I. Call to Order

II. Introductions

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Approval of Minutes – September 6, 2018

V. New Business
   1. Final Report: Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study
   2. Final Report: South Victory Drive / Hoffman Road Intersection Control Evaluation Study
   3. Release of Request for Proposal (RFP) for Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update
   4. Resolution Supporting MnDOT 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)
   5. Resolution Adopting Updated MAPO Public Participation Plan
   6. Re-designation of MAPO Representative to MnDOT Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7)
   7. Approval of 2019 Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7) Solicitation Flowchart
   8. Resolution Authorizing Submission of Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC) Phase 1 Planning Grant Application

VI. Other Business, Discussion & Updates
   1. Update: ADA Transition Plan

VII. November 15, 2018 MAPO TAC meeting minutes (informational)

VIII. Policy Board Comments

IX. Opportunity for Public Comment

X. Adjournment
Policy Board members present: Tim Auringer, Bob Freyberg, Jack Kolars, Mike Laven, Mark Piepho, Dan Rotchadl

Others Present: Paul Vogel, Charles Androsky, Dennis Dieken, Michael Fischer, Ryan Thilges

I. Call to Order

Mr. Piepho called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. Introductions

Introductions were made.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Freyberg moved and Mr. Kolars seconded a motion to approve the agenda. With all voting in favor, the agenda was approved.

IV. Approval of Minutes – August 2, 2018

Mr. Kolars moved and Mr. Rotchadl seconded a motion to approve the minutes. With all voting in favor, the minutes were approved.

V. New Business

5.1 Resolution Adopting 2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Staff presented the final draft of the 2019 UPWP. The work program included initiation of the MAPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan update, a Highway 169 Corridor Study, MAPO participation in cost sharing of aerial photography, and a Warren Street Corridor Study.

Staff emphasized the adjusted scope of the Highway 169 Corridor Study to allow for the potential expansion of the project beyond the scope identified in the application. The item was reviewed and recommended for approval by the MAPO TAC at their August 16, 2018 meeting.

Mr. Rotchadl moved and Mr. Freyberg seconded to approve the 2019 UPWP. Motioned carried.

5.2 Resolution to Re-Adopt 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Staff reported that the MAPO’s 2019-2022 TIP was developed and adopted in conjunction and on schedule with the MnDOT Area Transportation Partnership (ATP) 7 solicitation flowchart. After
adoption, a number of updates were made necessary as the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) and Area Transportation Plan (ATIP) were adjusted. The 30-day public comment period for the updated TIP ran August 2 – September 3, 2018. Advertisement for the TIP Public Comment period included notice in the Mankato Free Press, the MAPO website, distribution of informational posters to partner agencies, and the MAPO Twitter account. Hard copies were distributed to the cities of Mankato, North Mankato, and Eagle Lake, as well as to County Administrative Buildings of Blue Earth and Nicolette, Blue Earth County Library in Mankato and the Taylor Library in North Mankato. Email distribution was sent to local, state and federal partners, including the MAPO stakeholder email list.

Mr. Kolars moved and Mr. Rotchadl seconded to pass the Resolution to Re-Adopt the updated 2019-2022 TIP. Motion carried.

5.3 Release of the MAPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) Update for 45-day Public Comment
Staff reported that the MAPO’s current Public Participation Plan (PPP) was adopted June, 2014. The updated PPP includes updated language, formatting, graphical elements, state and federal legislation references, and member information.

New practices and tools for public engagement were defined, including implementation of a MAPO Twitter account, addition of a Public Participation section to the MAPO website, more specific and understandable displays at TIP open houses and engagement sessions, addition of opportunity for public comment as a consistent agenda item at MAPO TAC and Policy Board meetings, addition of federally-recognized Native American tribal interests as a transportation stakeholder group, and expansion of MAPO stakeholders email list. At the suggestion of FHWA, the updated PPP also includes a section on measurement of public engagement effectiveness.

Mr. Freyberg made a motion and Mr. Rotchadl seconded to approve the MAPO Public Participation Plan for 45-day Public Comment. Motion carried.

VI. Other Business, Discussion & Updates

6.1 Update: Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study
Staff reported on the continued coordination with the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) to direct the project consultant. The team is designing and reviewing preliminary schematic design layout alternatives. The alternatives were informed by public input and survey responses, including responses on highway build scenarios, travel preferences, and preferences regarding location and type of pedestrian crossings. A project TAC meeting was held August 7, 2018. A public Open House will be scheduled tentatively in the second week of October, after which a TAC meeting will be scheduled in order to discuss feedback and begin finalizing study report materials.

6.2 Update: Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan
Staff reported that the project management team is reviewing collected data and drafts of member agency plans. This includes map and graphic elements of inventoried areas within the MAPO, as well
6.2 Update: Hoffman Road at South Victory Drive ICE study
Staff reported on the initiation of the Hoffman Road at South Victory Drive Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) study. A project kickoff meeting was held August 24, 2018 with representatives from Blue Earth County, the City of Mankato, MAPO, and the project consultant.

Items discussed at the kickoff meeting included the project scope and schedule, as well as the standards and practices to be applied over the course of the study. Meeting participants also discussed intersection data to be reviewed and intersection-specific issues including traffic count data, crash data, traffic analysis tools, and materials to be supplied by MAPO to the consultant.

VII. TAC Comments (August 16, 2018 meeting minutes)

The minutes from the August 16, 2018 MAPO TAC meeting were distributed.

VIII. Opportunity for Public Comment

Mr. Piepho opened the floor for Public Comment. There were no comments.

IX. Adjournment

At approximately 6:50 p.m. Mr. Rotchadl moved and Mr. Auringer seconded to adjourn. Motion carried.

Chair, Mr. Piepho
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Final Report: Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study
No: 5.1

Agenda Item: Final Report: Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study

Recommendation Action(s): Informational

Summary:
A final report on the joint MAPO/MnDOT Trunk Highway 22 (TH22) Corridor Study will be delivered. The study team has coordinated over 2017-2018 to identify and address current and future transportation issues along the corridor and to identify alternatives for further analysis. The project is scheduled for final delivery in December, 2018.

