Application

13860-2020 Roadway Expansion
14324 - CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Avenue) \& TH 36 Interchange
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements
Status: Submitted
Submitted Date:
05/13/2020 3:44 PM

## Primary Contact



## Organization Information

## Name:

WASHINGTON CTY
Jurisdictional Agency (if different):

Organization Type:
Organization Website:

Address: | PUBLIC WORKS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 11660 MYERON RD |

|  | STILLWATER | Minnesota | 55082 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City | State/Province | Postal Code/Zip |
| County: | Washington |  |  |
| Phone:* | 651-430-4325 |  |  |
|  |  | Ext. |  |

Fax:
PeopleSoft Vendor Number
0000028637A10

## Project Information

Project Name
Primary County where the Project is Located
Cities or Townships where the Project is Located:

CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Ave) \& TH 36 Interchange
Washington
Lake Elmo, Grant

Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

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

Washington County is leading this interchange project in cooperation with MnDOT, the Cities of Grant and Lake Elmo. The project location is the existing at-grade signalized intersection of TH 36/CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Avenue).

TH 36 is a principal arterial roadway that runs eastwest approximately 20 miles in length from l-35W in Roseville to the Wisconsin border at Stillwater. TH 36 then provides a connection with Wisconsin State Highway 35. Within the project area, TH 36 is a four-lane divided expressway section.

CSAH 17 is a two-lane roadway and is functionally classified as an A-Minor Connector.

Since the opening of the St. Croix Crossing bridge in 2017, traffic volumes on TH 36 have increased to the point that the traffic demand is exceeding the capacity of the at-grade intersection, which in turn results in extended periods of heavy congestion and an unacceptable level of service during peak hours. This project is focused on addressing the safety hazards associated with this intersection. Currently, this at-grade intersection is a sustained crash location with 90 crashes between 2016 and 2018 including 1 fatality. This project will greatly improve safety while preserving the existing capacity along TH 36 by constructing an interchange at the existing signalized intersection. This project eliminates an at-grade intersection along TH 36 and helps achieve the expressway vision of this important inter-regional corridor. The selected interchange design would not preclude the expansion of TH 36 from four to six lanes, if desired by the region in the future. This intersection change would be combined with local street improvements to improve traffic safety in the corridor The interchange will remove accesses within a half mile of the project and median crossings within a mile of the project. The existing frontage road north of TH

36 will be connected or rerouted to accommodate the new interchange design. A 10-foot trail along the west side of the CSAH 17 will go under TH 36 to create a separated facility for multimodal users.
(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.

CSAH 17 (LAKE ELMO AVE) AT TH 36 IN GRANT AND LAKE ELMO- CONSTRUCT INTERCHANGE

Project Length (Miles)
1.1
to the nearest one-tenth of a mile

## 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
\$10,000,000.00
Match Amount
\$24,733,130.00
Minimum of $20 \%$ of project total
Project Total
\$34,733,130.00
For transit projects, the total cost for the application is total cost minus fare revenues.
Match Percentage 71.21\%
Minimum of $20 \%$
Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total
Source of Match Funds
County Funds
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:
2025
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

Functional Class of Road

Washington County
TH 36 is a Principal Arterial

CSAH 17 is a A-Minor Expander

Road System
TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET
Road/Route No.

## TH \& CSAH

i.e., 53 for CSAH 53

Name of Road
Highway 36, Lake Elmo Avenue
Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE
Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed
55082
(Approximate) Begin Construction Date
04/01/2025
(Approximate) End Construction Date
06/30/2027
TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)
From:
(Intersection or Address)
To:
(Intersection or Address)
DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Or At

Miles of Sidewalk (nearest 0.1 miles) 0
Miles of Trail (nearest 0.1 miles) 0.2
Miles of Trail on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles)

Primary Types of Work

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):
0.6 MILES WEST OF CSAH 17 (LAKE ELMO AVENUE)
0.5 MILES EAST OF CSAH 17 (LAKE ELMO AVENUE)

0

GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, BIKE PATH, BRIDGE

## 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:

This project aligns with many aspects of the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan including the following goals \& strategies:

Goal: Safety and Security (pg 60) Objective: Reduce crashes \& improve safety \& security for all modes of passenger travel \& freight transport(pg 60)
Strategy: B1) Regional transportation partners will incorporate safety and security considerations for all modes \& users throughout the processes of planning, funding, construction, and operation(pg 2.7)
(B4) Regional transportation partners will support the state's vision of moving toward zero traffic fatalities \& serious injuries, which includes supporting educational and enforcement programs to increase awareness of regional safety issues, shared responsibility and safe behavior(pg 2.7) Goal: Access to Destinations (pg 62)
Objectives: A) Increase the availability of multimodal travel options, especially in congested highway corridors; B) Increase travel time reliability \& predictability for travel on highway and transit systems; E) Improve multimodal travel options for people of all ages \& abilities to connect to jobs and other opportunities, particularly for historically underrepresented populations(pg 62)

Strategy: (C9) The Council will support investments in A-minor arterials that build, manage, or improve the system's ability to supplement the capacity of the principal arterial system \& support access to the region's job, activity, and industrial \& manufacturing concentrations(pg 2.9)
(C16) Regional transportation partners should fund projects that provide for bicycle \& pedestrian travel across/around physical barriers and/or improve continuity between jurisdictions(pg 2.10)
Goal: Competitive Economy(pg 64)

> Objectives: C)Support the region's economic competitiveness through the efficient movement of freight(pg 64)
> Strategy: D2)The Council will coordinate with other agencies planning \& pursuing transportation investments that strengthen connections to other regions in Minnesota, the Upper Midwest, nation, and world including intercity bus and passenger rail, highway corridors, air service, and freight infrastructure (pg 2.11)
> (D5)The Council and MnDOT will work with transportation partners to identify the impacts of highway congestion on freight \& identify cost effective mitigation(pg 2.11)

Limit 2,800 characters, approximately 400 words
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.

Goal: Plan, build, and maintain an interconnected and accessible transportation system that considers all users and modes of travel. Pg 3-8

## Policies:

- Pursue federal, state, regional, and local funding opportunities to preserve, maintain, expand, and modernize the transportation network.
- Plan, build, and maintain roadways to accommodate existing and future traffic growth. Strategies:
- Integrate non-motorized accommodations into the design of roadway and transit facilities to increase access to destinations.
- Balance existing and planned land uses with county goals through transportation planning.

List the applicable documents and pages:

- Identify gaps in trail network and prioritize investments to improve non-motorized access to destinations
Goal: Improve safety and efficient for all users. Pg 3-10
Policies:
-Support ongoing safety review process that promotes both proactive and reactive treatments to reduce crashes.
- Use traffic management techniques to improve operations, safety, and useful life of the roadways. Strategies:
- Develop roadway crossings and trail facilities within county roadway corridors to promote safety for all users.
- Promote access from local roadways to develop and implement corridor-specific access management plans for county roadways to

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:
09/30/2015
Link to plan:
See attached.

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
1589398741914_Washington County ADA TRANSITION
PLAN 9-30-2015.pdf
Upload as PDF
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. Yes
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. Yes
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 ESTIMATES <br> Cost

Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost)
\$1,188,000.00
Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost) \$713,000.00

Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) \$3,858,500.00

Roadway (aggregates and paving) \$2,778,080.00
Subgrade Correction (muck)
$\$ 0.00$
Storm Sewer \$240,000.00

Ponds
$\$ 0.00$
Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) \$713,300.00

Traffic Control \$1,188,000.00

Striping
\$17,500.00
Signing \$122,500.00

Lighting
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping \$926,000.00

Bridge
\$3,750,000.00
Retaining Walls
\$10,979,500.00
Noise Wall (not calculated in cost effectiveness measure)
Traffic Signals
Wetland Mitigation \$0.00
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection ..... $\$ 0.00$
RR Crossing ..... $\$ 0.00$
Roadway Contingencies ..... \$3,157,000.00
Other Roadway Elements ..... \$4,747,000.00
Totals ..... \$34,378,380.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES ..... Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... $\$ 344,000.00$
Sidewalk Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... \$8,750.00
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... $\$ 0.00$
Streetscaping ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$352,750.00
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) | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Subtotal | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Other Costs - Administration, Overhead,etc. | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Totals

| Total Cost | $\$ 34,731,130.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 34,731,130.00$ |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Congestion within Project Area:

The measure will analyze the level of congestion within the project area. Council staff will provide travel speed data on the "Level of Congestion" map. The analysis will compare the peak hour travel speed within the project area to fee-flow conditions.

Free-Flow Travel Speed: 56
Peak Hour Travel Speed: 42
Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour compared to Free-Flow:
25.0\%

Upload Level of Congestion map: 1589398898353_08 CSAH 17 TH 36 Lvl of Cong.pdf

## Congestion on adjacent Parallel Routes:

Adjacent Parallel Corridor
Adjacent Parallel Corridor Start and End Points:

## Start Point:

End Point:
Free-Flow Travel Speed:
The Free-Flow Travel Speed is black number
Peak Hour Travel Speed:
The Peak Hour Travel Speed is red number.
Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to
Free-Flow:
Upload Level of Congestion Map:

CSAH 15
CSAH 17

48

43
CSAH 12
10.42\%

1589398963188_09 CSAH17TH36 LOC METC.pdf

## Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study:

Proposed interchange or at-grade project that reduces delay at a High Priority Intersection:
(80 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection:
(60 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection:
(50 Points)
Proposed interchange project that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection:
(40 Points)
Proposed interchange project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection:
(0 Points)
Not listed as a priority in the study:
(0 Points)

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

Existing Employment within 1 Mile:
1734
Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile:

113
Existing Post-Secondary Students within 1 Mile:
Upload Map
0

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:
0
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
Along Tier 2:
Miles:
0
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
Along Tier 3:
Yes
Miles:
0.1
(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:

None of the tiers:

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

Location TH 36 at CSAH 17<br>Current AADT Volume 42000<br>Existing Transit Routes on the Project N/A<br>For New Roadways only, list transit routes that will likely be diverted to the new proposed roadway (if applicable).<br>Upload Transit Connections Map 1589399139019_11 CSAH 17 TH 36 Transit.pdf<br>Please upload attachment in PDF form.

## Response: Current Daily Person Throughput

Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership 0

Current Daily Person Throughput
54600.0

## Measure B: 2040 Forecast ADT

Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT No
volume
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

## 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.

Response:
This project is located along a trunk highway where the surrounding uses are primarily manufacturing and a few single family homes. Because there is very minimal housing in this area, it is difficult to ascertain which underrepresented populations would be the most impacted by this interchange. However, this project is designed bring safety and efficiency improvements to an area that is likely to develop in the future. Previously, a proposed overpass project for this intersection won Regional Solicitation funds in the early 2000?s but those funds were ultimately returned as the design wasn?t right for the communities emerging needs. After years of discussion and collaborating Washington County is confident that the attached layout meets the existing and future needs of the communities and the TH 36 corridor. The construction of an interchange will allow nonmotorized users to safely and legally cross TH 36 at CSAH 17, something that is not possible today. Those who are unable or unwilling to drive will now have the option of crossing TH 36 at CSAH 17 and will not be to cross illegally or reroute miles out of their way. Official public engagement will commence as the project develops.

## Response:

The primary purpose of this project is to remove the at-grade crossing of CSAH 17 and TH 36 to improve safety and congestion. Currently, this intersection is a sustained crash location which poses a safety hazard to anyone who travels through the intersection using any mode of transportation. The safety concerns at this intersection have been exacerbated by the growing traffic on the TH 36 corridor due to the opening of the St. Croix Crossing Bridge in 2017.The interchange will create a safer environment for users, motorized and non-motorized. The trail associated with the interchange project will bridge a gap in the multimodal network along CSAH 17. This provides a public health benefit through active living but primarily this trail will benefit those who are unable or unwilling to drive and are currently forced to dart to across TH 36 on foot illegally, on a bike with traffic or reroute their trip. With the construction of the interchange and its associated trail, those without cars will be able to safely cross TH 36 via the west side trail.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
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

Response:
It is anticipated that there would be a delay in the TH 36 corridor and to cities of Lake Elmo and Grant businesses and residents during the construction of the road improvements. While these delays are not permanent the goal would be to keep delays on TH 36 as minimal as possible by keeping TH 36 open as much as possible. The benefit is that the existing delay and safety issues at the at-grade signal will be removed in the future.
(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 Yes 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
1589399487701_12 CSAH 17 TH 36 Socio Economic
COnditions.pdf

## Measure B: Part 1: Housing Performance Score

|  | Segment Length <br> (For stand-alone <br> projects, enter <br> population from <br> City <br> Regional Economy <br> map) within each <br> City/Township | Segment <br> Length/Total <br> Project Length | Score | Housing Score <br> Multiplied by <br> Segment percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grant | 1396.0 | 0.3 | 7.0 | 2.088 |
| Lake Elmo | 3284.0 | 0.7 | 18.5 | 12.982 |

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length 1.1
Project length entered on the Project Information - General form.

