential. |
| | Improving the public infrastructure, primarily the |
| | pavement and lighting, improves the route for |
| | freight traffic. |

Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

| Upload Transit Map | 1468521240671_Tedesco - Transit Connections.pdf | |
|--|---|--|
| For New Roadways only, list transit routes that will be moved to the new roadway | | |
| Existing Transit Routes on the Project | 64 | |
| Current AADT Volume | 8100 | |
| Location | Tesdeco Street near Otsego Street | |

| Response: Current Daily Person Throughput | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership | 0 | | |
| Current Daily Person Throughput | 10530.0 | | |
| Measure B: 2040 Forecast ADT | | | |
| Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume | No | | |
| 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 | Ramsey County has determined that we are a no- growth county. As such the ADT is not expected to significantly increase. The current ADT is 8,100 vpd. | | |
| Forecast (2040) ADT volume | 8100 | | |

Measure A: Project Location and Impact to Disadvantaged Populations

Select one:

| Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): | Yes |
|--|-----|
| Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: | Yes |
| Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: | Yes |
| 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: | |

The project?s positive benefits are numerous. The City of Saint Paul has made the observation that when the City makes an investment to the public infrastructure; the entire community begins to take a greater interest in maintaining their own properties. This is a challenging component to measure, but it is absolutely true. The residents in this area are among the poorest, and represent greater ethnic diversity than encountered nearly anywhere else in the region.

At the east end of the project we have a bustling retail business (?Morelli?s Deli?) that is frequently accessed by customers by bicycle and on foot. Also immediately adjacent to the project is Weida Park which is community gather point with a playground, play fields and a basketball court. At the west end of the project, there is NHHI-St Paul Barrier Free Housing. This 36-unit housing facility is covered under the Section 202 Program and is for low income, elderly persons. To qualify, residents must verify that their annual income is below 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) and that they are over the age of 62. Many of the residents are disabled and will benefit from infrastructure improvements.

The presence of new pedestrian-scale lighting, audible pedestrian signals along with addressing sidewalk gaps will significantly improve the walkability of the area. The project will make much needed geometric improvements at the Lafayette ? Tedesco - Desoto intersection. Beyond reducing chaos for motorists, the crossing distances will be reduced. The crossing is so undesirable that a wheelchair user was photographed by Google Street View using the roadway instead of the sidewalk! Beyond the hard improvements, trees will be added to infill the urban canopy. Where present, Ash trees will be removed in advance of Emerald Ash Borer infestation. The improved pedestrian facilities will also make utilizing public transit

Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

opportunities more desirable.

Improvements to the pavement, curb and gutter, utilities, traffic signals will benefit all roadway users. The addition of bicycle lanes will provide a great connection to Payne Avenue bike facilities being constructed in 2016, 2017 and likely in 2018 (pending City and County approval). According to the Citywide Bike Plan, this will eventually be a critical link that ties this area to all of downtown, University Avenue, the Gateway Trail, and a host of other links that are growing rapidly on an annual basis.

The primary negative impact of this project will be associated with construction disruption. We will mitigate the disruption by always maintaining local access to motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. We will mitigate the disruption by not allowing work to commence before 7:00am, or during weekends unless absolutely necessary.

The response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations affected by the project.

Upload Map

1468530375671_Tedesco - Socio-Economic Conditions.pdf

| Measure B: Affordable Housing | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | City/Township | Segment Length in Miles (Population) | |
| Saint Paul | l | 0.2 | |
| Saint Paul | l | 0.05 | |
| | | 0 | |
| | | | |
| Total F | Project Length | | |
| Total Proje | ect Length (Total Population) | 0.25 | |
| | | | |

- -.

Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

| City/Township | Segment Length (Miles) | Total Length (Miles) | Score | | Segment Length/Total Length | Housing Sco Multiplied b Segment percent | |
|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |

Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

| Total Project Length (Miles) | 0.25 |
|------------------------------|------|
| Total Housing Score | 0 |

Measure A: Year of Roadway Construction

| Year of Original Roadway Construction or Most Recent Reconstruction | Segment Length | Calculation | Calculation 2 | |
|---|----------------|-------------|---------------|--|
| 1983 | 0.1 | 198.3 | 793.2 | |
| 1969 | 0.1 | 196.9 | 787.6 | |
| 1983 | 0.05 | 99.15 | 396.6 | |
| | 0 | 494 | 1977 | |
| Weighted Year 1977 Total Segment Length (Miles) 0.25 | | | | |
| Measure B: Geometric, Structural, or Infrastructure Improvements Improving a non-10-ton roadway to a 10-ton roadway: Yes Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words) Half of this segment was fully reconstructed in 1969 to a 9 ton design load. The other half of this segment was reconstructed in 1983 to a 9 ton design load. | | | 1969 | |

Yes

Improved clear zones or sight lines:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Improved roadway geometrics:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Access management enhancements:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Vertical/horizontal alignments improvements:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Improved stormwater mitigation:

Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)

Signals/lighting upgrades:

The intersection of Tedesco - Lafayette - Desoto is convoluted. Redesigning the intersection will improve clear zones and sight lines. Working in conjunction with Xcel Energy, we will seek to have distribution poles removed from within the roadway on Desoto Street.

Yes

The intersection of Tedesco - Lafayette - Desoto is convoluted. Redesigning the intersection will improve the roadway geometrics by reducing confusion, reducing the number of conflict points, and reducing pedestrian crossing distances.

Yes

The intersection of Tedesco - Lafayette - Desoto is convoluted. Redesigning the intersection will eliminate one access point in a section of roadway that features four access points in less than 200 feet.

Yes

The intersection of Tedesco - Lafayette - Desoto is convoluted. Redesigning the intersection means that there will be improvements to the horizontal alignment.

Yes

If the subsurface soil characteristics facilitate infiltration, this project will significantly reduce the amount of stormwater runoff from this area. Working in conjunction with Capital Region Watershed District (CRWD), we will incorporate infiltration trenches that capture a significant amount of runoff. We will meet or exceed the stringent requirements of CRWD.

Yes

| | Traffic signals will be upgraded and will feature Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS). |
|--|--|
| Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words) | Roadway styled lighting will be replaced using pedestrian-scale, lantern style light poles. This will provide better lighting for pedestrians and greater consistency for roadway users. |
| Other Improvements | Yes |
| Response (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words) | Removing abandoned street car tracks in Tedesco allows placement of a uniform pavement (PM) section. Recon of the PM will benefit motorists, transit users, and bicyclists. It will also improve the walking surface for pedestrians crossing the streets at 9 crosswalks. Ped ramps will be improved which will benefit all pedestrians, along with bringing them up to ADA standards. Improvements to the PM, curb and gutter and the stormwater system will improve drainage characteristics. Providing dedicated space for bicyclists improves the corridor for motorists and bicyclists alike. Filling sidewalk gaps will improve access to bus stops in the area and to numerous local/regional destinations. |

Measure A: Congestion Reduction/Air Quality

| Total Peak | Total Peak | Total Peak | | Total Peak | EXPLANATIO N of methodology | |
|---|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Hour Delay Per Vehicle Without The Project | Hour Delay Per Vehicle With The Project | Hour Delay Per Vehicle Reduced by Project | Volume (Vehicles per hour) | Hour Delay Reduced by the Project: | used to calculate railroad crossing delay, if applicable. | Synchro or HCM Reports |

Total Delay

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) Peak Hour Emissions Per Vehicle without the Project (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Per Vehicle with the Project (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced Per Vehicle by the Project (Kilograms): | Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 8100.0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 8100.0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | | 16200 | 0 |
| | | | | |

Total

Total Emissions Reduced:

0

Upload Synchro Report

Measure B: Roadway projects that are constructing new roadway segments, but do not include railroad grade-separation elements (for Roadway Expansion applications only):

| Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Per Vehicle without the Project (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Per Vehicle with the Project (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced Per Vehicle by the Project (Kilograms): | Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 8100.0 | 0 | |
| 0 | 0 | | 8100 | 0 | |
| Total Parallel Roadways Emissions Reduced on Parallel Roadways 0 Upload Synchro Report 0 | | | | | |

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 Produced on New Roadway (Kilograms): | 0 |
| EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words) | NA |
| 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: | 0 |
| 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): | 0 |
| EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words) | NA |

Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction

If the applicant is completing a transit or TDM 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

1)Project Scope (5 Percent of Points)

Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred

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 | Yes |
| 100% | |
| Layout or Preliminary Plan started | |
| 50% | |
| Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started | |
| 0% | |
| Anticipated date or date of completion | |
| 3)Environmental Documentation (5 Percent of Points) | |
| EIS | |
| EA | |
| PM | Yes |
| Document Status: | |
| Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet) | 100% |
| Document submitted to State Aid for review | 75% |
| Document in progress; environmental impacts identified; review request letters sent | |
| 50% | |
| Document not started | Yes |
| 0% | |
| Anticipated date or date of completion/approval | |
| 4)Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (10 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 project is not located on an identified historic bridge | Yes |
| 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 | |

date submitted

40%

Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological resources in the project area

0%

Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review:

Project is located on an identified historic bridge

5)Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (10 Percent of Points)

4(f) Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or public private historic properties?6(f) Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?

Yes

No Section 4f/6f resources located in the project area

100%

No impact to 4f property. The project is an independent bikeway/walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement; letter of support received

100%

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

80%

Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely coordination/documentation has begun

50%

Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely coordination/documentation has not begun

30%

Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area

0%

6) Right-of-Way (15 Percent of Points)

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements not required Yes

100%

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired

100%

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made

75%

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made

50%

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

25% Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not identified 0% Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed 0% Anticipated date or date of acquisition 7)Railroad Involvement (25 Percent of Points) No railroad involvement on project Yes 100% Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature page) 100% 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)Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)*

Project does not involve construction of a new/expanded

*Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mn.us or 651-234-7784) to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee.

Yes interchange or new interchange ramps 100% Interchange project has been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee 100% Interchange project has not been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee 0% 9)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 | Yes |
|---|------------|
| 50% | |
| Construction plans have not been started | Yes |
| 0% | |
| Anticipated date or date of completion | 05/30/2019 |
| 10)Letting | |
| Anticipated Letting Date | 05/04/2020 |
| | |

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

| Crash Modification Factor Used: | 0.41 |
|--|--|
| Rationale for Crash Modification Selected: | CMF ID 4103 is the only relevant 3 star or better rated CMF based on data from the U.S./Canada. The countermeasure is the installation of cycle track or bike lanes. The countermeasure addresses one bike crash from years 2013-2015. |
| (Limit 1400 Characters; approximately 200 words) | |
| Project Benefit (\$) from B/C Ratio | \$558,126.00 |
| Worksheet Attachment | 1468536125656_Lafayette_Rd-Otsego_to_Payne-B- C_and_crash_list.pdf |

Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements:

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

Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

The existing pedestrian connections include sidewalk, ped ramps and crosswalks. Sidewalks are present on both sides of the road in most locations. Along the S side of the road there is a large gap on the W end of the project. It requires that some users must cross the same road, twice, to get a bus stop. Closing this gap will increase accessibility. Most corners have ped ramps present, however they are in poor condition, small, and not pedestrian friendly. The intersection of Tedesco, Lafayette and Desoto present challenges to peds, especially disabled peds. When traversing this intersection along the N side of Tedesco a ped spends an unnecessary amount of time in the roadway. With vehicles coming from multiple directions at odd angles it presents a challenge even for healthy, astute users. Street lighting in the corridor is present, but it is not pedestrian scale. Dedicated bicycle facilities are not present. The pavement condition makes the corridor undesirable for bicyclists.

Transit connections are present at 4 bus stops. One pair of stops is located at Weida Park, a local gathering point that includes play fields, a playground and a basketball court. Another pair of stops is located at the W end of the project at NHHI-St Paul Barrier Free Housing. This 36-unit housing facility is covered under the Section 202 Program and is for low income, elderly persons. Residents there must be very poor and over the age of 62. Many of the residents are disabled and will benefit from infrastructure improvements. This bus stop is located just beyond the extents of the roadway improvements, but improvements at this crossing are planned for this project. This crossing has been the subject of ADA related inquiries. The City recently repainted the crosswalk, but further improvements are warranted. Further W, after Tedesco Street becomes Lafayette Road there is a deteriorated bridge that is also applying for funding.

Due to potential clearance issues that would require grade adjustments 100-200? beyond the bridge, reconstruction of the roadway in advance of a bridge design would not be prudent. But sidewalk improvements to better serve this bus stop are prudent, and are planned as part of this project. Both of these stops are near or surrounded by a dense mix of single and multi-family dwellings.