Attachments:
TH22 presentation materials
Corridor Study Limits

- Segment 1
  - US 169 to CR 2 (Blue Earth/Le Sueur County Line)

- Segment 2
  - CR 2 (Blue Earth/Le Sueur County Line) to CR 90

- Segment 3
  - CR 90 to Hwy 30/CR 29 (South of Mapleton)
Study Process

- Pop-up Events
- Focus Groups
- Open House #1
- Open House #2
- Open House #3

Data Collection → Purpose & Need → Corridor Vision → Alternatives Development → Alternatives Evaluation → Implementation Plan → Final Report

HIGHWAY 22 | CORRIDOR STUDY

Corridor Needs
Corridor Needs – Segment 2

- **Origin-Destination**
  - North of US 14 – Primarily local traffic
  - South of US 14 – High amount of traffic to/from Mankato from the south
  - North of CR 90 – High amount of commercial traffic to/from Mankato via US 14
  - Takeaway = Hwy 22 corridor primarily used for locally based traffic, not pass through traffic

---

Corridor Needs – Segment 2

- **Intersection safety issues at:**
  - CSAH 2
  - N Riverfront Drive (CR 57)
  - Augusta Drive
  - N Victory Drive (CR 3)
  - Bassett Drive
  - Hoffman Road
  - Stadium Road (Hwy 83/CR 60)
  - S Victory Drive / 206th Street
  - Statewide avg / Critical rate
Corridor Needs – Segment 2

- Traffic Forecasts
  - Leveraged MAPO LRTP forecasts (based on historic traffic volumes, land use, demographic growth)
  - Revised based on today’s condition (i.e. land use changes, development, etc.)
  - Updated based on input from study TAC members

Corridor Needs – Segment 2

- Operational issues at:
  - N Riverfront Drive (CR 57) (LOS E by 2030)
  - Augusta Drive (LOS F by 2030)
  - N Victory Drive (CR 3) (LOS D by 2030)
  - Adams Street (LOS F by 2030)
  - Madison Avenue (LOS E by 2030)
  - Bassett Drive (LOS D by 2045)
  - For overall intersection operations

- Pavement condition predicted to be poor in some locations on Hwy 22 by year 2026
Corridor Needs – Segment 2

- Pedestrian/multimodal considerations
  - Trail gap between Hoffman Road and CR 90
  - Need for improved pedestrian crossings of Hwy 22

Corridor Vision
Corridor Vision – Segment 2A
(CR 2 to CR 26 (227th Street) and Hwy 83/CR 60 (Stadium Road) to CR 90)

- Emphasis on multimodal connectivity
- Envision a two/four-lane (transition from four to two-lane roadway) urbanizing roadway with a speed limit of 45-55 mph
- Managed direct access to the corridor
- Consider corridor aesthetics

Corridor Vision – Segment 2B
(CR 26 (227th Street) to Hwy 83/CR 60 (Stadium Road))

- Emphasis on multimodal connectivity
- Envision a mostly four-lane urbanizing/parkway with a speed limit of 45-55 mph
- Limited direct access to corridor
- Consider corridor aesthetics
Corridor Alternatives – Segment 2A
(CR 2 to CR 26 (227th Street) and Hwy 83/CR 60 (Stadium Road) to CR 90)
Corridor Alternatives – Segment 2B
(CR 26 (227th Street) to Hwy 83/CR 60 (Stadium Road))

Rural

Urban

Intersection Alternatives - Segment 2B
(CR 26 (227th Street) to Hwy 83/CR 60 (Stadium Road))

- Four corridor intersection alternatives
  - Traffic signals
  - Roundabouts
  - Roundabouts with meters
  - Hybrid corridor / RCIs
Evaluation of Alternatives

- Preliminary evaluation completed
- Public feedback gathered
- Refinement of alternatives
- Evaluation of refined alternatives completed
Evaluation of Alternatives

- ICE reports completed for
  - N Riverfront Drive (CR 57), N Victory Drive (CR 3), 227th Street (CR 26), Bassett Drive

- No change in rural vs urban section travel time (if lanes, shoulders, etc. are same)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time for 2045 PM Peak Hour (Minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Alternatives

(Roadway Considerations)

- Resurface/reconstruct Hwy 22 from Stadium Road (Hwy 83/CR 60) to CR 90

2 Lane + Trail
Recommended Alternatives
(Roadway Considerations)

- Resurface/reconstruct Hwy 22 from N Riverfront Drive (CR 57) to Stadium Road (Hwy 83/CR 60)—either rural or urban section (TBD)

Recommended Alternatives
(Roadway Considerations)

- Widen Hwy 22 from CR 2 to N Riverfront Drive (CR 57) to a three-lane roadway
Recommended Alternatives
(Intersection Considerations)

1. Roundabout or Continuous-T at N Riverfront Drive (CR 57)
2. Roundabout at 227th Street (CR 26)
3. Roundabout at Augusta Drive
4. Roundabout at N Victory Drive (CR 3)
5. Roundabout at Bassett Drive
6. Roundabout at Hoffman Road
7. Roundabout at Stadium Road (Hwy 83/CY 60)

---

Recommended Alternatives
(Multimodal Considerations)

- Construct multiuse trail on west side of Hwy 22 from Hoffman Road to CR 90
  
  2 Lane + Trail
Recommended Alternatives
(Multimodal Considerations)

- Construct pedestrian overpass near Prairie Winds Middle School

Recommended Alternatives
(Multimodal Considerations)

- Construct pedestrian overpass between N Victory Drive (CR 3) and Augusta Drive
Preliminary Implementation Plan

• Phasing Sequence (Priority)
  • Short-term (high/medium priority)
  • Long-term (medium/low priority)
  • Opportunity driven (low priority)

• Outcomes
  • Corridor improvements implementation phasing still being finalized
  • Pedestrian improvements = opportunity driven
  • Short-term (high priority) intersections = North Riverfront Drive (CR 57), Augusta Drive, Bassett Drive
  • Short-term (medium priority) intersections = North Victory Drive (CR 3) and Hoffman Road

Next Steps

• Finalize Implementation Plan
• Final Documentation
• Present to Blue Earth County Board (12/11)
Questions???
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Final Report: South Victory Drive / Hoffman Road Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Study No: 5.2

Agenda Item: Final Report: South Victory Drive / Hoffman Road Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Study

Recommendation Action(s): Informational

Summary:
A final report on the MAPO’s South Victory Drive / Hoffman Road ICE Study will be delivered. The study team is currently assessing alternatives for intersection improvements based on safety and traffic efficiencies. The project is scheduled for final delivery in December, 2018.

