Application

17071-2022 Roadway Spot Mobility
17636 - Highway 5/Highway 11 Intersection Safety and Access Improvement
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements
Status: Submitted
Submitted Date:
04/14/2022 2:07 PM

## Primary Contact



## Organization Information

Name:

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

Address: | PUBLIC WORKS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $11360 \mathrm{HWY} 212 \mathrm{~W} \# 1$ |

| $*$ | COLOGNE | Minnesota | State/Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Phone:*

Fax:

PeopleSoft Vendor Number
0000026790A12

## Project Information

| Project Name | Highway 5/Highway 11 Intersection Safety and Access <br> Improvement |
| :--- | :--- |
| Primary County where the Project is Located | Carver |
| Cities or Townships where the Project is Located: | Victoria |
| Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant): | MnDOT |

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

The Highway 5 and Highway 11 Intersection Safety and Access Improvement project proposes to construct a single-lane roundabout at the key junction of Trunk Highway 5 and CSAH 11 in the City of Victoria. The existing intersection with the Highway 5 A-Minor Expander roadway is a highspeed three-leg intersection. The Highway 11 approach operates as stop-controlled and is causing failing peak hour operations for high volumes of commuter traffic that will only continue to increase with vast growth in the Cities of Waconia and Victoria. The project intersection also provides regional access to Carver Park Reserve and Downtown Victoria which has boomed with restaurants, bike paths, green spaces, and condos and other higher density housing options along Stieger Lake.

The city has much more growth planned for the Downtown West parcel (northeast quadrant) of the Highway 5 and Highway 11 Intersection that will significantly increase traffic mobility and safety pressures. The master plan for the Downtown West parcel calls for three phases with a total of 20,000 square feet of retail space, 300-plus units of residences in multifamily rental buildings and several owner-occupied townhomes, and public gathering space. The first phase will include a 149unit market rate apartment building.

Highway 11 is a key connection between Trunk Highways 5 and 7, two major east-west corridors providing access from the surrounding bedroom communities into the regional job centers in Chaska, Eden Prairie, and into the Twin Cities urban core areas. Along with operations issues, safety has been a historical issue at this location with a serious injury crash and several reported near misses in the last three years. The proposed roundabout will alleviate operational issues and eliminate serious injury or fatal crashes.

Include both the CSAH/MSAS/TH references and their corresponding street names in the TIP Description (see Resources link on Regional Solicitation webpage for examples).
Project Length (Miles) 0.7
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) | HSIP |
| :--- | :--- |
| Federal Amount | $\$ 2,400,000.00$ |
| Match Amount | $\$ 600,000.00$ |
| Minimum of $20 \%$ of project total |  |
| Project Total | $\$ 3,000,000.00$ |

For transit projects, the total cost for the application is total cost minus fare revenues.
Match Percentage 20.0\%
Minimum of 20\%
Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total
Source of Match Funds
Carver County, City of Victoria
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:
2026, 2027
Select 2024 or 2025 for TDM and Unique projects only. For all other applications, select 2026 or 2027.
Additional Program Years: 2025
Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available.

## Project Information: Roadway Projects

County, City, or Lead Agency
Functional Class of Road

Road System
TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET
Road/Route No.
i.e., 53 for CSAH 53

Name of Road

## Carver County

A-Minor Arterial Expander
TH, CSAH

5

Arboretum Boulevard

Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE

| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | 55386 |
| :---: | :---: |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date | 05/01/2026 |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date | 10/31/2026 |
| TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work) |  |
| From: <br> (Intersection or Address) |  |
| To: <br> (Intersection or Address) |  |
| DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION |  |
| Or At | CSAH 11 (Victoria Drive) |
| Miles of Sidewalk (nearest 0.1 miles) | 0.1 |
| Miles of Trail (nearest 0.1 miles) | 0 |
| Miles of Trail on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles) | 0 |
| Primary Types of Work | GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER, MEDIAN, LIGHTING, PED RAMPS |
| 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 <br> (Bridge or culvert name): |  |

## Requirements - All Projects

## All Projects

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

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

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

The overall goal of this project is to provide a safer intersection at a critical point along the important Highway 5 corridor, not just for drivers but for pedestrians as well. In this sense this project can relate to most major goals and objectives described in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. However, this project will specifically contribute to the following goals:

> GOAL: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM STEWARDSHIP (p. 42-43): This project involves making major improvements to an existing intersection, so directly addresses this goal to take care of what we already have.

> GOAL: SAFETY AND SECURITY (p. 44-45): This proposed project will improve the safety of commuters traveling along both Highway 5 as well as Highway 11. In addition will improved pedestrian facilities and lighting this will help multi-modal commuting traffic as well.

GOAL: ACCESS TO DESTINATIONS (p. 46-47): The Highway $5 / 11$ intersection is essentially the western gateway into downtown Victoria, and it is essential that traffic moves through that intersection safety and without delay.

List the applicable documents and pages: Unique projects are exempt from this qualifying requirement because of their innovative nature.

This project is referenced directly in the Carver County Arboretum Area Transportation Plan and meets local city, regional, and even state-wide goals as described in the City of Victoria's Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan for the City of Victoria lays out extensive plans for the future of their community.
(https://www.ci.victoria.mn.us/DocumentCenter/Vie w/4398/Our-Victoria-Tomorrow-2040-
Comprehensive-Plan--PDF)

The Highway 5/11 Intersection Improvements proposed in this project, which will not only install a single-leg roundabout (including private access closures and relocations) but will also improve intersection pedestrian facilities and lighting, will address almost all major goals and objectives listed in the Transportation \& Mobility section of Victoria's Comprehensive Plan (see p. 99-100 for a summary). However, most specifically this project directly addresses the county's transportation Goal T-2 to provide an efficient roadway system, and is specifically included under Policy T-2.1 to facilitate improvements to Highway 5 (p. 101).

However, this specific project is more directly referenced in the Carver County Arboretum Area Transportation Plan. The Full Implementation Plan for the project references the plan for the Hwy5/11 intersection improvement directly in a number of locations (e.g., p. 2, 4, 6) and lists it as one of the short-term improvement goals to be completed before 2026 (p.4).
https://www.co.carver.mn.us/departments/public-works/projects-studies/arboretum-area-

# The project is also described in some detail in the Interactive Story Map of the Arboretum Area Plan as part of the broader Highway 5 Vision. https://bmi.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index. html?appid=179cfee78337400aaa37f8f8b31d208b 

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. Unique project costs are limited to those that are federally eligible.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5.Applicant is a public agency (e.g., county, city, tribal government, transit provider, etc.) or non-profit organization (TDM and Unique Projects applicants only). 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 in Table 1. For unique projects, the minimum award is $\$ 500,000$ and the maximum award is the total amount available each funding cycle (approximately $\$ 4,000,000$ for the 2022 funding cycle).
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): $\$ 500,000$ 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.
(TDM and Unique Project Applicants Only) The applicant is not a public agency subject to the self-evaluation requirements in Title II of the ADA.

Date plan completed:
02/18/2014
https://www.co.carver.mn.us/home/showdocument?
id=1164

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
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. Unique projects are exempt from this qualifying requirement.

