Application

10354-2018 Roadway Modernization
10831 - CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements
Status: Submitted
Submitted Date:
07/13/2018 2:41 PM

## Primary Contact



## Organization Information

Name:

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

Organization Website:

| Address: | DPT OF PUBLIC WORKS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1600 PRAIRIE |  |  |
| * | MEDINA | Minnesota | 55340 |
|  | City | State/Province | Postal Code/Zip |
| County: | Hennepin |  |  |
| Phone:* | 763-745-7600 |  |  |
|  |  | Ext. |  |
| Fax: |  |  |  |
| PeopleSoft Vendor Number | 0000028004A9 |  |  |

## Project Information

| Project Name | CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Primary County where the Project is Located | Hennepin |
| Cities or Townships where the Project is Located: | Minneapolis |
| Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant): | Hennepin County |

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

The CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project provides improvements along the existing section of Osseo Rd from CSAH 2 (Penn Ave) to 49th Ave in North Minneapolis for a length of 0.78 miles as illustrated in Attachment 2. CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) is classified as an A-Minor Arterial that functions as a reliever.

The project objectives are to replace aging assets, improve safety and operations, and facilitate vehicle, freight, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movements through the area. Photos depicting the roadway's current condition are included in Attachment 3. The proposed cross section will maintain a three-lane roadway section with continuous center left-turn lane, bicycle facilities, boulevards, and sidewalks. The proposed typical section and concept are included in Attachments 4 and 5 , respectively.

The project will include, but is not limited to, the following elements (wherever feasible):

- Roadway improvements such as the replacement of the deteriorated curb, drainage elements, and pavement substructure.
- Safety improvements, such as the upgrading of traffic signal systems to include mast arms and dedicated left-turn phasing, enhancing of pedestrian crossings to minimize exposure of vehicles, and filling of sidewalk gaps to provide continuous off-street pedestrian facilities.
- Pedestrian improvements, such as ADA compliant ramps and sidewalks, raised concrete medians,
- Bicycle improvements, such as a more defined bicycle facility, bicycle pavement markings, and bicycle wayfinding signage.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
TIP Description Guidance (will be used in TIP if the project is selected for funding)

Project Length (Miles)
CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) from CSAH 2 (Penn Ave) to 49th Ave 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)
Federal Amount \$6,120,000.00

Match Amount \$1,530,000.00
Minimum of 20\% of project total
Project Total \$7,650,000.00
Match Percentage 20.0\%
Minimum of $20 \%$
Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total
Source of Match Funds Hennepin County
A minimum of $20 \%$ of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the $20 \%$ minimum can come from other federal sources

Preferred Program Year
Select one:

Select 2020 or 2021 for TDM projects only. For all other applications, select 2022 or 2023.
Additional Program Years:
Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available.

## Project Information-Roadways

| County, City, or Lead Agency | Hennepin County |
| :---: | :---: |
| Functional Class of Road | A-Minor Reliever |
| Road System | CSAH |
| TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET |  |
| Road/Route No. | 152 |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 |  |
| Name of Road | Osseo Road |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE |  |
| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | 55412 |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date | 04/04/2022 |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date | 11/24/2023 |
| TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work) |  |
| From: <br> (Intersection or Address) | CSAH 2 (Penn Ave) |
| To: <br> (Intersection or Address) | 49th Ave |
| DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION |  |
| Or At |  |

Grading, aggregate base, bituminous base and surfacing, curb and gutter, storm sewer, lighting, sidewalks, ADA, bike facility, and traffic signals.

```
Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF,
SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER,
SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS,
BRIDGE, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.
```

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)

Old Bridge/Culvert No.:
New Bridge/Culvert No.:
Structure is Over/Under
(Bridge or culvert name):

## Requirements - All Projects

## All Projects

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
2.The project must be consistent with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Reference the 2040 Transportation Plan goals, objectives, and strategies that relate to the project.
A) Transportation System Stewardship (P 2.172.19)

The reconstruction of CSAH 152 provides a new and structurally adequate roadway that accommodates 2040 forecasted traffic volumes and meets multi-modal transportation goals. The project provides a new pavement surface, curb and gutter, sidewalk, bike facility and stormwater systems.

## B) Safety/Security (P 2.20-2.23)

Improvements such as ADA compliant ramps and sidewalk, Accessible Pedestrian Signals, enhanced pedestrian crossings, high-visibility crosswalk markings, and countdown timers improve pedestrian safety and comfort. Traffic signal and lighting upgrades will improve safety for all users. Improvements are anticipated to result in an overall crash reduction of $28 \%$.
C) Access to Destinations (P 2.24-2.37)

This roadway section serves four current Metro Transit routes, along with the the proposed C-Line Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service that extends the length of the project. The Webber Natural Swimming Pool located near this route is both a neighborhood and regional destination. Webber Library and Henry High School are also popular destinations. The Grand Rounds Trail intersects Osseo Rd and is an important local regional trail connection. This project will enhance an important gap in the bicycle network to promote choices in transportation.
D) Competitive Economy (P 2.38-2.41)

Osseo Rd is the only roadway between TH 100 and $\mathrm{I}-94$ that includes a grade separated crossing of CP Rail. This promotes mobility in the area and provides users with reliable travel times. There are 5,700 employees within 1 mile of this project, indicating the importance of this road in terms of serving commuter trips in the Humboldt Industrial area.
E) Healthy Environment (2.42-2.45)

The bike/pedestrian enhancements along the corridor provide first/last mile connections to existing and planned Metro Transit routes (such as the BRT C-Line), increasing ridership potential. These features aim to provide more attractive choices in alternative modes of transportation. With the current roadway drainage deficiencies, modernizing the stormwater infrastructure will mitigate negative impacts within nearby watersheds.
F) Leveraging Transportation Investments to Guide Land Use (2.46-2.55)

The project has minimal right of way impacts and preserves the character of the neighborhood. The multi-modal enhancements optimize existing and planned infrastructure. This project will attract future investment and support sustainable infrastructure.

List the applicable documents and pages:

## Hennepin County Board Resolution - 2018 <br> Regional Solicitation (Attachment 7)

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 cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
7.The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Funding amounts by application category are listed below.
Roadway Expansion: $\$ 1,000,000$ to $\$ 7,000,000$
Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization Modernization and Spot Mobility: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Management): \$250,000 to \$7,000,000
Bridges Rehabilitation/ Replacement: $\$ 1,000,000$ to $\$ 7,000,000$
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
8.The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (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, or be substantially working towards, completing 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 applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and has an adopted ADA transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation.

Date plan adopted by governing body

The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people Yes and is currently working towards completing an ADA transition plan that covers the public rights of way/transportation.

Date process started $\quad$| Date of anticipated plan |
| :--- |
| completion/adoption |

The applicant is a public agency that employs fewer than $\mathbf{5 0}$ people and has a completed ADA self-evaluation that covers the public rights of way/transportation.

Date self-evaluation completed

The applicant is a public agency that employs fewer than 50 people and is working towards completing an ADA self-evaluation that covers the public rights of way/transportation.
(TDM Applicants Only) The applicant is not a public agency
subject to the self-evaluation requirements in Title II of the ADA.
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 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.
5. The length of the bridge must equal or exceed 20 feet

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
6. The bridge must have a sufficiency rating less than 80 for rehabilitation projects and less than 50 for replacement projects. Additionally, the bridge must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

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

Roadway Expansion, Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility, 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.