Attachments:
South Victory Drive / Hoffman Road ICE Study presentation slides
South Victory Drive / Hoffman Road ICE Decision Matrix
ICE Process

Documentation:
Select Alternative, Develop Report, Agency Approval
Alternatives Development and Analysis:
Develop Alternatives, Traffic Analysis,
Other Considerations, Decision Matrix
No-Build Conditions:
20-year Traffic Forecasts, Traffic Analysis
Existing Conditions:
Data Collection, Traffic Analysis

Intersection Location

South Victory Dr (CSAH B2) at Hoffman Rd ICE  December 2018
Existing Conditions

- Currently Signalized
- Residential to the west
- Retail shops in NE quadrant
- Public Works Facility and Transit Hub in SE quadrant
- Mankato East High School about 1/2 mile to the east

Existing Conditions

- Collected traffic data in September 2018
- ADTs and turning movement volumes shown derived from those counts
**Existing Conditions**

- **Crash History**
  - 70 crashes between 2011-2015
  - Above statewide average crash rate and critical crash rate for signalized intersection

- **Existing signal configuration could provide acceptable operations in 2018 and 2038**

---

**Future Volumes**

- Forecast volumes developed for 2038
- Existing volume data with growth rates from MAPO 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan
- Intersection alternative selection must keep future volumes in mind
Alternatives

- Possible alternatives to consider:
  - New Signal with Current Lane Configuration
  - New Signal with Geometric Improvements
  - Roundabout

- New Signal with Current Lane Configuration
  - Would upgrade to mast arms for all approaches
  - Chance to update pedestrian facilities
  - Does not address any issues with shared lanes
  - Does not address crash issues
Alternatives

- New Signal with Geometric Improvements
  - Adds dedicated right turn lanes for all approaches
  - Adds dedicated left turn lane for eastbound Hoffman Road approach
  - Provides ped crossings on all four legs
  - Right-of-way impacts; concept could be tweaked if cost prohibitive
  - Dedicated turn lanes will have some benefit, but not anticipated to fully address crash issues

Alternatives

Roundabout Alternative
- Can mostly fit within the footprint of the existing intersection
- Right-of-way impacts in SE quadrant; concept could be tweaked if cost prohibitive
- Anticipated to better address crash issues
Draft Alternatives Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Traffic Signal With Geometric Improvements</th>
<th>Roundabout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrants Analysis</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Analysis</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike and Ped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Acceptance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

- Vetting of alternatives with the City and County
- Draft ICE Report Documentation
- Address ICE comments
- Finalize ICE report
- Project Completion (December 31, 2018)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements</th>
<th>Roundabout Control</th>
<th>Recommended Alternative(s) Based on Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrants Analysis</td>
<td>• Existing Year 2018 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants</td>
<td>• Existing Year 2018 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements, Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>• Forecasted Year 2038 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants</td>
<td>• Forecasted Year 2038 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements, Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Analysis</td>
<td>2018 • Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements, Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS, significant delay during A.M. peak</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS, Significant delay during A.M. peak</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements, Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forecasted Year 2038 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants</td>
<td>• Forecasted Year 2038 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements, Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Analysis</td>
<td>Con(s): • More crashes expected than roundabout</td>
<td>• More crashes expected than roundabout</td>
<td>• Drivers select acceptable gaps</td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Analysis</td>
<td>Pro(s): • Signal indications show vehicle right-of-way</td>
<td>• Signal indications show vehicle right-of-way</td>
<td>• Least number of crashes expected</td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower capital costs ($440,000) than roundabout control</td>
<td>• Lower capital costs ($620,000) than roundabout control</td>
<td>• Lower operation/maintenance costs than traffic signal control</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher operation/maintenance costs than roundabout control</td>
<td>• Higher operation/maintenance costs than roundabout control</td>
<td>• Higher capital costs ($1,360,000) that traffic signal control requires substantial reconstruction</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Pro(s): N/A (existing control)</td>
<td>• Less ROW impacts than roundabout control</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con(s): • Requires additional ROW in the southwest and southeast quadrants</td>
<td>• Requires additional ROW in all four quadrants</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System</td>
<td>Pro(s): • Existing control Adjacent intersections on Victory Drive are signalized</td>
<td>• Existing control Adjacent intersections on Victory Drive are signalized</td>
<td>Traffic calming through residential area</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Considerations</td>
<td>Con(s): none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle</td>
<td>Pro(s): • Pedestrian pushbuttons and signal phasing</td>
<td>• Pedestrian pushbuttons and signal phasing</td>
<td>• Pedestrian Refuge islands Lower vehicle speeds thru intersection</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations</td>
<td>Con(s): • Pedestrian signal phasing can lead to a false sense of security</td>
<td>• Pedestrian signal phasing can lead to a false sense of security</td>
<td>• Longer route No pedestrian phase</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Acceptance</td>
<td>Pro(s): N/A (existing control)</td>
<td>• Similar to existing control Familiar to drivers Positive public feedback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements, Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con(s): none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Existing Conditions, Traffic Signal Geometric Improvements, Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Release of Request for Proposal (RFP) for Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update
No: 5.3

Agenda Item: Release of Request for Proposal (RFP) for Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update

Recommendation Action(s): Motion and approval by Policy Board to release RFP.

Summary:
The MAPO’s current LRTP was adopted 2015. Per federal requirements, a LRTP Update must be completed by December, 2020. MAPO staff have developed a draft RFP with input from MnDOT’s Office of Transportation System Management, MnDOT District 7, the Federal Highway Administration, the counties of Blue Earth and Nicollet, the cities of Mankato, North Mankato, and Eagle Lake, and the Region Nine Development Commission. The LRTP RFP is scheduled for release in January 2019, with work tentatively scheduled to begin in May 2019.