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 Strategic Capacity and Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility projects only:
2.The project must be designed to meet 10 -ton load limit standards.

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

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:
5.The length of the bridge clear span must 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.

Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

## Specific Roadway Elements

CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST

ESTIMATES

Cost

Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost)
Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost)
$\$ 70,000.00$
Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.)
\$135,000.00
Roadway (aggregates and paving)
\$1,225,000.00
Subgrade Correction (muck) \$0.00
Storm Sewer \$350,000.00
Ponds \$0.00
Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) \$380,000.00
Traffic Control \$90,000.00

Striping
\$25,000.00
Signing
\$25,000.00
Lighting
\$100,000.00
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping
\$130,000.00
Bridge
Retaining Walls
Noise Wall (not calculated in cost effectiveness measure) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Traffic Signals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wetland Mitigation ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection ..... $\$ 0.00$
RR Crossing ..... $\$ 0.00$
Roadway Contingencies ..... \$360,000.00
Other Roadway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$2,980,000.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST
ESTIMATES ..... Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Sidewalk Construction ..... \$15,000.00
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... \$5,000.00
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 ..... \$20,000.00
Specific Transit and TDM Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES ..... Cost
Fixed Guideway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Stations, Stops, and Terminals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Support Facilities ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, ..... $\$ 0.00$ fare collection, etc.)
Vehicles ..... $\$ 0.00$
Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Transit and TDM Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Operating Costs
Number of Platform hours 0
Cost Per Platform hour (full loaded Cost) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Subtotal ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Costs - Administration, Overhead,etc. ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals

| Total Cost | $\$ 3,000,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 3,000,000.00$ |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Congestion within Project Area:

Free-Flow Travel Speed: 52
The free-flow travel speed is the black number
Peak Hour Travel Speed:47
The peak hour travel speed is the red number
Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to Free-Flow (calculation):
Upload the "Level of Congestion" map:

## Congestion on adjacent Parallel Routes:

Adjacent Parallel Corridor TH 7
Adjacent Parallel Corridor Start and End Points:

Start Point:
End Point:
Free-Flow Travel Speed:
CR 44
Merrywood Lane
57
The Free-Flow Travel Speed is black number.
Peak Hour Travel Speed:
48
The Peak-Hour Travel Speed is red number.
Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to Free-Flow (calculation):

1649872108365_TH5 CSAH11N_LvIOfCongest.pdf

## Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study:

Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a High Priority Intersection:
(70 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection:
(65 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection:
(60 Points)
Not listed as a priority in the study: Yes
(0 Points)

## Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV:

Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a CMSP
opportunity area:
(70 Points)
Not listed as a CMSP priority location:
Yes
(0 Points)

## Measure C: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

RESPONSE: Select one for your project, based on the updated 2021 Regional Truck Corridor Study:
Along Tier 1:

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

Miles:
0
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
Along Tier 3:
Yes
Miles:
0.2
(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: Engagement

i.Describe any Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, disabled populations, youth, or older adults within a $1 / 2$ mile of the proposed project. Describe how these populations relate to regional context. Location of affordable housing will be addressed in Measure C.
ii.Describe how Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing were engaged, whether through community planning efforts, project needs identification, or during the project development process.
iii.Describe the progression of engagement activities in this project. A full response should answer these questions:

Response:
The Arboretum Area Transportation Plan identified the vision for Highway 5 improvements through the cities of Victoria and Chanhassen. This project was identified as a high priority spot mobility improvement to address existing regional commuter traffic operations and safety concerns while supporting the City of Victoria's aggressive development plans for the project area. The city has much growth planned for the Downtown West parcel (northeast quadrant) of the Highway 5 and Highway 11 Intersection. The master plan calls for three phases with a total of 20,000 square feet of retail space, 300-plus units of residences in multifamily rental buildings and several owneroccupied townhomes, and public gathering space. The first phase will include a 149-unit apartment building. Victoria is historically a dominantly white and higher income population. The proposed highdensity development will allow more affordable housing options for varying income populations to enjoy the high quality of life the community has to offer.

As part of the planning process, the project was informed with a thorough engagement plan guided by NEPA or Title VI regulations. Over 500 people attended in-person public/neighborhood meetings from June 2019-December 2020. Public meeting dates were strategic to engage at every decisionmaking milestone of the process. A community pop-up event was also held at the Victoria Classic Car Night that engaged seniors to children. Victoria Downtown Business meetings were also held. Online tools enabled providing feedback at personal convenience made the process accessible to families with children, seniors, and shift workers. Over 800 online surveys and comments were submitted using virtual engagement tools. Each public meeting was followed with a study team response summary that documented the feedback. Concept development was influenced by this
feedback, particularly for accessible and safe improvement in Downtown Victoria including this project.

To engage communities impacted by the project and reach populations historically underrepresented, participants at meetings received free U of M Landscape Arboretum access to attend (\$15 value per adult). This incentive generated wide public participation and provided access to an international tourism attraction to which all Highway 5 improvements will improve multi-modal access. The Arboretum provides benefits for equity populations which includes extensive youth education to a diverse body of over 36,000 students and free membership for over 2,500 social assistance eligible households in Carver, Scott, Dakota, Ramsey, and Hennepin Counties.

## Measure B: Equity Population Benefits and Impacts

Describe the projects benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Benefits could relate to:
This is not an exhaustive list. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to Equity populations residing or engaged in activities near the project area, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting Equity populations specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.
Acknowledge and describe any negative project impacts to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Describe measures to mitigate these impacts. Unidentified or unmitigated negative impacts may result in a reduction in points.
Below is a list of potential negative impacts. This is not an exhaustive list.

Response:
This project will address mobility and safety issues at this regional junction of Trunk Highway 5 and County Highway 11. Highway 5 is an arterial corridor connecting rapidly growing neighborhoods to regional job centers and destinations. Its primary purpose is to move people and goods safely and efficiently - today none of this is realized. Within the project area, there have been 5 crashes, including a serious injury crash in the past three years.

This not only impedes regional commuter traffic but also near future plans for high density residential and commercial development in the northeast quadrant (Downtown West parcel) of the project intersection. The city has much growth planned for the Downtown West parcel. The master plan calls for three phases with a total of 20,000 square feet of retail space, 300-plus units of residences in multifamily rental buildings and several owneroccupied townhomes, and public gathering space. The first phase will include a 149-unit apartment building. Victoria is historically a dominantly white and higher income population. The proposed highdensity development will allow more affordable housing options for varying income populations to enjoy the high quality of life the community has to offer.

No pedestrian facilities are present at the intersection today. As part of the planning process, the study team prioritized active transportation options, access to outdoor recreation, and environmental benefits. As such, the project will include new pedestrian facilities across the north leg of the roundabout to provide safe crossing of Highway 11, connecting existing and future residential areas to the existing Dairy Queen and childcare facility and future commercial amenities. Stieger Lake Lane just east of the project intersection provides access to the Lake Minnetonka LRT Trail, Carver Park Reserve, and
downtown Victoria jobs and amenities.