## Housing Performance Score

Total Project Length (Miles) or Population
4680.0

Total Housing Score15.07

## 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.
This project is located along a trunk highway where the surrounding uses are primarily manufacturing and a few single family homes. The purpose of this project is to fix a hazardous intersection and bring safety and efficiency improvements to an area that is likely to develop in the future. The inclusion of the trail under TH 36 will allow multimodal users to safely cross TH 36. The interchange is designed to accommodate any future developments in the immediate project area as well as the greater community.

Upload map:

## Measure A: Infrastructure Age

Year of Original
Roadway Construction
or Most Recent
Segment Length Calculation Calculation 2
Reconstruction

| 1960.0 | 10.0 | 19600.0 | 1088.889 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1988.0 | 8.0 | 15904.0 | 883.556 |

## Average Construction Year

Weighted Year
1972.445

## Total Segment Length (Miles)

Total Segment Length

## Measure A: Congestion Reduction/Air Quality

| Total Peak | Total Peak | Total Peak |  |  |  |  | EXPLANA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour | Hour | Hour | Volume | Volume | Total Peak | Total Peak methodolo |  |  |
| Delay Per | Delay Per | Delay Per | without | with the | Hour | Hour | gy used to | Synchro |
| Vehicle | Vehicle | Vehicle | we Project | Project | Delay | Delay | calculate | Seduced |
| Without | With The | Reduced | Reduced | railroad | or HCM |  |  |  |
| The | Project | by Project | (Vehicles | (Vehicles | Rer hour) | Per Hour): | by the | by the |
| Project: | Project: | crossing | Relay, if |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project | (Seconds/ | (Seconds/ |  |  |  |  | applicable. |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 158940047 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7315_13 |
| 50.0 | 31.0 | 19.0 | 4994 | 2002 | 94886.0 | 38038.0 | N/A | Traffic |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 38038.0 |  | Analysis - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lake Elmo |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ave.pdf |

## 38038

## Vehicle Delay Reduced

Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced
94886.0

Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced
38038.0

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



Total (CO, NOX, and VOC)
Peak Hour Emissions with the Project (Kilograms):

Total (CO, NOX, and VOC)
Peak Hour Emissions
Reduced by the Project
(Kilograms):

## Total

Total Emissions Reduced:

Upload Synchro Report
1589400860370_13 Traffic Analysis - Lake Elmo Ave.pdf
Please upload attachment in PDF form. (Save Form, then click 'Edit' in top right to upload file.)

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 without the Project (Kilograms):

Total (CO, NOX, and VOC)
Peak Hour Emissions with the Project (Kilograms):

Total (CO, NOX, and VOC)
Peak Hour Emissions
Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):

| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 | 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: | 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 | 0 |
| Project (Kilograms): |  |
| EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit |  |
| 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words) |  |

## Measure A: Benefit of Crash Reduction

Crash Modification Factor Used:
(Limit 700 Characters; approximately 100 words)

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:

Crash Modifications Used: Convert at-grade intersection to a grade separated interchange and engineering judgement to assume mainline rear end crashes are eliminated with removal of the at grade intersection.

Rationale: The CMF used was found to be the most applicable for the intersection improvements. Engineering judgement was used to determine that mainline rear end crashes will no longer occur once the at grade intersection is removed. This was determined since the traffic signal is no longer stopping mainline movements and they are freeflowing, rear end crashes associated with the signal will be eliminated and a CMF of 0.00 can be used.
\$42,710,337.00
1
0
1

Total Crashes:
90
Total Fatal (K) Crashes Reduced by Project: 1
Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes Reduced by Project: 0
Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes Reduced by Project:

Total Crashes Reduced by Project: 85

Worksheet Attachment
1589401018940_TH 36 and Lake Elmo Ave BCA and CMF.pdf

Please upload attachment in PDF form.

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

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

0
0
0

Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

CSAH 17 has a posted speed limit of 55 MPH through the project area, and an average daily traffic volume of 4,900 . TH 36 has a posted speed limit of 65 , and an average daily traffic volume of 42,000. The volumes on TH 36 have increased since the 2017 opening of the St. Croix Crossing Bridge. This corridor has become increasingly important to freight movements. Currently, CSAH 17 at TH 36 is an at-grade, signalized intersection with no pedestrian or multimodal infrastructure in the project area. Along CSAH 17 pedestrians are forced to walk on the shoulder/ditch. TH 36 acts as a large barrier and safety hazard for non-motorized transportation as pedestrians are not allowed to legally travel along or across TH 36 at CSAH 17. Those who choose to cross TH 36 illegally take a large safety risk.
The proposed interchange project includes multiuse trail on the west side of CSAH 17. FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures indicates that sidewalks provide a 65-89 percent reduction in crashes involving pedestrians walking along roadways. This trail will allow pedestrians to safely cross TH 36 without the risk of traffic conflict. The trail will extend from just north of the south frontage road, under TH 36, to the tie down point just north of the north frontage road, see layout attached. The trail will be accessible to all users, as it will be designed to meet ADA standards and will remove conflicts with pedestrians and traffic.

## Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

Response:
Currently, there are limited facilities for and significant barriers to bicycle and pedestrian travel in this project area. CSAH 17 north and south of TH 36 has wide shoulders and is designated as an onroad facility in the draft Washington County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. TH 36 at CSAH 17 is identified as a barrier (W018) in the RBBS study as it acts as a major impediment to bikes and peds who wish to travel north/south along CSAH 17. It is illegal for pedestrians to cross TH 36 at CSAH 17. The proposed TH 36/CSAH 17 interchange will build a road-separated, ADA compliant, 10 foot trail along the west side of CSAH 17 from just north of the south frontage road to just north of the northern frontage road. See attached layout. The addition of this trail will allow users to safely cross TH 36 without having to risk traffic conflicts or signal timing. Without this project and the associated trail, bicycle users attempting to cross TH 36 will be forced to travel one mile east to CSAH 15 (Manning Avenue) or take a large risk and attempt to cross at the existing at-grade traffic signal at CSAH 17. This project will allow all users greater and safer access. Although CSAH 17 is not part of the RBTN, this project will create north/south connectivity to multimodal users attempting to access the existing T1 RBTN alignment on CSAH 12 to the north and the T2 corridor on CSAH 14 to the south.
Metro Transit currently does not operate any service in the immediate project area. However, the Route 294 has stops along CSAH 15 to the east and CSAH 14 to the south in downtown Lake Elmo. The Route 294 runs from Stillwater to downtown St. Paul by way of the 3M Headquarters and Sun Ray Shopping Center in Maplewood. This route is critical for community members who are unable to drive. The multimodal improvements associated with the proposed TH 36 and CSAH 17 interchange will provide safer multimodal access to those walking or biking to Rt 294 stops. Additionally, Washington County is currently leading a TH 36 examine transit needs between Stillwater and Minneapolis. This project area is critical to the study and will be included in future transit improvement recommendations.

## 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 attachedYes along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.

100\%
Attach Layout
1589401698681_03 TH36 CSAH17 Layout.pdf
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.

50\%
Attach Layout
Please upload attachment in PDF form.
Layout has not been started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
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.

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

Yes

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

0\%
Anticipated date or date of acquisition
10/31/2024
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)

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:
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.

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\%

Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):
The City of Lake Elmo in partnership with MnDOT and Washington County undertook a study identifying a TH 36 south frontage road route and intersection improvements from the Hilton Trail interchange in the west to the CSAH 15/Manning intersection in the east. The study took place over 18 months and identified intersection improvements, access management opportunities, potential connections, and overpass/interchange locations along the corridor including the proposed interchange layout.

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form):
Enter Amount of the Noise Walls:
Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls:
\$34,731,130.00
$\$ 0.00$
\$34,731,130.00

Enter amount of any outside, competitive funding:
$\$ 0.00$
Attach documentation of award:
Points Awarded in Previous Criteria
Cost Effectiveness
$\$ 0.00$

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 CSAH 17TH36 Cover Sheet.pdf | Summary Sheet CSAH 17 at TH 36 <br> Interchange | 981 KB |
| 02 Existing Conditions TH 36 CSAH 17 <br> Interchange.pdf | Existing Conditions CSAH 17 at TH 36 <br> Interchange | 657 KB |
| 04 County Board Resolution 2020-035 |  |  |
| Met Council Regional Solicitation.pdf | Washington County Board of <br> Commissioners Resolution | 125 KB |
| 05 Lake Elmo LOS TH36 CSAH 17 <br> Interchange.pdf | City of Lake Elmo Letter of Support <br> CSAH 17 at TH 36 Interchange | 108 KB |
| 06 Grant LOS TH36 CSAH17 <br> Interchange.pdf <br> 07 MnDOT LOS TH 36 CSAH 17 | City of Grant Letter of Support CSAH 17 <br> at TH 36 Interchange | 222 KB |
| Interchange.pdf | MnDOT Letter of Support CSAH 17 at <br> TH 36 Interchange | 558 KB |
| 16 IRP-TH36-LakeEImo(CSAH17).pdf | Interchange Request Approval CSAH 17 <br> at TH 36 Interchange | 127 KB |
| TH 36 and Lake Elmo Ave Crash <br> Data.pdf | Crash Data CSAH 17 at TH 36 <br> Interchange | 123 KB |

## Washington County ADA Transition Plan <br> $$
\text { September 30, } 2015
$$

## Introduction

## Transition Plan Need and Purpose

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), enacted on July 26, 1990, is a civil rights law prohibiting discrimination against individuals on the basis of disability. ADA consists of five titles outlining protections in the following areas:

1. Employment
2. State and local government services
3. Public accommodations
4. Telecommunications
5. Miscellaneous provisions

Title II of ADA pertains to the programs, activities and services public entities provide. As a public entity that employs 50 or more persons, Washington County must comply with this section of the Act as it specifically applies to public service agencies. Title II of ADA provides that, "...no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity." (42 USC. Sec. 12132; 28 CFR. Sec. 35.130)

As required by Title II of ADA, 28 CFR. Part 35 Sec .35 .105 and Sec. 35.150, Washington County has conducted a self-evaluation of its facilities throughout the County and has developed this Transition Plan detailing how the organization will ensure that all of those facilities are accessible to all individuals.

## ADA and its Relationship to Other Laws

Title II of ADA is companion legislation to two previous federal statutes and regulations: the Architectural Barriers Acts of 1968 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 is a Federal law that requires facilities designed, built, altered or leased with Federal funds to be accessible. The Architectural Barriers Act marks one of the first efforts to ensure access to the built environment.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is a Federal law that protects qualified individuals from discrimination based on their disability. The nondiscrimination requirements of the law apply to employers and organizations that receive financial assistance from any Federal department or agency. Title II of ADA extended this coverage to all state and local government entities, regardless of whether they receive federal funding or not.

## Agency Requirements

Under Title II, Washington County must meet these general requirements:

- Must operate their programs so that, when viewed in their entirety, the programs are accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities (28 C.F.R. Sec. 35.150).
- May not refuse to allow a person with a disability to participate in a service, program or activity simply because the person has a disability ( 28 C.F.R. Sec. 35.130 (a).
- Must make reasonable modifications in policies, practices and procedures that deny equal access to individuals with disabilities unless a fundamental alteration in the program would result (28 C.F.R. Sec. 35.130(b) (7).
- May not provide services or benefits to individuals with disabilities through programs that are separate or different unless the separate or different measures are necessary to ensure that benefits and services are equally effective ( 28 C.F.R. Sec. 35.130 (b) (iv) \& (d).
- Must take appropriate steps to ensure that communications with applicants, participants and members of the public with disabilities are as effective as communications with others (29 C.F.R. Sec. 35.160(a).
- Must designate at least one responsible employee to coordinate ADA compliance [28 CFR Sec. 35.107(a)]. This person is often referred to as the "ADA Coordinator." The public entity must provide the ADA coordinator's name, office address, and telephone number to all interested individuals [28 CFR Sec. 35.107(a)].
- Must provide notice of ADA requirements. All public entities, regardless of size, must provide information about the rights and protections of Title II to applicants, participants, beneficiaries, employees, and other interested persons [ 28 CFR Sec. 35,106]. The notice must include the identification of the employee serving as the ADA coordinator and must provide this information on an ongoing basis [ 28 CFR Sec. 104.8(a)].
- Must establish a grievance procedure. Public entities must adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of complaints [ 28 CFR Sec. 35.107 (b)]. This requirement provides for a timely resolution of all problems or conflicts related to ADA compliance before they escalate to litigation and/or the federal complaint process.


## Facilities

## Self-Evaluation

## Overview

Washington County is required, under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and 28CFR35.105, to perform a self-evaluation of its current building infrastructure policies, practices, and programs. This self-evaluation will identify what policies and practices impact accessibility and examine how the County implements these policies. The goal of the selfevaluation is to verify that, in implementing the County's policies and practices, the division is providing accessibility and not adversely affecting the full participation of individuals with disabilities. A summary of the inventoried County policies and practices is found in Appendix A.

