Application

01967-2014 Roadway Expansion
02265 - Roundabout- proposed traffic control revision at the intersection of TH 3 and CSAH 26
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Status:
Submitted Date:

Submitted
12/01/2014 1:16 PM

## Primary Contact

| Name:* |  | John | Patrick |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salutation | First Name | Middle Name | Last Name |
| Title: | Transportation Project Manager |  |  |  |
| Department: | Dakota County Transportation Department |  |  |  |
| Email: | John.Sass@co.dakota.mn.us |  |  |  |
| Address: | 14955 Galaxie Avenue, 3rd Floor |  |  |  |
| * | Apple Valley | Min |  | 55124 |
|  | City | State |  | Postal Code/Zip |
| Phone:* | 952-891-7130 |  |  |  |
|  | Phone |  | Ext. |  |
| Fax: |  |  |  |  |
| What Grant Programs are you most interested in? | Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements |  |  |  |

## Organization Information

Name:

Jurisdictional Agency (if different):

| Organization Type: | County Government |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization Website: |  |  |  |
| Address: | TRANSPORTATION DEPT |  |  |
|  | 14955 GALAXIE AVE |  |  |
| * | APPLE VALLEY | Minnesota | 55124 |
|  | City | State/Province | Postal Code/Zip |
| County: | Dakota |  |  |
| Phone:* 952-891-7100 |  |  |  |
|  | Ext. |  |  |
| Fax: |  |  |  |
| PeopleSoft Vendor Number | 0000002621 A15 |  |  |

## Project Information

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

Roundabout- proposed traffic control revision at the intersection of TH 3 and CSAH 26

Dakota
Mn/DOT

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

Reconstruction project is located in City Inver Grove Heights, Dakota County at TH 3 (Robert Street) and CSAH 26 (70th Street). The existing all way stop intersection will be reconstructed as an urban roundabout with pedestrian/bike accommodations. The current intersection is deficient and does not meet current standards for this area that provides regional access to 1494 1.6miles N., TH 52 1.3-miles E., \& TH 55 0.9-miles S. for a large developing Mixed Use area, medium to long suburb-to-suburb trips.

Project purpose is to reduce existing delays in traffic flow due to the existing four way stop condition, and to allow for more efficient traffic flow in the future as traffic volumes increase.

Currently traffic volumes through the intersection are approximately 14,150 vehicles per day. Large portions of undeveloped Mixed Use consisting of retail and service, commercial, office, institutional, and higher density residential exist in the area.

TH 3 is currently a two lane undivided north-south highway at the proposed project location. It is classified as A-Minor-Arterial Expander and has a posted speed limit of 50 mph . TH 3 currently has right turn lanes in both directions at the intersection. The AADT $2013(2030)$ is $6,400(21,000)$ south and $8,600(27,000)$ north of the intersection.

CSAH 26 is a two lane undivided east-west highway at the intersection with TH 3, with no turn lanes. It is classified as A-Minor-Arterial Reliever and has posted speed limit of 50 mph and the AADT $2013(2030)$ is $7,100(23,000)$ east and $6,200(26,000)$ west of the intersection.

The analysis shows a LOS F for northbound TH 3 during the AM peak and a LOS F for southbound TH 3 and both eastbound and westbound CSAH 26 during the PM peak. This analysis shows the delays at this intersection justify a new traffic control, which is also supported by citizen complaints received. This intersection has been operating in its current all-way stop condition since 1998.

An all way stop condition with multiple approach lanes on each leg, introduces driver confusion on whose turn it is to go next, resulting in an inefficient operation of the intersection. Constructing a roundabout at this location would have a lower initial cost than and would not have the associated signal maintenance costs a signalized intersection would have. The greatest crash reduction is anticipated if a roundabout is constructed at this location.

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

The construction of a roundabout will implements a solution to intersection operations, make safety improvements, and provide for the increased traffic levels as discussed within the Dakota County 2030 Transportation Plan;

Chapter 7, Goal 4: Management to Increase
Transportation System Efficiency, Improve Safety and Maximize Existing Highway Capacity p.7-1 to 7-3 \& p.7-22 to 7-27

Goal 5: Replace Deficient Elements of the System p.8-1 to 8-3

Connection to Local Planning
Chapter 9, 10-Ton route System Implementation Highway Expansion Needs p. 9-16\& 9-20

The Roundabout is identified in
1.Dakota County 2014-2018 Capital Improvement Program (online version)
a.CP 64-47 Trans 13, 56 \& CIP Map between $p$. Trans 10-11
2.Inver Grove Height Financing Plan for the 2015 2019 Capital Improvement Plan p. 5

## Project Funding

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

If yes, please identify the source(s)
Federal Amount
Match Amount
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
Preferred Program Year
Select one:
2018

## 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? No
New Bridge/Culvert? No
Structure is Over/Under
(Bridge or culvert name):
NA

Dakota County (Lead Agency)
TH 3 is A-Minor-Arterial Expander

Intersection of TH 3 A-Minor-Arterial Expander and CSAH 26 A-Minor-Arterial Reliever

TH 3 (Robert St.) and CSAH 26(70th St.)