With increased safety and access for pedestrians and vehicles, no negative impacts are anticipated. This project also leverages many millions in Highway 5 investments identified in the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan. This project, as proposed, is identified in the Highway 5 vision and competitive funds will continue to help fill that gap so full growth and accessibility of the region can be realized.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

## Measure C: Affordable Housing Access

Describe any affordable housing developmentsexisting, under construction, or plannedwithin $1 / 2$ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the number of existing subsidized units, which will be provided on the Socio-Economic Conditions map. Applicants can also describe other types of affordable housing (e.g., naturally-occurring affordable housing, manufactured housing) and under construction or planned affordable housing that is within a half mile of the project. If applicable, the applicant can provide self-generated PDF maps to support these additions. Applicants are encouraged to provide a self-generated PDF map describing how a project connects affordable housing residents to destinations (e.g., childcare, grocery stores, schools, places of worship).
Describe the projects benefits to current and future affordable housing residents within $1 / 2$ mile of the project. Benefits must relate to affordable housing residents. Examples may include:
This is not an exhaustive list. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to residents of affordable housing, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting residents of affordable housing specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

There is existing affordable housing options withing and near the half-mile threshold surrounding the project area (see attached). In total, the City of Victoria has 457 naturally occurring affordable housing units. A new senior housing development was recently constructed one mile east of the project; 11 of 52 units are affordable at or below $50 \%$ of AMI. This site provides independent living for adults with developmental disabilities. The Carver County CDA has been purchasing the single housing properties on Arboretum Blvd east of the project and west of CSAH 13, to acquire right-of-way necessary for the Highway 5 expansion in that area, and plan to rent the units at $60 \%$ of AMI. There are three scattered site public housing units where residents pay $30 \%$ of their income-one each on Marigold Cir, Fieldcreek Cir, and Victoria Dr. There are also Housing Choice Vouchers accepted by private landlords throughout the city.

In addition, the adjacent Downtown West master plan calls for three phases with a total of 20,000 square feet of retail space, 300-plus units of residences in multifamily rental buildings and several owner-occupied townhomes, and public gathering space. The first phase will include a 149unit apartment building. The proposed high-density development will allow more affordable housing options for varying income populations to enjoy the high quality of life the community has to offer.

The proposed project will provide increased safety and access for pedestrians and vehicles. Specifically new pedestrian facilities will be provided where none exist today connecting existing and future residential areas to the existing Dairy Queen and childcare facility and future commercial amenities. Stieger Lake Lane just east of the project intersection provides access to the Lake Minnetonka LRT Trail, Carver Park Reserve,

## Measure D: BONUS POINTS

Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty:
Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color (Regional Environmental Justice Area):

Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color Yes (Regional Environmental Justice Area):

Upload the Socio-Economic Conditions map used for this measure.

1649872559680_TH5 CSAH11N_SocioEcon_packaged.pdf

## Measure A: Congestion Reduction/Air Quality

| Total Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour | Total Peak | Total Peak |
| Delay Per | Hour | Hour |
| Vehicle | Delay Per | Delay Per |
| Without | Vehicle | Vehicle |
| The | With The | Reduced |
| troject | Project | by Project |
| (Seconds/ | Seconds/ | (Seconds/ |
| Vehicle) |  | Vehicle) |

EXPLANA
TION of


164987295
9382_TH
5_CSAH
11N_OpsE
missions_p
ackaged.pd
f

40052

## Vehicle Delay Reduced

Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced
Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced
40052.0
40052.0

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

| Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions <br> without the Project <br> (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions with <br> the Project (Kilograms): | Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) <br> Peak Hour Emissions <br> Reduced by the Project <br> (Kilograms): |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.11 | 2.5 |  |
| 2 | $\mathbf{3}$ | 0.39 |

## Total

Total Emissions Reduced:

Upload Synchro Report
$-0.39$
1649873009377_TH 5_CSAH
11N_OpsEmissions_packaged.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 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):

## Total Parallel Roadway

Emissions Reduced on Parallel Roadways
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
Produced on New Roadway (Kilograms):
EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

## 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:
Crash modification factors used includes CMF ID 229 - Convert intersection with minor-road stop control to modern roundabout.
(Limit 700 Characters; approximately 100 words)

Rationale for Crash Modification Selected:
The existing intersection is side-street stop controlled against a rural high-speed trunk highway. Converting a roundabout at this location not only adds the required capacity to better serve side street traffic but prevents high-speed right angle and left turn collisions which have been a historical issue at this location. The project restricts and relocates private accesses that are currently in close proximity to the intersection which further complicates operations, increases conflict points, and causes frequent near misses.

```
Project Benefit ($) from B/C Ratio $4,299,822.00
Total Fatal (K) Crashes: 0
Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes: 1
Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes: 0
Total Crashes: 5
Total Fatal (K) Crashes Reduced by Project: 0
Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes Reduced by Project: }
Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes Reduced by
Project:
Total Crashes Reduced by Project: 2
Worksheet Attachment
1649962723729_TH5_CSAH11N_Safety_packaged.pdf
Upload Crash Modification Factors and B/C Worksheet in PDF form.
```


## Measure A: Pedestrian Safety

```
Determine if these measures do not apply to your project. Does the project match either of the following descriptions?
If either of the items are checked yes, then score for entire pedestrian safety measure is zero. Applicant does not need to respond to the sub-measures and can proceed to the next section.
Project is primarily a freeway (or transitioning to a freeway) and does not provide safe and comfortable pedestrian facilities and No crossings.
Existing location lacks any pedestrian facilities (e.g., sidewalks, marked crossings, wide shoulders in rural contexts) and project does not add pedestrian elements (e.g., reconstruction of a No roadway without sidewalks, that doesnt also add pedestrian crossings and sidewalk or sidepath on one or both sides).
```


## SUB-MEASURE 1: Project-Based Pedestrian Safety Enhancements and Risk Elements

```
To receive maximum points in this category, pedestrian safety countermeasures selected for implementation in projects should be, to the greatest extent feasible, consistent with the countermeasure recommendations in the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and state and national best practices. Links to resources are provided on the Regional Solicitation Resources web page.
Please answer the following two questions with as much detail as possible based on the known attributes of the proposed design. If any aspect referenced in this section is not yet determined, describe the range of options being considered, to the greatest extent available. If there are project elements that may increase pedestrian risk, describe how these risks are being mitigated.
1. Describe how this project will address the safety needs of people crossing the street at signalized intersections, unsignalized intersections, midblock locations, and roundabouts.
Treatments and countermeasures should be well-matched to the roadways context (e.g., appropriate for the speed, volume, crossing distance, and other location attributes). Refer to the Regional Solicitation Resources web page for guidance links.
```

Response:
No pedestrian facilities are present at the intersection today. The project will install pedestrian facilities across the north leg of the roundabout to provide safe crossing of Highway 11, connecting residential areas to the adjacent Dairy Queen and childcare facility. The roundabout splitter islands will provide pedestrian refuge areas allowing pedestrians to make two-stage crossings. Pedestrians may cross one lane of traffic at a time, a large improvement from the three lanes of traffic that must be crossed today. Improved lighting, signage, and pavement markings will be provided to further promote pedestrian visibility. Future plans for Highways 5 and 11 feature pedestrian facilities to better serve the future downtown west parcel development and Victoria residents as a whole. The proposed pedestrian facilities at the roundabout will be designed to make future connections as easy as possible to minimize waste.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
Is the distance in between signalized intersections increasing (e.g., removing a signal)?
Select one: No
If yes, describe what measures are being used to fill the gap between protected crossing opportunities for pedestrians (e.g., adding HighIntensity Activated Crosswalk beacons to help motorists yield and help pedestrians find a suitable gap for crossing, turning signal into a roundabout to slow motorist speed, etc.).