The self-evaluation also examines the condition of the County's Pedestrian Access Route (PAR) and identifies potential need for PAR infrastructure improvements. This will include the sidewalks, curb ramps, parking lots and buildings that house Washington County public services. Any barriers to accessibility identified in the self-evaluation and the potential / recommended remedy to the identified barrier are set out in this transition plan.

## Summary

In 2014, Washington County conducted an inventory of pedestrian access to facilities within its public system consisting of the evaluation of the following facilities:

- 24 Building Entrances
- 13 Courtrooms
- 97 Curb Ramps
- 28 Building Floors
- 2 Jury Rooms
- 23 Parking Lots
- 62 Sidewalk Control Points
- 5 Sidewalk Ramps

A detailed evaluation on how these facilities relate to ADA standards is found in Appendix A and will be updated periodically.

## Policies and Practices

## Previous Practices

Since the adoption of the ADA, Washington County has strived to provide accessible pedestrian features as part of the County's capital improvement projects. As additional information was made available, as to the methods of providing accessible pedestrian features, the County updated their procedures to accommodate these methods.

## Policy

Washington County's goal is to continue to provide accessible pedestrian design features as part of the County capital improvement projects. The County has established ADA design standards and procedures as listed in Appendix F. These standards and procedures will be kept up to date with nationwide and local best management practices.

The County will consider and respond to all accessibility improvement requests. All accessibility improvements that have been deemed reasonable will be scheduled consistent with facility priorities.

Requests for accessibility improvements can be submitted to the Title II ADA Coordinator. Contact information for Title II ADA Coordinator is located in Appendix E.

## Improvement Schedule

## Priority Areas

Prioritizing and scheduling of work will be established by the Transition Plan Implementation Committee based on numerous factors, including, but not limited to, severity of noncompliance, a barrier to access a program, feasibility of remedies, a safety concern, or a location that receives high public use. Prioritization will also be given to locations that would most likely not be updated by means of other county programs

## Schedule

Washington County has set the following schedule goals for improving the accessibility of its pedestrian facilities within the County jurisdiction:

- After 10 years, $95 \%$ of accessibility features within the priority areas identified by County staff would be ADA compliant.
- After 20 years, $95 \%$ of accessibility features within the jurisdiction of the County would be ADA compliant.


## Methodology

Washington County will utilize two methods for upgrading pedestrian facilities to the current ADA standards. The first and most comprehensive of the two methods are the scheduled facility improvement projects. All pedestrian facilities impacted by these projects will be upgraded to current ADA accessibility standards. The second method is the stand alone ADA accessibility improvement project. These projects will be incorporated into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) on a case by case basis as determined by Washington County staff. The County CIP, which includes a detailed schedule and budget for specific improvements, is included in Appendix B.

# Public Rights of Way 

## Self-Evaluation

## Overview

Washington County is required, under Title ll of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and 28CFR35.105, to perform a self-evaluation of its current transportation infrastructure policies, practices, and programs. This self-evaluation will identify what policies and practices impact accessibility and examine how the County implements these policies. The goal of the selfevaluation is to verify that, in implementing the County's policies and practices, the division is providing accessibility and not adversely affecting the full participation of individuals with disabilities. A summary of the inventoried County policies and practices is found in Appendix A.

The self-evaluation also examines the condition of the County's Pedestrian Circulation Route/Pedestrian Access Route (PCR/PAR) and identifies potential need for PCR/PAR infrastructure improvements. This will include the sidewalks, curb ramps, paved bicycle/pedestrian trails, traffic control signals and transit facilities that are located within the County rights of way. Any barriers to accessibility identified in the self-evaluation and the potential / recommended remedy to the identified barrier are set out in this transition plan.

## Summary

In 2014, Washington County conducted an inventory of pedestrian facilities within its public right of way consisting of the evaluation of the following facilities:

- 1287 Curb Ramps
- 897 Sidewalk Control Points
- 149 Traffic Control Signals

A detailed evaluation on how these facilities relate to ADA standards is found in Appendix A and will be updated periodically.

## Policies and Practices

## Previous Practices

Since the adoption of the ADA, Washington County has strived to provide accessible pedestrian features as part of the County's capital improvement projects. As additional information was made available, as to the methods of providing accessible pedestrian features, the County updated their procedures to accommodate these methods.

Washington County's goal is to continue to provide accessible pedestrian design features as part of the County capital improvement projects. The County has established ADA design standards and procedures as listed in Appendix F. These standards and procedures will be kept up to date with nationwide and local best management practices.

The County will consider and respond to all accessibility improvement requests. All accessibility improvements that have been deemed reasonable will be scheduled consistent with County priorities. The County will coordinate with external agencies to ensure that all new or altered pedestrian facilities within the County jurisdiction are ADA compliant to the maximum extent feasible.

Maintenance of pedestrian facilities within the public right of way will continue to follow the policies set forth by the County.

Requests for accessibility improvements can be submitted to the Title II ADA Coordinator. Contact information for Title II ADA Coordinator is located in Appendix E.

## Improvement Schedule

## Priority Areas

Prioritizing and scheduling of work will be established by the Transition Plan Implementation Committee based on numerous factors, including, but not limited to, severity of noncompliance, a barrier to access a program, feasibility of remedies, a safety concern, or a location that receives high public use. Prioritization will also be given to locations that would most likely not be updated by means of other county programs

Additional priority will be given to any location where an improvement project or alteration was constructed after January 26, 1991, and accessibility features were omitted.

## External Agency Coordination

Many other agencies are responsible for pedestrian facilities within the jurisdiction of Washington County. The County will coordinate with those agencies to track and assist in the facilitation of the elimination of accessibility barriers along their routes.

## Schedule

Washington County has set the following schedule goals for improving the accessibility of its pedestrian facilities within the County jurisdiction:

- After 10 years, $80 \%$ of accessibility features within the priority areas identified by County staff would be ADA compliant.
- After 20 years, $80 \%$ of accessibility features within the jurisdiction of the County would be ADA compliant.


## Implementation Schedule

## Methodology

Washington County will utilize two methods for upgrading pedestrian facilities to the current ADA standards. The first and most comprehensive of the two methods are the scheduled street and utility improvement projects. All pedestrian facilities impacted by these projects will be upgraded to current ADA accessibility standards. The second method is the stand alone sidewalk and ADA accessibility improvement project. These projects will be incorporated into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) on a case by case basis as determined by Washington County staff. The County CIP, which includes a detailed schedule and budget for specific improvements, is included in Appendix B.

## Parks

## Self-Evaluation

## Overview

Washington County is required, under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and 28CFR35.105, to perform a self-evaluation of its current park infrastructure policies, practices, and programs. This self-evaluation will identify what policies and practices impact accessibility and examine how the County implements these policies. The goal of the self-evaluation is to verify that, in implementing the County's policies and practices, the division is providing accessibility and not adversely affecting the full participation of individuals with disabilities. A summary of the inventoried County policies and practices is found in Appendix A.

The self-evaluation also examines the condition of the County's outdoor recreation access routes (ORAR), outdoor recreation trails (ORT) and outdoor constructed features and identifies potential need for ORAR, ORT or other constructed feature improvements. This will include the sidewalks, trails, picnic facilities, campsites and other features that are located within the County park system. Any barriers to accessibility identified in the self-evaluation and the potential / recommended remedy to the identified barrier are set out in this transition plan.

## Summary

In 2014, Washington County conducted an inventory of pedestrian facilities within its park system consisting of the evaluation of the following facilities:

- 1 Archery Range
- 4 Boat Launching Docks
- 5 Building Entrances
- 1 Conference Cottage
- 95 Curb Ramps
- 6 Designated Camp Sites
- 6 Fishing Piers
- 1 Nordic Center
- 11 ORAR Segments
- 699 ORT Segments
- 3 Park Offices
- 42 Parking Lots
- 30 Picnic Areas
- 7 Play Structure Areas
- 14 Restroom Buildings
- 84 Sidewalk segments
- 5 Swim Beaches
- 3 Viewing Blinds
- 35 Water Fountains

A detailed evaluation on how these facilities relate to ADA standards is found in Appendix A and will be updated periodically.

## Policies and Practices

## Previous Practices

Since the adoption of the ADA, Washington County has strived to provide accessible pedestrian features as part of the County's capital improvement projects. As additional information was made available, as to the methods of providing accessible pedestrian features, the County updated their procedures to accommodate these methods. Washington County Parks had previously evaluated the Park System in terms of its accessibility. This previous evaluation is found in Appendix H .

## Policy

Washington County's goal is to continue to provide accessible pedestrian design features as part of the County capital improvement projects. The County has established ADA design standards and procedures as listed in Appendix F. These standards and procedures will be kept up to date with nationwide and local best management practices.

The County will consider and respond to all accessibility improvement requests. All accessibility improvements that have been deemed reasonable will be scheduled consistent with park priorities. Maintenance of pedestrian facilities within the park system will continue to follow the policies set forth by the County.

Requests for accessibility improvements can be submitted to the Title II ADA Coordinator. Contact information Title II ADA Coordinator is located in Appendix E.

## Improvement Schedule

## Priority Areas

Prioritizing and scheduling of work will be established by the Transition Plan Implementation Committee based on numerous factors, including, but not limited to, severity of noncompliance, a barrier to access a program, feasibility of remedies, a safety concern, or a location that receives high public use. Prioritization will also be given to locations that would most likely not be updated by means of other county programs

## Schedule

Washington County has set the following schedule goals for improving the accessibility of its pedestrian facilities within the County jurisdiction:

- After 10 years, $80 \%$ of accessibility features within the priority areas identified by County staff would be ADA compliant.
- After 20 years, $80 \%$ of accessibility features within the jurisdiction of the County would be ADA compliant.


## Implementation Schedule

## Methodology

Washington County will utilize two methods for upgrading pedestrian facilities to the current ADA standards. The first and most comprehensive of the two methods are the scheduled park improvement projects. All pedestrian facilities impacted by these projects will be upgraded to current ADA accessibility standards. The second method is the stand alone ADA accessibility improvement project. These projects will be incorporated into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) on a case by case basis as determined by Washington County staff. The County CIP, which includes a detailed schedule and budget for specific improvements, is included in Appendix B.

## County Website

## Self-Evaluation

## Overview

Washington County is required, under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and 28CFR35.105, to perform a self-evaluation of its current building infrastructure policies, practices, and programs. This self-evaluation will identify what policies and practices impact accessibility and examine how the County implements these policies. The goal of the selfevaluation is to verify that, in implementing the County's policies and practices, the County is providing accessibility and not adversely affecting the full participation of individuals with disabilities. A summary of the inventoried County policies and practices is found in Appendix A.

The self-evaluation also examined the accessibility of the County's website. The County is required to ensure that communications with individuals with disabilities are as effective as communications with others. The evaluation of the website reviews the content of the website to ensure that it is perceivable, operable, understandable and robust.

## Summary

In 2015, Washington County conducted an inventory of its website. A detailed evaluation on how these facilities relate to ADA standards is found in Appendix A and will be updated periodically.

## Policies and Practices

## Previous Practices

Since the adoption of the ADA, Washington County has strived to provide accessible technological features as part of the County's capital improvement projects. As additional information was made available, as to the methods of providing accessible technological features, the County updated their procedures to accommodate these methods.

## Policy

Washington County's goal is to continue to provide accessible communications with the public.
The County will consider and respond to all accessibility improvement requests. All accessibility improvements that have been deemed reasonable will be scheduled consistent with County priorities.

Requests for accessibility improvements can be submitted to the Title II ADA Coordinator. Contact information for Title II ADA Coordinator is located in Appendix E.

## Improvement Schedule

## Priority Areas

Prioritizing and scheduling of website improvements will be established by the Transition Plan Implementation Committee based on numerous factors, including, but not limited to, severity of non-compliance, a barrier to access a program, feasibility of remedies, a safety concern, or an area that receives high public use.

## Schedule

Washington County has set the following schedule goals for improving the accessibility of its website:

- After 2 years, $95 \%$ of accessibility features within the priority areas identified by County staff would be ADA compliant.
- After 5 years, $95 \%$ of accessibility features would be ADA compliant.


## Implementation Schedule

## Methodology

Washington County will utilize two methods for upgrading the website to the current ADA standards. The first and most comprehensive of the two methods are the scheduled content replacement. As information is placed on the website, County staff will ensure that it meets accessibility criteria. The second method is the stand alone ADA accessibility improvement project. These projects will be incorporated into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) on a case by case basis as determined by Washington County staff. The County CIP, which includes a detailed schedule and budget for specific improvements, is included in Appendix B.

## ADA Coordinator

In accordance with 28 CFR 35.107(a), the Washington County has identified an ADA Title II Coordinator to oversee the County policies and procedures. Contact information for this individual is located in Appendix E .

## Public Outreach

Washington County recognizes that public participation is an important component in the development of this document. Input from the community has been gathered and used to help define priority areas for improvements within the jurisdiction of Washington County.