The RFP for the LRTP Update includes a comprehensive update of elements within the current LRTP, along with integration of required elements introduced since the previous LRTP’s adoption. The scope of work is organized into nine sections:

1. Initiate Study
   Includes early preparation of a Timeline and Workflow Document to aid in completing the LRTP Update by the required deadline. Timeline will include deadlines for project work products and internal (project management) and external (stakeholder engagement) meetings.

2. Project Management
   Includes establishing a project administration scheme to ensure proper management of all project elements, including billing and work product ownership elements.

3. Data Collection & Deliverables
   Includes a review of existing data and documentation and provides a plan for obtaining necessary data. Includes a Systems Performance Report for Performance Measurement.

4. Data Analysis and Plan Development
   Includes development of final data analysis and plan documents, as well as updating of all required plan components.

5. Public Input and Partnerships
   Emphasizes public engagement, including employment of traditional and
innovative techniques. The RFP calls for at least three (3) Open Houses, seven (7) meetings with the MAPO TAC, and four (4) meetings with the MAPO Policy Board.

6. Financial Resources
   Includes development of revenue projections with supportive assumptions through 2045. Includes a demonstration of Fiscal Constraint.

7. Efficient Transportation Decision Making
   Includes establishing contact with relevant local/regional planning and policy-making agencies and integrating their input as appropriate.

8. Environmental Justice and Title VI
   Includes all Environmental Justice (EJ) elements as related to federal, state, and local requirements.

9. Project Completion / Plan Adoption
   Includes all work necessary to ensure final adoption of the LRTP Update by the MAPO Policy Board no later than their meeting scheduled December 3, 2020.

The MAPO’s standard “Best Value Selection” method will be used to review proposals submitted in response to the RFP. Selected TAC members will evaluate all proposals received by the deadline. The MAPO’s standard 100-point scale will be used to create the final evaluation and selection. The factors and weighting on which proposals will be judged are: Technical Approach (40 points), Cost (30 points), Organization, personnel and expertise (20 points), and General quality of response and responsiveness to terms and conditions (10 points).

The RFP will be distributed through the below venues:
  - Posting on the MAPO website
  - Notice in the Mankato Free Press
  - Email Distribution to the MAPO Policy Board and TAC
  - Individual emails to Bolton & Menk, Kimley-Horn, SEH, SRF, WSB, WSN, Wenck & Associated, and I&S Group
  - Announced on MAPO Twitter account

Staff recommends the MAPO Policy Board motion to approve release of the RFP.

This item was brought before the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their meeting held November 15, 2018 and was recommended for approval.

Attachments:
Draft LRTP Update RFP
LRTP RFP Internal Cost Estimate (handout)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO)

Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update

Issued By: Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
10 Civic Center Plaza
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

Issue Date: January 2, 2019

Deliver To: Charles Androsky
Transportation Planner

Respond By: 4:30 p.m. February 18, 2019

Late proposals will not be accepted

Direct Questions To:
Charles Androsky
MAPO Transportation Planner
(507) 387-8389
candrosky@mankatomn.gov
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Introduction

The Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) hereby solicits proposals from qualified firms for a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update that provides regional transportation leadership and is compliant with all applicable local, state, and federal guidance and legislation.

As the region’s designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the MAPO must maintain and periodically update its Long Range Transportation Plan (23 CFR §450.324). The MAPO’s current Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is available for viewing and download on the MAPO’s website at the following web address: https://mnmapo.org/2045-long-range-transportation-plan/

Per federal requirement, the LRTP must be updated every five years to reflect changes in population, policy, legislation, technologies, and guidance (local, regional, state, and federal). The time horizon for the LRTP Update is to be 2045. Federal requirements dictate that the Update to the MAPO’s existing LRTP is required for adoption by the MAPO Policy Board by December 3, 2020. The Update will fully adhere to the guidance and requirements of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015, as well as other required federal legislation.

Interested firms can obtain a further copies of this RFP by downloading from www.mnmapo.org, by emailing candrosky@mankatomn.gov, or by calling (507) 387-8389.

Background

Under the authority of 23 CFR §450.310(a) the MAPO is the federally-designated MPO for the Mankato/North Mankato urbanized area. The MAPO’s role is to provide planning assistance to local jurisdictions on transportation and land use interactions and related transportation issues within the MAPO area. One of its major work products is a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) required under 23 CFR §450.324. The LRTP provides a systems-level framework of policy goals, objectives, and strategies for the development of the MAPO area multimodal transportation system. The LRTP Update is developed in consultation with local jurisdictions and updated every five years. This Request for Proposal (RFP) solicits consultant proposals for the MAPO’s first LRTP Update to its original LRTP, adopted 2015. The time horizon for the MAPO’s LRTP Update will run through 2045.

The Update to the MAPO’s current LRTP must be adopted by the MAPO Policy Board on or before December 3, 2020. The contracted consultant (Consultant) shall perform work to ensure this deadline is met. Accomplishing this goal will entail consideration to scheduling the requisite public comment period(s), open houses, and/or workshops beforehand, obtaining guidance and/or approval from local, state and federal entities, as well as presenting the finalized draft document to the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) by November 19, 2020 (see Scope of Work Task IX). The MAPO TAC and Policy Board function through the standard advisory-action relationship, whereas adoption of the final LRTP Update by the Policy Board must be at the formal recommendation of the MAPO TAC.
The LRTP Update will provide the foundation for the development of the MAPO’s Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) and the MAPO’s annual Unified Planning Work Programs (UPPWPs), as well as other short-and long-term plans, studies, projects, and recommendations. As per 23 CFR §450.306(b), the LRTP Update process shall provide for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, services, and policies that will address the following ten (10) Transportation Planning factors, as outlined in 23 CFR 450.306:

(1) Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
(2) Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
(3) Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
(4) Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight;
(5) Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
(6) Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
(7) Promote efficient system management and operation;
(8) Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;
(9) Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and
(10) Enhance travel and tourism

These ten factors shall provide a framework for the work products generated for LRTP Update. The LRTP Update will be prepared cooperatively by and between the selected Consultant, the public, MAPO partners, and state/federal oversight and approval agencies. The primary participants of this study shall include the MAPO Policy Board and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The MAPO will contract with the selected Consultant and staff of the MAPO will perform contract oversight and coordination. **The budget for this project is not to exceed $180,000.**

**Scope of Work**

The Scope of Work specifies the tasks that may be issued in part or whole, to the Consultant. During contract negotiations and throughout the course of the project, additional tasks and work elements may be added or deleted at the discretion of the MAPO. The MAPO must approve initiation of work tasks, which may be one or more tasks identified in the Scope of Work in writing before the Consultant may perform work. The Consultant shall prepare a final Work Plan, to be included in the contract. All work shall be completed and submitted to the MAPO before **November 11, 2020** to allow the MAPO TAC adequate time to review final documents and recommend formal adoption by the MAPO Policy Board.

