Application

01967-2014 Roadway Expansion
02002 - CSAH 16 Reconstruction
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Status:
Submitted Date:

Submitted
12/01/2014 1:40 PM

## Primary Contact

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

## Organization Information

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

## Organization Website:

Address: 600 COUNTRY TRAIL E

| * | JORDAN | Minnesota |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| County: | City | Scate/Province |
| Postal Code/Zip |  |  |
| Phone:* | $612-496-8355$ |  |
| Fax: |  | Ext. |
| PeopleSoft Vendor Number | $0000024262 A 3$ |  |

## Project Information

## Project Name

Primary County where the Project is Located

CSAH 16 Reconstruction
Scott

Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

The proposed project will reconstruct approximately 1.7 miles of two-lane rural roadway to four-lane divided urban roadway. Trails will be constructed on both sides of the road, completing the gap between CSAH 83 and CSAH 21, and providing non-motorized access to the Eagle Creek Transit Station. The roadway will also include turn lanes, paved shoulders, and a dual left turn lane for westbound CSAH 16 to northbound CSAH 21 with signal modification at the intersection to reduce delay and air emissions. The horizontal alignment will be shifted to the south for a portion of the project to create a frontage road from the existing roadway and eliminate 17 direct private driveways to the CSAH 16. The McKenna Road intersection will be realigned to provide improved sight lines and geometric design. Curb and gutter will be installed and stormwater detention ponds will be constructed for water quality and rate control purposes.

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

CSAH 16 is an east/west A-Minor Arterial roadway that serves a reliever role to Trunk Highway 169 in Shakopee and Trunk Highway 13 in Savage. CSAH 16 also serves as a key connection between two developed portions of Shakopee from the original town center in the west to the Southbridge area in the east. The roadway is currently a substandard rural design with no shoulder and no bike/ped facilities, and was not designed to handle todays traffic and multi-modal demands. The road segment experiences higher than expected crash and severity rates and a number of run off the road crashes. With improvements to CSAH 83 in 2010 and CSAH 21 in 2011, traffic patterns have adjusted, creating the need for additional capacity between these two roadways. Volume and congestion has increased on TH 169 and many commuters are using CSAH 16 as a local alternative.

The purpose of this project is to address safety issues, modernize the roadway, and provide additional multi-modal transportation capacity on CSAH 16 to serve the traveling public in northern Scott County, including the City of Shakopee and the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community by filling a gap in the corridor and expanding a twolane rural section positioned between two northsouth four-lane arterials. Residential and commercial land use opportunities have expanded in these communities, resulting in an increased demand for transportation capacity and a desire for multi-modal facilities.

Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Project Length (Miles) } & 2.0\end{array}$

## Connection to Local Planning:

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

> Scott County 2014-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (Page 39)
> Scott County 2030 Comprehensive Plan (Page VI49 )

Connection to Local Planning
City of Shakopee 2030 Comprehensive Plan (Page 4.10)

Scott County CSAH 16 Corridor Study (All Pages)

## Project Funding

Are you applying for funds from another source(s) to implement this project?

## No

If yes, please identify the source(s)
Federal Amount
\$7,000,000.00
Match Amount
\$2,428,000.00
Minimum of $20 \%$ of project total

Minimum of 20\%
Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total
Source of Match Funds
Local
Preferred Program Year
Select one:
2017 (Roadway Projects Only)

## MnDOT State Aid Project Information: Roadway Projects

County, City, or Lead Agency
Functional Class of Road

Road System
TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET
Name of Road
Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE
Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed
(Approximate) Begin Construction Date
(Approximate) End Construction Date
LOCATION
From:
(Intersection or Address)
Do not include legal description;
Include name of roadway if majority of facility
runs adjacent to a single corridor.
To:
(Intersection or Address)

Type of Work

Examples: grading, aggregate base, bituminous base, bituminous surface, sidewalk, signals, lighting, guardrail, bicycle path, ped ramps, bridge,
Park \& Ride, etc.)
Old Bridge/Culvert?
New Bridge/Culvert? No
Structure is Over/Under
(Bridge or culvert name):

No
Scott County
A-Minor Reliever
CSAH

## Eagle Creek Blvd

55379
05/01/2017
12/01/2017

CSAH 83

Pike Lake Road

Grade, Agg Base, Bit Base, Bit Surf, Curb and Gutter, Storm Sewer, Signals, Lighting, Bike Path, Ped Ramps
n/a