Public outreach for the creation of this document consisted of the following activities:
Four open houses were held to introduce the Transition Plan to the public and begin a conversation about the county's work thus far, and to outline how the county will continue to provide accessibility throughout the county. Information gathered at the open houses will help identify priority areas of improvement within the county, including buildings, parks, roadways, and other county facilities. The open houses were held:

- 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. Tuesday, April 7, at the Oakdale City Hall, 1584 Hadley Ave. N. in Oakdale ;
- 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. Tuesday, April 7, at the Government Center 14949 N. $62^{\text {nd }}$ St. in Stillwater;
- 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 8, at the Headwaters Service Center, 19955 Forest Lake Road N. in Forest Lake; and
- 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. Thursday, April 9, at the Cottage Grove Service Center, 13000 Ravine Parkway S. in Cottage Grove.

Additional information about the open houses is located in Appendix C.
This document was also available for public comment. A summary of comments received and detailed information regarding the public outreach activities are located in Appendix C.

## Grievance Procedure

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act, each agency is required to publish its responsibilities in regards to the ADA. A draft of this public notice is provided in Appendix D. If users of Washington Country facilities and services believe the County has not provided reasonable accommodation, they have the right to file a grievance.

In accordance with 28 CFR 35.107 (b), the County has developed a grievance procedure for the purpose of the prompt and equitable resolution of citizens' complaints, concerns, comments, and other grievances. This grievance procedure is outlined in Appendix D.

## Monitor the Progress

This document represents the first phase of transition planning within the County and focuses on public infrastructure and the County website. Additional transition planning for specific government programs and services will be incorporated as future phases of work. Washington County will continue to update this transition plan and appendices as conditions within the County evolve. With each main body update, public outreach on this document will be continued.

## Appendices

## A. Self-Evaluation Results

a. Facilities
b. Public Rights of Way
c. Parks
d. County Website
B. Schedule / Budget Information
C. Public Outreach
a. Open House Communication Efforts
b. Open House Content
c. Transition Plan Public Comments (Upcoming)
D. Grievance Procedure
a. Public Notice
b. ADA Comment Form
c. Comment Period Notification
d. Comment Period Website
e. Public Comments

## E. Contact Information

F. Agency ADA Design Standards and Procedures
a. Facilities
b. Public Rights of Way
c. Parks
d. County Website
e. Policy \#5024 - ADA Title II (Program Accessibility) Compliance Policy
f. Policy \#5026 ADA Title II Service Animal Policy
g. Policy \#P012 - Motorized Vehicles on Trails Policy
h. Policy \#P021 - Free Annual Vehicle Permit for any Veteran who has a Total and Permanent Service-connected Disability
i. Policy \# PO22 - Free Daily Vehicle Permit for any Veteran with any Service-connected Disability
j. Proposed Right of Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) as adopted by the MnDOT
k. ADA Transition Plan Inventory Manual

1. ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal

## G. Glossary of Terms

H. Washington County Previous ADA Planning Efforts


Regional Economy Roadway Expansion Project: CSAH 17 \& TH 36 Interhchange | Map ID: 1588176082947
Results
WITHIN ONE MI of project:
Postsecondary Students: 0
Totals by City:
Grant
Population: 1396
Employment: 336
Mfg and Dist Employment: 85
Lake Elmo
Population: 3284
Employment: 1230
Mfg and Dist Employment: 26
Stillwater
Population: 1738
Employment: 168
Mfg and Dist Employment: 2
Project Points
Project $\square$
Manfacturing/Distribution Centers
Job Concentration Centers
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
http://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx
MEIROPOLITAN




[^0] Synchro 11 Report

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SBT | SBR |
| Lane ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ (onfigurations | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 67 | 80 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 67 | 80 |
| Turn Type | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 16.5\% | 16.5\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -4.0 | -4.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lead/Lag | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |
| Act Efft Green (s) | 21.8 | 21.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.31 | 0.26 |
| Control Delay | 70.0 | 1.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 70.0 | 1.8 |
| LOS | E | A |
| Approach Delay | 43.4 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |

5: Lake Elmo Avenue \& 60th Street

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 646 |
| Total Delay $/$ Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 2 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.54 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.10 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.13 |

10: Lake Elmo Avenue \& Highway 36

|  | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Direction | 4348 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 48 |
| Total Delay $/$ Veh (s/v) | 18.45 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.59 |
| NOx Emissions kg ) | 4.28 |

## 5: Lake Elmo Avenue \& 60th Street

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 750 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 5 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.90 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.18 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.21 |

10: Lake Elmo Avenue \& South Frontage Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 684 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 5 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.73 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.14 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.17 |

## 15: South Frontage Rd \& TH 36 Off Ramp

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 204 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 9 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.17 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.03 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.04 |

25: TH 36 On Ramp \& 60th Street

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 218 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 5 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.26 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.05 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.06 |

30: South Frontage Rd \& TH 36 On Ramp

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 166 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 7 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.23 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.04 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.05 |

Delays

| Lake Elmo Ave/60th Ave |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Existing Volume | 646 | vehicles |
| Existing Delay | 2 | sec $/$ veh |
| Existing Total Delay | 1292 | seconds |
| Future Volume | 750 | vehicles |
| Future Delay | 5 | sec $/$ veh |
| Future Total Delay | 3750 | seconds |
| Total Delay Reduction | -2458 | seconds |

2 Lake Elmo Ave/TH 36 (|r|l| | Existing Volume | 4348 | vehicles |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Existing Delay | 48 | sec/veh |
| Existing Total Delay | 208704 | seconds |
| Future Volume | 0 | vehicles |
| Future Delay | 0 | sec/veh |
| Future Total Delay | 0 | seconds |
| Total Delay Reduction | 208704 | seconds |

| South Frontage Rd and TH 36 Off Ramp |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Existing Volume | 0 | vehicles |
| Existing Delay | 0 | sec/veh |
| Existing Total Delay | 0 | seconds |
| Future Volume | 204 | vehicles |
| Future Delay | 9 | sec/veh |
| Future Total Delay | 1836 | seconds |
| Total Delay Reduction | -1836 | seconds |


| 60th Street and TH 36 On Ramp |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Existing Volume | 0 | vehicles |
| Existing Delay | 0 | sec/veh |
| Existing Total Delay | 0 | seconds |
| Future Volume | 218 | vehicles |
| Future Delay | 5 | sec/veh |
| Future Total Delay | 1090 | seconds |
| Total Delay Reduction | -1090 | seconds |


| Lake Elmo Ave/South Frontage Rd |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Existing Volume | 0 | vehicles |
| Existing Delay | 0 | sec/veh |
| Existing Total Delay | 0 | seconds |
| Future Volume | 684 | vehicles |
| Future Delay | 5 | sec/veh |
| Future Total Delay | 3420 | seconds |
| Total Delay Reduction | -3420 | seconds |

6 | South Frontage Rd and TH 36 On Ramp |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Existing Volume | 0 | vehicles |
| Existing Delay | 0 | sec/veh |
| Existing Total Delay | 0 | seconds |
| Future Volume | 166 | vehicles |
| Future Delay | 7 | sec/veh |
| Future Total Delay | 1162 | seconds |
| Total Delay Reduction | -1162 | seconds |

Total Network Delay Reduction 198738 seconds
Emissions

| Existing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CO | 0.54 | 18.45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18.99 |
| NO | 0.1 | 3.59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.69 |
| VOC | 0.13 | 4.28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.41 |


| Build | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CO | 0.9 | 0 | 0.73 | 0.17 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 2.29 |
| NO | 0.18 | 0 | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.44 |
| VOC | 0.21 | 0 | 0.17 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.53 |
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Traffic Safety Benefit-Cost Calculation
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Reactive Project

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | TH 36 | District | County Miles | Washington |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP |  | End RP |  |  |
| Location | Lake Elmo Avenue and TH 36 |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work | Convert Intersection to an Interchange |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Cost* | \$34,733,130 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth Factor | 2.0\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

## C. Crash Modification Factor

| 0.00 | Fatal (K) Crashes | ReferenceTraffic Engineering Judgement <br> 0.00 | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.00 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type |  |
| 0.00 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |  |
| 0.00 | Property Damage Only Crashes Rear ends and Left-turn/Angle Crashes |  |  |

D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)

|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
|  | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type |  |
|  |  |  | www.CMFClearinghouse.org |


| E. Crash Data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin Date <br> Data Source | 1/1/2016 | End Date | 12/31/2018 | 3 years |
|  | MnDOT |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity | Mainline Rear ends a | / <optional |  |
|  | K crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | A crashes | 0 |  |  |
|  | B crashes | 6 |  |  |
|  | C crashes | 22 |  |  |
|  | PDO crashes | 52 |  |  |
| F. Benefit-Cost Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| \$40,734,868 |  | Benefit (present value) | $B / C$ Ratio = 1.18 |  |
|  | 733,130 |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed project expected to reduce 27 crashes annually, 1 of which involving fatality or serious injury. |  |  |  |

F. Analysis Assumptions

Crash Severity

| K crashes | $\$ 1,360,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| A crashes | $\$ 680,000$ |
| B crashes | $\$ 210,000$ |
| C crashes | $\$ 110,000$ |
| PDO crashes | $\$ 12,000$ |

Link: mndot.gov/planning/program/appendix_a.html

Real Discount Rate $\quad 1.2 \%$
Traffic Growth Rate 2.0\%
Project Service Life 20 years
G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 1.00 | 0.33 | $\$ 453,333$ |
| A crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| B crashes | 6.00 | 2.00 | $\$ 420,000$ |
| C crashes | 22.00 | 7.33 | $\$ 806,667$ |
| PDO crashes | 52.00 | 17.33 | $\$ 208,000$ |


| H. Amortized Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |  |
| 2024 | \$1,888,000 | \$1,888,000 | Total $=$ | \$40,734,868 |
| 2025 | \$1,925,760 | \$1,902,925 |  |  |
| 2026 | \$1,964,275 | \$1,917,968 |  |  |
| 2027 | \$2,003,561 | \$1,933,130 |  |  |
| 2028 | \$2,043,632 | \$1,948,411 |  |  |
| 2029 | \$2,084,505 | \$1,963,814 |  |  |
| 2030 | \$2,126,195 | \$1,979,338 |  |  |
| 2031 | \$2,168,719 | \$1,994,985 |  |  |
| 2032 | \$2,212,093 | \$2,010,755 |  |  |
| 2033 | \$2,256,335 | \$2,026,651 |  |  |
| 2034 | \$2,301,461 | \$2,042,672 |  |  |
| 2035 | \$2,347,491 | \$2,058,819 |  |  |
| 2036 | \$2,394,441 | \$2,075,095 |  |  |
| 2037 | \$2,442,329 | \$2,091,499 |  |  |
| 2038 | \$2,491,176 | \$2,108,032 |  |  |
| 2039 | \$2,540,999 | \$2,124,696 |  |  |
| 2040 | \$2,591,819 | \$2,141,492 |  |  |
| 2041 | \$2,643,656 | \$2,158,421 |  |  |
| 2042 | \$2,696,529 | \$2,175,484 |  |  |
| 2043 | \$2,750,459 | \$2,192,681 |  |  |
| 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

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | TH 36 | District | County Miles | Washington |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin RP |  | End RP |  |  |
| Location | Lake Elmo Avenue and TH 36 |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work | Convert Intersection to an Interchange |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Cost* | \$34,733,130 | Installation Year | 2024 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth Factor | 2.0\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |  |  |

## C. Crash Modification Factor

| 0.58 | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.43 | Serious Injury (A) Crashes Clearinghouse |  |  |
| 0.43 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type All |  |
| 0.43 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |  |
| 0.58 | 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 |


F. Analysis Assumptions

Crash Severity

| K crashes | $\$ 1,360,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| A crashes | $\$ 680,000$ |
| B crashes | $\$ 210,000$ |
| C crashes | $\$ 110,000$ |
| PDO crashes | $\$ 12,000$ |

Link: mndot.gov/planning/program/appendix_a.html

Real Discount Rate $\quad 1.2 \%$
Traffic Growth Rate 2.0\%
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 | 1.14 | 0.38 | $\$ 79,800$ |
| C crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| PDO crashes | 2.94 | 0.98 | $\$ 11,760$ |

$\$ 91,560$

| H. Amortized Benefit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| 2024 | \$91,560 | \$91,560 | Total = \$1,975,469 |
| 2025 | \$93,391 | \$92,284 |  |
| 2026 | \$95,259 | \$93,013 |  |
| 2027 | \$97,164 | \$93,749 |  |
| 2028 | \$99,107 | \$94,490 |  |
| 2029 | \$101,090 | \$95,237 |  |
| 2030 | \$103,111 | \$95,990 |  |
| 2031 | \$105,174 | \$96,748 |  |
| 2032 | \$107,277 | \$97,513 |  |
| 2033 | \$109,423 | \$98,284 |  |
| 2034 | \$111,611 | \$99,061 |  |
| 2035 | \$113,843 | \$99,844 |  |
| 2036 | \$116,120 | \$100,633 |  |
| 2037 | \$118,443 | \$101,429 |  |
| 2038 | \$120,811 | \$102,231 |  |
| 2039 | \$123,228 | \$103,039 |  |
| 2040 | \$125,692 | \$103,853 |  |
| 2041 | \$128,206 | \$104,674 |  |
| 2042 | \$130,770 | \$105,502 |  |
| 2043 | \$133,386 | \$106,336 |  |
| 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 |  |

CMFS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS STUDY
CATEGORY: INTERCHANGE DESIGN
Countermeasure: Convert at-grade intersection into grade-separated interchange
Area Type
Not Specified
Not Specified
Not Specified
Not Specified
Not Specified
Not Specifed


## CSAH 17 at TH 36

## Interchange Project

Project Location The CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Ave) at TH 36 interchange project will replace the existing atgrade intersection in the cities of Lake Elmo and Grant with a grade separated interchange.

