Application

01968-2014 Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization
02005 - CSAH 8 Reconstruction
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Status:
Submitted Date:

Submitted
12/01/2014 1:00 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:* | 952-49 |  |  |  |
|  | 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 8 Reconstruction
Scott

Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

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

The proposed project is the modernization of CSAH 8 from west of CSAH 27 to west of CSAH 91 in Credit River Township. Improvements include the reconstruction of CSAH 8 from a two lane rural roadway with very little shoulder to a two lane rural roadway with paved shoulders, turn lanes at intersections, and a trail along CSAH 8. A roundabout is the preferred intersection treatment at CSAH 27 and CSAH 8 to improve safety and reduce the potential for life-altering crashes at the high-speed rural intersection.

The project will improve operations and safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bikers that utilize the roadway/corridor. The reconstruction project will also implement access management to improve the overall access spacing in the corridor. Changes to access as part of the project include adding turn lanes for existing public street accesses and removal of private driveways where possible.

The overall project objective is to preserve the roadway and improve the safety of the connector roadway in the region by investing in the CSAH 8 A-Minor Arterial. CSAH 8 is the only continuous east-west arterial connection from the Jordan/Belle Plaine area to $\mathrm{I}-35$, a distance of over 15 miles. When CSAH 8 is connected to TH 169 with future development, this connection with serve as the only continuous east-west roadway between TH 169 and I-35 in the entire county.

### 1.62

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.

Scott County 2030 Comprehensive Plan (Page VI35)

Scott County 2014-2023 Transportation
Improvement Program (Page 51)

Scott County CSAH 8 Corridor Study (Pages 17-
21)

## 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 | \$4,400,000.00 |
| Match Amount | \$1,100,000.00 |
| Minimum of 20\% of project total |  |
| Project Total | \$5,500,000.00 |
| Match Percentage | 20.0\% |
| Minimum of $20 \%$ |  |
| Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total |  |
| Source of Match Funds | Local |
| Preferred Program Year |  |
| Select one: | 2019 |

## MnDOT State Aid Project Information: Roadway Projects

| County, City, or Lead Agency | Scott County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Class of Road | A-Minor Connector |
| Road System | CSAH |
| TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET |  |
| Name of Road | Lucerne Blvd |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE | 55044 |
| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | $04 / 05 / 2019$ |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date | $11 / 08 / 2019$ |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date |  |
| LOCATION |  |


RR Crossing ..... $\$ 0.00$
Roadway Contingencies ..... \$750,000.00
Other Roadway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... \$5,250,000.00
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES ..... Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... $\$ 250,000.00$
Sidewalk Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
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 ..... \$250,000.00
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 | $\$ 5,500,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 5,500,000.00$ |
| 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

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 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0815_Layout (11x17).pdf | Project Layout | 1.6 MB |
| 2005 Scott Co HSIP.pdf | Crash B/C | 30 KB |
| Scott County Resolution.pdf | Scott County Resolution | 82 KB |

## 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
12:00am-1:00am
1:00am-2:00am
2:00am-3:00am
3:00am-4:00am
4:00am-5:00am
5:00am - 6:00am
6:00am-7:00am
7:00am-8:00am

## Capacity <br> Volume exceeds capacity

```
8:00am-9:00am
9:00am-10:00am
10:00am - 11:00am
11:00am - 12:00pm
12:00pm-1:00pm
1:00pm-2:00pm
2:00pm-3:00pm
3:00pm-4:00pm
4:00pm-5:00pm
5:00pm-6:00pm
6:00pm-7:00pm
7:00pm - 8:00pm
8:00pm-9:00pm
9:00pm-10:00pm
10:00pm-11:00pm
11:00pm - 12:00am
```


## Expander/Connector/Augmentor/Non-Freeway Principal Arterial

Select one:

Area

Project Length

Average Distance
Upload Map

Connector
14.0
1.6
8.75

CH 8 Roadway Area Map.pdf

## Measure B: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

## Location

Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume

CSAH 8 east of CSAH 27
820.0

## 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

County or City Plan Reference (Limit 700 characters;
approximately 100 words)
Upload Map CH 8 Economy Map.pdf

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

| Location | CSAH 8 between CSAH 27 and CSAH 91 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current AADT Volume | 4050.0 |
| Existing Transit Routes on the Project |  |

## Response: Current Daily Person Throughput

| Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current Daily Person Throughput | 5265.0 |

## Measure B: 2030 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

Forecast (2030) ADT volume
10100.0

## 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 Yes includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly.