## Specific Roadway Elements

Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost) ..... $\$ 425,000.00$
Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost) ..... \$254,000.00
Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) ..... \$2,054,000.00
Roadway (aggregates and paving) ..... \$2,679,000.00
Subgrade Correction (muck) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Storm Sewer ..... \$1,293,000.00
Ponds ..... \$216,000.00
Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) ..... \$693,000.00
Traffic Control ..... \$60,000.00
Striping ..... \$53,000.00
Signing ..... \$18,000.00
Lighting ..... \$65,000.00
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping ..... \$184,000.00
Bridge ..... $\$ 0.00$
Retaining Walls ..... $\$ 0.00$
Noise Wall ..... \$500,000.00
Traffic Signals ..... \$175,000.00
Wetland Mitigation ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection ..... $\$ 0.00$
RR Crossing ..... $\$ 0.00$
Roadway Contingencies ..... \$430,000.00
Other Roadway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$9,099,000.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... \$302,000.00
Sidewalk Construction ..... \$12,000.00
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... \$15,000.00
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... $\$ 0.00$
Streetscaping ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$329,000.00
Specific Transit and TDM Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES Cost
Fixed Guideway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Stations, Stops, and Terminals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Support Facilities ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.)
Vehicles ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit and TDM Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Transit and TDM Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Operating Costs
OPERATING COSTS ..... Cost
Transit Operating Costs ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$

## Totals

| Total Cost | $\$ 9,428,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 9,428,000.00$ |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Requirements - All Projects

## All Projects

1.The project must be consistent with the goals and policies in these adopted regional plans: Thrive MSP 2040 (2014), the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (amended 2013), the 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan (amended 2013), and the 2030 Water Resources Management Policy Plan (2005).
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
2.Applicants that are not cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
4.The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Expansion, reconstruction/modernization, and bridges must be between $\$ 1,000,000$ and $\$ 7,000,000$. Roadway system management must be between \$250,000 and \$7,000,000.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

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

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
8. The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term independent utility means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match. Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
9. The project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

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

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

## Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

## Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization Projects Only

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

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Bridge Projects Only
3. The bridge project must be identified as a Principal Arterial (Non-Freeway facilities only) or A Minor Arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map.

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
5.Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a Principal Arterial of freeway design must be limited to the federal share of those project costs identified as local (non-MnDOT) cost responsibility using MnDOTs Cost Participation for Cooperative Construction Projects and Maintenance Responsibilities manual. In the case of a federally funded trunk highway project, the policy guidelines should be read as if the funded trunk highway route is under local jurisdiction.

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

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

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

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

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

## Bridge Replacement Projects Only

10. The bridge must have a sufficienty rating less than 50. Additionally, it must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

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

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

## Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2002 Scott Co HSIP.pdf | Crash B/C | 30 KB |
| CP16-31_RoadwayLayout_08-13- <br> 14[1].pdf | Project Layout | 8.9 MB |
| Scott County Resolution.pdf | Scott County Resolution | 82 KB |
| Shakopee Letter of Support-CH 16.pdf | Letter of Support - City of Shakopee | 229 KB |

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

## Reliever: Non-Freeway Facility or

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

## Non-Freeway Facility Volume/Capacity Table

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

## Expander/Augmentor/Non-Freeway Principal Arterial

## Select one:

| Area | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Length | 0 |
| Average Distance | 0 |
| Upload Map | CH 16 Roadway Area Map.pdf |

## Measure B: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

| Location | CSAH 16 east of CSAH 83 *road closed east of CH 21 due to <br> flood repairs during count |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume | 375.0 |

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

## Select all that apply

Direct connection to or within a mile of a Job Concentration
Direct connection to or within a mile of a Manufacturing/Distribution Location Yes

Direct connection to or within a mile of an Educational Institution
Project provides a direct connection to or within a mile of an existing local activity center identified in an adopted county or city plan

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

Upload Map

The project is within a mile of a major manufacturing and distribution area along TH 169 and Canterbury Road, and is home to large employers including Shutterfly, Emerson, Seagate, SanMar, Canterbury Park, and FedEx. This area is planned for additional commercial and industrial development in the City of Shakopee 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

CH 16 Economy Map.pdf

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

Location
Current AADT Volume

CSAH 16 between CSAH 83 and CSAH 21
7900.0

## Response: Current Daily Person Throughput

Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership 737.0

Current Daily Person Throughput 11007.0

## Measure B: 2030 Forecast ADT

Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2030) ADT No
volume
METC Staff - Forecast (2030) ADT volume 0
OR
Approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2030) ADT volume

Forecast (2030) ADT volume 20500.0

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

Select one:
Project located in Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty
Project located in Concentrated Area of Poverty
Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color

Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly.