55077
03/09/2018
11/16/2018
at the intersection of TH 3 (Robert Street) and CSAH 26 (70th Street)

The intersection itself is located approximately 1 -mile north of TH 55 and approximately 1.5 -miles s

GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT SURF, CURB AND GUTTER, STORM SEWER, BIT TRAIL, PED RAMPS, LIGHTING

## Specific Roadway Elements

CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST
Cost
ESTIMATES
$\$ 125,000.00$
Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost)
\$125,000.00
Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost)
\$400,000.00
Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.)
\$875,000.00
Roadway (aggregates and paving)
$\$ 0.00$
Subgrade Correction (muck)
\$100,000.00
Storm Sewer
\$50,000.00
Ponds
\$300,000.00
Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers)
\$25,000.00
Traffic Control
$\$ 100,000.00$
Striping
\$25,000.00
Signing
\$175,000.00
Lighting
\$75,000.00
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping
$\$ 0.00$
Bridge
$\$ 0.00$
Retaining Walls
$\$ 0.00$
Noise Wall
$\$ 0.00$
Traffic Signals
$\$ 0.00$
Wetland Mitigation
$\$ 0.00$
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection
$\$ 0.00$
RR Crossing
$\$ 0.00$
Roadway Contingencies
$\$ 0.00$
Other Roadway Elements\$2,375,000.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST EStIMATES Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... \$100,000.00
Sidewalk Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... \$25,000.00
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... $\$ 0.00$
Streetscaping ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$125,000.00
Specific Transit and TDM Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES Cost
Fixed Guideway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Stations, Stops, and Terminals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Support Facilities ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Vehicles ..... $\$ 0.00$
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
\$2,500,000.00
Construction Cost Total
\$2,500,000.00
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 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2265 Dakota Co HSIP.pdf | Crash B/C | 30 KB |
| Application 02265 TH 3_CSAH 26 City of <br> Inver Grove Heights letter of support and <br> funding.pdf | City of Inver Grove Heights letter of <br> support and financialcommitment | 430 KB |
| Application 02265 TH 3_CSAH 26 <br> MnDOT letter of support.pdf | Minnesota Department of Transportation <br> letter of support | 38 KB |
| Plan drawing of proposed improvements <br> 02265 - Roundabout- TH 3 \& CSAH <br> 26.pdf | Plan layout of 02265 - Roundabout- <br> proposed traffic control revision at the <br> intersection of TH 3 and CSAH 26 | 3.0 MB |

## Reliever: Freeway Facility or

Facility being relieved
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-3:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 3:00pm-4:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 4:00pm - 5:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 5:00pm-6:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 6:00pm-7:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |
| 7:00pm - 8:00pm |  |  | 0 |  |

```
8:00pm-9:00pm 0
9:00pm-10:00pm 0
10:00pm-11:00pm 0
11:00pm-12:00am 0
```


## Expander/Augmentor/Non-Freeway Principal Arterial

| Select one: | Expander |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area | 1.118 |
| Project Length | 0.337 |
| Average Distance | 3.3175 |
| Upload Map | RdwyAreaDef Application 02265 - Roundabout.pdf |

## Measure B: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

| Location | TH 3 north of CSAH 26 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume | 305.0 |

## 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
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
0.25 -miles south of the intersection is Inver Glen Senior Living which provides seniors with arrangements for independent, assisted or memory care living.
1.79-miles southeast is INVER HILLS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

County or City Plan Reference (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)
1.4-miles southeast is the Division Headquarters and Headquarters Battalion (DHHB), 34th Infantry Division a Minnesota Army National Guard Battalion that provides the necessary internal logistics, communications, and security for the 34th Infantry Division Headquarters. Additionally, the DHHB is prepared to support the State of Minnesota with troops capable of assisting civil authorities during a disaster.

Regional Economy Application 02265 - Roundabout.pdf

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

Location
Current AADT Volume
Existing Transit Routes on the Project

TH 3 North of CSAH 26
8600.0

## Response: Current Daily Person Throughput

Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership 0
Current Daily Person Throughput
11180.0

## Measure B: $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ Forecast ADT

Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2030) ADT volume

METC Staff - Forecast (2030) ADT volume
0
OR
Approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2030) ADT volume

## 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

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

Areas across the metropolitan region identified as developing community are anticipated to be the recipient of the projected growth through the year 2030. The northern two thirds and a few slivers of land on either side of the city are identified with this designation. Inver Grove Heights affordable housing need is identified as 871 new construction housing units between the years 2011 and 2020 as determined by the Metropolitan Council.

The roundabout project will improve mobility and safety at this intersection and will cost effectively enhance linkages between existing and future jobs and housing. South of the intersection 0.25 -miles is Inver Glen Senior Living that provides seniors with arrangements for independent, assisted or memory care living.

TH 3 and CSAH 26: The Comprehensive Plan designates the area at this intersection as mixed use. The vision for this area is to establish a neighborhood hub that integrates higher density residential uses with neighborhood commercial services. The opportunity exists to integrate a variety of land uses making neighborhood commercial areas truly accessible to the surrounding residential neighborhood both due to the close proximity of the uses and a pedestrian sidewalk or trail system that provides direct linkages.

Socio-Economic Conditions Application 02265 - Roundabout .pdf

## Measure B: Affordable Housing

City/Township

## Total Project Length

Total Project Length
Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

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

| Total Project Length (Miles) | 0.33 |
| :--- | :--- |


| Total Housing Score | 73.0 |
| :--- | :--- |

## 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 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1934.0 | 0.33 | 638.22 | 1934.0 |
|  | $\mathbf{0}$ | 638 | 1934 |

## Average Construction Year

Weighted Year
1934.0

Total Segment Length (Miles)
Total Segment Length 0.33

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness of Vehicle Delay Reduction

| Total Project Cost from Cost Sheet | $\$ 2,500,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay Without The Project | 62130.0 |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay With The Project | 0 |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay Reduced by Project | 62130.0 |
| Cost Effectiveness | $\$ 40.24$ |
| Synchro or HCM Reports | Synchro Report Application 02265 - Roundabout.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
$\$ 2,500,000.00$
1.55
\$1,612,903.23
Synchro Report Application 02265 - Roundabout.pdf

## Measure A: Benefit/Cost of Crash Reduction

| Project Benefit/Cost Ratio | 0.68 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Worksheet Attachment | HSIP 2014 worksheetApplication 02265 - Roundabout.xls |

## Measure A: Transit Connections

Existing Routes Directly Connected to the Project
N/A
Planned Transitways directly connected to the project (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP)

Upload Map

Transit Connections Application 02265 - Roundabout.pdf

## Response

Met Council Staff Data Entry Only
Route Ridership 0
Transitway Ridership 0

## Measure B: Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections

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

The Roundabout includes trail connections to allow bicyclists and pedestrians an option for crossing TH 3 and CSAH 26 at all four approaches. The current trail system on CSAH 26 ends 0.56 miles to the east. With development a multi-purpose off road trail (both sides) will be constructed along CSAH 26 this road is planned for reconstructed in the future. County policy PP. 6 requires trails as a regular component of highway improvements on both sides of the highway.

Dakota County is developing a comprehensive transit system, bicycle and pedestrian network, and other non-automobile modes for people to maximize the efficiency of the transportation system by providing safe, timely, and efficient connections between communities, activity generators, and employment centers.

Increasingly, pedestrian and bicyclist facilities in the developing Cities of Dakota County are serving the dual role of providing recreational value as well as viable options for commuters (for work or shopping). The expansion of commuter pedestrian and bicyclist use is expected into the future with the expansion of transit facilities and expected continued increases in automobile cost. To better develop opportunities for Dakota County residents to walk and bike for transportation and for recreation, the County is working closely with local communities to improve walkability.

## Measure C: Multimodal Facilities

The existing intersection does not accommodate any bicycle, pedestrian, or transit elements. The intersection project will accommodate bicycle and pedestrian by providing 10 foot paved bike/ped trail in all four quadrants with crossings. No transit exist but this is future possible transitway corridor (the Robert Street Corridor).

The roundabout project will improve mobility and safety at this intersection and will cost effectively enhance linkages between existing and future jobs and housing. The project provides integrated multimodal transportation system that advances regional land use and growth management goals. This is a low-cost safety and mobility projects.

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

Enhanced lighting and pedestrian intersection enhancements will give this intersection the comfort and safety elements needed to provide a multimodal pedestrian level scale. Lighting will provide convenient, desirable, and safe travel for motorists along a heavily used corridor. Improving the pedestrian experience with lighting will provide a vertical element at a pedestrian scale that enhances safety and provides for a strong design feature within the future transitway. Streetscape will add interest and support pedestrian and bike activity.

Specific benefits include reduced congestion, reduced travel times, improved safety, improved pedestrian and bicyclist circulation and connectivity.