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

Upload Map

The CSAH 8 project will provide a benefit to the children and elderly that currently live in the rural area of Credit River Township. CSAH 8 is a high speed highway that has narrow shoulders. Rural living can be an isolated existence for children or elderly living on a farm or rural acreage without the ability to interact with others outside of their home. The project will provide a trail for rural residents, including children and elderly to walk or bike for exercise or to visit friends and neighbors along CSAH 8. The trail connects into a commercial center in Lakeville where shopping and employment opportunities exist. The trail gives these residents freedom to get outside their home without the use of an automobile for social interaction.

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 8 Socio Economic Map.pdf

## Measure B: Affordable Housing

City/Township Segment Length (Miles)
Credit River

## Total Project Length

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

| City/Township | Segment | Total Length | Score | Segment | Housing Score <br> Length (Miles) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Miles) |  | Length/Total | Multiplied by |  |
| Segment | percent |  |  |  |  |

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

Total Project Length (Miles)
Total Housing Score
1.62

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 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1969.0 | 1.6 | 3150.4 | 1969.0 |
|  | 2 | 3150 | 1969 |

## Average Construction Year

Weighted Year
1969.0

Total Segment Length (Miles)
Total Segment Length

Measure B: Geometric, Structural, or Infrastructure Improvements

The project will increase shoulder widths to current standards. Current shoulder width varies between 1-3 feet. This segment of roadway was identified in the Countys Highway Safety Plan as one of the highest risk segments for road departures.
Increasing the paved shoulder width will reduce the potential for road departure crashes. There is a vertical curve on CSAH 8 at the west approach leg to the CSAH 27 intersection. This curve will be addressed to improve the sight lines at the intersection. Currently a red flashing beacon is located above the intersection, alerting eastbound motorists on CSAH 8 there is a stop condition ahead. Without this advanced warning, the vertical curve is so severe that the stop sign at CSAH 27 is obstructed by the vertical curve and eastbound motorists traveling at 55 mph are unable to react fast enough to stop at this intersection.

The project will also provide a trail along one side of CSAH 8. The trail will allow residents along this roadway to have pedestrian and bike access for employment or services in Lakevilles businesses park and commercial property near l-35. The trail will be a continuation of a trail to be constructed in 2015 from CSAH 91 to Lakeville.

The project will bring the road from a 9-ton roadway to current 10 -ton roadway standards. New signage will be installed with current reflectivity standards.

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness of Vehicle Delay Reduction

| Total Project Cost from Cost Sheet | $\$ 5,500,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay Without The Project | 7447.0 |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay With The Project | 4739.0 |
| Total Peak Hour Vehicle Delay Reduced by Project | 2708.0 |
| Cost Effectiveness | $\$ 2,031.02$ |

## Measure B: Cost Effectiveness of Emissions Reduction

| Total Project Cost from Cost Sheet | $\$ 5,500,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Peak Hour Kilograms Reduced by Project | 0.16 |
| Cost Effectiveness | $\$ 34,375,000.00$ |
| Synchro or HCM Reports | CH8-CH27 Synchro Report.pdf |

## Measure A: Benefit/Cost of Crash Reduction

| Project Benefit/Cost Ratio | 0.75 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Worksheet Attachment | 8 Phase 2 benefitcostworksheet.xls |

## Measure A: Transit Connections

| Existing Routes Directly Connected to the Project | N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Planned Transitways directly connected to the project (alignment <br> and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP) | N/A |
| Upload Map | CH 8 Transit Connections Map.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 project is located in the rural residential area of Credit River Township. A trail will be constructed along the entire length of the project, and will connect on the east end to a trail (to be constructed in 2015) extending into Lakeville/Dakota County. Destinations include a movie theater, restaurants, convenience stores, park and pool lot, and other service businesses. By constructing the trail it will tie into the Citys greater trail system and allow bike and ped access to Downtown Lakeville and Lake Marion.

The Scott County Comprehensive Plan guides this area of Credit River for a mix of rural residential and agricultural uses. Residents enjoy the community parks, trails, and open space within the corridor. However non-motorized access to these amenities is limited due to the narrow shoulder and high speed traffic on existing CSAH 8. The project will provide access for all ages and experience levels to use the off road trail and wider paved shoulders to be able to enjoy this corridor.

To the west, the trail is planned to connect to Doyle Kennefick Regional Park in central Scott County. The trail and wider paved shoulders will provide a safe, scenic bike route serving riders at all levels of experience.