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

Upload Map

The CSAH 16 project is located in an area above the regional average for race or poverty.
Approximately 25 percent of Shakopees population is non-white. Between 2000-2010, 46\% of new residents were people of color (the largest percentage for suburban edge communities). The diversity of the community is continuing to increase, and it is especially noticeable in the schools and the youth population. This project will provide pedestrian and bike facilities linking together the two developed parts of the City and improve access to the Eagle Creek Transit Station and Eagle Creek Elementary School. The bike/ped facilities will benefit residents (especially the youth) by supporting non-motorized travel across the city. Access to manufacturing and warehousing jobs near CSAH 83 will also be improved with this project.

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

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

CH 16 Socio Economic Map.pdf

## Measure B: Affordable Housing

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length
2.0

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

| City/Township | Segment <br> Length (Miles) | Total Length <br> (Miles) | Score | Segment <br> Length/Total <br> Length | Housing Score <br> Multiplied by <br> Segment <br> percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Shakopee | 1.99 | 1.99 | 60.0 | 1.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | $\mathbf{2}$ | 60 | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ |

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

| Total Project Length (Miles) | 1.99 |
| :--- | :--- |

## Measure A: Year of Roadway Construction

Year of Original

| Roadway Construction <br> or Most Recent <br> Reconstruction | Roadway Segment <br> Length (Miles) | Calculation | Calculation 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1960.0 | 1.65 | 3234.0 | 1625.126 |
| 2002.0 | 0.34 | 680.68 | 342.05 |
|  | 2 | 3915 | 1967 |

## Average Construction Year

Weighted Year
1967.176

Total Segment Length (Miles)
Total Segment Length

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness of Vehicle Delay Reduction

| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay Without The Project | 25545.0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay With The Project | 22139.0 |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay Reduced by Project | 3406.0 |
| Cost Effectiveness | $\$ 2,768.06$ |
| Synchro or HCM Reports | CH16-CH21 Synchro Report.pdf |

## Measure B: Cost Effectiveness of Emissions Reduction

Total Project Cost from Cost Sheet
Total Peak Hour Kilograms Reduced by Project
Cost Effectiveness
Synchro or HCM Reports
\$9,428,000.00
0.13
\$72,523,076.92
CH16-CH21 Synchro Report.pdf

## Measure A: Benefit/Cost of Crash Reduction

Project Benefit/Cost Ratio
Worksheet Attachment
16 Expansion benefitcostworksheet.xls

## Measure A: Transit Connections

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

Upload Map

CH 16 Transit Connections Map.pdf

## Response

Met Council Staff Data Entry Only
Route Ridership 185574.0

Transitway Ridership
0

## Measure B: Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections

The project will complete a key east-west gap in the Shakopee trail system between two primary population centers. Shakopee has developed in two areas: near the original town center west of Canterbury Road and in the Southbridge area near the TH 169 Bloomington Ferry Bridge. This project includes trails on both sides of the road, connecting into existing trails on CSAH 16, CSAH 21, and CSAH 83. This provides non-motorized connections via existing trails to the major employment and commercial centers near Southbridge, Canterbury Road, and the St. Francis Hospital campus. Non-motorized access will also be improved to Eagle Creek Elementary School adjacent to the project, and three schools on CSAH 16 west of CSAH 83.

In addition, the trails and paved shoulders will provide east-west pedestrian and bicycle access to the Eagle Creek Transit Station, which serves Routes 490 and 491, reducing the need to drive to the station to utilize bus service.

CSAH 16 is identified as a Tier 2 Undefined Alignment Corridor in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN). This project completes the planned trail connections identified in the City and County comprehensive plans.

## Measure C: Multimodal Facilities

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

There are currently no pedestrian or bicycle facilities on this segment of CSAH 16. The current rural design with no paved shoulders makes it very hazardous for pedestrians and bicyclists to travel this corridor. When bike/ped use occurs today, it is often in the bottom of the unmowed ditch. This project will significantly improve safety conditions by providing paved shoulders and separated trails on both sides of CSAH 16 for pedestrian and bicycle use. Along the Dean Lake neighborhood, the trail will align with the frontage road to increase access to nearby homes and provide further separation from the mainline. At each end of the project, the trails will connect into the existing trail systems along CSAH 83, CSAH 21, and CSAH 16. This improves trail access for the high-density housing area near CSAH 83 and CSAH 16.

The project abuts the Eagle Creek Transit Station, and will improve pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle access to the Blue Xpress bus service (Routes 490 and 491). Existing amenities at the transit station includes a shelter, bike racks, and bike lockers for transit users. In addition, the projects connects to existing north-south and east-west trails at each end of the project, providing non-motorized connections from the transit station to employment and commercial centers in the Southbridge, Canterbury Road, and St. Francis hospital areas.

# Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction 

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

## Measure A: Risk Assessment

1)Project Scope (5 Percent of Points)

| Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred | Yes |
| :---: | :---: |
| 100\% |  |
| Stakeholders have been identified |  |
| 40\% |  |
| Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted |  |
| 0\% |  |
| 2)Layout or Preliminary Plan (5 Percent of Points) |  |
| Layout or Preliminary Plan completed | Yes |
| 100\% |  |
| Layout or Preliminary Plan started |  |
| 50\% |  |
| Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started |  |
| 0\% |  |
| Anticipated date or date of completion | 04/28/2014 |
| 3)Environmental Documentation (10 Percent of Points) |  |
| EIS |  |
| EA | Yes |
| PM |  |
| Document Status: |  |
| Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet) | 100\% |
| Document submitted to State Aid for review |  |
|  | 75\% |
| Document in progress; environmental impacts identified | Yes |
| 50\% |  |
| Document not started |  |
| 0\% |  |
| Anticipated date or date of completion/approval | 12/01/2015 |
| 4)Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 Percent of | Points) |
| No known potential for archaeological resources, no historic resources known to be eligible for/listed on the National Register of Historic Places located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge | Yes |
| 100\% |  |
| Historic/archeological review under way; determination of no historic properties affected or no adverse effect anticipated |  |
| 80\% |  |

Historic/archaeological review under way; determination of adverse effect anticipated

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

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

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

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

80\%
Adverse effects (land conversion) to Section 4f/6f resources likely
$30 \%$
Unknown impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area
0\%
6)Right-of-Way (15 Percent of Points)

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

Anticipated date or date of acquisition
7)Railroad Involvement (25 Percent of Points)

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

Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated 60\%

Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

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

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

Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)

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

Anticipated Letting Date

12/01/2015

Yes

100\%

Yes

09/01/2015

02/15/2017



## BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA

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

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

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

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

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

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

# BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA 

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

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

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


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

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

November 7, 2014

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

Re: CSAH 16 Expansion
Dear Mr. Jenson:

The City of Shakopee is aware Scott County is applying for funding through the Regional Solicitation for roadway expansion to a 4-lane of CSAH 16 from CSAH 83 to CSAH 21, under the Roadway Expansion category. The local match is expected to come from a combination of City and County sources. These improvements are endorsed by the City of Shakopee and we are supportive of the Regional Solicitation application.

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

Sincerely,

Public Works Director

## Roadway Area Definition

Project
Project Area

Principal Arterials
Principal Arterials Planned
A Minor Arterials ——A A Minor Arterials Planned

Regional Economy Roadway Expansion Project: CSAH 16 Reconstruction \| Map ID: 1414762644611

Results
Project NOT IN area of Job Concentration.
Project WITHIN ONE MI of area of Manufacturing and Distribution.

Project NOT CONNECTED to area of Education Institutions.


Project

- PostSecondary Education Centers $\square$ Job Concentration Centers
Project Area $\square$ Manfacturing/Distribution Centers
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
ttp:///giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx

Socio-Economic Conditions Roadway Expansion Project: CSAH 16 Reconstruction I Map ID: 1414762644611

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

$\square$

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

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

## 3: CSAH 16 \& CSAH 21

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1703 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 15 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.72 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.53 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |

Total Delay $=15 \mathrm{sec} . / \mathrm{veh} .{ }^{*} 1703 \mathrm{veh} .=25,545 \mathrm{sec}$.

## 3: CSAH 16 \& CSAH 21

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1703 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 13 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.63 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.51 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.61 |

Total Delay $=13 \mathrm{sec} . /$ veh. ${ }^{*} 1703 \mathrm{veh} .=22,139 \mathrm{sec}$.

## 3: CSAH 16 \& CSAH 21

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1703 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 15 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.72 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.53 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.63 |

Total Delay $=15 \mathrm{sec} . / \mathrm{veh} .{ }^{*} 1703 \mathrm{veh} .=25,545 \mathrm{sec}$.

## 3: CSAH 16 \& CSAH 21

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1703 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 13 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.63 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.51 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.61 |

Total Delay $=13 \mathrm{sec} . /$ veh. ${ }^{*} 1703 \mathrm{veh} .=22,139 \mathrm{sec}$.

Transit Connections Roadway Expansion Project: CSAH 16 Reconstruction | Map ID: 1414762644611

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

—— Transit Routes

$\square$
Project Area
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
For complete disclas.state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx