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

## Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

| Specific Roadway Elements |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST | Cost |
| ESTIMATES | $\$ 255,000.00$ |
| Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost) | $\$ 255,000.00$ |
| Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost) | $\$ 1,020,000.00$ |
| Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) | $\$ 920,000.00$ |
| Roadway (aggregates and paving) | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Subgrade Correction (muck) | $\$ 950,000.00$ |
| Storm Sewer | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Ponds | $\$ 200,000.00$ |
| Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) | $\$ 70,000.00$ |
| Traffic Control | $\$ 60,000.00$ |
| Striping | $\$ 60,000.00$ |
| Signing | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Lighting | $\$ 50,000.00$ |
| Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Bridge | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Retaining Walls | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Noise Wall (not calculated in cost effectiveness measure) | $\$ 910,000.00$ |
| Traffic Signals | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Wetland Mitigation | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection | $\$ 0,170,000.00$ |
| RR Crossing | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Roadway Contingencies | $\$ 000$ |
| Other Roadway Elements |  |
| Totals |  |

Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian ElementsCONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COSTESTIMATES
Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... \$50,000.00
Sidewalk Construction ..... \$140,000.00
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 360,000.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... \$230,000.00
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... \$230,000.00
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... \$60,000.00
Streetscaping ..... \$70,000.00
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... \$340,000.00
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$1,480,000.00
Specific Transit and TDM Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES Cost
Fixed Guideway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Stations, Stops, and Terminals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Support Facilities ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, ..... $\$ 0.00$
fare collection, etc.)
Vehicles ..... $\$ 0.00$
Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Transit and TDM Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Operating Costs

Number of Platform hours
Subtotal ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Costs - Administration, Overhead,etc. ..... $\$ 0.00$

## Totals

| Total Cost | $\$ 7,650,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 7,650,000.00$ |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Congestion on adjacent Parallel Routes:

Adjacent Parallel Corridor CSAH 81 (Bottineau Boulevard)

Adjacent Parallel Corridor Start and End Points:

| Start Point: | CSAH 9 (42nd Ave) |
| :--- | :--- |
| End Point: | CSAH 10 (Bass Lake Rd) |
| Free-Flow Travel Speed: | 37 |
| The Free-Flow Travel Speed is black number. | 28 |
| Peak Hour Travel Speed: |  |
| The Peak-Hour Travel Speed is red number. $24.32 \%$ |  |
| Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to <br> Free-Flow (calculation): | 1530907023405 2018 RS Map 01 - CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) <br> Reconstruction Project - Level of Congestion - Combined.pdf |
| Upload the "Level of Congestion" map: |  |

## Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study:

Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a High Priority Intersection:
(65 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection:
(55 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection:

```
(45 Points)
```

Not listed as a priority in the study:
Yes
(0 Points)
(0 Points)

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

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

Existing Post-Secondary Students within 1 Mile:

Upload Map

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:
Along Tier 2:
Along Tier 3:
Yes
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 | South of 49th Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current AADT Volume | 11500 |
| Existing Transit Routes on the Project | $5,19,721,724$ |
| For New Roadways only, list transit routes that will likely be diverted to the new proposed roadway (if applicable). |  |
| Upload Transit Connections Map | 1528309845890_2018 RS Map 04 - CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) |
|  | Reconstruction Project - Transit Connections.pdf |

Please upload attachment in PDF form.

## Response: Current Daily Person Throughput

Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership
Current Daily Person Throughput

## Measure B: 2040 Forecast ADT

Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT Yes
volume
volume
If checked, METC Staff will provide Forecast (2040) ADT volume 12300
OR

Identify the approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume

Forecast (2040) ADT volume

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

## Select one:

Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50\% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):
(up to $100 \%$ of maximum score)
Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:
(up to $80 \%$ of maximum score )
Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:
(up to 60\% of maximum score )
Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:
(up to $40 \%$ of maximum score )
1.(0 to 3 points) A successful project is one that has actively engaged low-income populations, people of color, children, persons with disabilities, and the elderly during the project's development with the intent to limit negative impacts on them and, at the same time, provide the most benefits.
Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include:
outreach 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 the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

As part of the CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd)
Reconstruction project, staff will engage and gather input from all members within the community through an inclusive and accessible process.

The engagement process will continue on the success of the Webber Pkwy Reconstruction Project, currently ongoing, which helps build upon an inclusive community process that listens and responds to all residents (Attachment 9). The engagement includes open houses, neighborhood meetings, online engagement, and pop-up activities at Open Streets events. These current and planned
Response: engagement activities aim to establish trust with the community that began with the Penn Ave Framework Plan (completed by Hennepin County Community Works in conjunction with Metro Transit C-Lane BRT Project).

Hennepin County plans to continue to partner with local residents, neighborhood associations (particularly Victory and Webber-Camden neighborhoods), property and business owners, transit riders, local students and youth, City of Minneapolis, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Metro Transit, Minneapolis Public Schools and others.

The CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project is located in a census tract Area of Concentrated Poverty with $50 \%$ or more of the residents being people of color. This project is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on populations in poverty or populations of color.

When complete, this project will achieve a safe and inviting corridor for all ages, physical abilities, and travel modes. The project greatly enhances connectivity and safety, specifically for the elderly and disabled by constructing ADA compliant pedestrian ramps, Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS), durable crosswalk markings, enhanced sidewalks, and countdown timers. Considering the existing bus service along this corridor, pedestrian enhancements and ADA features are critical to ridership.

CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) is at the heart of a critical regional connection that directly serves the historically disadvantaged business community of North Minneapolis and is an identified Tier 3 truck route in Metropolitan Council's Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study. This commercial node in North Minneapolis is a diverse community and is home to minority-owned businesses, providing a vital connection to the Penn Ave corridor.
3.(-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.
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.
Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
Other

The reconstruction project is expected to only have minor property impacts, primarily during construction whenever its required for construction crews to perform work outside the right of way.

The reconstruction project may remove the traffic signal at 47th St. The initial public reaction to the potential traffic signal removal may be negative due to the perceptions of increasing crashes and delays. If the signal is removed, negative impacts will be mitigated through the introduction of a raised median to provide traffic calming and an improved pedestrian experience. Hennepin County will work to provide up-to-date information about conversions and conduct on-going public outreach.

1528310950890_2018 RS Map 03 - CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project - Socio Economic Conditions.pdf

## Measure B: Affordable Housing

|  | Segment Length <br> (For stand-alone <br> projects, enter <br> population from <br> Regional Economy <br> map) within each <br> City/Township | Segment <br> Length/Total <br> Project Length | Score | Multiplied by <br> Segment percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minneapolis | 0.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length (as entered in the "Project Information" form)
0.7

## Affordable Housing Scoring

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Total Project Length (Miles) or Population } & 0.7\end{array}$
Total Housing Score 100.0

## Affordable Housing Scoring

## Measure A: Year of Roadway Construction

Year of Original
Roadway Construction or Most Recent Reconstruction

1966
1955
1952
1952

Segment Length
Calculation
Calculation 2

| 196.6 | 280.857 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 196.6 | 280.857 |
| 195.5 | 279.286 |
| 585.6 | 836.571 |
| 195.2 | 278.857 |
| 1370 | 1956 |

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length (as entered in "Project Information" form) 0.7

## Average Construction Year

## Total Segment Length (Miles)

Total Segment Length

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

Osseo Rd is a Tier 3 truck route as identified by Metropolitan Council's Regional Truck Corridor Study. This project will better facilitate commercial traffic, specifically to the Humboldt Industrial Rail Terminal and Upper Harbor Terminals areas. Driveway aprons that are poorly designed or exhibit deterioration will be replaced to better accommodate local delivery trucks.
Response:

Intersection control devices will be evaluated to determine if other countermeasures (roundabouts, two-way stops, etc) offer more reliable travel times without degrading user safety. Furthermore, the existing curb is damaged and has settled, therefore its replacement is necessary to better define the roadway extents.
(Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)
Improved clear zones or sight lines:
Yes

Response:
(Limately 100 words
Improved roadway geometrics:

Response:
y 100 words
Access management enhancements:

Osseo Rd extends at a northwest/southeast diagonal through North Minneapolis, therefore, many local city streets intersect at an angle. This creates some challenging sight lines, especially with the presence of signs and utility poles adjacent to the roadway.

Intersection design and access management strategies (such as curb extensions, realignment, and access closure) will be evaluated to ensure adequate visibility for vehicles entering/exiting Osseo Rd. Pedestrian crossing locations will be evaluated for raised median potential in an effort to improve pedestrian visibility. Furthermore, the burial of overhead utilities will be considered as a supplemental activity to this project.

Yes
The CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) reconstruction project enhance the boulevard, and reduce existing sign clutter, and enhance safety by implementing the following improvements (wherever feasible):

- Curb extensions and raised medians for traffic calming
- New curb to define roadway extents
- Turn lanes of adequate length for vehicle storage
- Proper driveway transitions into private residences

Yes

Since Osseo Rd extends at a diagonal, many of the local city streets intersect at skewed angles. Staff will work with the city and local residents to determine the feasibility of modifying access to minimize user discomfort at intersections.

Response:
(Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)
Vertical/horizontal alignment improvements:

Response:
Additionally, the intersections at Victory Memorial Pkwy and 45th Ave will be evaluated to determine if other intersection control devices (such as a roundabout) better accommodate vehicles entering/exiting Osseo Rd. Furthermore, the presence of the Grand Rounds Trail contributes to the ambiguity of the intersection.

The roadway configuration will remain a 3-lane to provide sufficient mobility and access along the corridor.

Yes
No significant modifications to the existing vertical and horizontal alignments since the surrounding land use along Osseo Rd is developed.

Pedestrian crossing enhancements (curb extensions, raised medians, and crossing beacons) will be considered in an effort to minimize limited visibility caused by vertical and horizontal alignments.

All project elements will be designed accordingly to a 30 or 35 mph design speed to ensure that adequate intersection and stopping sight distances are achieved.

Hennepin County Environment and Energy and Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) staff will be directly involved during the design phase of the project to investigate the feasibility of incorporating various strategies and project elements to minimize storm water runoff. The MPRB has provided its landscaping services in two recent Hennepin County Capital Projects (Penn Ave and Washington Ave S). Landscaping elements will be key in collecting rain water in an effort to avoid ponding in undesirable areas. Landscaping features will be able to sustain harsh winter conditions, especially snowfall events that require salt application.
(Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)
Signals/lighting upgrades:

Response:
(Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)
Other Improvements

## Yes

The project will replace/upgrade traffic signal systems along the corridor. Improvements include (but not limited to): exclusive left-turn phasing, mast arms, signal communications, and various ITS components. Staff anticipates that a different intersection control device will be implemented at 47th Ave in an effort to provide safe, efficient, and environmentally-friendly mobility along Osseo Rd.

The existing lighting along the corridor is outdated and needs replacement. The specific type and location of lighting elements will be consistent with guidelines included in Access Minneapolis as recommended by the Minneapolis Street Lighting Plan (Attachment 10).

Yes

This project will offer significant improvements in areas outside the curb lines. Various sidewalk gaps exist along the west side of the roadway that will be filled. Streetscaping will be key to transitioning roadway elements to private residences that currently converge and lack neighborhood character.

Response:

The proposed project will provide a balance in mobility and access to ensure commercial vehicle traffic and local businesses are not negatively impacted by improvements.

## Measure A: Congestion Reduction/Air Quality

| Total Peak |  |  |  | EXPLANATIO |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Peak | Total Peak |  |  | N of |  |
| Hour Delay | Hour Delay | Hour Delay |  |  | methodology |  |
| Per Vehicle | Per Vehicle | Per Vehicle | Volume |  | used to |  |
| Without The | With The | Reduced by | (Vehicles per | Hour Delay | calculate | Synchro or |
| Project | Project | Project | hour) | Reduced by | railroad | HCM Reports |
| (Seconds/Ve icle) | (Seconds/Veh | (Seconds/Veh |  | ject | crossing |  |
|  | icle) | icle) |  |  | delay, if |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | applicable. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 15309165715 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 77_CSAH 152 |
| 31.0 | 24.0 | 7.0 | 1936 | 13552.0 | at 49th Ave | - CP 1741 - |
|  |  |  | 1 | 13552.0 | at 49 Ave | MOE Report - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | At 49th |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Ave.pdf |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 15309165366 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 55_CSAH 152 |
| 2.0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | - CP 1741 - |
|  | 0 | 2.0 | 1560 | 3120.0 | at 47th Ave | MOE Report - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | At 47th |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Ave.pdf |



## Vehicle Delay Reduced

Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced
30744.0

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
1.31

1530917094327_CSAH 152 - CP 1741 - MOE Report Combined.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):

## 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):

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

Cruise speed in miles per hour without the project:
Vehicle miles traveled without the project:
Total delay in hours without the project:
Total stops in vehicles per hour without the project:
Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project:
Vehicle miles traveled with the project:
Total delay in hours with the project:
Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project:
Fuel consumption in gallons (F1)
Fuel consumption in gallons (F2)
Fuel consumption in gallons (F3)
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):

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

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

The following are CMF's from the CMF
Clearinghouse (Attachment 11):

XX - Improvement (CMF ID, \% reduction)

1) Upgrade existing pavement markings to ground-in, wet-reflective pavement markings - All Crashes (8109, 18\%)
2) Resurface pavement - All Crashes (9298, 9.9\%)

Crash Modification Factor Used:
03) Remove unwarranted signal - All Crashes (332, 42\%)
04) Improve left-turn lane offset to create positive offset - Rear End Crashes (6098, 32\%)
05) Increase intersection illuminance - Nighttime Crashes (8320, 53\%)
06) Convert signalized intersection to single-lane roundabout - All Crashes (9296, 48\%)

Rationale for Crash Modification Selected:
(Limit 1400 Characters; approximately 200 words)
Project Benefit (\$) from B/C Ratio

Worksheet Attachment

The Benefit/Cost Analysis evaluated the project corridor in eight separate sections (comprised of major intersections and segments) in an effort to target crashes themes. Up to two (of the six identified) CMFs were applied to each crash based on the reported crash type along with the anticipated benefit provided by each safety countermeasure. A maximum of two CMFs were applied to each individual segment or intersection since the project corridor experiences diverse crash types (vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian related).

The expected service life for each improvement ranged from 10 years to 20 years, therefore, staff assumed an average value to enter into the Benefit/Cost Worksheets. If a service life value was not stated within the guidelines of the 2018 Highway Safety Improvement Program Criteria, then staff identified an expected service life value based on information provided in the 2015 MnDOT Traffic Engineering Manual.

The overall average crash reduction expected from the project is $28 \%$ (Based on a Crash Modification Factor of $72 \%$ ). Approximately $28 \%$ (14) of the total number of reported crashes from the years 20132015 (51) will be reduced by the implementation of various safety countermeasures as part of this project. A detailed listing of crashes considered in this analysis are included in Attachment 12.
\$5,013,743.00
1531348828796_CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project - BC Analysis Worksheets.pdf

Please upload attachment in PDF form.

Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements:
Current AADT volume: ..... 0
Average daily trains: ..... 0
Crash Risk Exposure eliminated: ..... 0

Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

The CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project will transform the corridor into one that benefits all users by reallocating space within the existing cross section.

Improvements to All Users

This project will introduce traffic calming elements (such as raised medians and curb extensions) and create more space for a dedicated bikeway along a RBTN Tier 1 Alignment.

## Pedestrian Improvements

This project will include full replacement of sidewalks and pedestrian ramps, and installation of countdown timers and accessible pedestrian signals to improve navigation for people who walk, especially those with limited mobility. Various sidewalk gaps exist along the west side of the roadway that will be filled as part of the project. Additionally, the project will provide a consistent boulevard that includes various streetscaping elements (such as lighting, trees, and amenities) to improve the user experience.

## Bicycle Improvements

This project will improve the existing bicycle network, as identified in both the city and county's bicycle transportation plans (Attachments 13 and 14). Osseo Rd offers bikeway connections to the Grand Rounds Trail, 45th Ave, and 49th Ave. Additionally, the City of Brooklyn Center and Hennepin County have programmed capital projects for the sections of CSAH 152 (44th
Ave/Webber Pkwy/Brooklyn Blvd) on either end of this project. Both these programmed capital
projects will include bicycle accommodations that will connect to this project once constructed.
Residents in Brooklyn Center and Robbinsdale will have an additional direct connection to the Grand Rounds Trail and other RBTN Tier 1 corridors.

Transit Improvements

There are currently four Metro Transit bus routes that utilize CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) on a daily basis. Additionally, the planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) C-Line and D-Line routes will offer enhanced services along CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd). Although no BRT stations are planned along this project, adequate traffic operations and non-motorized facilities (sidewalks, bike lanes, and ADA accommodations) will be provided as part of this project to ensure strong transit usage. Furthermore, Metro Transit has identified 47th Ave as a potential future location of a BRT stop as part of the C-Line or D-Line routes (Attachment 15). Staff will ensure that the proposed intersection design at Osseo Rd/47th Ave can accommodate a future BRT stop.

# 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 (30 Percent of Points)

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

## Attach Layout

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

50\%
Attach Layout
Please upload attachment in PDF form.
Layout has not been started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
07/09/2018
2)Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (20 Percent of Points)

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

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

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 (30 Percent of Points)

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

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

50\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified

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

0\%
4)Railroad Involvement (20 Percent of Points)
No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way
agreement is executed (include signature page, if applicable) Yes
$100 \%$

Signature Page
Please upload attachment in PDF form.
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

50\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.