Response:
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
Will your design increase the crossing distance or crossing time across any leg of an intersection? (e.g., by adding turn or through lanes, widening lanes, using a multi-phase crossing, prohibiting crossing on any leg of an intersection, pedestrian bridge requiring length detour, etc.). This does not include any increases to crossing distances solely due to the addition of bike lanes (i.e., no other through or turn lanes being added or widened).

Select one: No
If yes,
How many intersections will likely be affected?
Response:
Describe what measures are being used to reduce exposure and delay for pedestrians (e.g., median crossing islands, curb bulb-outs, etc.)

## Response:

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
If grade separated pedestrian crossings are being added and increasing crossing time, describe any features that are included that will reduce the detour required of pedestrians and make the separated crossing a more appealing option (e.g., shallow tunnel that doesnt require much elevation change instead of pedestrian bridge with numerous switchbacks).

Response:
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
If mid-block crossings are restricted or blocked, explain why this is necessary and how pedestrian crossing needs and safety are supported in other ways (e.g., nearest protected or enhanced crossing opportunity).

Response:
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
2. Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, both for through traffic and turning movements. Describe any project-related factors that may affect speed directly or indirectly, even if speed is not the intended outcome (e.g., wider lanes and turning radii to facilitate freight movements, adding turn lanes to alleviate peak hour congestion, etc.). Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower (e.g., visual narrowing, narrow lanes, truck aprons to mitigate wide turning radii, etc.) or protect pedestrians if increasing motorist speed (e.g., buffers or other separation from moving vehicles, crossing treatments appropriate for higher speed roadways, etc.).

Response:

> The project location is at the intersection of two rural highways with posted speed limits of $50-55$ miles per hour. High speeds and lack of acceptable gaps in traffic are leading causes for the safety issues present. The proposed roundabout will provide traffic calming on all approaches due to the alignment of the splitter islands and geometry of the center circle. Vehicles must reduce speed to between 15 and 20 miles per hour to safely navigate the intersection. This calming provides large improvement in pedestrian safety; NCHRP research shows that the severity of pedestrianvehicle crashes is exponentially reduced when vehicles speeds are low. Additionally, slower moving traffic allows pedestrians more time to judge when a gap is safe to cross, reduces stopping sight distances of vehicles yielding to pedestrians, and provides a more comfortable experience for non-motorized users.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
If known, what are the existing and proposed design, operation, and posted speeds? Is this an increase or decrease from existing conditions?
Existing posted speed limits are 55 mph on the north and west approaches, and 50 miles per hour on the east approach. Posted speed limits will likely

Response: not be changed but the roundabout will require circulatory speeds of 15-20 mph within the intersection area, a marked decrease from the existing condition.

## SUB-MEASURE 2: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Risk Factors

These factors are based on based on trends and patterns observed in pedestrian crash analysis done for the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Check off how many of the following factors are present. Applicants receive more points if more risk factors are present.

Existing road configuration is a One-way, $3+$ through lanes
or
Existing road configuration is a Two-way, 4+ through lanes
Existing road has a design speed, posted speed limit, or speed study/data showing 85th percentile travel speeds in excess of 30 Yes MPH or more

Existing road has AADT of greater than 15,000 vehicles per day
List the AADT

## SUB-MEASURE 3: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Exposure Factors

These factors are based on based on trends and patterns observed in pedestrian crash analysis done for the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Check off how many of the following existing location exposure factors are present. Applicants receive more points if more risk factors are present.

Existing road has transit running on or across it with 1+ transit stops in the project area (lf flag-stop route with no fixed stops, then 1+ locations in the project area where roadside stops are allowed. Do not count portions of transit routes with no stops, such as non-stop freeway sections of express or limited-stop routes. If service was temporarily reduced for the pandemic but is expected to return to 2019 levels, consider 2019 service for this item.)

Existing road has high-frequency transit running on or across it and 1+ high-frequency stops in the project area (high-frequency defined as service at least every 15 minutes from 6am to 7pm weekdays and 9am to 6pm Saturdays. If service frequency was temporarily reduced for the pandemic but is expected to return to 2019 levels, consider 2019 frequency for this item.)

Existing road is within 500 of $1+$ shopping, dining, or entertainment destinations (e.g., grocery store, restaurant)

## Yes

The intersection directly serves a Dairy Queen restaurant, situated on the northeast corner of the intersection. This is the only fast-food restaurant within Victoria and is a popular destination yearround. Lack of pedestrian facilities to the site is a noted issue. Currently, patrons travel from Downtown Victoria via Stieger Lake Lane and walk/bike through a grass area along Highway 5 for over 500 feet. This occurs so frequently that a goat path is visible on aerial imagery between the Dairy Queen restaurant and Stieger Lake Lane.
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
Existing road is within 500 of other known pedestrian generators (e.g., school, civic/community center, senior housing, multifamily Yes housing, regulatorily-designated affordable housing)

Alphabet Junction Childcare Centers is located within 500' of the northern project limit on Highway 11. Victoria Veterinary Hospital is located on the northwest corner. While Highway 11 does not If checked, please describe: presently feature any pedestrian facilities, they are included in long range visions for the corridor to be implemented with development. The project will add pedestrian facilities across Highway 11 and will be set up for these future connections.

## Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

No pedestrian or multimodal trail facilities exist in the project area today. The project will provide pedestrian facilities and accessibility to surrounding existing and future housing and amenities. Specifically, the project will install pedestrian facilities across the north leg of the roundabout to provide safe crossing of Highway 11. The roundabout splitter islands will provide pedestrian refuge areas allowing pedestrians to make twostage crossings. Pedestrians may cross one lane of traffic at a time, a large improvement from the three lanes of traffic that must be crossed today. Improved lighting, signage, and pavement markings will be provided to further promote pedestrian visibility. Future plans are for Highways 5 and 11 feature pedestrian facilities to better serve Victoria and Carver County residents. Development plans show that future sidewalk and trails will connect along these highways and through the development of this area when it is built out. All pedestrian and bicycle facilities reinstalled with the project will be ADA compliant and an accessible pedestrian signal system will be installed at the intersection.

The Highway 5 corridor, through the City of Victoria and the project area, has been designated as a RBTN Tier 2 alignment that will connect the Cities of Waconia, Victoria, and Chanhassen. As part of the planning process, the study team prioritized active transportation options, access to outdoor recreation, and environmental benefits. As such, the project will connect existing and future residential areas to the existing Dairy Queen and childcare facility and future commercial amenities. Stieger Lake Lane just east of the project intersection provides access to the Lake Minnetonka LRT Trail, Carver Park Reserve, and downtown Victoria jobs and amenities.

There is no fixed route transit service in the project
area as this area is not part of the transit taxing district; however, transit benefits include increased travel time reliability for school buses (36,000+ students) accessing the Arboretum to the east every year and commuters accessing the nearby park and rides (SouthWest Transit?s Chanhassen Transit Station and East Creek Transit Station in Chaska). SouthWest Transit provides on-demand transit service, SouthWest Prime, along the project corridor.

# 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.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. The focus of this section is on the opportunity for public input as opposed to the quality of input. NOTE: A written response is required and failure to respond will result in zero points.

Multiple types of targeted outreach efforts (such as meetings or online/mail outreach) specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need.

100\%
At least one meeting specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

50\%
At least online/mail outreach effort specific to this project with the general public 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.

Describe the type(s) of outreach selected for this project (i.e., online or in-person meetings, surveys, demonstration projects), the method(s) used to announce outreach opportunities, and how many people participated. Include any public website links to outreach opportunities.

Response:
Completed in early 2021, the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan process identified the Highway 5 vision and was informed with a thorough engagement plan. Tools used included in-person neighborhood meetings and an online story map with surveys and comment map. Over 500 people attended three open houses, ten neighborhood focused meetings, and three stakeholder business/property owner meetings. Meetings were held on the following dates: 6/19/19,6/25/19,6/27/19,7/16/19,11/6/19,11/20/19,1 2/4/19,12/17/19, 3/11/20, 4/13/20, 5/29/20, $7 / 20 / 20,8 / 7 / 20,12 / 15 / / 20$. Public meeting dates were strategic to engage at decision-making milestones. A community pop-up event was held at the Victoria Classic Car Night on 9/4/19 that engaged seniors to children. Online tools enabled feedback at personal convenience, making the process accessible to families with children, seniors, and shift workers. Over 300 online surveys and 100+ comments on the web-based comment map were received.

To engage populations impacted by the project and reach those traditionally not engaged in transportation projects, two of the three open houses were held at the Arboretum and participants received free access to attend ( $\$ 15$ value per adult). This incentive generated wide public participation.

An environmental screening was completed with the study and will inform future public engagement activities. As the proposed Highway 5 project moves into preliminary design, NEPA and Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities. Carver County and project partners look forward to building upon the vastly successful engagement activities to date. This includes more outreach to diverse
student populations associated with the UofM Landscape Arboretum programs. The Arboretum offers youth education (K-12) field trips (~36,000 students/year anticipated to be expanded by $30 \%$ up to 60,000 students annually) and the Plant Mobile program bringing programming to schools (~10,000 students/year).

Study website:
https://www.co.carver.mn.us/departments/public-works/projects-studies/arboretum-area-transportation-plan

Interactive StoryMap - click Highway 5 Vision on left hand side: https://bmi.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index. html?appid=179cfee78337400aaa37f8f8b31d208b

Interactive Comment Map summary: https://www.co.carver.mn.us/home/showpublishedd ocument/18350/636991260708330000

Survey summary:
https://www.co.carver.mn.us/home/showpublishedd ocument/18469/637007653202300000

All public meeting documents and summaries: https://www.co.carver.mn.us/departments/public-works/projects-studies/arboretum-area-transportation-plan/arboretum-area-transportation-plan-additional-information/-fsiteid-1

[^0]Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties/MnDOT. If a MnDOT trunk highway is impacted, approval by MnDOT must have occurred to receive full points. A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.

## $100 \%$

A layout does not apply (signal replacement/signal timing, standalone streetscaping, minor intersection improvements). Applicants that are not certain whether a layout is required should contact Colleen Brown at MnDOT Metro State Aid colleen.brown@state.mn.us.

## 100\%

For projects where MnDOT trunk highways are impacted and a MnDOT Staff Approved layout is required. Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted local jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties), and layout review and approval by MnDOT is pending. A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.

Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.

50\%
Layout has been started but is not complete. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.

25\%
Layout has not been started
0\%
Attach Layout
1649873765566_001_TH5 at CSAH11N_Proposed.pdf
Please upload attachment in PDF form.

Additional Attachments

Please upload attachment in PDF form.

## 3.Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 Percent of Points)

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

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

100\%
Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of no adverse effect anticipated

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

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

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

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit either not required or all have been acquired

100\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

50\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - parcels identified

25\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - parcels not all identified

0\%
5.Railroad Involvement (15 Percent of Points)

No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way Yes 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\%

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | $\$ 3,000,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | $\$ 3,000,000.00$ |
| Enter amount of any outside, competitive funding: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Attach documentation of award: |  |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria |  |

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001_TH5 at CSAH11N_Proposed.pdf | Project Layout | 751 KB |
| 002_TH5 at CSAH11N_Existing.pdf | Existing Conditions Layout | 734 KB |
| 003_TH5 at CSAH11N_Existing Photos.pdf | Existing Conditions Photos | 4.5 MB |
| 004_TH5_11_AffordableHousing_8X11L. pdf | Affordable Housing Figure | 434 KB |
| 005_Downtown West Feasibility Study.pdf | Downtown West Feasibility Study | 869 KB |
| Carver County Resolution 23-22 signed.pdf | Carver County Resolution Hwy5/CSAH11 Intersection | 368 KB |
| City of Victoria 2022-03-28-Letter of Support.pdf | City of Victoria Letter of Support Highway 5 Victoria | 83 KB |
| One Page Description Highway 5 at 11 Project.pdf | One Page Summary_Hwy 5 at Hwy 11 | 320 KB |
| RS MnDOT Letter Carver Co TH 5 c orridor.pdf | MnDOT Letter of Support | 223 KB |




## Socio-Economic Conditions

Total of publicly subsidized rental housing units in census tracts within $1 / 2$ mile: 69

Project located in census tracts that are BELOW the regional average for population in poverty or population of color.

Points
Area of Concentrated Poverty
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit http://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissite/hotice.aspx
METROPOLITAN

Highway 5/Highway 11 Intersection Safety and Access Improvement



## HousingLink

## Streams

Return to main site

## Property Detail



Known Property Addresses

| 1 | Waconia |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |

[^1]First known closing: 7/31/2003
Most recent closing: 7/31/2003
Earliest expiration:
Last Activity: Preservation

HUDPH: Public Housing
Close Date: 7/31/2003
Known Property Identifiers
HousingLink: 11337
HUDPH: MN211000001

10: TH 5 \& CSAH 11 (North)

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1292 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 35 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.48 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.29 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.34 |



10: TH 5 \& CSAH 11 (North)

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1292 |
| Total Delay $/$ Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.75 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.34 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.41 |

10: TH 5 \& CSAH 11 (North)

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1292 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 35 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.48 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.29 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.34 |



10: TH 5 \& CSAH 11 (North)

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1292 |
| Total Delay $/$ Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.75 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.34 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.41 |

## Traffic Safety Benefit-Cost Calculation

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Reactive Project

| A. Roadway Description |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | TH 5/CSAH11N | District | Metro | County | Carver |
| Begin RP | 38.45 | End RP |  | Miles |  |
| Location | TH 5 at CSAH 11N |  |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work Conversion to Si | Conversion to Single-lane Roundabout |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Cost* ${ }^{*}$ \$3,000,000 | Installation Year 2026 |
| Project Service Life 20 years | Traffic Growth Factor 2.0\% |
| * exclude Right of Way from Project Cost |  |


| C. Crash Modification Factor |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.29 | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference ID 229 |  |  |
| 0.29 | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |  |
| 0.29 | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type All |  |  |
| 0.29 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |  |  |
| 0.29 | 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. Benefit-Cost Calculation

| $\$ 4,299,822$ |  | Benefit (present value) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 3,000,000$ | Cost | B/C Ratio $=\mathbf{1 . 4 4}$ |
|  | Proposed project expected to reduce 2 crashes annually, 1 of which involving fatality or serious injury. |  |

F. Analysis Assumptions

| Crash Severity | Crash Cost |
| :--- | :---: |
| K crashes | $\$ 1,500,000$ |
| A crashes | $\$ 750,000$ |
| B crashes | $\$ 230,000$ |
| C crashes | $\$ 120,000$ |
| PDO crashes | $\$ 13,000$ |


| G. Annual Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
|  | K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$0 |
|  | A crashes | 0.71 | 0.24 | \$177,500 |
|  | B crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$0 |
|  | C crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$0 |
|  | PDO crashes | 2.84 | 0.95 | \$12,307 |
|  |  |  |  | \$189,807 |
| H. Amortized Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |  |
| 2026 | \$189,807 | \$189,807 | Total $=$ | \$4,299,822 |
| 2027 | \$193,603 | \$192,257 |  |  |
| 2028 | \$197,475 | \$194,739 |  |  |
| 2029 | \$201,424 | \$197,253 |  |  |
| 2030 | \$205,453 | \$199,799 |  |  |
| 2031 | \$209,562 | \$202,379 |  |  |
| 2032 | \$213,753 | \$204,991 |  |  |
| 2033 | \$218,028 | \$207,638 |  |  |
| 2034 | \$222,389 | \$210,318 |  |  |
| 2035 | \$226,837 | \$213,033 |  |  |
| 2036 | \$231,373 | \$215,784 |  |  |
| 2037 | \$236,001 | \$218,569 |  |  |
| 2038 | \$240,721 | \$221,391 |  |  |
| 2039 | \$245,535 | \$224,249 |  |  |
| 2040 | \$250,446 | \$227,144 |  |  |
| 2041 | \$255,455 | \$230,076 |  |  |
| 2042 | \$260,564 | \$233,047 |  |  |
| 2043 | \$265,775 | \$236,055 |  |  |
| 2044 | \$271,091 | \$239,102 |  |  |
| 2045 | \$276,512 | \$242,189 |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |

## CMF／CRF Details

CMF ID： 229

Convert intersection with minor－road stop control to modern roundabout Description：

Prior Condition：No Prior Condition（s）
Category：Intersection geometry
Study：NCHRP Report 572：Applying Roundabouts in the United States， Rodegerdts et al．， 2007

Adjusted Standard Error：
0.05

Unadjusted Standard Error：
0.04

Crash Reduction Factor（CRF）
Value

Adjusted Standard Error：
5

## Applicability

| Crash Type: | All |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not Specified |
| Number of Lanes: | 1 |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Rural |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: |  |

## If countermeasure is intersection-based

Intersection Type:

Intersection Geometry:

Traffic Control:

Major Road Traffic Volume:

Minor Road Traffic Volume:

Roadway/roadway (not interchange related)

4-leg

Stop-controlled

Date Range of Data Used:

Municipality:

State:

| Country: |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | 2 |
| Type of Methodology Used: | 2 |  |
| Sample Size Used: |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other Details

## Included in Highway Safety

 Manual?
## Date Added to Clearinghouse:

## Comments:

Yes. HSM lists this CMF in bold font to indicate that it has the highest reliability since it has an adjusted standard error of 0.1 or less.

Dec-01-2009

Countermeasure name changed from "convert two-way stop-controlled intersection to roundabout" to match HSM

This site is funded by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and maintained by the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center

The information contained in the Crash Modification Factors (CMF) Clearinghouse is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse. The information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation, nor is it a substitute for sound engineering judgment.

Crash Case Listing

| Route System | Route Number | Measure | Co | City | Incident <br> Number | Date | Time | Day of Week | Basic Type | Num Veh | Sev |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03-MNTH | 5 | 38.454 | 10 | Victoria | 00939154 | 09/08/21 | 0749 | WED | Angle | 2 | N |
| 03-MNTH | 5 | 38.456 | 10 | Victoria | 00907755 | 05/17/21 | 1730 | MON | Angle | 2 | A |
| 03-MNTH | 5 | 38.491 | 10 | Victoria | 00767218 | 12/02/19 | 0525 | MON | SVROR | 1 | N |
| 03-MNTH | 5 | 38.495 | 10 | Victoria | 00843531 | 09/28/20 | 1952 | MON | Rear End | 2 | N |
| 03-MNTH | 5 | 38.511 | 10 | Victoria | 00868156 | 12/14/20 | 1830 | MON | Other | 1 | N |

Selection Filter:
WORK AREA: County('659455') - FILTER: Year('2019','2020','2021') - SPATIAL FILTER APPLIED
Analyst: Notes:

Jacob Bongard


April 14, 2022
Elaine Koutsoukos
TAB Coordinator
Metropolitan Council
390 Robert St. N
St. Paul, MN 55101
SUBJECT: Highway 5/Highway 11 Intersection Safety and Access Improvement Project Risk Assessment Layout Approval Letter

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos:
This letter is to confirm the County's agreement with and approval to date of the attached layout for the Highway 5/Highway 11 Intersection Safety and Access Improvement Project. The project has undergone substantial study and coordination with project partners. The County led and partnered on the development of the layout with MnDOT and the City of Victoria through the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan corridor study planning process, and we are aware of the details specified in the application attachment.

As a roadway owner, MnDOT also provided the required letter of support for the project and has conducted additional scoping work as part of the layout development. MnDOT was the funding lead on the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan, investing approximately \$500,000 in the study and directing the development of the approved concept vision and layout. The City of Victoria submitted a letter of support for the project, and like the County, adopted the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan in 2021 by resolution.

The County is committed to continuing to work with MnDOT and the City of Victoria to complete the final layout approval engineering process for the Highway 5/Highway 11 Intersection Safety and Access Improvement Project in the coming months.