## Measure C: Multimodal Facilities

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

There are currently no bicycle/pedestrian facilities on this segment of CSAH 8. The current rural design with narrow shoulders and high speed vehicle traffic makes it hazardous and uninviting for pedestrians and bikers to travel this corridor. This project will significantly improve safety conditions by providing paved shoulders and a separated paved trail adjacent to CSAH 8 for pedestrian and bicycle use. The trail will connect to the existing Lakeville system to the east.

There are no fixed service transit routes in the project area. ADA and dial-a-ride service is provided by SmartLink. There is a park and pool located at the I-35 and Dakota County CSAH 70 intersection, with land available for future park and ride use.

## 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

Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started

## 0\%

Anticipated date or date of completion
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
11/16/2018
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:

10/28/2017

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; 6f 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
Yes
$100 \%$

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
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
Yes
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

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 Yes
50\%
Construction plans have not been started
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
12/01/2018
9)Letting

Anticipated Letting Date 03/01/2019
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## 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.

## Roadway Area Definition

## Results

Project Length: 1.626 miles
Project Area: 14.069 sq mi


Project
Project Area

Regional Economy Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project: CSAH 8 Reconstruction | Map ID: 1414764159300

Results
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
Project Area
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
thp://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx


Socio-Economic Conditions Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project: CSAH 8 Reconstruction | Map ID: 1414764159300

## Results

Project NOT IN any area of concentrated poverty.

$\square$
$\square$
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
ttp://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx

9: CSAH 8 (217th Street) \& CSAH 27

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 677 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 11 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.80 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.54 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.65 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |
| Entry Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h |  | 85 |  | 311 |  | 84 |  | 257 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h |  | 86 |  | 317 |  | 85 |  | 262 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h |  | 312 |  | 75 |  | 141 |  | 271 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h |  | 221 |  | 151 |  | 257 |  | 121 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s |  | 3.186 |  | 3.186 |  | 3.186 |  | 3.186 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 5.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 7.6 |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |
| Lane | Left |  | Left |  | Left |  | Left |  |
| Designated Moves | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  |
| Assumed Moves | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Critical Headway, s | 5.193 |  | 5.193 |  | 5.193 |  | 5.193 |  |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 86 |  | 317 |  | 85 |  | 262 |  |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 827 |  | 1048 |  | 981 |  | 862 |  |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.983 |  | 0.981 |  | 0.984 |  | 0.983 |  |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 85 |  | 311 |  | 84 |  | 257 |  |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 813 |  | 1029 |  | 966 |  | 847 |  |
| V/C Ratio | 0.104 |  | 0.302 |  | 0.087 |  | 0.304 |  |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 5.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 7.6 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |

9: CSAH 8 (217th Street) \& CSAH 27

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 677 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 2.69 |
| NOX Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.52 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.62 |

9: CSAH 8 (217th Street) \& CSAH 27

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 677 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 11 |
| CO Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 2.80 |
| NOx Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.54 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.65 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |
| Entry Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h |  | 85 |  | 311 |  | 84 |  | 257 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h |  | 86 |  | 317 |  | 85 |  | 262 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h |  | 312 |  | 75 |  | 141 |  | 271 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h |  | 221 |  | 151 |  | 257 |  | 121 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s |  | 3.186 |  | 3.186 |  | 3.186 |  | 3.186 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 5.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 7.6 |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |
| Lane | Left |  | Left |  | Left |  | Left |  |
| Designated Moves | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  |
| Assumed Moves | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Critical Headway, s | 5.193 |  | 5.193 |  | 5.193 |  | 5.193 |  |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 86 |  | 317 |  | 85 |  | 262 |  |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 827 |  | 1048 |  | 981 |  | 862 |  |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.983 |  | 0.981 |  | 0.984 |  | 0.983 |  |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 85 |  | 311 |  | 84 |  | 257 |  |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 813 |  | 1029 |  | 966 |  | 847 |  |
| V/C Ratio | 0.104 |  | 0.302 |  | 0.087 |  | 0.304 |  |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 5.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 7.6 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |

9: CSAH 8 (217th Street) \& CSAH 27

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 677 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 2.69 |
| NOX Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.52 |
| VOC Emissions $(\mathrm{kg})$ | 0.62 |

Transit Connections Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project: CSAH 8 Reconstruction | Map ID: 1414764159300

Results
Transit with a Direct Connection to project: -- NONE --
*indicates Planned Alignments


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