## 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.

## 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
10/05/2011
3)Environmental Documentation (10 Percent of Points)

EIS
EA
PM
Yes
Document Status:

Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)
$100 \%$

Document submitted to State Aid for review

Document in progress; environmental impacts identified

50\%
Document not started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion/approval
04/15/2016
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

Yes located on an identified historic bridge

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

Right-of-way or easements identification has not been completed
0\%
Anticipated date or date of acquisition
11/18/2016
7)Railroad Involvement (25 Percent of Points)

No railroad involvement on project Yes
100\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature page)
$100 \%$
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated

60\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

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

0\%
Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement
8)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 Yes
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
02/17/2017
9)Letting

Anticipated Letting Date

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control <br> Section | T.H. / <br> Roadway | Location | Beginning <br> Ref. Pt. | E |
|  |  |  | TH 3 041+00.713 <br> $@$ CSAH 26 |  |
|  | TH 3 | The intersection of TH 3 \& CSAH26 | 004+00.996 | TH |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ending <br> Pt. | Refate, <br> County, City <br> or Township | Study Period <br> Begins | Study Period <br> Ends |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TH 3 @ CSAH 26 | Inver Grove <br> Heights, <br> Dakota Co. | $1 / 1 / 2011$ | $12 / 31 / 2013$ |



City of
Inner Grove Heights
www.ci.inver-grove-heights.mn.us

November 24, 2014

Mr. Mark Krebsbach
Dakota County Transportation Director
14955 Galaxie Avenue
Apple Valley, MN 55124
Dear Mr. Krebsbach:
The City of Inver Grove Heights is providing this letter in support of a Regional Solicitation Grant Application for funding for Dakota County Project 26-47, CSAH 26 at Trunk Highway 3 (South Robert Trail) Roundabout. The improvement of this intersection is a priority for the City. In addition to improved safety the project will provide, the highway improvements will be an important part of the development of the northwest portion of Inver Grove Heights.

The City supports this proposed project for federal funding and agrees to provide a financial commitment for the improvements directly related to CSAH 26/TH 3 Roundabout.

Sincerely,


George Tourville
Mayor of Inver Grove Heights

GT/kf
cc: Joe Lynch, City Administrator

# Minnesota Department of Transportation <br> Metro District <br> 1500 West County Road B-2 <br> Roseville, MN 5511 

November 25, 2014
Brian K. Sorenson
Assistant County Engineer
Dakota County Transportation Department
14955 Galaxie Avenue
Apple Valley, MN 55124
RE: Regional Solicitation Application for intersection improvements (roundabout) at Highway 3 and CSAH 26

Dear Mr. Sorenson:

Thank you for requesting a letter of support from MnDOT for the Metropolitan Council's 2014 Regional Solicitation. Your application for intersection improvements (roundabout) at Highway 3 and CSAH 26 in Inver Grove Height impacts MnDOT right of way on Highway 3.

As the agency with jurisdiction over Highway 3, MnDOT supports the application for intersection improvements (roundabout) at Highway 3 and CSAH 26 in Inver Grove Heights. Details of a future maintenance agreement with the county will be determined during project development to define how the project will be maintained for the project's useful life.

This project currently has no funding from MnDOT.
Sincerely,


Scott McBride, P.E.
Metro District Engineer
Cc: Elaine Koustsoukos, Metropolitan Council Jon Solberg, MnDOT Metro District - South Area Manager

중
0



Project
Project Area

Principal Arterials
1 Principal Arterials Planned
A Minor Arterials -. A Minor Arterials Planned

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

Regional Economy Roadway Expansion Project: 02265 - Roundabout at the intersection of TH 3 and CSAH 26 | Map ID: 1416856037589

Project NOT IN area of Job Concentration.
Project NOT IN to 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
http://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx

Socio-Economic Conditions Roadway Expansion Project: 02265 - Roundabout at the intersection of TH 3 and CSAH 26 | Map ID: 1416856037589

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


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
htpp://giswebsite.metc.

## 11: MN 3/South Robert Trail \& CSAH 26/70th Street

| Direction |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1354 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 23 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 2.59 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.50 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.60 |

CSAH 26 \& MN 3
PM Existing
All Way Stop

## 11: MN 3/South Robert Trail \& CSAH 26/70th Street

| Direction | Al |
| :--- | :---: |
| Volume (vph) | 1635 |
| Total Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 38 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 3.52 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.68 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.81 |

CSAH 26 \& MN 3
AM Peak
Single lane Roundabout 11/20/2014

## 11: MN 3/South Robert Trail \& CSAH 26/70th Street

| Direction | Al |
| :--- | :--- |
| Volume (vph) | 1354 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 2.06 |
| NOX Emissions (kg) | 0.40 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.48 |

11: MN 3/South Robert Trail \& CSAH 26/70th Street

| Diection | All |
| :--- | :--- |
| Volume (vph) | 1635 |
| Total Delay /Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.43 |
| NOX Emissions (kg) | 0.47 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.56 |
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