Sincerely,

# BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS CARVER COUNTY, MINNESOTA 

Date: March 16, 2021
Motion by Commissioner:

Degler
Resolution No: __32-21
Seconded by Commissioner: __Workman

## Resolution to Support and Adopt the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan

WHEREAS, Carver County, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), the City of Victoria, the City of Chaska, and the City of Chanhassen and are responsible for the planning and development of a safe and functional multimodal transportation system within their jurisdictional boundaries; and

WHEREAS, Carver County partnered with the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), the City of Victoria, the City of Chaska, and the City of Chanhassen to identify transportation system improvements in the area of the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum including Highway 5, Highway 41, Rolling Acres Road, Bavaria Road, and 82nd Street West; and

WHEREAS, the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan recommends roadway corridor visions including roadway typical sections and corridor footprints, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and access type and intersection control to serve short, mid, and long-term development and transportation infrastructure needs; and

WHEREAS, the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan includes an implementation framework with estimated improvement costs, project sequencing, and timeframes to guide capital improvement planning for Carver County, MnDOT, the City of Victoria, the City of Chaska, the City of Chanhassen, and their partners for improvements along Highway 5, Highway 41, Rolling Acres Road, Bavaria Road, and $82^{\text {nd }}$ Street West; and

WHEREAS, Carver County recognizes the recommended planning level alternatives establish a future vision for agencies to jointly work towards, noting additional engineering design and environmental review will be required for individual projects; and

WHEREAS, Carver County acknowledges that the implementation framework is subject to funding availability and Arboretum Area Transportation Plan partners will continue to coordinate to advance the goals and objectives of the plan, seek and maximize outside funding sources, and will request approvals as required as individual projects move forward; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Carver County hereby supports and adopts the findings, recommended corridor visions, and the proposed implementation framework of the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan to guide future investments in the study area.

| Yes | No | Abstained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Degler |  |  |
| Fahey |  |  |
| Lynch |  |  |
| Udermann |  |  |
| Workman |  |  |

## STATE OF MINNESOTA

## COUNTY OF CARVER

I, Dave Hemze, duly appointed and qualified County Administrator of the County of Carver, State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of this resolution with the original minutes of the proceedings of the Board of County Commissioners, Carver County, Minnesota, at its session held on the _16_day of March , 2021, now on file in the Administration office, and have found the same to be a true and correct copy thereof.

Dated this $\qquad$ day of March , 2021.
DocuSigned by:
dave lemze
Datbe bbetrazg9420...

# Resolution No. 2021-14 

Moved by Roberts
Seconded by Gunderson

## A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE ARBORETUM AREA TRANSPORTATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the City of Victoria, Carver County, and MnDOT are responsible for the planning and development of a safe and functional multimodal transportation system within their jurisdictional boundaries; and

WHEREAS, the City of Victoria partnered with Carver County, MnDOT, the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum, and the cities of Chaska and Chanhassen to identify transportation system improvements in the Arboretum Area including Highway 5, Highway 41, Rolling Acres Road, Bavaria Road, and 82nd Street West; and

WHEREAS, the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan recommends roadway corridor visions including: roadway typical sections and corridor footprints, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and access type and intersection control to serve short, mid, and long-term development and transportation infrastructure needs; and

WHEREAS, the City of Victoria recognizes that the study recommendations establish future planning-level corridor visions for agencies to jointly work towards, noting additional design and environmental review will be required for individual projects; and

WHEREAS, the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan includes an implementation framework with estimated improvement costs, project sequencing, and timeframes to guide capital improvement planning for the City of Victoria, Carver County, and their partners for improvements along Highway 5, Rolling Acres Road, Bavaria Road, 82nd Street West, and Highway 41; and

WHEREAS, the City of Victoria acknowledges that the implementation framework is subject to funding availability and all Arboretum Area Transportation Plan partners will continue to coordinate to advance the goals and objectives of the plan, seek and maximize outside funding sources, and will request City Council approval for each specific project and City of Victoria contribution as individual projects move forward; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Victoria does hereby support the findings, recommended corridor visions, and the proposed implementation framework of the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan to guide future transportation investments in the study area.

RESULT: Motion carried unanimously 4-0
Ayes: $\quad$ Council Member Black, Council Member Gunderson, Mayor McMillan, and Council Member Roberts

This Resolution is adopted by the City of Victoria and approved by the Mayor this 08 day of February 2021


ATTEST:


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

April 12, 2022

Lyndon Robjent, PE
Public Works Director, County Engineer
Carver County Public Works

## Re: MnDOT Letter for Carver County's Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board 2020 Regional Solicitation Funding Request for TH 5 improvements <br> Lyndon,

This letter documents MnDOT Metro District's recognition for Carver County to pursue funding for the Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board's (TAB) 2022 Regional Solicitation for the following improvements on TH 5.

As proposed, these projects impacts MnDOT right-of-way on TH 5. As the agency with jurisdiction over TH 5, MnDOT will allow Carver County to seek improvements proposed in the applications. If funded, details of any future maintenance agreement will need to be determined during project development to define how the improvements will be maintained for the projects' useful life.

TH 5 Lake Minnewashta and Arboretum Access and Mobility Improvement. Reconstruct and expand TH 5 from a two-lane rural highway to a four-lane divided expressway between Minnewashta Parkway and Highway 41 including a bridge over Lake Minnewashta.

TH 5 Victoria Mobility and Safety Improvement. Reconstruct and expand TH 5 from a two-lane rural highway to a four-lane divided expressway from 78th St./Stieger Lake Ln. to west of Highway 13 (Rolling Acres Rd.) including improvements at the Highway 5/Park Dr./Kochia Ln. intersection and the TH 5/78th St./Stieger Lake Ln. intersection.

TH 5/Highway 11 N Intersection Safety and Access Improvement. Construct a roundabout at the intersection and reconstruct adjacent portions of TH 5 and Hwy 11

There is no funding from MnDOT currently planned or programmed for these projects. If they receive funding, continue to work with MnDOT Area staff to coordinate development and to review needs and opportunities for cooperation.

If you have questions or require additional information at this time, please reach out to Ryan Wilson South Area Manager, at ryan.wilson@state.mn.us or 651-234-4216.

Sincerely,

## Michael Barnes, PE Metro District Engineer

CC: Ryan Wilson, Metro Area Manager; Molly McCartney, Metro Program Director; Dan Erickson, Metro State Aid Engineer



Existing Conditions - TH 5 at CSAH 11, Victoria, MN


Existing Conditions - Westbound TH 5


Existing Conditions - Southbound CSAH 11


Highway 5/Highway 11 Intersection Safety and Access Improvement




## Site Data Summary

| Property Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Property Area | 14.53 AC |
| Right of Way Dedication | 1.86 AC |
| Net Property Area | 12.67 AC |


| Parking Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Off Street Parking | 248 Stalls |
| On Street Parking | 52 Stalls |
| Covered Parking | 380 Stalls |
| Total Parking | $\mathbf{6 8 0}$ Stalls |


| Building Data Summary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building \# | Area | Use | Units |
| Building 1 | 9,600 SF (1,200 SF/Unit) | Rowhomes | 8 |
| Building 2 | 9,600 SF (1,200 SF/Unit) | Rowhomes | 8 |
| Building 3 | 3,600 SF (1,200 SF/Unit) | Rowhomes | 3 |
| Building 4 | 20,000 SF/Floor (5 Floors) 5,000 SF Retail Facing Green | Senior Housing/Retail | 80 |
| Building 5 | 37,000 SF/Floor (4 Floors) | Residential | 125 |
| Building 6 | 22,000 SF $1^{\text {st }}$ Floor Retail 18,000 SF $2^{\text {nd }}-4^{\text {th }}$ Floor Residential | Residential/Reta il | 33 |
| Building 7 | 20,000 SF/Floor (4 Floors) 10,000 SF Retail Facing Green | Residential/Reta il | 60 |
| Building 8 | 26,000 SF/Floor (4 Floors) | Senior Housing | 74 |

## Catalyst for Development

- New housing on the site perimeter and along the east side of the property will create demand and desire for commercial and retail uses on the west side of the site
- A fully developed site creates an urban template for more sustainable development in Victoria


March 28, 2022

Mr. Lyndon Robjent, P.E.
Public Works Director, County Engineer
Carver County Public Works
11360 Highway 212, Suite 1, Cologne, MN 55322

Re: Letter of Support for Carver County's Application to the Metropolitan Council's 2022 Regional Solicitation for Highway 5/Highway 11 N Intersection Safety and Access Improvement

Dear Mr. Robjent,
This letter documents the City of Victoria's support for Carver County's pursuit of funding for the Highway 5/Highway 11 N Intersection Safety and Access 1 mprovement. The proposed project is for construction of a roundabout at the existing 3-legged, 1-way stop-controlled intersection and to reconstruct adjacent portions of Highway 5 and Highway 11 to manage access and better serve development and economic growth in the Downtown Victoria area.

The City of Victoria partnered with Carver County, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), the City of Chanhassen, the City of Chaska, and the MN Landscape Arboretum on the Arboretum Area Transportation Plan corridor study to identify coordinated roadway improvements to address significant existing transportation mobility, safety, and access issues on the Highway 5 corridor. The Arboretum Area Transportation Plan corridor study included a robust technical analysis, concept development, concept evaluation, and a diversified and broad public engagement strategy to identify and build consensus for short and long-term roadway concepts and recommendations. The proposed project is consistent with the adopted study.

The City of Victoria supports the County's application for Highway 5/Highway 11 N Intersection Safety and Access Improvement to the Metropolitan Council's 2022 Regional Solicitation funding program and acknowledges potential City cost-share in the project per existing policies as outlined in the application. The proposed improvements will greatly address regional safety and mobility issues and are endorsed by the City of Victoria.

Sincerely,


Debra-MicMillan
Mayor

## Primary Contact:

Angie Stenson
Sr. Transportation Planner 11360 Hwy 212, Suite 1, Cologne, MN 55322
612.360.7422
astenson@co.carver.mn.us

Project Location:
TH 5 at CSAH 11
Victoria, MN


Application Category: Roadways including Multimodal Elements - Spot Mobility

Intersection Fast Facts:

- Project decreases over 66\% peak hour congestion
- Project reduces all crashes by over 70\%


Funding Information: Requested Award Amount:
\$2,400,000
Local Match: \$600,000
Project Total: \$3,000,000

Match \$ Sources:

- Carver County
- City of Victoria
- Trunk Highway Funds


## Project Description

This project at Highway 5 (Arboretum Boulevard) and Highway 11 (Victoria Drive) installs a single-leg roundabout accompanied by pedestrian facilities, intersection lighting, and private access closures and relocations within the City of Victoria.

Regional Significance: This intersection serves connection between Trunk Highways 5 and 7 in the west metro. This link carries significant commuter traffic during the week and recreational traffic on the weekends due to the many area parks and lakes. the cities of Chaska, Waconia, Victoria and Carver. Development pressures and expansion of Downtown Victoria will further drive the importance of this key intersection within central Carver County.

The Issues: The Highway 5/11 intersection within the City of Victoria has been experiencing significant crash and congestion issues for years and an agreed upon and fundable solution proved to be challenging. Due to area growth, operations and safety issues have further degraded and action must be taken. Commuter traffic during the AM peak hour results in heavy southbound left and eastbound through traffic. These heavy conflicting movements, combined with high posted speed limits result in unacceptable delays on Highway 11. These delays often leave drivers frustrated and become willing to accept smaller and riskier gaps in Highway 5 traffic to enter the Trunk Highway, resulting in elevated crash rates. Several fatal and serious injury crashes have occurred at this intersection within the last decade.


## Project Benefits

Proposed improvements will provide increased safety by eliminating the opportunity for dangerous right angle and left turn crash types and by calming traffic on both corridors, serving as a gateway to Downtown Victoria east of the project location. Private accesses are closed, restricted, and relocated throughout the project area, eliminating conflict points within the functional area of the intersection. Operations during the peak hours is also improved with all movements experiencing reduced delay. Pedestrian facilities are introduced allowing for comfortable crossing of Highways 5 and 11. These facilities will accommodate future extension of the pedestrian network on Highway 5 which is designated as a RBTN Tier 1 corridor.

## Part of a Bigger Picture

A study of Highway 5 in the area identified a vision for the corridor which includes a roundabout at this intersection to best improve safety and operations, as well as meet the future needs for development and pedestrian access. This project as proposed fits the adopted vision for the corridor and will fit with future infrastructure investments and support development opportunities.

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

April 12, 2022

Lyndon Robjent, PE
Public Works Director, County Engineer
Carver County Public Works

## Re: MnDOT Letter for Carver County's Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board 2020 Regional Solicitation Funding Request for TH 5 improvements <br> Lyndon,

This letter documents MnDOT Metro District's recognition for Carver County to pursue funding for the Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board's (TAB) 2022 Regional Solicitation for the following improvements on TH 5.

As proposed, these projects impacts MnDOT right-of-way on TH 5. As the agency with jurisdiction over TH 5, MnDOT will allow Carver County to seek improvements proposed in the applications. If funded, details of any future maintenance agreement will need to be determined during project development to define how the improvements will be maintained for the projects' useful life.

TH 5 Lake Minnewashta and Arboretum Access and Mobility Improvement. Reconstruct and expand TH 5 from a two-lane rural highway to a four-lane divided expressway between Minnewashta Parkway and Highway 41 including a bridge over Lake Minnewashta.

TH 5 Victoria Mobility and Safety Improvement. Reconstruct and expand TH 5 from a two-lane rural highway to a four-lane divided expressway from 78th St./Stieger Lake Ln. to west of Highway 13 (Rolling Acres Rd.) including improvements at the Highway 5/Park Dr./Kochia Ln. intersection and the TH 5/78th St./Stieger Lake Ln. intersection.

TH 5/Highway 11 N Intersection Safety and Access Improvement. Construct a roundabout at the intersection and reconstruct adjacent portions of TH 5 and Hwy 11

There is no funding from MnDOT currently planned or programmed for these projects. If they receive funding, continue to work with MnDOT Area staff to coordinate development and to review needs and opportunities for cooperation.

If you have questions or require additional information at this time, please reach out to Ryan Wilson South Area Manager, at ryan.wilson@state.mn.us or 651-234-4216.

Sincerely,

[^2]
[^0]:    2.Layout (25 Percent of Points)

    Layout includes proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries. A basic layout should include a base map (north arrow; scale; legend;* city and/or county limits; existing ROW, labeled; existing signals;* and bridge numbers*) and design data (proposed alignments; bike and/or roadway lane widths; shoulder width;* proposed signals;* and proposed ROW). An aerial photograph with a line showing the projects termini does not suffice and will be awarded zero points. *If applicable

[^1]:    Funding Dates \& Programs

[^2]:    Michael Barnes $\begin{gathered}\text { Digitally signed by Michael }\end{gathered}$
    Date: 2022.04.12 09:43:07-05'00'

    Michael Barnes, PE Metro District Engineer

    CC: Ryan Wilson, Metro Area Manager; Molly McCartney, Metro Program Director; Dan Erickson, Metro State Aid Engineer