Proposed improvements that will significantly benefit bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections include: pedestrian scale lighting, new pavement, improved stormwater drainage characteristics dedicated bicycle lanes, new sidewalk with new connections and ped ramps, signals featuring APS, infill to the tree canopy, improved geometrics to reduce confusion and crossing distances and signage indicating the presence of bicycle lanes.

Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | \$2,537,000.00 |
|--|----------------|
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | \$0.00 |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | \$2,537,000.00 |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria | |
| Cost Effectiveness | \$0.00 |

Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
|---|---|-----------|
| RADTedescoRdStPRM.pdf | RADTedescoRdStPRM | 234 KB |
| RECTedescoRdStPRM.pdf | RECTedescoRdStPRM | 297 KB |
| RECUniversityStPRM.pdf | RECUniversityStPRM | 309 KB |
| RES 16-1053 SignatureCopy12-Jul- 2016-03-18-08.pdf | Council Resolution supporting the project and committing local funds. | 118 KB |
| Tedesco - Project Map.pdf | Tedesco - Project Map | 88 KB |







| HSIP | | Control Section | T.H. / Roadway | | Location | 1 | | | eginning Ref. Pt. | Ending Ref. Pt. | State, County, City or Township | Study Period Begins | Study Period Ends | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| WUIN | 5110 | ει | | MSAS 113 (Lafayette/T edesco) | Otsego St to Pay | me Ave | | | 00 | 00+00.550 | 000+00.740 | Saint Paul | 1/1/2013 | 12/31/2015 |
| | | | Descripti Proposed | | Reconstruct road | lway to in | | | | | | | | |
| Accid | lent D | iagram Codes | 1 Rear End | | | | | 5 Right Angle | 4,7 F | an off Road | 8, 9 Head On/ Sideswipe - | | 6, 90, 99 | |
| | | | | | | J | ◄ | > | | | Opposite Direction | Pedestrian | Other | Total |
| | Fatal | F | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | y (PI) | A | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Study Period: | Personal Injury (PI) | В | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Number of Crashes | Person | С | | | 2 | | | | | | | | 1 | 3 |
| | Property | PD | | | | | | 2 | | | | | 2 | 4 |
| % Change | Fatal | F | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % Change in Crashes | | A | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Use Desktop | PI | В | | | | | | | | | -59% | | | |
| Reference for Crash | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reduction Factors | Property | PD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Fatal | F | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | A | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Change in Crashes | PI | В | | | | | | | | | -0.59 | | | -0.59 |
| = No. of | | С | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | 0.00 | |
| crashes X % change in crashes | Property | PD | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.00 | |
| Year (Safety) | | | | on) | 2020 | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.00 | |
| Project Cost | (excl | ude Ri | ght of Way) |) | \$ 2,537,000 | Type of Crash | Study Period: Change in Crashes | Annual Change in Crashes | | Cost per Crash | Annual Benefit | | B/C= | 0.22 |
| Right of Wa | y Co | s ts (op | tional) | | | F | | | \$ | 1,140,000 | | Using present | worth value | rs, |
| Traffic Grov | vth H | actor | | | 0.0% | Α | | | \$ | 570,000 | | B= | \$ | 558,126 |
| Capital Reco | overy | | | | | В | -0.59 | -0.20 | \$ | 170,000 | \$ 33,464 | C= | | 537,000 |
| 1. Discour | ıt Ra | te | | | 2% | С | | | \$ | 83,000 | | See "Calculat amortization. | ions" sheet f | or |
| 2. Project | Serv | ice Li | fe (n) | | 20 | PD | | | \$ | 7,600 | | | | |
| | | | | | | Total | | | | | \$ 33,464 | Office of Tra Technology | ffic, Safety Augus | |

Crash data shows one head on crash between bike and car. CMF of 0.41 based on CMF ID 4103 from CMF Clearinghouse

CMF ID 4103 is for countermeasure of installing cycle track or bike lanes. It is the only 3 star or better rated CMF factor based on US/Canada data.

Lafayette Rd/Tedesco St from Otsego St to Payne Ave Crash data is managed by the Mn/DOT Office of Traffic Safety and O

ion

| Glasii | lata is manay | eu by the Mil/ | DOT Office of Th | anic, Jaiel | y, and ope | rations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|------------|----------|------|-----|-----|---|----|------|-------|-------|-----|------|------|-----|------------|---------|------|----|------|------|
| SYS | NUM | REF_POINT | GIS_ROUTE | GIS_TM | RD_DIR | ELEM | RELY | INV | R_U | ATP | со | CITY | DOW | MONTH | DAY | YEAR | TIME | SEV | NUM_KILLED | NUM_VEH | JUNC | SL | TYPE | DIAG |
| 05 | 34250113 | 000+00.550 | 0534250113 | 0.550 | S | | 1 | 3 | U | ON 03/10/15 AT 0637 HOURS THE DRIVER OF UNIT 1 WAS DRVING HIMSELF TO THE HOPSITAL AFTER HE HAD A BL | 62 | 3425 | 3-Tue | 3 | 10 | 2015 | 0637 | С | 0 | 1 | 2 | 30 | 25 | 90 |
| 05 | 34250113 | 000+00.551 | 0534250113 | 0.551 | Z | | 1 | 0 | U | | 62 | 3425 | 5-Thu | 1 | 8 | 2015 | 1420 | N | 0 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 5 |
| 05 | 34250113 | 000+00.551 | 0534250113 | 0.551 | S | | 1 | 90 | U | OFFICERS RESPONDED TO A BUS VS. PARKED CAR ACCIDENT. THE MTC BUS WAS PROCEEDING SOUTH BOUT ON BURR | 62 | 3425 | 3-Tue | 8 | 4 | 2015 | 1500 | С | 0 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 2 | 2 |
| 05 | 34250113 | 000+00.560 | 0534250113 | 0.560 | Z | | 1 | 3 | U | V1 WAS ATTEMPTING TO MAKE A U-TURN WHEN THE DRIVER STATED THE BRAKES WENT OUT. IN AN ATTEMPT TO STO | 62 | 3425 | 4-Wed | 1 | 28 | 2015 | 1934 | N | 0 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 41 | 90 |
| 05 | 34250113 | 000+00.639 | 0534250113 | 0.639 | Z | | 1 | 3 | U | DRIVER #1 SPOKE HMONG OFFICER VANG ASSISTED IN TALKING TO DRIVER. DRIVER #1 STATED TO OFFICER VANG | 62 | 3425 | 6-Fri | 10 | 25 | 2013 | 1749 | С | 0 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 1 | 2 |
| 05 | 34250113 | 000+00.667 | 0534250113 | 0.667 | Z | | 1 | 3 | U | VEH #2 WAS TURNING LEFT INTO 500 TEDESCO AND VEH #1 THOUGHT #2 WAS PULLING OVER TO PARK AND WENT TO | 62 | 3425 | 6-Fri | 2 | 8 | 2013 | 1324 | N | 0 | 2 | 8 | 30 | 1 | 90 |
| 05 | 34250113 | 000+00.681 | 0534250113 | 0.681 | Z | | 1 | 3 | U | V1 WAS W/B ON TEDESCO ST. V2 WAS W/B ON TEDESCO ST IN FRONT OF V1. V2 ATTEMPTED TO MAKE A LEGAL U-T | 62 | 3425 | 7-Sat | 11 | 22 | 2014 | 1640 | Ν | 0 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 1 | 5 |
| 05 | 34250113 | 000+00.740 | 0534250113 | 0.740 | Z | | 1 | 3 | U | DRIVER OF VEHICLE #1 WAS STOPPED AT STOP SIGN AT THE INTERSECTION OF TEDESCO ST AND PAYNE AVE. DRIV | 62 | 3425 | 6-Fri | 9 | 4 | 2015 | 1024 | В | 0 | 1 | 2 | 30 | 6 | 8 |