Funding Request
Federal: \$10,000,000
Local Match: \$ 24,733,130
Project Total: \$ 34,733,130

## Project Goals

Address the existing deficiencies
" Improve safety, capacity, and operation of the intersection and area

Achieve highway corridor vision

## Project Summary

CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Avenue) at TH 36 currently operates as an at-grade intersection controlled by a fully actuated control signal. Within the project area TH 36 is a fourlane divided roadway and has a posted speed limit of 65 mph . CSAH 17 is a two lane rural roadway with a posted speed limit of 55 mph in the project area. Since the opening of the St Croix Crossing Bridge in 2017, traffic on TH 36 has grown tremendously. The increase in traffic volume has increased congestion and travel delays. More importantly, the growth in volumes has exacerbated the existing safety hazards associated with the at-grade signalized intersection in the highway corridor. These hazards and continued growth justify the need for a grade separated interchange. This project will remove the existing traffic signal at TH 36 and CSAH 17 and replace it with a grade separated, full access interchange and improve access management along the TH 36 corridor.

## Summary of Benefits

» Improves regional accessibility and efficiency by relieving congestion and travel delays on TH 36 through the removal of the signal and addition of grade separated infrastructure
" Improve corridor safety through reduction of conflict points and crash potential
"Provides a multi-modal route for cyclists and pedestrians to cross TH 36 at CSAH 17, removing a large barrier to non-motorized movement
» Support TH 36 and CSAH 17's role in the regional transportation network and economy

## Safety

90 Crashes at this intersection between 2016 and 2018 including 1 Fatality making this intersection a sustained crash location


## CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Ave) at TH 36

Strategic Capacity: Interchange
Existing Conditions


Aerial of project area


TH 36 at CSAH 17 facing west


TH 36 at CSAH 17 facing east


CSAH 17 at TH 36 facing north


CSAH 17 at TH 36 facing south
DATE March 24, 2020
MOTION
BY COMMISSIONER Weik

## department Public Works <br> SECONDED BY <br> COMMISSIONER <br> Kriesel

## RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMITTAL OF APPLICATIONS TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR FUNDING UNDER THE METROPLITAN COUNCIL REGIONAL SOLICITATION

WHEREAS, the Regional Solicitation process started with the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in 1991; and

WHEREAS, as authorized by the most recent federal surface transportation funding act, FAST ACT, projects will be selected for funding as part of three federal programs: Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program, and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Regional Solicitation and the regulations promulgated thereunder, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive federal grants for a project shall submit an application first with the appropriate metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for review and inclusion in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Council and the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) act as the MPO for the seven county Twin Cities region and have released the Regional Solicitation for federal transportation funds for 2024 and 2025; and

WHEREAS, Washington County is an eligible project sponsor for Regional Solicitation funds; and
WHEREAS, Washington County is proposing to submit grant applications to Metropolitan Council as part of the 2020 Regional Solicitation for the following projects:

WHEREAS, Washington County is proposing to submit applications for the following projects.

1. County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 15 South Segment: Addition of new road segment spanning from the intersection of CSAH 15 and Trunk Highway (TH) 36 to $58^{\text {th }}$ Street North in the cities of Oak Park Heights, Lake Elmo, Stillwater, and Stillwater Township.
2. TH 120: Conversion of roadway from one lane divided to two lane divided and addition of sidewalk and trail on TH 120 between Interstate 694 and TH 244 in the City of Mahtomedi.
3. CSAH 17 at TH 36: Conversion of at-grade intersection to grade-separated interchange in the cities of Lake Elmo and Grant.
4. CSAH 15 Phase 4: Reconstruction of CSAH 15, drainage improvements, and addition of sidewalk and multiuse trail between Interstate 94 and Oakland Middle School in the City of Lake Elmo and West Lakeland Township.
5. CSAH 32 Reconstruction: Intersection control improvements, drainage improvements, addition of pedestrian facility, and potential realignment of CSAH 32 between CSAH 33 and TH 61 in the City of Forest Lake.
6. CSAH 12 Pedestrian Facility: Addition of 10 -foot pedestrian facility and boulevard on the south side of CSAH 12 between Ideal Avenue and the Mahtomedi School entrance in the cities of Mahtomedi and Grant.
7. CSAH 16 Multiuse Trail: Segment of multiuse trail on the south side of CSAH 16 between Queens Drive and Tower Drive in the City of Woodbury.
8. METRO Gold Line Multiuse Trail: Addition of multiuse trail on Hudson Boulevard between Greenway Avenue and Hadley Avenue in the cities of Landfall and Oakdale.
9. I-494 Park and Ride Parking Structure: Construction of shared parking structure in Woodbury west of the Woodbury Theatre in the City of Woodbury.

WHEREAS, the projects will be of mutual benefit to the Metropolitan Council, Washington County, Ramsey County and the Cities of Oak Park Heights, Lake Elmo, Stillwater, Stillwater Township, Mahtomedi, White Bear Lake, Grant, West Lakeland Township, Forest Lake, Landfall, Oakdale, and Woodbury; and

WHEREAS, Washington County is committed to providing the county share of the costs if the projects are selected as part of the 2020 Regional Solicitation; and

WHEREAS, Washington County is committed to completing the project, if selected, and funding is provided as part of the 2020 Regional Solicitation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Washington County is requesting funding from the federal government through the Metropolitan Council's 2020 Regional Solicitation and the county is committed to completing the projects identified above and providing the county share of funding.

ATTEST:


March 6, 2020

Wayne Sandberg<br>County Engineer<br>Washington County Public Works<br>11660 Myeron Road<br>Stillwater, MN 55082

## RE: Support for Washington County's Regional Solicitation Application for an interchange at the intersection of County State Aid Highway 17 (CSAH 17) and Trunk Highway 36 (TH 36) in the City of Lake Elmo.

Dear Mr. Sandberg,
The purpose of this letter is to express the City of Lake Elmo's support for Washington County's 2020 solicitation of Federal funds through the Metropolitan Council's Regional Solicitation program for a grade separate interchange at the intersection of County State Aid Highway 17 (CSAH 17) and Trunk Highway 36 (TH 36). These improvements are consistent with both the City's and the County's 2040 comprehensive plans.

The City of Lake Elmo will continue to support Washington County's efforts to improve the County road network as identified with the Lake Elmo 2040 Comprehensive Plan update and Washington County's 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to send our support and your commitment to get this project completed. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

## Sincerely,

L Ma


Kristina Hand
Administrator, City of Lake Elmo

## City of Grant Minnesota

March 17, 2020

Wayne Sandberg
County Engineer
Washington County Public Works
11660 Myeron Road
Stillwater, MN 55082

RE: Support for Washington County's Regional Solicitation Application for an interchange at the intersection of County State Aid Highway 17 (CSAH 17) and Trunk Highway 36 (TH 36) in the City of Grant.

Dear Mr. Sandberg,

The purpose of this letter is to express the City of Grant's support for Washington County's 2020 solicitation of Federal funds through the Metropolitan Council's Regional Solicitation program for a grade separate interchange at the intersection of County State Aid Highway 17 (CSAH 17) and Trunk Highway 36 (TH 36). These improvements are consistent with both the City's and the County's 2040 comprehensive plans.

The City of Grant will continue to support Washington County's efforts to improve the County road network as identified with the Grant 2040 Comprehensive Plan update and Washington County's 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to send our support and your commitment to get this project completed. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,


Brad A. Reifsteck, City of Grant Engineer

MnDOT Metro District<br>1500 West County Road B-2<br>Roseville, MN 55113

May 12, 2020
Kurt Howard
Washington County Public Works
11660 Myeron Road North
Stillwater, MN 55082

## Re: MnDOT Letter for Washington County

 Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board 2020 Regional Solicitation Funding Request for CSAH 17 at TH 36Dear Kurt Howard,

This letter documents MnDOT Metro District's recognition for Washington County to pursue funding for the Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board's (TAB) 2020 Regional Solicitation for the conversion of intersection to grade-separated interchange at the intersection of CSAH 17 and TH 36.

As proposed, this project impacts MnDOT right-of-way on TH 36. As the agency with jurisdiction over TH 36, MnDOT will allow Washington County to seek improvements proposed in the application for the conversion of the intersection to grade-separated interchange. If funded, details of any future maintenance agreement with Washington County will need to be determined during project development to define how the improvements will be maintained for the project's useful life.

There is no funding from MnDOT currently planned or programmed for this project. Due to expected loss of future state and federal transportation revenues as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, there is likely to be significant disruptions to the current MnDOT construction program that will surface in the next year. MnDOT does not anticipate partnering on local projects beyond current agreements.

In addition, the Metro District currently does not anticipate any significant discretionary funding in state fiscal years 2024 or 2025 that could fund project construction, nor do we have the resources to assist with MnDOT services such as the design or construction engineering of the project. If your project receives funding, continue to work with MnDOT Area staff to coordinate project development and to periodically review needs and opportunities for cooperation.

MnDOT Metro District looks forward to continued cooperation with Washington County as this project moves forward and as we work together to improve safety and travel options within the Metro Area.

If you have questions or require additional information at this time, please reach out to your Area Manager at adam.josephson@state.mn.us or 651-234-7719.

Sincerely,

## Michael Digitally signed by Michael Barnes <br> Barnes Date: 2020.05.12

Michael Barnes, PE
Metro District Engineer

## CC: Adam Josephson, Metro District East Area Manager Molly McCartney, Metro Program Director Dan Erickson, Metro State Aid Engineer

April 8th, 2020
Nathan Arnold, PE
Engineer II
Washington County
11660 Myron Rd North
Stillwater, MN 55082-9573

Dear Mr. Arnold,

This letter is to serve as your notification that the Interchange Planning Review Committee has determined that the proposed TH 36 interchange and associated access changes at CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Avenue) in the Cities of Lake Elmo and Grant are consistent with the 5 qualifying criteria found in Appendix F of the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Policy Plan and is approved. An important aspect of meeting criterion \#4 - Local Roadway Network and Access Management, includes construction of the proposed south frontage road that will address many of the access management issues and provide a safe and efficient highway system.

As the project layout and design progresses, please continue to work with the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and the Metropolitan Council to assure that the project is developed consistent with the region's plan. In addition, please ensure that appropriate steps are taken to complete the Metropolitan Council's Metro Freeway Project Approval process. The formal Metro Freeway Project Approval request typically happens toward the end of the planning process, once an environmental document is completed. However, the approval must take place before the project right-of-way is purchased or construction begins. Additional information on the Metro Freeway Project Approval process can be found by following this link: https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transit-Plans,-Studies-Reports/HighwaysRoads/ControlledAccessApproval.aspx or by contacting Tony Fischer at 651-602-1703.

We appreciate your work with the Interchange Planning Review Committee in our effort to understand this project. If you have any questions concerning this review, please feel free to contact me at (651) 234-7793.