0\%
Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | $\$ 7,650,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | $\$ 7,650,000.00$ |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria |  |
| Cost Effectiveness | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attachment 00 - List of Attachments.pdf | List of Attachments | 47 KB |
| Attachment 01 - Project Narrative.pdf | Project Narrative | 793 KB |
| Attachment 02 - Project Location Map.pdf | Project Location Map | 198 KB |
| Attachment 03 - Existing Roadway Deficiencies.pdf | Existing Roadway Deficiencies | 825 KB |
| Attachment 04 - Proposed Typical Section.pdf | Proposed Typical Section | 790 KB |
| Attachment 05 - Proposed Concept.pdf | Proposed Concept | 1.3 MB |
| Attachment 06 - Hennepin County 20182022 Transportation Capital Improvement Program.pdf | Hennepin County 2018-2022 Transportation CIP | 1.2 MB |
| Attachment 07 - Hennepin County Board Resolution-2018 Regional Solicitation.pdf | Hennepin County Board Resolution 2018 Regional Solicitation | 1.2 MB |
| Attachment 08 - MnDOT 50 Series Map.pdf | MnDOT 50 Series Map | 1.9 MB |
| Attachment 09 - Webber44 Public Engagement Plan.pdf | Webber44 Public Engagement Plan | 676 KB |
| Attachment 10 - Minneapolis Street Lighting Plan.pdf | Minneapolis Street Lighting Plan | 740 KB |
| Attachment 11-Crash Modification Factors.pdf | Crash Modification Factors | 1.1 MB |
| Attachment 12-Crash Detail Listing (2013-2015).pdf | Crash Detail Listing | 687 KB |
| Attachment 13 - Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan.pdf | Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan | 1.1 MB |
| Attachment 14-2040 Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan.pdf | 2040 Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan | 1.2 MB |
| Attachment 15 - Metro Transit Draft Osseo and Victory Area Station Plan.pdf | Metro Transit Draft Osseo and Victory Area Station Plan | 1.3 MB |
| Attachment 16 - Support Letter from City of Minneapolis.pdf | City of Minneapolis Letter of Support | 942 KB |



Level of Congestion - Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project: CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project | Map ID: 1527856748908


## Regional Economy

Results

WITHIN ONE MI of project:
Postsecondary Students: 0
Totals by City:
Brooklyn Center
Population: 6438
Employment: 2460
Mfg and Dist Employment: 541
Crystal
Population: 2362
Employment: 150
Mfg and Dist Employment: 74
Minneapolis
Population: 15106
Employment: 2097
Mfg and Dist Employment: 405

## Robbinsdale

Population: 4226
Employment: 1005
Mfg and Dist Employment: 12
Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project: CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project | Map ID: $152785 \$ 748$


Project Points $\square$ Manfacturing/Distribution Centers
Project $\square$ Job Concentration Centers

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


## Socio-Economic Conditions

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project: CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project | Map ID: 1527856748908

Project census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: (0 to 18 Points)


Project Points
Project

## Area of Concentrated Poverty

$\square$ Above reg'l avg conc of race/poverty

Area of Concentrated Povertry >50\% residents of color
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit

| Existing Conditions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SRF 11099 HC RS - Osseo Rd Existing PM |  | 06/20/2018 |
| 3: Osseo Rd/Brooklyn Blvd \& 49th Ave |  |  |
| Direction | All |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1937 |  |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 31 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.44 |  |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.67 |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.80 |  |
| Proposed Conditions |  |  |
| 3: Osseo Rd/Brooklyn Blvd \& 49th Ave |  |  |
| Direction | All |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1936 |  |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 24 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.10 |  |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.60 |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.72 |  |


|  | $4$ | $\rightarrow$ | 1 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | NBTL | EBTL | SBTL | WBTL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 25 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 35.7\% | 32.1\% | 32.1\% | 32.1\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |  |  |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 47.5 | 25 | 47.5 |
| End Time (s) | 25 | 0 | 47.5 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 20.5 | 65.5 | 43 | 65.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 20.5 | 65.5 | 43 | 65.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 47.5 | 25 | 47.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 20.5 | 65.5 | 43 | 65.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 20.5 | 65.5 | 43 | 65.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length | 70 |  |  |  |
| Control Type | Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle |  |  | 65 |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Osseo Rd/Brooklyn Blvd \& 49th Ave



Splits and Phases: 3: Osseo Rd/Brooklyn Blvd \& 49th Ave


6: Osseo Rd \& 47th Ave

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 1560 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 2 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.43 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.28 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.33 |


| Proposed Conditions |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Osseo Upgraded PM |  |
| 6: Osseo Rd \& 47th Ave |  |
| Direction | All |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1560 |
| Total Delay /veh (s/v) | 0 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.16 |
| NOx Emissions kg ) | 0.23 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.27 |

## Signal Removal Candidate

|  |  | $\dagger$ | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | NBT | SBTL | WBL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 42.5 | 42.5 | 22.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 65.4\% | 65.4\% | 34.6\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 0 | 42.5 |
| End Time (s) | 42.5 | 42.5 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 38 | 38 | 60.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 38 | 38 | 49.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 0 | 42.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 38 | 38 | 60.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 38 | 38 | 49.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length |  |  | 65 |
| Control Type | Actuat | d-Uncoor | dinated |
| Natural Cycle |  |  | 65 |

Splits and Phases: 6: Osseo Rd \& 47th Ave


Staff is proposing to remove the signal at 47th Ave (pending further evaluation and local approval), therefore, there are no proposed signal timing plans.

| Existing Conditions |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| SRF 11099 HC RS - Osseo Rd |  |  |
| Existing PM |  |  |
| 8: Victory Memorial Pkwy \& Osseo Rd |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Direction | All |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1759 |  |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 21 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 2.15 |  |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.42 |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.50 |  |


| Proposed Conditions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Osseo |  |
| Proposed PM |  |
| 8: Victory Memorial Pkwy |  |
| Direction | All |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1759 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 13 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.85 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.36 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.43 |


|  |  | $\rightarrow$ | * | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | NBTL | EBTL | SBTL | WBTL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| Maximum Split (s) | 31 | 29 | 31 | 29 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 51.7\% | 48.3\% | 51.7\% | 48.3\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 |
| End Time (s) | 31 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 26.5 | 55.5 | 26.5 | 55.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 15.5 | 44.5 | 15.5 | 44.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 |
| Local Yield (s) | 26.5 | 55.5 | 26.5 | 55.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 15.5 | 44.5 | 15.5 | 44.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length |  |  | 60 |  |
| Control Type P |  |  | retimed |  |
| Natural Cycle |  |  | 50 |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 8: Victory Memorial Pkwy \& Osseo Rd


|  |  | $\rightarrow$ | * | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | NBTL | EBTL | SBTL | WBTL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| Maximum Split (s) | 37 | 23 | 37 | 23 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 61.7\% | 38.3\% | 61.7\% | 38.3\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| End Time (s) | 37 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 32.5 | 55.5 | 32.5 | 55.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 21.5 | 44.5 | 21.5 | 44.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| Local Yield (s) | 32.5 | 55.5 | 32.5 | 55.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 21.5 | 44.5 | 21.5 | 44.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length |  |  | 60 |  |
| Control Type P |  |  | retimed |  |
| Natural Cycle |  |  | 55 |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 8: Victory Memorial Pkwy


| Existing Conditions |  | $06 / 20 / 2018$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| SRF 11099 HC RS - Osseo Rd |  |  |
| Existing PM |  |  |
| 9: Penn Ave \& Osseo Rd | All |  |
| Direction | 1313 | 13 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1.13 |  |
| Total Delay /Veh (s/v) | 0.22 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.26 |  |
| NOx Emisisions (kg) |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) |  |  |


| Proposed Conditions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Osseo |  |
| Upgraded PM |  |
| 9: Penn Ave \& Oseeo Rd |  |
| Direction | All |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1313 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 13 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.12 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.22 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.26 |



| Cycle Length | 60 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Type | Pretimed |
| Natural Cycle | 50 |

Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBL and 6:EBT, Start of Green
Splits and Phases: 9: Penn Ave \& Osseo Rd



| Cycle Length | 60 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Type | Pretimed |
| Natural Cycle | 45 |

Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBL and $6: E B T$, Start of Green
Splits and Phases: 9: Penn Ave \& Oseeo Rd


| Existing Conditions |  | $06 / 20 / 2018$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| SRF 11099 HC RS - Osseo Rd |  |  |
| Existing PM |  |  |
| 9: Penn Ave \& Osseo Rd | All |  |
| Direction | 1313 | 13 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1.13 |  |
| Total Delay /Veh (s/v) | 0.22 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.26 |  |
| NOx Emisisions (kg) |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) |  |  |


| Proposed Conditions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Osseo |  |
| Upgraded PM |  |
| 9: Penn Ave \& Oseeo Rd |  |
| Direction | All |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1313 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 13 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.12 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.22 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.26 |


| Existing Conditions |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| SRF 11099 HC RS - Osseo Rd |  |  |
| Existing PM |  |  |
| 8: Victory Memorial Pkwy \& Osseo Rd |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Direction | All |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1759 |  |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 21 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 2.15 |  |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.42 |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.50 |  |


| Proposed Conditions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Osseo |  |
| Proposed PM |  |
| 8: Victory Memorial Pkwy |  |
| Direction | All |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1759 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 13 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.85 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.36 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.43 |

6: Osseo Rd \& 47th Ave

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume $(\mathrm{vph})$ | 1560 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 2 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 1.43 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.28 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.33 |


| Proposed Conditions |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Osseo Upgraded PM |  |
| 6: Osseo Rd \& 47th Ave |  |
| Direction | All |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1560 |
| Total Delay /veh (s/v) | 0 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.16 |
| NOx Emissions kg ) | 0.23 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.27 |