The MAPO LRTP Update will include long-range and short-range strategies and actions that contribute to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. In keeping with the intent and requirements of the FAST Act (and other applicable transportation legislation), and the requirements stipulated by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the State of Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), this plan update will be multimodal.
in nature. It will include: public transportation, pedestrian facilities, bikeways, streets, roads, highways, air- and landside airport improvements, transportation system management and operations (TSMO); and freight transportation.

Areas of Emphasis

The ten Transportation Planning factors as outlined in 23 CFR 450.306 (listed above) shall provide an organizational framework for the MAPO LRTP Update. However, to ensure the LRTP Update is specific to the unique contextual factors of the MAPO, the Consultant shall perform work to identify and develop Areas of Emphasis. The Areas of Emphasis of the LRTP Update shall be determined early in the project by the Consultant through a collaborative visioning and input process through engagement with the public and Project Management Team (PMT). The plan’s Areas of Emphasis may include broad goals such as safety, economic development, affordability, transportation system maintenance, compliance with Federal/State requirements, and environmental stewardship, as well as more specific goals such as increased housing and jobs in central locations, providing improved transportation options (ADA compliance, walking, bicycling, and transit) to specific areas, or improved coordination of local policies. The Update will include provisions to enable the MAPO to initiate special studies as needed as issues (special opportunities, problematic intersections/corridors, rapid proliferation of new technologies/travel preferences, etc.) are identified. The Update will include safety and security elements to meet the Federal requirements indicated in 23 CFR 450.

The LRTP Update shall include a robust public involvement component to provide interested parties opportunities to participate in the LRTP Update process. The Update shall also be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies responsible for: transportation, land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, public health, conservation, historic preservation and other appropriate agencies. The LRTP Update shall consider new and emerging technologies, practices, and services such as connection and/or automation of freight and personal vehicles, Transportation Network Companies (TNCs), electrification, and vehicle/ride sharing services.

The LRTP Update shall incorporate a performance-driven, outcome-based approach to planning in full support of the Federal Highway Administration’s Performance-Based Planning and Programming Guidebook. This document includes the guidance; “[MPOs]..., in cooperation with the State and public transportation operators, shall develop long-range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs through a performance-driven, outcome-based approach to planning.” 23 USC Section 134(c)(1); 49 USC Section 5303(c)(1). “The metropolitan transportation planning process shall provide for the establishment and use of a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support the national goals....” 23 USC Section 134(h)(2); 49 USC Section 5303(h)(2).

The overall Update process and policy decisions shall be guided by the MAPO TAC. Outlined below is the Scope of Work that will steer development of the project. MAPO has included the Scope of Work to provide interested Consultants insight into project intent, context, coordination, responsibilities, and other elements to help facilitate proposal development. The Consultant is encouraged to offer innovative initiatives in addition to, or supplemental to the included Scope of Work. In order to achieve the project goal and ensure the ten (10) Transportation Planning factors listed above are addressed and incorporated, the following tasks will be performed by the chosen...
Consultant. At a minimum, the Consultant shall be expected to establish detailed analysis, recommendations, and/or deliverables for the following tasks:

**Scope of Work Task I: Initiate Study**

Early in the process the Consultant shall prepare a detailed **Timeline and Workflow Document** to aid in the accurate and timely generation of work products/sections of the final document. This is intended to aid in completing the LRTP Update by the deadline. In development of the **Timeline and Workflow Document**, the Consultant shall provide scheduling consideration for the below tasks:

- Scheduling of internal and external meetings and Public Engagement/Outreach events and campaigns. This shall include a project kickoff meeting, engagement to identify project **Areas of Emphasis**, a schedule of regular **Project Management Team (PMT)** meetings, meetings with MAPO member jurisdictions, timed social media “blasts,” obtaining guidance and approval from local, state, and federal entities, and required updates/presentations to the MAPO TAC and Policy Board during the course of the study.
- Identification of current federal and state transportation requirements and guidance for MPOs, including all components required for the LRTP Update to be approved by local, state, and federal entities.
- Identification of specific issues to be addressed in the LRTP Update.
- Review current LRTP goals, update as needed.
- Determine roles of MAPO staff and partners.
- Establish data collection and analysis needs and methods for obtaining data.
- Establish partner/stakeholder contact list and meeting schedule.
- Calculate financial estimates and expense scheduling to ensure all work stays within budget and within time parameters over course of project.

The **Timeline and Workflow Document** shall be designed to allow adequate time for development of elements and/or sections of the final LRTP Update which are required under §450.324, including the below bulleted list. The below list is not exhaustive and is only intended to provide foundational guidance. The Consultant shall take action to ensure the LRTP Update fulfills all content requirements as dictated by all applicable state and federal agencies. The LRTP Update shall address, but not be limited to, each of the below items. Detailed review, analysis, and consideration must be given to §450.324, as well as the below work areas:

- Evaluation of the MAPO’s current LRTP and analysis of elements to add, amend, expand, or improve upon in the LRTP Update.
- The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the LRTP.
- Review of existing and proposed transportation facilities.
- Operational and management strategies to maintain and improve the performance of existing transportation facilities.
- Performance measures and performance targets in accordance with §450.306(d).
- A **System Performance Report** as described in §450.324.
- Consideration of the results of congestion management processes.
- Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure.
• Transportation and transit enhancement activities.
• Consideration to the linkages between land use decision making and the direct and indirect effects of those decisions on the transportation system. For example, the effect on the system of concentrating housing near employment and retail centers.
• A discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities. The discussion call be developed with all applicable federal, state, and tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies.
• A **Financial Plan** that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented, with demonstration of **Fiscal Constraint**.
• Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g).
• Update of traffic forecasting projections. This shall include analysis of forecasts developed in the previous LRTP and consultation with local, MnDOT and FHWA partners.

Deliverables under Task I shall include, but not be limited to, a **Timeline and Workflow Document** developed with consideration to the above bulleted tasks and deliverables.

**Scope of Work Task II. Project Management**

The Consultant shall ensure first-rate management of the entire project including staff, equipment, and documentation, as well as all activities related to any subcontracted firms. The Consultant shall prepare progress reports, documentation of travel and expense receipts, and preparation and submission of invoices. It is imperative to consider the public and keep MAPO citizens informed of the planning activities and outcomes using a public engagement strategy that includes use of established public engagement methods such as print, internet, and social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, etc.) The Consultant is encouraged to provide innovative options, tools, and methods for public engagement throughout the study. The Consultant shall maintain a project website and provide information to MAPO and member-municipalities for posting on their respective websites.

**Subcontracts**
The primary Consultant is expected to perform either the entirety or the majority of all aspects of the LRTP Update. However, at points agreed upon and authorized beforehand by the MAPO, certain technical aspects of the LRTP Update may be found to be more efficiently performed by other specialized firms, traditionally referred to as “subcontracted” consultants. For the purposes of this RFP, the term “Consultant” shall apply to both the primary and all subcontracted consultants. All guidance, requirements, and performance standards provided shall apply to the primary Consultant and to any subcontracted consultants, in the event the MAPO authorizes this practice. The primary consultant shall be held responsible for any/all practices and work products undertaken by any/all subcontracted firms.

The Consultant shall also organize and host biweekly (every two weeks) **Project Management Team (PMT) meetings** with MAPO, including preparation of meeting agendas and taking and reporting meeting minutes. Attendance to PMT meetings shall always include Consultant and MAPO staff; however representatives from the MAPO TAC, Policy Board, and member municipalities may attend PMT meetings and provide input varying on meeting topics and areas of focus.
Additional consultations, in the form of letters, emails and/or telephone conversations with project planners and engineers will, where necessary, clarify the technical requirements and objectives of the contract and work tasks. The Consultant shall ascertain the applicability of information provided, review data for completeness, and notify the project stakeholders of any additional data required. It will be the responsibility of the Consultant to determine the reliability of all information which they choose as reference.

The Consultant shall assign a single person to serve through the life of the contract as Consultant Project Manager (PM). The PM must be the person identified in the selected firm’s proposal and may not be changed without prior written approval of MAPO. The PM will be responsible for overall project management necessary to ensure the satisfactory, on-time, on-budget completion of the LRTP Update in accordance with the scope of services. The PM will serve as a single point of contact and will be expected to ensure the consultant team is properly managed, adequate resources are available, submittals are timely and QA/QC reviewed, and disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) firms, if any, are utilized for maximum benefit and paid in a timely fashion.

The PM shall work closely with MAPO staff to ensure strong communication and coordination through the life of the contract. Communication shall include mandatory written monthly progress reports with an updated actual schedule versus planned schedule, task progress, identification of critical path tasks, and actual expenditures versus budget report. Beyond normal phone and email communication, the PM and MAPO will be expected to hold PMT meetings by teleconference or in person on a biweekly basis to review the progress report, monitor progress, and discuss upcoming tasks.

The PM will submit monthly invoices in a form and with documentation acceptable to MAPO within 30 business days following the end of each month throughout the life of the contract. Invoices must include the monthly progress report, a breakout of activities by task, employee, and employee hours for those tasks, and any supportive documentation for expenses. Invoices shall also include a description of expenses incurred to date. The PM may request approval from MAPO, in writing, to skip a monthly invoice if no activity occurs during the month or for other reasons.

MAPO will retain all rights and ownership of materials generated, including (but not limited to) data, reports, presentations, maps, graphics, photos, video, figures, GIS databases, and social media elements delivered by the Consultant in order to complete the tasks delivered within this Scope of Work. All reports shall be of high quality and reproducible. All text-and graphic-based deliverables shall be provided in both PDF and Word format. GIS-related data shall be provided in a GIS platform compatible with MAPO’s computer software and hardware. The MAPO shall be granted the right to use any and all materials for future planning, education, or communication needs.

Deliverables under Task II shall include, but not be limited to, documentation of MAPO ownership of the above stated elements.

Scope of Work Task III: Data Collection & Deliverables

The Consultant shall identify, obtain, compile, review, and utilize a wide range of documents and data in support of developing required deliverables for the LRTP Update. Whenever possible,
documents and data shall be obtained in an electronic format. The Consultant is expected to use and leverage existing data and information to the maximum extent possible to avoid duplicative data collection efforts.

The Consultant shall compile and review all documents, plans, studies, and data pertaining to the MAPO’s multimodal transportation system, as well as both existing and forecasted travel activities in the region. Where existing data is not available, the Consultant shall take measures (as appropriate and approved by the PMT) to produce primary data and subsequent analyses. These data, plans, studies, and documents may include, but are not limited to:

- Adopted MAPO member-municipality plans and studies, land use information, and zoning practices.
- Previous MAPO plans and studies.
- Traffic counts, crash and accident data, HPMS data, signal warrants, aerial photos, major street network classifications, sign inventories, traffic signal data, GIS/CADD property and right of way maps, funding data, etc.
- Limited and dated data includes: signalized and unsignalized intersection capacity analyses (LOS), travel speeds, turning movements, roadway widths, right of way widths, number of lanes, sidewalk inventories, ADA ramp locations, transit ridership, transit maps and route information.
- U.S. Bureau of Census data.
- MnDOT’s Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Architecture Plan
- City building permits, County permits, utility records, etc.
- Socioeconomic data and projections compiled by MAPO staff and the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED).
- GIS data/layers, as available from City, County, and State sources.
- Base and horizon year socio-economic data developed by State and Federal sources.
- The MAPO’s current LRTP, as well as the MAPO’s body of existing area plans and studies.
- Municipal Capital Improvement Plans.
- Pavement and Bridge Condition ratings and data.
- Local, state, and federal statutes.
- Comprehensive plans for MAPO member municipalities.
- State and County Safety Plan.
- Local and State goals and requirements regarding Toward Zero Deaths
- MAPO member-municipality Safe Routes to School plans, Park and Open Space plans, Complete Streets plans, City Center plans.
- DNR Parks and Trails plans.
- Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan
- MnDOT District 7 Safety Plan
- North Mankato Downtown Study (ies).
- Airport Planning Documents.
- Hazard and Disaster Preparation Documents.
- Locally adopted master plans, utility and public facilities plans and related development regulations.
- Projected traffic volumes for the duration of the LRTP Update time horizons.
• Consultation with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of a LRTP Update. This will include comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.
• Intersection and corridor capacity analyses relative to existing and projected demand.
• Existing and unmet maintenance and preservation needs of the existing transportation system.
• Accident analysis for identified high accident locations.
• Major Street Network will be reviewed for appropriateness.
• Functional Classification Review – each classified roadway on the major street network will be reviewed for accuracy and appropriateness.
• Travel time analysis for peak and off-peak periods.
• Intersection LOS/Roadway capacity.
• Opportunities for using access management to protect or enhance street system capacity.
• Guidance and plans pertaining to facilities and services for alternative transportation modes including bicycles, pedestrians, and mass transit.
• Title VI, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other applicable non-discriminative plans/procedures consistent with Federal and State requirements.
• Develop the recommended street network by including future major street corridors and by addressing connections between individual neighborhoods and activity centers with motorized and non-motorized modes of transportation.
• Standard cross sections for the major street network (review, revise as appropriate).
• Traffic Calming measures – review of current programs.
• Scenic roadway guidance and/or plans.
• Committed projects will be summarized/listed, with year-of-construction estimates.
• Financial resources inventory and review of potential funding for recommended improvements (State and Federal funding information will be provided by MNDOT).
• Minnesota State University Mankato Campus Plans.
• Airport Analysis Plan.
• Mankato Transit System’s Transit Development Plan.

The Consultant shall review and summarize these documents and data in terms of their impact and relevance to the LRTP Update, particularly state and federal legislation and include any potential conflicts or inconsistencies that must be addressed. The Consultant shall prepare a LRTP checklist that reflects the elements of the scope and summarize the state and federal requirements of long range transportation plans.

Data necessary to support development and measurement of the goals and objectives of the project, as well as required performance measures, will be collected and in some cases generated by the Consultant. The Consultant is expected to identify GIS and other mapping data needs early in the project schedule to support analysis and other LRTP Update tasks. MAPO will work with the Consultant to provide, where possible, a list of available GIS layers, maps, and data and will supply requested materials, when feasible, to the Consultant.

The Consultant shall review and consider the current and newly-enacted transportation legislation at all levels of government during the life of the contract that may impact the LRTP Update.
The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act was passed after adoption of the current LRTP. The Consultant will identify and summarize areas of change and opportunities for the MAPO planning area. This includes development of a **Systems Performance Report** for updates/change due to current legislation, including Performance Measurement. The Consultant shall ensure that the LRTP Update is in full compliance with all federal and state Performance Measurement requirements, including those required under the FAST Act and/or MAP-21 and 23 CFR 490.107, as well as coordinate with MAPO and the Mankato Transit System to ensure full compliance with FTA Transit Asset Management (TAM) requirements and any/all transit safety performance measures. The Consultant shall design this section, as well as the entire plan, in compliance with all aspects of 23 USC Section 134(h)(2) and 49 USC Section 5303 (h)(2). This legislation states; “The metropolitan transportation planning process shall provide for the establishment and use of a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support the national goals...” This language includes the MAPO’s and MnDOT’s adopted Performance Measures but is also intended to go beyond, wrapping the entire LRTP Update process in a performance-driven, outcomes-based methodology.

The Consultant shall create an electronic inventory to include all electronically available documents and data that will be updated regularly throughout the life of the contract. GIS-based data and data sets will be obtained and consolidated by the Consultant as mutually agreed by the MAPO.

A **Data Summary** document shall be prepared by the Consultant to provide documentation and inventory of available documents and data, identify missing information, potential areas of conflict or inconsistencies with the data, minimum federal and state requirements, key policy issues, best practices, potential areas of conflict, etc. Additional tasks pertaining to the Consultant’s data collection duties shall include, but not be limited to:

- Identification of transportation priorities and proposed system improvements within the MAPO area.
- Review and update, as needed, of population, employment, and traffic predictions.
- Gathering of existing and historic traffic and truck count information.
- Gathering of transportation-related accident location information.
- Conduct asset management data collection of transportation infrastructure in the MAPO area.
- Identification of safety and other performance measures as pertaining to the FAST Act and/or MAP-21.
- Survey and report on any significant changes to the MAPO area since previous LRTP, including large developments, population changes, and significant projects e.g. reclassification of floodplains, economic development projects, etc.

Deliverables under Task III shall include, but not be limited to, an **LRTP checklist** that reflects the elements of the scope and summarizes the state and federal requirements of long range transportation plans, a **Systems Performance Report** of updates/changes needed due to current legislation, including Performance Measures, and a **Data Summary** to provide documentation and inventory of available documents and data.

**Scope of Work Task IV: Data Analysis, Document Review, & Plan Development**
The Consultant shall perform all data analysis and document review necessary to develop all plan documents for inclusion in the LRTP Update. Work areas requiring analyses, review, and generation of deliverables (these deliverables will then comprise sections and content of the final LRTP Update document) shall include, but not be limited to:

- **Safety.** Safety shall receive significant attention in the LRTP Update, in sufficient depth and detail to obtain approval from local, state, and federal transportation planning partners. In performing safety analyses the Consultant shall incorporate applicable sections of the Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan, MnDOT District 7 Safety Plan, and applicable municipal safety plans. Analysis of high-accident intersections will be performed, and safety-specific projects will be proposed. Bicycle and pedestrian accidents on major roadways will be reviewed for any discernible trends. Local law enforcement agencies will be contacted for relevant statistics, safety project information, etc. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.

- **Non-Motorized Facilities.** The Consultant shall review the MAPO’s recently-completed ADA Transition Plan, as well as municipal Complete Streets and suggest priority areas for new upgrade projects. Attention shall be given to Complete Streets and areas/routes in need of pedestrian facilities. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.