Sincerely,

## Michael g.Corbett

Michael J. Corbett, PE
State Program Administrator Coordinator
Copy sent via E-Mail:
Adam Josephson, MnDOT
Jason Junge, MnDOT
Kaare Festvog, MnDOT
Steve Peterson, Metropolitan Council
Tony Fischer, Metropolitan Council

Ryan Coddington, MnDOT<br>Molly McCartney, MnDOT<br>David Burns, Metropolitan Council<br>Emily Jorgenson, Washington County

| bjectid | ncident ID Date and TV | Hour | Crash severity | Number kil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2293107 | $5701402 / 27 / 2018$ | 2018 | 12 fatal Crash |  | M | Wastingto take Elm |  | te Trunl 30000000 | 1 MNTH 36 E |  | Front of Remotor veh on Roadw Daylight | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con clear |  |  |  | Not APPu |
| 177532 | 429114 3/13/2017 | 2017 | 15 Minor r ijury Crash | 0 | 3 The crash M M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 33000000 C | 15.66 MNH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw: Davight | None | Notat Int Teaffic Con Clear |  | Dry | ${ }_{2}$ | Nот АРРи |
| 1791009 | 427984 2/27/2017 | 2017 | 21 Minorl Inury Crash | 0 | 2 V \#11 was M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tru | 15.82 MNTH 36 | West | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw: Dark Strerer |  | Four-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | Dry | ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| 1965658 | 362038 7/4/2016, | 2016 | 23 Minor Injur Crash | 0 | 2 val was M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 33000000 | 15.7 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw: Dark (stre |  | Four-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | Dry | 2 | NOT APPL |
| 2287994 | 445330 4/11/2017 | 2017 | 12 Minor Iniury Crash | 0 | 4 The crash M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trun 33000000 | 15.58 мNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor veh On Roadww Davight | None | Not at inte No Control Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Nот АРРи |
| 2410649 | 494800 8/13/2017 | 2017 | 0 Minor Injury Crash | 0 | 1 U WAS M | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Tunl 3 3000000 | 15.83 мNнH 36 | west | Pedestrian On Roadwi Dark Sste | ef None | Four-Way Intersectior Clear |  | Dry | 2 | NOT APPL |
| 2428335 | 621080 7/12/2018 | 2018 | 19 Minor Iniury Crash | 0 | 2 V 1 is M | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunlo3000000 | 15.7 MNTH 36 E | East | Angle Motor veh On Roadwisunset | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Nот APPL |
| 2429806 | 633233 9/3/2018, | 2018 | 15 Minor Injury Crash | 0 | 2 Unit 1 M | Wastingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl $30000000{ }^{\text {cos }}$ | 15.72 MNTH 36 |  | Front of fr Motor Veh On Roadw: Daylight | None | Four-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPL |
| 2533863 | 36292578/2016, | 2016 | 8 Minor Iniury Crash | - | 2 The crash MM | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.87 MNтH 36 W | west | Front one R Motor veh On Roadw: Baylight | None | Not at tit Tefficic con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPL |
| 178172 | 5663042/12/2018 | 2018 | 13 Possible nijury Crash | 0 | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 3 3000000 | 15.87 мптн 36 | west | Front one M Motor Veh On Roadw: Daviligh | None | Four-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | Dry | 2 | мот АРРи |
| 1830584 18853 185 | $529378812 / 1 / 2 / 21$ 38277 | ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | ${ }^{16}$ P Possile Iniur Crash | 0 | 5 The crash M | Wastingto Lake Elmo |  | State Trun 0 3000000 | 15.56 MNTH 36 E 1583 MNTH 36 | East west | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw Daylight Front to ReMotor veho R Roadw Dark Stree | None | Not at Inte No Control Cloudy |  | ${ }_{\text {or }}^{\text {or }}$ | 2 | Not APPU |
| 1881553 <br> 188158 | $3872771101 / 1 / 2 / 21$ $39195711 / 2016$ | ${ }_{2016}^{2016}$ | 20 Possible Injury Crash 13 Possible Injury Crash | $\bigcirc$ | 2 VEHICLES $\backslash M$ | Washingto ake Elmo Washingto oake Elmo |  | State Trun O300000c |  | West | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadwi Dark (Stree | CNone Congestion Backup Other | Four-Way ITraffic Con Cloudy |  |  | $2$ | NOT APPLI |
| 1888402 | 451289 5/12/2017 | 2017 | 14 Possible Injury Crash | - | 4 vEHICLES TM | Wastingto ake EImo |  | State Trunl 3 30000000 | 15.67 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to ReMotor Veh On Roadw Daylight | None | Not at thte Traffic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPLII |
| 195974 | 419583 1/23/2017 | 2017 | 16 Possible Injury Crash | 0 | 1 VEHCLIES 7 M | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.7 MNTH 36 E | East | Front o Re M Motor veh On Roadw: Daviligh | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | Dry | 2 | NOTAPPL |
| 2001133 | 629940 8/24/2018 | 2018 | 7 Possible Injury Crash | 0 | $2 \mathrm{VEHSE/B}+\mathrm{M}$ | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trun 3 3000000c | 15.72 MNTH 36 E | East | Front of Remotor veh On Roadw: Daylight | Congestion Backup Other | Intersectio Not Applicicloudy |  | wet | 2 | Nот APPL |
| 2074281 | 3737538/23/2016 | 2016 | 16 Possible Injury Crash | 0 | 2 vehliles 7 M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 3 3000000c | 15.62 MNH 36 E | East | Front to Re M Otor veh On Roadw: Daylight | None | Not at Int No Control Cloudy |  | Dry | , | NOT APPL |
| 2093019 | 403887 12/3/2016 | 2016 | 20 Possible Injury Crash | - | 2 wв мтн м | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.83 млтн 36 w | west | Front to ReM Motor veh On Roadw Dark (Stree | efone | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | NOT APPL |
| 2093357 | $42333427 / 72017$, | 2017 | 19 Possible Injury Crash | 0 | 2 Eastbou M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 3 3000000 | 15.64 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw: Dark (No S | $s$ None | Not at int No Control Cloudy |  | Dry | $2$ | Nот APPU |
| 2097998 <br> 218729 | $5339221 / 8 / 2018$, $51588311 / 82017$ | ${ }_{2017}^{2018}$ | ${ }^{16}$ P Possible Injury Crash | $\bigcirc$ |  | Washingto Iake Elmo |  |  | 15.68 MNTH 36 E 1563 MNTH ${ }^{\text {E }}$ E | ${ }_{\text {cost }}^{\substack{\text { East } \\ \text { East }}}$ |  | None | Notat Inte No Control Clear |  | Dry | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ |  |
| 2187429 2217012 | 515883 11/8/2017 655036 10/27/201 | ${ }_{2018}^{2017}$ | 18 Possible Injury Crash 14 Possible Injury Crash | $\bigcirc$ | 2 The crash M <br> 2 The crash M | Washingto Lake Elmo Washingto Lake Elmo |  | State Trun O3000000 State Trunlo300000c | 15.63 MNTH 36 <br> 15.62 MNTH 36 | East | Front to Re Motor Ven On Roadw: Dark (Stree Front to ReM Motor veh O Roadw Daylight |  | (eour-Way ITreftic Con Cloudy |  | Dry Ory | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | NOT APPLI NOT APPLI |
| ${ }^{2266558}$ | 393249 11/7/2016 | 2016 | 17 Possible Injury Crash | - | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake EImo |  | State Trunl 3 30000000 | 15.98 мNTH 36 | West | Front to Remotor veh On Roadw Dark Stree | efone | Four-Way ITrafic Con loudy |  | Ory | 2 | Not APPLII |
| 2286972 | 406228 12/19/201 | 2016 | 7 Possible Injury Crash | 0 | 2 The crash $M$ | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl $33000000{ }^{\text {cos }}$ | 15.59 млнН 36 s | South | Angle Motor veh On Roadw: Sunise | Road Surface Condition (wet, icy, snow, sis | Pfou-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | Ice/f | 2 | NOT APPL |
| 2340518 | 3718138/15/2016 | 2016 | 13 Possible mijury Crash | 0 | 2 Unit 1 was M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 30000000 | 15.9 мnth 36 W | west | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadwi Daylight | None | Intersectio Trafic Con Clear |  |  | 2 | Not APPLI |
| 2391826 | 381193 9/15/2016 | 2016 | 9 Possible Injury Crash | 0 | 3 Westrou m | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.88 мNTH 36 | West | Front to Re Motor vehon Roadw: Daylight | None | Not at tite No Control Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPL |
| 10611 | 5036849/13/2017 | 2017 | 18 Possible Iniury Crash | 0 | 2 venicle 41 M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trun 33000000 | 15.66 мNTH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor Veh On Roadw: Dalight | None | Notat Int Terafic Con Cloudy |  | Dry |  | Nот APPLI |
| 2415500 | 49815998/31/2017 | 2017 | 21 Possible Injury Crash | 0 | 4 ALlunits M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Truniozoooooc | 15.68 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor ven on Roadww Dark \stre |  | Four-Way ITrafic Con lear |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPL |
| 2474554 2501524 | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{4203142 / 2 / 2 / 217,}$ | ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | ${ }_{22} 9$ Possible Injury Crash | $\bigcirc$ |  | Washingto Iake Elmo Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trun O3000000 State Trunl 3 300000c |  | ${ }_{\text {East }}^{\text {East }}$ | Front to Re Motor Veh on Roadw Daplight | None | Intersectio Traffic Con Clear |  | Dry Ory | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | Not APPL NOT APPII |
| 2584463 | 654025 10/23/201 | 2018 | 16 Possible Ifiury Crash | 0 | 2 VEHICLES IM | Wastingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 30000000 | 15.79 MNTH 36 E | Esast | Front to Re Motor veh On Roadw Daylight | None | Notat Inte No Control Clear |  | Dry |  | Nот APPL |
| ${ }^{17982588}$ | 622490 7/21/2018 | 2018 | 18 Property Damage only Cras | - 0 | $2{ }^{2}$ nitit 1 M | Washingto ake Emo |  | State Trunl 33000000 c | 15.73 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor ven On Roadw: Daylight | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | Dry | ${ }^{2}$ | NOTAPPLII |
| 180839 | 505062 9/26/2017 | 2017 | 14 Property Damage only Cras | - | 2 Location M | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Tunl $33000000{ }^{\text {cos }}$ | 15.7 Mn HWY 3 E |  | Front of Remotor veh On Roadw: Daylight | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | Dry | , | NOTAPPLI |
| 1817516 | 567506 2/20/2018 | 2018 | 9 Property Damage only Cras |  | 1 V 1 TRavelm | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunl 30000000 | 15.86 мпнH 36 E |  | Cable Med On Roadw: Davilight | Road Surface | -Fou-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | Iee/fros | 2 | NOT APPL |
| 1823032 | 38820 10/19/201 | 2016 | 17 Property Damage only Cras | co | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake Emo |  | State Tunl 33000000 | 15.66 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw: Davight | Congestion Bach | Not at int No Control Clear |  |  | 2 | Not APPL |
| 1843354 1899466 | ${ }^{444199949 / 2017,}$ | ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | ${ }^{14} 11$ Property Damage only cras | cas | ${ }_{2}^{2 \text { ® вотн }}$ | WASSHINGI Lake Etmo Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trun $\mathbf{0}$ O300000 State Trunlo300000c | 15.71 MNTH 36 E 15.64 MNTH 36 Eas | ${ }_{\text {cest }}^{\text {East }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {None }}^{\text {Noad }}$ | Four-Way ITratif Con cloud |  | ory wet | 2 | Notapplil NOT APLII |
| 1850151 | 6254448/3/2018, | 2018 | 9 Property Damage only cras | 碞 0 | 2 The crash M | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.83 MNтH 36 W | west | Front onemotor veh on Roadw Daylight | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Rain |  | wet | 2 | Nот APPL |
| 1861712 | 3461665/2/2016, | 2016 | 12 Property Damage only Cras | 0 | 1 The crash M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 33000000 | 15.85 MNTH 36 |  | Front to Remotor veh On Roadw: Daylight | None | Intersectio Trafic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPL |
| 1861754 | 352757 5/18/2016 | 2016 | 16 Property Damage only Cras | 0 | 1 The crash $M$ | Washingto Iake Elmo |  | State Tunl 33000000 | 15.58 мптн 36 N | Not Applicable | le Ditch On Medianoylight | None | Not at Inte No Control Clear |  | Dry | 2 | NOT APPLI |
| 1862580 | 500777 9/11/2017 | 2017 | 16 Property Damage only Cras | cas | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake Emo |  | State Trunl 33000000 c | 15.64 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor Ven On Roadw: Baylight | None | Four-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | Dry |  | NOT APPLI |
| 1863075 | $5969265 / 13 / 2018$ | 2018 | ${ }_{11}^{11}$ Property Damage only Cras | cas 0 | 2 The crash $1 M$ | Washingto ake Emm |  | State Trunl 3 O300000c | 1.559 мNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw: Daylight | Congestion Backup Other | Not at Int No Control Clear |  |  | 2 | NоT APPL |