## Signal Removal Candidate

| Existing Conditions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SRF 11099 HC RS - Osseo Rd Existing PM |  | 06/20/2018 |
| 3: Osseo Rd/Brooklyn Blvd \& 49th Ave |  |  |
| Direction | All |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1937 |  |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 31 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.44 |  |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.67 |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.80 |  |
| Proposed Conditions |  |  |
| 3: Osseo Rd/Brooklyn Blvd \& 49th Ave |  |  |
| Direction | All |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1936 |  |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 24 |  |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.10 |  |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.60 |  |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.72 |  |



| Cycle Length | 60 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Type | Pretimed |
| Natural Cycle | 50 |

Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBL and 6:EBT, Start of Green
Splits and Phases: 9: Penn Ave \& Osseo Rd


|  |  | $\rightarrow$ | * | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | NBTL | EBTL | SBTL | WBTL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| Maximum Split (s) | 31 | 29 | 31 | 29 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 51.7\% | 48.3\% | 51.7\% | 48.3\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 |
| End Time (s) | 31 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 26.5 | 55.5 | 26.5 | 55.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 15.5 | 44.5 | 15.5 | 44.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 |
| Local Yield (s) | 26.5 | 55.5 | 26.5 | 55.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 15.5 | 44.5 | 15.5 | 44.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length |  |  | 60 |  |
| Control Type P |  |  | retimed |  |
| Natural Cycle |  |  | 50 |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 8: Victory Memorial Pkwy \& Osseo Rd


|  |  | $\dagger$ | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | NBT | SBTL | WBL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 42.5 | 42.5 | 22.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 65.4\% | 65.4\% | 34.6\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 0 | 42.5 |
| End Time (s) | 42.5 | 42.5 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 38 | 38 | 60.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 38 | 38 | 49.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 0 | 42.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 38 | 38 | 60.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 38 | 38 | 49.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length |  |  | 65 |
| Control Type | Actuat | d-Uncoor | dinated |
| Natural Cycle |  |  | 65 |

Splits and Phases: 6: Osseo Rd \& 47th Ave


|  | $4$ | $\rightarrow$ | 1 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | NBTL | EBTL | SBTL | WBTL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 25 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 35.7\% | 32.1\% | 32.1\% | 32.1\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |  |  |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 47.5 | 25 | 47.5 |
| End Time (s) | 25 | 0 | 47.5 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 20.5 | 65.5 | 43 | 65.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 20.5 | 65.5 | 43 | 65.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 47.5 | 25 | 47.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 20.5 | 65.5 | 43 | 65.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 20.5 | 65.5 | 43 | 65.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length | 70 |  |  |  |
| Control Type | Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle |  |  | 65 |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Osseo Rd/Brooklyn Blvd \& 49th Ave



| Cycle Length | 60 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Type | Pretimed |
| Natural Cycle | 45 |

Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBL and $6: E B T$, Start of Green
Splits and Phases: 9: Penn Ave \& Oseeo Rd


|  |  | $\rightarrow$ | * | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | NBTL | EBTL | SBTL | WBTL |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| Maximum Split (s) | 37 | 23 | 37 | 23 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 61.7\% | 38.3\% | 61.7\% | 38.3\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 0 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| End Time (s) | 37 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 32.5 | 55.5 | 32.5 | 55.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 21.5 | 44.5 | 21.5 | 44.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 0 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| Local Yield (s) | 32.5 | 55.5 | 32.5 | 55.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 21.5 | 44.5 | 21.5 | 44.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length |  |  | 60 |  |
| Control Type P |  |  | retimed |  |
| Natural Cycle |  |  | 55 |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 8: Victory Memorial Pkwy


Staff is proposing to remove the signal at 47th Ave (pending further evaluation and local approval), therefore, there are no proposed signal timing plans.


Splits and Phases: 3: Osseo Rd/Brooklyn Blvd \& 49th Ave










# CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project 

## List of Attachments

1. Project Narrative
2. Project Location Map
3. Existing Roadway Deficiencies
4. Proposed Typical Section
5. Proposed Concept
6. Hennepin County 2018-2022 Transportation Capital Improvement Program
7. Hennepin County Board Resolution - 2018 Regional Solicitation
8. MnDOT 50 Series Map
9. Webber44 Public Engagement Plan
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11. Crash Modification Factors
12. Crash Detail Listing (2013-2015)
13. Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan
14. 2040 Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan
15. Draft Metro Transit Osseo and Victory Area Station Plan
16. City of Minneapolis Support Letter

## 2018 REGIONAL SOLICITATION <br> HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA

Project Location


## Existing Conditions



|  | Project Overview |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Name: | CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project |
| Roadway: | CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) |
| Project Termini: | From CSAH 2 (Penn Ave) to 49th Ave |
| Project Location: | City of Minneapolis |

## Solicitation Information

| Applicant: | Hennepin County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Funding Requested: | $\$ 6,120,000$ |
| Total Project Cost: | $\$ 7,650,000$ |

## Project Information

The proposed project will reconstruct CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) to extend its service life. Improvements will include (but are not limited to): new pavement, sidewalk, bikeway, streetscaping, curb, drainage structures, and traffic signals. The project includes numerous safety improvements, including the upgrading of traffic signal systems to include mast arms and dedicated left-turn phasing, enhancing of pedestrian crossings to minimize exposure to vehicles, and filling of sidewalk gaps to provide continuous off-street pedestrian facilities.

## Project Benefits

The existing CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) roadway has reached the end of its useful life and warrants a full reconstruction. Routine maintenance activities (such as a pavement overlay) are no longer effective in preserving critical roadway assets. Previous overlays extended over the existing gutter, reducing the benefits provided by the curb in terms of drainage and safety.

Additionally, various defects (cracking, discontinuities, and settlement) and obstructions (utility poles, signs, and signal equipment) are present within the sidewalk. This project will address these issues and improve mobility and accessibility for pedestrians.

## 2018 Regional Solicitation | Project Location Map

## CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project



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

Attachment 3 - Existing Roadway Deficiencies


## CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project




Hennepin County Improvements
CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) from 49th Avenue to Penn Avenue
Figure 1
Minneapolis, MN


Hennepin County Improvements
CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) from 49th Avenue to Penn Avenue
Figure 2
Minneapolis, MN


Hennepin County Improvements
CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) from 49th Avenue to Penn Avenue
Figure 3
Minneapolis, MN

## Attachment 5 - Proposed Concept

## CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) Reconstruction Project - Impacted Properties

Parcels with High Impact:

- $220644^{\text {th }}$ Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412 - Corner of building is over R/W line. Potential to minimize impacts by moving the proposed walk to the back of curb.
- 4410 Queen Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412 - House, steps, and retaining wall is over R/W line. Potential to minimize impacts by moving the proposed walk to the back of curb.
- 4530 Thomas Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412 - Corner of garage is over R/W line. Potential to minimize impacts by moving the proposed walk to the back of curb.

Parcels with Low Impact:

- $221044^{\text {th }}$ Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412 - Potential permanent R/W. Potential issues with driveway tie-in (garage near property line). Potential to minimize impacts by moving the proposed walk to the back of curb.
- 4421 Osseo Rd Minneapolis, MN 55412 - Potential permanent R/W. Retaining wall impacts (appears that retaining wall is within existing right of way). Potential to minimize impacts by moving the proposed walk to the back of curb.