| | | | | | | | | | PERSON1 | | | | | | | | | | | PERSON2 | | | | | | | | | | | PERSON3 | |
|------|-----|-----|-------|-------|------|------|-------|-----------|---------|-----|-----|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|---------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|--------|-------|-------|---------|-------|
| LOC1 | TCD | LIT | WTHR1 | WTHR2 | SURF | CHAR | DESGN | ACC_NUM | VTYPE | DIR | ACT | FAC1 | FAC2 | POSN | INJ | EQP | PHYS | AGE | SEX | VTYPE2 | DIR3 | ACT4 | FAC15 | FAC26 | POSN7 | INJ8 | EQP9 | PHYS10 | AGE11 | SEX12 | VTYPE13 | DIR14 |
| 2 | 98 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 150700011 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 1 | С | 4 | 90 | 56 | М | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 98 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 150410153 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | N | 4 | 0 | 33 | М | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Ν | 4 | 0 | 63 | М | | |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 152170284 | 8 | 5 | 90 | 9 | 15 | 1 | N | 4 | 1 | 60 | М | 8 | 5 | 90 | 9 | 15 | 6 | С | 98 | 0 | 65 | F | | |
| 90 | 98 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 150280130 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 1 | N | 4 | 1 | 20 | F | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 98 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 132980142 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 1 | С | 4 | 1 | 24 | М | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | N | 4 | 1 | 44 | М | 1 | 7 |
| 1 | 98 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 130390095 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | N | 4 | 1 | 25 | М | 1 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | Ν | 4 | 1 | 20 | М | 1 | 7 |
| 1 | 98 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 143270002 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 1 | N | 4 | 1 | 36 | F | 2 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 1 | Ν | 4 | 1 | 60 | М | 1 | 7 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 152470108 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 1 | Ν | 4 | 1 | 40 | М | 53 | 98 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 22 | В | 98 | 1 | 67 | М | 1 | 0 |









City of Saint Paul

Signature Copy

Resolution: RES 16-1053

File Number: RES 16-1053

Authorizing the Departments of Public Works and Parks and Recreation to submit 14 project applications for federal funding into the 2016 Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation Program and to authorize the commitment of a 20% local funding match for any project(s) that get awarded federal funding.

WHEREAS, The Departments of Public Works and Parks and Recreation are proposing to submit 14 project applications for possible federal transportation funding in years 2020 and 2021 under the Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation Process, and

WHEREAS, there is a required twenty percent local funding match to any project(s) awarded to an agency under the Regional Solicitation Program, and

WHEREAS, the projects to be submitted by the City under the Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation are:

- Freight Connection from Pierce Butler to I-94 via Transfer, Ellis and Vandalia
- University Avenue Reconstruction I35E to Lafayette Road
- Sidewalk Infill, Replacement and ADA Compliance Area Bounded by Maryland-Case-Forest-Duluth
- Tedesco Street Reconstruction University Avenue to Payne Avenue
- Como Avenue Trail Construction Raymond Avenue to Hamline Avenue
- Troutbrook Road Connection Kittson Street to Lafayette/University
- Eastbound Kellogg Boulevard Bridge near the RiverCentre Ramp
- Johnson Parkway Trail (Grand Round) Burns Avenue to Phalen Boulevard
- Bruce Vento Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge connects Sam Morgan Trail with Bruce Vento Trail
- Pierce Butler East Extension Grotto to Arundel
- Battle Creek to Sam Morgan Regional Trial Rehabilitation
- Arterial Corridor Management (Snelling and Lexington) Implement Technology to Improve Traffic Flow & Safety (Fiber Optics, Detection, ADA Upgrades)
- Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Washington Magnet School Area and Ran-Ham Schools (Cretin, Holy Spirit Elementary and Expo Elementary)
- Lafayette Bridge reconstruction from University to Otsego

WHEREAS, these projects all fall within appropriate funding categories and all meet the conditions and requirements specified for eligibility of federal funding, and so

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of the City of Saint Paul to authorize submission of the thirteen project applications for possible award of federal transportation funds through the Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation Program, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Council of the City of Saint Paul to authorize the commitment of local funds on a twenty percent match basis for any project(s) awarded federal funding under

the Regional Solicitation Program.

At a meeting of the City Council on 7/6/2016, this Resolution was Passed.

Yea: 6 Councilmember Bostrom, Councilmember Brendmoen, Councilmember Tolbert, City Council President Stark, Councilmember Noecker, and Councilmember Prince

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 Councilmember Thao

 Vote Attested by

 Council Secretary
 Trudy Moloney

Date 7/6/2016

Approved by the Mayor

Chilp B. Colema

Date 7/8/2016

Chris Coleman