| 1868864 1881096 | $4141181 / 1 / 1 / 2017$ $3242011 / 282016$ | ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | ${ }^{15}$ Property Damage only cras ${ }^{16 \text { Proerty }}$ | cas |  | Washingto ake Etmo Washingoto ake Elmo |  |  | 15.65 MNTH 36 E 15.75 MNTH 36 em | $\underset{\substack{\text { East } \\ \text { east }}}{\text { cest }}$ |  |  | -Notat Inte Traftic Con Cloudy Four-Way ITrafic Con lear |  |  | 2 | Notet APL NOT APLu |
| ${ }_{1881478}$ | 375520 8/10/2016 | 2016 | 11 Property amaze only cras | cos | 2 The crash cm | Washingto ake EImo |  | State Trunlo 30000000 | 15.62 MNTH 36 E | Est | Front to Remotorv Veh On Roadw Payy light | None | Four-Way ITrafic Con liear |  | Ory | 2 | Not APPLII |
| 7 | 415607 1/1/5/2017 | 2017 | 12 Property Damage Only |  | 2 Eesstruinm | Wastingto ake Elmo |  | State Trun 0300000000 | 15.65 MNTH 36 E | Est |  | None | Notat tine No Co Control clear |  | , | 2 | Nota |
| 1953558 | 49924999/2017, | 2017 | 6 Property Damage Only Cras |  | 2 V 1 AND V2M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 33000000 | 15.85 MNHH 36 | west | Front o Re M Motor Veh On Roadw: Daviligh | None | Four-Way ITraficic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPL |
| 1966532 | 508795 10/14/201 | 2017 | 15 Property Damage only Cras | co | 2 WB36@ M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 33000000 | 15.01 WB 36 @ LW | LWest | Front to Re M Motor Veh On Roadwi Dark Stree | ef None | Not at Int Terafic Con Cloudy | Rain | wet |  | Not APPLI |
| 197364 | 606729 6/19/2018 | 2018 | 13 Property Damage Only Cras | 0 | 2 vehliles ${ }^{\text {M }}$ | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunlo3000000 | 15.88 мптн 36 | West | Front to Re Motor veh On Roadw: Davight | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  |  | 2 | Not APPL |
| 2023144 | $51223510 / 28 / 201$ | 2017 | 0 Property Damage only Cras | cos | 2 Respond M | WASHINGI Lake Elmo |  | State Tunl 3 3000000 | 15.83 MNTH 36 | West | Front to Re M Motor Veh On Roadwidark Stree | ef Road Surface Conditio None | Four-Way IStop Sign Sleet, | (freeing |  | 2 | NOT АРРU |
| 2025149 204617 | $52023011 / 18 / 201$ $5043459 / 2 / 2017$ | ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | ${ }^{12}$ Property Damage only cras | cas ${ }^{\text {cose }}$ |  | Washingto Iake Elimo WASHINGIIake Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 OOOOOOO State Trunl 3 300000 | 15.7 MNTH 36 15.73 MNTH 36 | East West | Front to $R \in$ Motor Veh On Roadw: Daylight Front to Rє Motor Veh On Roadwe Daylight | ${ }_{\text {None }}^{\text {Nongestiol }}$ | Four-Way ITratic C Con Clear Notat Int No Control Cear |  | Dry Ory | 2 | Not APPU Not APLII |
| 205029 | 397678 11/22/201 | 2016 | 23 Property Damage only cras |  | 1 VEHILIEWM | Wastingto ake EImo |  | State Trunl 30000000 | 15.67 MNTH 36 E | East |  |  |  |  | Snow | 2 | Not Appli |
| 207414 | $36817381 / 12016$, | 2016 | 16 Property Damage only cras | cos | 2 vehicles ${ }^{\text {m }}$ | Washingto ake Elmo |  |  | 15.57 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw: Daylight | None | Notat Inte No Control Coudy |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPLI |
| 209653 | 508001 10/11/201 | 2017 | 14 Property Damage only Cras | cas | 1 The crash M | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.51 млтн 36 E | East | Cable Med On Roadw Daylight | None | Not at int No Control Cloudy |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPLI |
| 209633 | 524074 12/10/201 | 2017 | 17 Property Damage only Cras | - 0 | 3 Unit 1 M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 3 3000000 | 15.69 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to ReM Motor Veh On Roadw Darkk (No S | $s$ None | Four-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | Dry |  | NOT APPL |
| 2097957 | 3723208/15/2016 | 2016 | ${ }_{11} 1$ Property Damage only Cras | - | 2 V Was M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunlozoooooc | 16 MNTH 36 | West | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadw: Daylight | None | Not at int No Controlclear |  | Dry | , | NOTAPPL |
| 2106817 | 423533 2/13/2017 | 2017 | 14 Property Damage only Cras | cas | ${ }^{3}$ The crash $M$ | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl 3 O300000 | 15.65 MNTH 36 E | East |  | None |  |  |  | 2 | NOT АРРU |
| 2110055 213459 | $524248121 / 12 / 201$ $358804 / 1 / 2016$ | 2017 2016 | 7 Property Damage only cras 16 Proeerty |  |  | Washingto are Emmo Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Truni 30000000 c State Tun 3 3000000 | 15.67 MNTH 36 15.73 MNTH 36 | East East E. | Front to $\mathrm{R} \in$ Motor Veh On Roadwe Daylight Front to R€ Motor Veh On Roadwi Daylight | None None | Four-Way ITraffic Con Clear Four-Way ITraffic Con Cloudy | Sn |  | 2 | Not APPL Not APLu |
| 2135707 | $508007101 / 6 / 2017$ | 2017 | 15 Property Damage only Cras | cas | 2 вотн UNIM | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 300000000 | 15.6 MNTH 36 E | ${ }_{\text {cost }}^{\text {cost }}$ |  | None | Notat the No Control Rain |  | wet | 2 | Not APPLII |
| 163359 | $384807107 / 1 / 2016$ | 2016 | 7 Property Damage only cras | cos | $2 \mathrm{VEHS} / \mathrm{/B}+\mathrm{M}$ | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 30000000 | 15.66 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadww Daylight | None | Intersectio Not Anpliciclear |  | Dry | 2 | Nот APPLI |
| 2165686 | 665545 12/7/2018 | 2018 | 17 Property Damage Only Cras | 兂 0 | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.53 MNHH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor veh On Roadw: Dark Stree | ef None | Not at int No Control Clear |  | Dry | 2 | NOTAPPL |
| 2189118 | 399302 11/1/2/201 | ${ }^{2016}$ | 20 Property Damage only Cras | cas 0 | 1 VEHCLCL WM | Washingto ake Emm |  | State Trun O3000000 | 15.63 MNTH 36 E | East | Deer On Roadw Dark Stre |  | Not at inte No Control Clear |  | Dry | 2 | NоT APPL |
| 2188857 | 598771 5/20/2018 | 2018 | 17 Property Damage only Cras | - 0 | 2 VEHCLLES IM | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 330000000 | 15.55 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor Veh On Roadw: Baylight | None | Not at Inte No Control Clear |  |  | 2 | NOT APPLI |
| 2261733 | 4288543/13/2017 | 2017 | ${ }^{6}$ Property Damage only Cras |  | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 O300000c | 15.75 MNTH 36 | West | Angle Motor veh On Roadws Sunise | Road Surface Con | Not at Inte No Control Clear |  | Ise/frost | 2 | Not APPLI |
| 2222760 2290101 | $5014309 / 15 / 2017$ $363597 / 9 / 2016$, | 2017 2016 | 10 Property Damage only Cras 16 Proerty damage only Cras | cas |  | Washingto Lake Elmo Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trun O3000000 State Trunlo300000c | 15.52 MNTH 36 | East East |  | None None | Not at Inte No Control Cloudy Not at Inte Traffic Con Cloud |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dr } \\ & \text { Dr } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | NOT APPLI NOT APPLI |
| 2336121 | 427127 3/5/2017, | 2017 | 20 Property Damage only Cras | cos | 2 VEHILLES im | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 330000000 | 15.84 MNTH 36 W | west | Front to R EM Motor veh On Roadw Dark ( Stree | efone | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPL |
| 2337256 | 3192971/1/1/2016 | 2016 | 11 Property Damage only Cras | cas | 2 The crash M $M$ | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 330000000 | 15.82 MNTH 36 | west | Angle Motor veh on Roadw: Baylight | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | , | 2 | Not APPLI |
| 2338328 | 353554 5/27/2016 | 2016 | 16 Property Damage Only Cras | s | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000 | 15.55 MNHH 36 E | Esast | Front ofe R Motor Veh On Roadw: Daviligh | Congestion Backup Due to Non-recurring In | Not at int No Control Cloudy | Rain | Wet | 2 | мот АРР |
| 2330421 <br> 234184 | $37518888 / 21 / 2016$ $50079911 / 2017$ | ${ }_{2016}^{2017}$ | ${ }^{17}$ Property Damage only Cras | cas |  | Washingto Iake Elmo |  | State Trun $\mathbf{0}$ O3000000 State Trun 3 3000000 | 15.79 MNTH 36 E 15.8 MNTH 36 som |  |  | None None | Notat Mnte No Control Clear four-Way ITrafic Conclear |  | Ory Dry | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ |  |
| 2365773 | 582651 3/10/2018 | 2018 | 12 Property Damage only cras | cos | 2 VEHSW W/B M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000 | 15.89 MNTH 36 W | west | Front on Remotor Veh On Roadwi Daylight | None | Intersectio Not Applicic loudy |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPLI |
| 2366194 | 3765489/3/2016, | 2016 | ${ }_{13} 3$ Property Damage Only Cras | cas | 4 The crash $M$ | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trun 3 3000000 | 15.69 мntH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor Veh On Roadw: arlight | None | Notat the Teafic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | мот АРРU |
| 2368156 | 6215447/10/2018 | 2018 | 13 Property Damage Only Cras | cos | 2 The crash M | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Tunlo3000000 | 15.73 мNтH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor veh On Roadw: Daylight | None | Not at the Teaffic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Nот АРРU |
| 2387466 | 424876 2/23/2017 | 2017 | ${ }_{17} 7$ Property Damage only Cras | Cos | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trun 3 3000000 | 15.63 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor veh On Roadw Sunset | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | Dry | 2 | мот АРРи |
| 234479 241019 | ${ }^{6362039 / 19 / 29018}$ | 2018 | 14 Proentry Damage only Cras | cas | 2 MNHT 36 M | Washingto ate Elmo |  | State TTunl 3000000 C State Trun 3 300000 |  | $\xrightarrow[\substack{\text { east } \\ \text { east }}]{\text { cest }}$ |  | None None | Four-Way ITrafit Con loudy |  | ory | 2 | Note APL |
| ${ }_{2482502}^{24}$ | $51827711 / 18 / 201$ | 2017 | 13 Property amage o only cras | cas | $2 V_{1}$ ANO V2M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State ${ }^{\text {State }}$ Trunl 3 30000000 | 15. | Est |  | None None | litersectio Tratit con clear |  | Ory | 2 | Notapplu |
| 242929 | $6254458 / 3 / 2018$, | 2018 | 10 Property Damage Only Cras | - | 2 The crash M | Washingto take Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.84 млнН 36 | west | Front to Re Motor veh On Roadw Davyight | None | Fou-Way ITrafic Con Cloudy |  | wet | 2 | Not APPL |
| 2435358 <br> 202854 |  | ${ }_{2018} 2017$ | 11 Property Damage only Cras | cras ${ }^{0}$ | ${ }^{2}$ 2 enicle 10 M | Washingto ake Emmo |  |  | 15.73 MNTH 36 E 1569 MNTH 36 E | ${ }_{\substack{\text { East } \\ \text { East }}}^{\text {cester }}$ | Front to Remotor Ven On Roadww Doplifht | None None | Four-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  |  | 2 | Nот АРРU |
| 2488854 258136 | ${ }^{530839} \mathbf{3 5 1 6 5 5 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 0 1 6}$ | 2016 |  |  | 1 1 Westrou m | Washingto ake Emo |  | State Trun 3 3000000 |  | East |  | Sone |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Or }}^{\text {Ireffrost }}$ | 2 | Noteral Not APLII |
| 2557930 | 61995177/2018, | 2018 | 17 Property Damage Only Cras | cos | 2 The crash M | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Tunl $33000000{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 15.68 MNHH 36 E | East | Front to Remotor ve On Roodw: Daylight | None | Four-Way ITrafic Con Clear |  | Dry | 2 | NOTAPPL |
| 8595 | 656234 11/1/2018 | 2018 | 15 Property Damage only cras | cos | 2 Veh 1 M | Washingto lake Elmo |  | State Trunl 30000000 | 15.6 MNTH 36 E | East | Front o Re M Motor Veh On Roadw: Daylight | None | Notat inte No Control Clear |  | Dry | 2 | Not APPL |
| 2604345 | 321942 1/18/2016 | 2016 | Property Damage only Cras | s | 2 VEHILIES 7 | Washingto ake Elmo |  | State Trunl 3 3000000c | 15.7 MNTH 36 E | East | Front to Re Motor Veh On Roadwis Sunset | None | Not at Int No Control Clear |  | Dry | , | Not APPL |
| 96233 | $525652121 / 15 / 201$ $4031151212 / 201$ | 217 | 15 Property Damage only cras 10 Proeerty Damage o only Cras | cos | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ 2The crash $M$ | Sshingto lake Emmo |  | State Trun 130000000 Stat Trun Sosooooc | 15.61 MNTH 36 E 15.66 MNTH 36 ex |  | Front to ReMotor Veh On Roadwi |  | Not at Inte Traftic Con Cloudy |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ | Notappul NOT APPLI |
| 56 | 625446883/2018, | 2018 |  | Stes |  | Washingto lake Ilmo |  | cooc | 15.6 MNHH6 |  | Front to ReMotor Veh On Roadww Daylight |  | Intersectio No Control Clear |  | Dr | ${ }_{2}$ | ¢ |