## Attachment 6-2018-2022 Hennepin County Transportation Capital Improvement Program



Attachment 6-2018-2022 Hennepin County Transportation Capital Improvement Program

| Project Name: 2174100 CSAH 152 <br> Major Program: Public Works <br> Department: Transportation Road | 2174100 CSAH 152 - Reconst Osseo Rd fr CSAH 2 (Penn Ave) to 49th Ave <br> Public Works <br> Transportation Roads \& Bridges |  |  | Funding Start: 2022 <br> Funding Completion: Beyond 2022 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Year's CIP Process Summary | Budget to Date | 2018 Budget | 2019 Estimate | 2020 Estimate | 2021 Estimate | 2022 Estimate | Beyond 2022 | Total |
| Department Requested | - | - | - | - |  | 1,229,000 | 8,192,000 | 9,421,000 |
| Administrator Proposed | - | - | - | - |  | 1,229,000 | 8,192,000 | 9,421,000 |
| CBTF Recommended |  |  | - | - |  | 1,229,000 | 8,192,000 | 9,421,000 |
| Board Approved Final | - | - | - | - |  | 1,229,000 | 8,192,000 | 9,421,000 |
| Scheduling Milestones (major phases  <br> Scoping: 2018-2020 <br> Design: TBD <br> Procurement: TBD <br> Construction: TBD <br> Completion: TBD |  |  | Board Resolutions / Supplemental Information: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project's Effect on Annual Operating B Additional planning and design work is requir annual operating costs are anticipated by this <br> Annual Impact for Requesting Department: Annual Impact for all other Depts: Total | get: <br> o determine impa ject. $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underline{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | department staf |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Changes from Prior CIP: <br> This is a new project request for the 2018-2022 Capital Improvement Program. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Last Year's CIP Process Summary | Budget to Date | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Beyond | Total |
| Department Requested | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Administrator Proposed | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| CBTF Recommended | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Board Approved Final | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Attachment 7 - Hennepin County Board Resolution - 2018 Regional Solicitation


## Hennepin County, Board of Commissioners RESOLUTION 18-0258

2018

The following resolution was moved by Commissioner Mike Opat and seconded by Commissioner Debbie Goettel:
WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Council has given notice that funding through the Regional Solicitation is available; and WHEREAS, a board resolution must be submitted with the application for Regional Solicitation funding;

BE IT RESOLVED, that Hennepin County be authorized to apply for funding grants through the Regional Solicitation and recognize its role as the public agency sponsor for the following projects (separated by category), if funding is awarded:

## Roadway reconstruction/modernization

- Programmed in 2018-2022 CIP

1. County State Aid Highway 5 (CSAH 5) (Minnetonka Boulevard) from Trunk Highway 100 to France Avenue in Saint Louis Park - CP 2168100
2. CSAH 152 (Osseo Rd) from CSAH 2 (Penn Avenue) to 49th Avenue in Minneapolis - CP 2174100
3. CSAH 153 (Lowry Avenue) from Washington Street NE to Johnson Street NE in Minneapolis - CP 1001648 \& 2140900

- Project Not Programmed in 2018-2022 CIP

4. CSAH 23 (Marshall St NE) from 16th Avenue NE to 27th Avenue NE in Minneapolis - CP 2984500

## Roadway expansion

- Programmed in 2018-2022 CIP

5. CSAH 109 (85th Avenue) at TH 252 in Brooklyn Park - CP 2167700

## Bridges

- Programmed in 2018-2022 CIP

6. CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive) Bridge \#27592 over Tanager Channel in Orono - CP 2163400

- Projects Not Programmed in 2018-2022 CIP

7. CSAH 152 (Washington Avenue) Bridge \#91333 at Bassett Creek in Minneapolis - CP 2176400
8. CSAH 158 (Vernon Avenue) Bridge \#4510 over CP Rail in Edina - CP 2176600

## Multi-use trails and bicycle facilities

- Programmed in 2018-2022 CIP

9. Midtown Greenway ramp access between Garfield Avenue and Harriet Avenue in Minneapolis - CP 0031547
10. CSAH 10 (Bass Lake Road) from CSAH 8 (West Broadway Avenue) to Xenia Avenue in Crystal - CP 2172800
11. CSAH 52 (Hennepin Avenue/First Avenue) from CSAH 23 (Main Street NE) to Eighth Street SE in Minneapolis - CP 2182100
12. CSAH 36 (University Avenue)/CSAH 37 (Fourth Street) from I-35W to Oak Street SE in Minneapolis - CP 2167301 13. CSAH 81 (Bottineau Boulevard) from CSAH 109 (85th Avenue) to First Avenue NW in Brooklyn Park and Osseo - CP 2182200

## Pedestrian facilities

Attachment 7 - Hennepin County Board Resolution - 2018 Regional Solicitation

- Programmed in 2018-2022 CIP

14. Americans with Disabilities Act retrofits at various locations to complement bus rapid transit and light rail transit services - CP 2999965
The question was on the adoption of the resolution and there were $\underline{7}$ YEAS and $\underline{0}$ NAYS, as follows:



## Attachment 9 - Webber 44 Community Engagement Plan Webber 44 Community Engagement

## Purpose

Hennepin County is planning for the reconstruction of CSAH 152 (portions of Osseo Road, 44th Street, Webber Parkway, and Lyndale Avenue). Tentatively named Webber 44, the project seeks to engage and gather input from all within the community through an inclusive and accessible process. This dialogue between the community and the project team will deliver a successful project with a community-focused solution.

## Messaging

The key overall messages to the public include that this project:

- Benefits the community through the development of a multimodal corridor serving pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and drivers
- Addresses existing issues with safety, aesthetics, and substandard conditions, with safe, attractive, and functional new design
- Accommodates the new D Line bus rapid project, bringing a high quality service for local transit riders
- Complements existing local parks, institutions, and businesses, and sets the stage for more positive change
- Builds upon an inclusive community process that listens and responds to everyone


## Community groups and stakeholders

 Local residents, employers, business associations, neighborhood associations (particularly Webber Camden and Victory), property and business owners, transit riders, local students and youth, City of Minneapolis, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Metro Transit, Minneapolis Public Schools and others
## Online and in-person engagement



Text and email surveys

Project video

Input ID

Digital and social
media campaign

Pop-up engagement and tactical urbanism


Partnership and agency coordination

Open houses

Community stakeholder/youth outreach


## Goals

Respect and listen to public questions and concerns

Relay information to the public in a timely, clear, and effective manner

Maintain and strengthen the relationship between Hennepin County and project stakeholders

Coordinate outreach and engagement across multiple projects impacting the area


## Attachment 11 - Crash Modification Factors

CRASH MODIFICATION FACTORS CLEARINGHOUSE

## CMF / CRF Details

## CMF ID: 332

## Remove unwarranted signal (one-lane, one-way streets, excluding major arterials)

## Description:

Prior Condition: No Prior Condition(s)

## Category: Intersection traffic control

Study: Crash Reductions Related to Traffic Signal Removal in Philadelphia, Persaud et al., 1997

| Star Quality Rating: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.76 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: | 0.09 |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.07 |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 24 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: | 9 |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 7 |
|  | Applicability |
| Crash Type: | All |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Not specified |

## Attachment 11 - Crash Modification Factors

CRASH MODIFICATION FACTORS CLEARINGHOUSE

## CMF / CRF Details

## CMF ID: 6098

## Improve left-turn lane offset to create positive offset

Description: Improve left-turn lane offset to make the left-turn lanes with positive offset
Prior Condition: Left-turn lanes with negative offset

## Category: Intersection geometry

Study: Safety Evaluation of Offset Improvements for Left-Turn Lanes, Persaud et al., 2009
Image: View the countermeasure image.

| Star Quality Rating: | menter [View score details] |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.683 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.109 |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 31.7 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 10.9 |
|  | Applicability |
| Crash Type: | Rear end |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Not specified |

## Attachment 11 - Crash Modification Factors

## CMF / CRF Details

## CMF ID: 8109

## Upgrade existing markings to wet-reflective pavement markings

Description: This strategy involves upgrading existing markings from standard marking materials to wet-reflective markings applied as paint, tape, or thermoplastic material.

Prior Condition: Standard pavement markings
Category: Delineation
Study: Safety Evaluation of Wet Reflective Pavement Markers, Lyon et al., 2015

Star Quality Rating: tinkirir [View score details]

|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| ---: | :--- |
| Value: | 0.825 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.051 |
| Value: | 17.5 |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |  |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 5.1 |

## Applicability

## Crash Type: All

Crash Severity: All
Roadway Types: Not specified

Number of Lanes: multilane

Road Division Type:

Speed Limit:

Area Type:

Attachment 11 - Crash Modification Factors

CRASH MODIFICATION FACTORS CLEARINGHOUSE

## CMF / CRF Details

CMF ID: 8320

## increase intersection illuminance from low ( $<0.2 \mathrm{fc}$ ) to medium ( $\geq 0.2 \mathrm{fc}$ and $<1.1 \mathrm{fc}$ ) <br> Description: Increase intersection illuminance 13 from low ( $<\mathbf{0 . 2} \mathbf{f c}$ ) to medium ( $\geq \mathbf{0 . 2} \mathbf{f c}$ and $<\mathbf{1 . 1} \mathbf{f c}$ ) <br> Prior Condition: Signalized intersections with lower illuminance (<0.2 fc) <br> Category: Highway lighting <br> Study: Safety Effects of Street I/luminance at Urban Signalized Intersections in Florida, Wei et al., 2016

| Star Quality Rating: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.47 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: |  |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 53 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: |  |
|  | Applicability |
| Crash Type: | Nighttime |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: |  |
| Area Type: | Urban |

## Attachment 11 - Crash Modification Factors

## CMF / CRF Details

CMF ID: 9296

## Conversion of intersection into single-lane roundabout

Description: Conversion of intersection into single-lane roundabout
Prior Condition: signalized, stop-controlled, yield-controlled and non-controlled intersections

## Category: Intersection geometry

Study: Safe roundabouts for cyclists, Jensen, S. U., 2017

| Star Quality Rating: | bivere [View score details] |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.52 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.046 |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |
| Value: | 48 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 4.6 |
|  | Applicability |
| Crash Type: | All |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Number of Lanes: |  |
| Road Division Type: | All |
| Speed Limit: | $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Area Type: | All |
| Traffic Volume: |  |

## Attachment 11 - Crash Modification Factors

## CMF / CRF Details

CMF ID: 9298

## Resurface pavement

## Description:

Prior Condition: No Prior Condition(s)

## Category: Roadway

Study: Time series trends of the safety effects of pavement resurfacing, Park et al., 2017

| Star Quality Rating: | mincor [View score details] |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |  |
| Value: | 0.901 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.05 |
| Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) |  |
| Value: | 9.9 (This value indicates a decrease in crashes) |
| Adjusted Standard Error: |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 5 |
| Applicability |  |
| Crash Type: | All |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Principal Arterial Other |
| Number of Lanes: | 1-4 |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Speed Limit: | 25 mph to 65 mph |
| Area Type: | Urban |
| Traffic Volume: | Minimum of 2100 to Maximum of 40500 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) |


| RD NO | MILE PT | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { LEFT } \\ \text { DIST } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { RIGHT } \\ \text { DIST } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | INTER TYPE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { YR } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH <br> MONT H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { DAY } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH HOUR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH D } \\ & \text { O WK } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH NO | MUN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CITY } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAX } \\ & \text { SEV } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { DIAG } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH <br> TYPE | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { NO } \\ \text { VEH } \end{array}$ |  | CRSH <br> PRI <br> WEATH <br> ER | RD SUR | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { CRSH } \\ \text { WKZO } \\ \text { TYPE } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection - CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) at 49th Ave N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2013 | 8 | 13 | 19 | 3 | 132250171 | 2 | 460 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2014 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 5 | 140380371 | 2 | 460 | C | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2015 | 1 | 22 | 10 | 5 | 150220101 | 2 | 460 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2015 | 4 | 28 | 18 | 3 | 151190014 | 2 | 460 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2015 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 152750091 | 2 | 460 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2014 | 2 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 140430146 | 2 | 460 | N | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2015 | 4 | 26 | 17 | 1 | 151160143 | 2 | 460 | N | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2015 | 7 | 29 | 15 | 4 | 152370061 | 2 | 460 | N | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2013 | 6 | 28 | 16 | 6 | 131810013 | 2 | 460 | N | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2013 | 6 | 25 | 16 | 3 | 131760211 | 2 | 460 | N | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2013 | 12 | 20 | 21 | 6 | 133570008 | 2 | 460 | K | 90 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 98 |

## Segment - CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) - 49th Ave N - 47th Ave

| 152 | 5.67 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 2013 | 9 | 19 | 10 | 5 | 132620069 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 98 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152 | 5.53 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 2013 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 132930018 | 27 | 460 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

ntersection - CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) at 47th Ave N


Segment - CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) - 47th Ave/Memorial Parkway

| 152 | 5.89 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 2014 | 5 | 31 | 12 | 7 | 141510087 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 98 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152 | 5.81 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 2015 | 7 | 28 | 17 | 3 | 152100002 | 27 | 2585 | C | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 5.88 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 2013 | 10 | 26 | 10 | 7 | 133310036 | 27 | 2585 | N | 5 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |

Intersection - CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) at Memorial Parkway

| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 131260091 | 27 | 2585 | C | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 98 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| RD NO | MILE PT | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { LEFT } \\ \text { DIST } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { RIGHT } \\ \text { DIST } \end{array}$ | ROAD TYPE | INTER TYPE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { YR } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH <br> MONT <br> H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { DAY } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH HOUR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH D } \\ & \text { O WK } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH NO | MUN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CITY } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAX } \\ & \text { SEV } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { DIAG } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH <br> TYPE | NO VEH | CRSH <br> LIGHIN G | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { CRSH } \\ \text { PRI } \\ \text { WEATH } \\ \text { ER } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | RD SUR | CRSH <br> WKZO <br> TYPE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 6 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 131660035 | 27 | 2585 | C | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 12 | 10 | 18 | 3 | 140140139 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2014 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 2 | 141880076 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2014 | 8 | 24 | 15 | 1 | 142360071 | 27 | 2585 | C | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2014 | 11 | 17 | 21 | 2 | 143210278 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2014 | 11 | 17 | 14 | 2 | 150910049 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2015 | 4 | 4 | 21 | 7 | 150940109 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2015 | 9 | 20 | 10 | 1 | 152630070 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2015 | 10 | 17 | 21 | 7 | 152950134 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2015 | 12 | 30 | 17 | 4 | 153640184 | 27 | 2585 | C | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2014 | 1 | 23 | 8 | 5 | 140230096 | 27 | 2585 | B | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 8 | 30 | 16 | 6 | 132420177 | 27 | 2585 | N | 4 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 130040020 | 27 | 2585 | C | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 4 | 22 | 12 | 2 | 131120086 | 27 | 2585 | C | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 5 | 24 | 9 | 6 | 131440120 | 27 | 2585 | N | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 131560084 | 27 | 2585 | N | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 98 |
| 152 | 6.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2014 | 3 | 27 | 8 | 5 | 141190051 | 27 | 2585 | N | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 97 |
| 152 | 6.04 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2014 | 11 | 27 | 21 | 5 | 143310232 | 27 | 2585 | C | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 98 |
| Intersec | tion - CSA | AH 152 (O) | Osseo Ro | ad) at CSA | AH 9 (45th | th Ave N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 9.31 | 0 | 0.02 | 0 | 4 | 2015 | 4 | 18 | 19 | 7 | 151080130 | 27 | 2585 | C | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 9 | 9.31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2013 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 131240027 | 27 | 2585 | N | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 98 |
| 9 | 9.31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2014 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 140370062 | 27 | 2585 | B | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 98 |
| Segment - CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) - S of CSAH 9 (45th Ave N) to N of Penn Ave W Jct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 152 | 6.12 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 2013 | 1 | 22 | 9 | 3 | 130220063 | 27 | 2585 | C | 7 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |

Attachment 12 - Crash Detail Listing (2013-2015)

| RD NO | MILE PT | LEFT DIST | RIGHT DIST | ROAD TYPE | INTER TYPE | CRSH YR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { MONT } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { DAY } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH HOUR | CRSH D O WK | CRSH NO | MUN | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { CITY } \\ \text { CODE } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAX } \\ & \text { SEV } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { DIAG } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { NO } \\ \text { VEH } \end{array}$ | CRSH LIGHIN G | CRSH <br> PRI <br> WEATH <br> ER | RD SUR | CRSH <br> WKZO <br> TYPE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 2013-2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RD NO | MILE PT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LEFT } \\ & \text { DIST } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { RIGHT } \\ \text { DIST } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | INTER TYPE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { YR } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH <br> MONT <br> H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { DAY } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH HOUR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH D } \\ & \text { O WK } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH NO | MUN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CITY } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | MAX SEV | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { DIAG } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRSH } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO } \\ & \text { VEH } \end{aligned}$ | CRSH <br> LIGHIN G | CRSH <br> PRI <br> WEATH <br> ER | RD SUR | CRSH <br> WKZO <br> TYPE |
| Intersection - CSAH 152 (Osseo Road) at CSAH 2 (Penn Ave N) - Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0.02 | 0 | 26 | 2013 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 131590068 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 98 |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2014 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 3 | 141750111 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0.01 | 0 | 26 | 2015 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 7 | 151220067 | 27 | 2585 | C | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2015 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 1 | 151300054 | 27 | 2585 | N | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 98 |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0.02 | 0 | 26 | 2015 | 1 | 31 | 2 | 7 | 150310105 | 27 | 2585 | N | 4 | 38 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2015 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 7 | 153180095 | 27 | 2585 | B | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2014 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 141590029 | 27 | 2585 | N | 7 | 24 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2015 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 152550130 | 27 | 2585 | N | 7 | 25 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 90 |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0.01 | 0 | 26 | 2015 | 12 | 31 | 14 | 5 | 153650148 | 27 | 2585 | N | 9 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 98 |
| 2 | 4.52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2015 | 7 | 19 | 7 | 1 | 152000054 | 27 | 2585 | N | 90 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Figure 7.7 - Bikeways Master Plan



## Attachment 14-2040 Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan

Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan
Planned bikeway system - April 2015


## Appendix C: Draft Osseo \& Victory Area Station Plan Station Plan: Osseo \& Victory Area

The Osseo \& Victory Area station would serve the northern portions of the Victory neighborhood. The station would function as an access point on the C Line corridor to ensure adequate station distancing. Several station options are being considered and public input is requested to help inform a final station plan. The various station location options are focused around Victory Memorial Parkway. See Figure 1 for a summary of station location options. The Penn \& 43rd Avenue station location will be about 0.3 mile south of the parkway. Railroad tracks create a geographic barrier that will result in a longer distance from the parkway to the Brooklyn Boulevard Area station over 0.8 mile to the north.