| Unit3 Injur Units Phy | 3 Sex | vehiunit | maminuma |  | tinters city_sectio |  | ttmy | interchang | intersectio citysectio ala |  | longitude shape | roadway t $^{\text {x }}$ |  |  | kid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | MNTH 36 IMN36 fror | ${ }_{\text {5 }}^{509177.9}$ | ${ }^{4986907}$ |  | \{1980980, | 45.04 | ${ }^{-92.88}$ | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5627122}$ |  |
| Suspected Apparently | 19 Female |  |  |  | MN36 fror | 509997.5 | 4986997 |  | ${ }_{\text {H0005499 }}$ | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5}^{5627123}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | TH 36 AND LakE E | 509190.6 | 4986941 |  | [19809800-7496-45F\% | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5}^{5627717}$ | 102100 |
| Suspected Apparenty | 74 Male | Motor Veh Sport Utilit Eastbound Operated I Driver Dist Motor Veh Moving Forward | Possible In. Apparenty | 27 female | M ${ }_{\text {M } 36 \text { fror }}^{\text {M } 36 \text { fror }}$ | 50915.5 509118.6 | 4988909 498907 |  | ${ }_{\text {fodesant }}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92.88 <br> -9288 <br> -88 | 3 | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 18220 | 5627125 5627122 | 10210 10210 |
|  |  |  |  |  | M M 36 Fror | ${ }_{509207.5}^{5095}$ | 498694 |  | ${ }^{100055499}$ | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5627182}^{5021}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { MN3 } 6 \text { fror }}$ | (50914.3.3 | ${ }_{4}^{4988969}$ |  |  | 45.04 4504 | -92.88 <br> .9288 <br> 98 | 3 | -11+07 | 5627122 <br> 5627125 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MNTH $36 /$ MN36 Fror MN36 Fror | 50988.2 50926.8 | 4986999 498932 |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | $\begin{array}{r}-92.88 \\ .92 .88 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 12220 | 5627715 | 102100 102100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5092588.3}^{50}$ | 4986949 |  |  | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5627182}^{502188}$ |  |
| No Appare Apparently | 40 Male | Motor veh Sport Utilit Eastbund Noc Clear Contributing Motor veh Slowing | Possible In Apparenty | 53 Male | M ${ }^{\text {36 Fror }}$ | 508928.1 | 4988890 |  | ¢00D54a9 | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627099 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{509199.1}$ | ${ }^{4986954}$ |  |  | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627188 | 102 |
| Possible In Apparenty | 27 female | Motor Ven Pickup Eastbound Following Too Closely Motor Veh Moving Forward | No Appare Apparently | 19 Male | MN36 Fror | - 509055.1 | 4988920 49690 |  | ${ }^{100054491}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92889 <br> .9288 | 3 3 | ${ }_{\text {- }}^{\text {-1E+07 }}$ | ${ }_{5627122}^{562141}$ | 102 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 50915.7 | 498699 |  | 100054999 | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627116 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509017 509297 | 4989941 4986924 |  | ${ }^{\text {¢ODO54A99 }}$ | 45.04 4504 | -92889 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627111 5627147 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 5092929.7 <br> 5023 | ${ }^{4986924}$ |  | ${ }^{100055499}$ | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5}^{5627147}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509203.3 50963.6 | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{49869924}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {¢00054A9 }}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92.88 -92.88 | $3_{3}^{3}$ | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 1 <br> 220 | 5627170 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | M M 36 Fror | 509122.9 | 4986899 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 45.04 | ${ }_{\text {-92.88 }}$ | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627110 | 10210 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509046.7 | 4988890 |  | [00054991 | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627099 | 102100 |
|  |  |  |  |  | M 36 Fror | 509021.3 | 4986907 |  | 100054A99 | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627123 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509336.1 <br> 508978.9 | ${ }_{4}^{4988997}$ |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | -92.88 .9289 | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 1220 | 5627114 5627135 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | M 336 fror | 509317.6 | 498694 |  | 100054991 | 45.04 | ${ }^{-92.88}$ | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627182 |  |
| No Appare Apparently | 25 Male |  |  |  | M 366 fror | 509275.3 | 4986941 |  | [00054A9 | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627710 |  |
|  | 60 Male | Veh Sort Utilit eastbund No Clear Contributing Motor veh Vehicle Stopped or | StiNo Appare Apparently | 44 Female | MN36 Fror | 50984.8 509122.9 | ${ }_{49889916}^{4989}$ |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | -92.88 <br> .92 .88 <br> . | 3 | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 1822 | 5627135 5627134 |  |
| No Appare apparenty |  | Sport Unilitastbund No Clear Contributing Moorven venicle Stopped or | Steno Appare Apparenty |  | MN36 Fror | ${ }_{\text {509093, }}^{5093}$ | ${ }_{4986924}^{49896}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {lozascast }}$ | 45.04 | ${ }_{\text {-92.88 }}$ | 3 | ${ }_{-1 \text { E+07 }}$ | ${ }_{5627147}^{562174}$ | 1020100 |
|  |  |  |  |  | M ${ }^{\text {S36 Fror }}$ | 509072.1 | 4986916 |  | [00054991 | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627135 | 102100 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 50930.7 <br> 502012 | ${ }^{4989913}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {loObSa49 }}$ | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5}^{5627131}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509201.2 <br> 509152.5 | ${ }_{49889907}^{49891}$ |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | $\begin{array}{r}-92888 \\ .9288 \\ \hline-88\end{array}$ | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ |  | 56271188 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 509221.4 | 4986945 |  |  | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627176 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 fror | 509997.5 | 4986903 |  | 100054a9 | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627117 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MNTH $36 /$ MN36 Fror MN36 Fror | 509166.9 <br> 509063.6 | ${ }_{4986916}^{498916}$ |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | $\begin{array}{r}-92.88 \\ -9288 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $3_{3}^{3}$ |  | 5627135 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 509207.5 | ${ }_{4986941}$ |  |  | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627170 | 102100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 509332.9 | 4986949 |  |  | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627182 | 102100 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | ${ }_{\text {509055.1 }}^{50862}$ | ${ }_{4988899}^{49896}$ |  | ¢00054a96 100054A9 | 45.04 45.04 | -92889 .9289 | $3_{3}^{3}$ | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ | 5627135 | 1021 1021 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 fror | 508978.9 | 498692 |  | 100054991 | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627147 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509080.5 <br> 509063.6 | 4988899 498632 |  | (000544991 | 45.04 45.04 | $\begin{array}{r}-92.88 \\ -92.88 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 1 | ${ }_{5}^{56277111}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | M 336 fror | 509025.5 | 4986911 |  | (00054a9 | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5627129}^{52719}$ | 102100 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509080.5 5973.2 | 4986920 |  | (00054A991 | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5}^{5627141}$ | 102100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4986999 <br> 98694 |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | ${ }_{-92.88}^{-9288}$ | 3 3 | -1E+07 <br> $-1 E+0$ | 5627182 | ${ }^{1022100}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 509288 | 4986932 |  |  | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5}^{5627158}$ | 102 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 50198.5 509156.7 | 498939 498907 |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | .92 .88 <br> .92 .88 <br> . | 3 | ${ }_{-1 \mathrm{l}}^{-1 \mathrm{E}+07}$ | 5627117 5627122 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | ${ }_{\text {S09000,4 }}$ | ${ }_{4986947}^{49897}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {P0, }}$ | ${ }_{45.04}^{45}$ | -92.88 -9289 | 3 | -1E+07 <br> $-1 E+0$ | ${ }_{56271180}^{5621}$ | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 5099923.3 | ${ }_{4}^{4988993}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {loob5ase }}$ | 45.04 4504 | $\begin{array}{r}-92888 \\ -928 \\ \hline 189\end{array}$ | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627116 567132 | 102 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 508942.9 508556.2 | ${ }_{4986916}^{49893}$ |  | ${ }^{1000554491}$ | ${ }_{45.04}^{4504}$ | -92.89 -929 | 3 | ${ }_{-1 E+07}^{\text {-1E+07 }}$ | ${ }_{5627135}^{562132}$ |  |
| No Appare Apparently | 43 Female |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | ${ }^{509131.3}$ | 4986999 |  | ${ }^{100054499}$ | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627125 | 102100 |
| No Appare Apparenty | 77 female |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509465.8 50972.1 | ${ }_{4986924}^{49893}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{\text {l0005499 }}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92.88 <br> .9288 | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ | ${ }_{\text {- }}^{\text {-1E+07 }}$-1E07 | 5627164 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mn36 Fror | 509108 | 4986905 |  | [00054999 | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627119 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 50938.2 508991.6 | ${ }_{49886907}^{4983}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {lo }}^{\text {¢00054A9 }}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 1 | 5627159 5627123 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | M N 36 Fror | ${ }_{509093.2}^{50}$ | 4986920 |  | ${ }_{\text {100054A9! }}$ | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | ${ }_{5627141}^{5221}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 508877.3 <br> 509767 | ${ }^{4989916}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {P00054a9 }}$ | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -11+07 | 5627135 562799 | 102100 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509046.7 508907 | ${ }_{\text {4986990 }}^{49880}$ |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | -92.89 -9289 | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ | -1E+07 <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 1220 | 5627099 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | M M 36 fror | ${ }_{\text {509063. }}^{50.6}$ | 4986949 |  | ${ }^{\text {loOP54a9\% }}$ | ${ }_{4}^{45.04}$ | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627183 5627123 | 1021 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror ${ }_{\text {M }}$ F Fror | 508888.9 509114.4 | ${ }_{4}^{4988997}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {loODSAA9\% }}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92889 <br> .9288 | 3 |  | 5627173 5627146 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | мм36 Fror | 509209.6 | 498694 |  | 100054991 | 45.04 | ${ }^{-92.88}$ | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627179 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 50977.9 | ${ }_{4}^{4988995}$ |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | .92 .88 .92 .89 | 3 | $-1 E+07$ <br> $-1 E+07$ <br> 18220 | 5627176 5627159 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 509911.1.2 | ${ }_{4}^{49889939}$ |  | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{\text { ¢0055499 } \\ \text { [00054ast }}}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92.89 -9288 | $3_{3}^{3}$ |  | 56271199 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509152.5 <br> 5026.4 | ${ }^{4988954}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {loOOSAA9 }}$ | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627188 |  |
| No Appare Apparenty | 61 Male | Motor Veh Passenger Eastbund Operated I Driver Dist Motor Veh Moving Forward | No Appare Asleep orf | 82 Male | MN36 Fror | 509295.4 <br> 50939.8 | ${ }_{4986997}^{49893}$ |  |  | ${ }_{45.04}^{4504}$ | $\begin{array}{r}-92.88 \\ -928 \\ \hline \text {-2888 }\end{array}$ | 3 | ${ }_{-1 E+07}^{\text {-1E+07 }}$ | ${ }_{56271122}^{56218}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509046.7 | 4986932 |  | [00054991 | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627159 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509046.7 50955.1 | ${ }_{49886932}^{4981}$ |  | ¢ODO54A9 COOS5AA9 | 45.04 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627129 5672159 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509156.6 | 4986912 |  | [00054999 | 45.04 | ${ }_{-92.88}$ | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627129 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | ${ }^{509133.4}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4986999}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {POOD54a9 }}$ | 4504 4504 | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627125 5627170 | 1021 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509216. | ${ }_{4986916}^{498941}$ |  |  | 45.04 45.04 | $\begin{array}{r}-92888 \\ -9288 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 3 3 | -1E+07 $-1 E+07$ | 5627170 5627134 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | 509139.8 <br> 50972.8 | ${ }^{4988996}$ |  | l00054a99 | ${ }_{4}^{45.04}$ | -92.88 | 3 | -1E+07 | 5627134 56717 | 10210 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror | ( $\begin{aligned} & 509012.8 \\ & 50912.9\end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{49886990}^{4989}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {lobosadel }}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92.89 -928 | 3 | -1E+07 <br> $-1 E+0$ | ${ }_{562717988}^{5627}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | M ${ }^{36}$ fror | 508988.4 509874 | 4988899 |  | l00054A9 | 45.04 | -92.89 | 3 | -16+07 | ${ }_{5}^{5627111}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | MN36 Fror ${ }_{\text {M 3 F Fror }}$ | 508987.4 50904.3 | 4988999 498899 |  | ${ }_{\text {¢00054a9 }}$ | 45.04 45.04 | -92889 -9289 | 3 | ${ }_{-1 E+07}^{1 E+07}$ | 5627183 <br> 562711 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | M 336 fror | 509089 | 498692 |  | (00054999 | 45.04 | -92.88 | 3 | 1 1F07 | 5627147 |  |
| No Appare Apparenty | 30 Female |  |  |  | M 336 Fror | 50933 |  |  | [00554991 | 45.04 | 92.88 | 3 | $-1 E+07$ | 5627170 | 102100 |
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