Table 1: Station Plan Summary - Osseo \& Victory Area

| Osseo \& Victory |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Station <br> Characteristic | Planned Condition* |

[^0]
## Notes and Discussion

Several bus stops currently exist within the Osseo \& Victory area. Station locations currently under consideration include existing bus stop locations and sites not currently used by bus operations. A final station location alternative will include local service bus stop adjustments to maintain but not increase the number of stops in the area. Nearby bus stops would likely be relocated and/or consolidated with C Line operations.

Existing transit service in the area includes Route 5 for local service between Brooklyn Center and the Mall of America and Routes 721 and 724 for limited stop service between northern suburbs and downtown Minneapolis. Under C Line and future D Line operations, reduced Routes 19 and 5 local service would still be maintained in the area.

The intersection of Osseo Road and Victory Memorial Parkway is signalized. Dependent on a final station location, transit signal priority will be considered for implementation during the detailed design and engineering phase. Implementation is dependent upon a traffic analysis balancing acceptable traffic operations for all street users.

## Station Locations Under Consideration

Three station location alternatives are being considered for the Osseo \& Victory Area station, along with an alternative to omit a station at this location. See Figure 1 for platform location information. These alternatives are identified below.

## Alternative A: Southbound at Victory Memorial Drive (Platform location \#1) \& Northbound at 46th Avenue (\#3)

Alternative A would construct a southbound platform on the nearside of Victory Memorial Drive (\#1) and a northbound platform on the nearside of 46th Avenue (\#3). Both platform locations are within existing right-of-way and outside of parkland area. The location would serve ridership in the area that is concentrated around Victory Memorial Parkway. The northbound platform would be located adjacent to a vacant, publicly owned, triangular parcel bordered by 46th Avenue on the north and Sheridan Avenue on the east. The southbound platform would be located adjacent to a vacant, publicly owned parcel, bordered by a single-family residence. Given the surrounding residential area, a final station design would address site-specific issues to the extent possible. The station would ultimately be shared by planned service on the D Line (Chicago/Emerson-Fremont) corridor.

## Alternative B: Southbound at Victory Memorial Drive (\#1) \& Northbound at 45th Avenue (\#5)

Alternative B would construct a southbound platform on the nearside of Victory Memorial Drive (\#1) and a northbound platform on the nearside of 45th Avenue (\#5). Both platform locations are within existing right-of-way and outside of parkland area. The northbound platform would be located at an existing bus stop, adjacent to a vacant, publicly owned parcel, bordered by a single-
family residence. The southbound platform would be located adjacent to a vacant publicly owned parcel, also bordered by a single-family residence. The northbound platform would be located about 0.25 mile from the Penn \& 43rd Avenue station, the minimum distance within station spacing guidelines. Platforms are within residential areas, and a final station design would address sitespecific issues to the extent possible. The station would ultimately be shared by planned service on the D Line (Chicago/Emerson-Fremont) corridor.

## Alternative C: Southbound at Victory Memorial Parkway (\#2), Northbound at Victory Memorial Parkway (\#4)

Alternative C would construct a southbound and northbound platform on the nearside of Victory Memorial Parkway. The southbound platform would be located at an existing southbound bus stop (\#2); the northbound platform would relocate the 45th Avenue bus stop approximately 200 feet north (\#4). These platforms would be located within the parkway, requiring additional coordination and potential design mitigations to address any parkland impacts and develop related design adjustments. Close coordination with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board would be required to ultimately determine feasibility of this alternative. It is anticipated station improvements would be built on existing transportation right-of-way. As noted, a final station design would address site-specific issues to the extent possible.

## Alternative D: Do not build station

Alternative D would not construct a station in the Osseo \& Victory area. Under this alternative, the C Line and D Line would not stop in this area to pick up or drop off customers, reducing overall transit access long-term within the immediate area. Existing riders in the area would still have access to existing transit service on Routes 721 and 724, along with less frequent Route 19 and Route 5 service that would remain after C Line and D Line implementation.

## Station Locations with Fatal Flaws - No Longer Under Consideration

Other platform locations were analyzed for feasibility but deemed unsuitable for further consideration. See Figure 1 for platform location details. Additional information is provided below.

## Southbound Options

Platform location \#6 - Southbound Osseo at Upton: This southbound platform would be located at an existing bus stop location where Upton Avenue dead-ends at Osseo Road. While there is available right-of-way at this location, the potential ridership catchment area is severely limited by the railroad to the north. A station in this location would not serve the core of existing or future ridership in the neighborhood as well as a station further south.
\#7 - Southbound Osseo at Thomas: This southbound platform would be located on the farside of Thomas Avenue on Osseo Road. Limited right-of-way exists for BRT improvements and a mid-block location introduces unsafe pedestrian crossings. There are also no sidewalks connecting to this location from the north or south.
\#8 - Southbound Osseo at Sheridan: This southbound platform would be located at an existing bus stop across from where Sheridan Avenue meets Osseo Road. Limited right-of-way exists for BRT improvements and a mid-block location introduces unsafe pedestrian crossings. There are also no sidewalks connecting to this location from the north or south.

## Northbound Options

\#9 - Northbound Osseo near dog park: This northbound platform would be located on the farside of the existing driveway north of 47th Avenue. While there is available right-of-way at this location, the potential ridership catchment area is severely limited by the railroad to the north. A station in this location would not serve the core of existing or future ridership in the neighborhood as well as a station further south. The location would also introduce mid-block pedestrian movements to cross Osseo Road.
\#10 - Northbound Osseo at 47th (farside): This northbound platform would be located farside of 47th Avenue, south of the existing driveway. The approximately 50 ' length between the intersection and the driveway is too short to accommodate a BRT platform.
\#11 - Northbound Osseo at 47th (nearside): This northbound platform would be located at an existing bus stop location on the nearside of 47th Avenue. Available right-of-way does not exist at this location.
\#12 - Northbound Osseo at Thomas: This northbound platform would be located at an existing bus stop location on the nearside of Thomas Avenue. Available right-of-way does not exist at this location.
\#13 - Northbound Osseo at Russell: This northbound platform would be located on the farside of Russell Avenue at an existing bus stop location. Available right-of-way does not exist at this location

Figure 1: Osseo \& Victory Area Station Location Alternatives


Attachment 16 - Support Letter from City of Minneapolis<br>Support for Hennepin County<br>Regional Solicitation Applications

Dear Mrs. Stueve:

Hennepin County has requested letters of support for a series of grant applications across three funding categories as part of the Regional Solicitation process, by which the Metropolitan Council competitively allocates federal transportation funds. Due to the number of application submittal by Hennepin County in the Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization category, Minneapolis Public Works has submitted a prioritized list of support.

Minneapolis Public Works evaluated Hennepin County's requested letters of support for Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization projects to develop a priority list for which the City wishes to express its support. This evaluation included a review of completed plans, studies, and community engagement, as well as documented City priorities and funding capacity. Minneapolis Public Works supports the following list of projects, in priority order based on this evaluation and overall anticipated benefit for Minneapolis and Hennepin County residents, workers, businesses, freight operators, and visitors:

1. Lowry Avenue NE (CSAH 153) Reconstruction: Washington Street NE to Johnson Street NE
2. Marshall Street NE (CSAH 23) Reconstruction: 16th Avenue NE and 27th Avenue NE
3. Osseo Road (CSAH 152) Reconstruction: Penn Avenue $N(C S A H ~ 2) ~ t o ~ 49 t h ~ A v e n u e ~ N ~$

In addition to the letters of support requested for Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization projects, Hennepin County requested letters of support for three projects in the Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facilities category and one project in the Bridge Rehabilitation/ Replacement category. The City of Minneapolis hereby expresses its support, in no particular order, for the following two federal funding applications:

- University Avenue (CSAH 36) / 4th Avenue (CSAH 37) Protected Bikeway
- Basset Creek (Washington Avenue - CSAH 152) Bridge Replacement

Thank you for making us aware of this application effort and the opportunity to provide support. Minneapolis Public Works looks forward to working with you on these projects.

Sincerely,


Robin Hutcheson
Director of Public Works
City of Minneapolis


[^0]:    *Final conditions to be developed during the engineering/design process.