- **Bicycle Routing.** The Consultant shall utilize the project’s public engagement elements and internal/external meetings to identify preferred on-street bicycle routes. Preferred routes shall be reviewed for capacity to accommodate on-street bike facilities, and route signage/striping will be recommended for each on-street route. Priorities will be identified for bike route projects. Connectivity (on-street connectivity, and connectivity to/within the off-street trail system), Complete Streets, current and future demand, feasibility and funding availability will drive project priority identification. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.

- **Freight.** The Consultant shall identify major freight destinations, hubs, and travel routes and facilities. This shall include identification of major truck and rail destinations and sources, including major freight traffic generators located both within and outside the MAPO planning boundary. Analyses shall be performed regarding the current and future demands freight may put on the transportation system. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.

- **Livable Communities.** The concept of our streets as important components of the fabric of the community will be emphasized and reflected in the context of the MAPO area. Areas where transportation projects can enhance livability will be identified, as well as projects recommended for incorporation of livability concepts such as complete streets, walkability, multi-mode mobility (i.e. consideration of integration of separate modes into a comprehensive mobility network). Projects that enhance economic development opportunities will be given consideration. General methods for incorporating context sensitive design into all roadway projects will be outlined. Funding methods for non-traditional design features (such as landscaping or streetscapes) will be identified. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.
• **Air.** The Consultant shall identify air and passenger facilities along with providing an analysis of the current airport and Land to Air Express service that is currently offered. The Consultant shall review future aviation investments for short, mid, and long range investments. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.

• **Mitigation.** The plan shall include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the Plan. The discussion shall be developed in consultation with federal, state, and land management, and regulatory agencies. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.

• **Transit and Public Transportation.** Mankato Transit will be closely consulted to identify needs and project costs and funding sources and amounts. This shall include review of the system’s Transit Development Plan. The potential for partnership between established traditional transit systems (i.e. Mankato Transit and other public, private, and nonprofit transit providers) and private and emerging mobility services, such as taxis, shuttles, and Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) shall be explored.

The LRTP Update shall include consideration of land use practices and the resulting effects on the cost and viability of transit. The Consultant shall generate land use recommendations toward making transit more efficient, cost-effective, and affordable within the MAPO planning area.

The Consultant shall provide an inventory and overview of air travel facilities, intercity bus service and facilities and implementing tactics for pursing potential passenger rail and facilities as outlined in MnDOT’s Statewide Freight and Passenger Rail Plan for potential passenger rail service. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, and long range sections.

• **Emergency and Disaster Response (i.e. Security)** The Plan shall address strategies and methods to design a transportation network and system that will help the community to effectively respond to natural and man-made disasters. Barriers to effective and prompt response will be identified, including an evaluation of community evacuation routes. While this section is not expected to be extensive, it should both draw upon and add to the community’s general emergency preparedness. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.

• **Maintenance Operations.** Suggestions for improved roadway surface maintenance will be emphasized, and the various agency responsibilities will be clearly denoted. Federal-aid roadway responsibilities versus roadway control will be discussed, and methods for maintaining striping, signals, signage, and other areas will be identified. The Consultant shall perform a [Capacity Analysis](#) and future projects considering short range, mid, and long term future projects. Options for innovative pavement preservation methods will be provided, including the use of recycled materials. Sustainable storm water management techniques will be reviewed, with feasible techniques included in the Plan. A brief discussion of non-motorized facility maintenance responsibilities will be included.
considering recommendations for maintenance of future facilities that may be constructed. Minnesota and local municipal law shall be consulted. Recommended projects will be prioritized in the short, mid, long range, and illustrative sections.

- Connection of all collected data to existing GIS and performance of geographic analyses.
- Review of existing traffic data and future forecasts/projections and update as needed to identify current and future deficiencies in the road network.
- Analysis of land use and transportation systems to identify conflicts or potential conflicts.
- Analysis of impacts of current and proposed transportation issues on underserved and low income populations.
- Review and update of Environmental Justice component of LRTP.
- Review and update of the Financial Plan that demonstrates how the plan can be implemented. This includes demonstration of Fiscal Constraint, an update to revenue forecasts, and potential changes to funding streams at all levels of government e.g. potential future changes to sales tax.
- Review eligibility criteria as identified in the existing LRTP, use data to review criteria to prioritize future projects that meet LRTP Update objectives, including state and federal requirements. Review potential impacts performance measures and targets may have on criteria.
- Analyze and update entirety of LRTP project list and maps. All proposed infrastructure improvements and/or policy changes (i.e., capital investments and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure and provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs) should be described in sufficient detail, including design concept and scope, and estimated engineering and construction costs in year of construction dollars. The recommendations should be prioritized on the basis of:
  - Significance of meeting system needs and/or resolving system problems.
  - Urgency of addressing targeted needs or problems.
  - Efficacy and cost efficiency of addressing targeted needs or problems.
  - Meeting stated community goals and project objectives.
  - Anticipated funding and economics of scale opportunities

When available, alternatives for resolving issues or problems are to be identified. Operational and management strategies to improve performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety, mobility, and health of people and goods are to be recommended. The Consultant shall consider land use and access management policies throughout the development of these short, mid, and long range recommendations.

Deliverables under Task VI shall include, but not be limited to, a Capacity Analysis, an Environmental Justice component reviewed and approved by the MAPO and state and federal
agencies, a **Financial Plan**, updates to the entirety of the **LRTP project list and maps** with documentation supporting how list was designed and why projects were included, as well as updates/summaries of the items bulleted above.

**Scope of Work Task V: Public Input & Partnerships**

The project will utilize the MAPO’s Public Participation Plan and Staff Guide (PPP) to serve as a guiding framework for the project’s public engagement process and the development of a **LRTP Update Public Involvement Plan (PIP)**. Adherence to the MAPO’s PPP and development of a **Public Involvement Plan** specific to this project shall ensure compliance with federal 3-C regulations. At project outset the Consultant shall develop the **Public Involvement Plan (PIP)**, which will clearly articulate strategies to be employed for public outreach, education, input, and involvement for the project, as well as contain a schedule of effective public engagement events and methods to ensure the residents of the MAPO region are aware of, actively participate in, and are engaged to the maximum extent possible. The **Public Involvement Plan (PIP)** shall also describe the processes by which public input shall be considered and integrated into the LRTP Update at respective stages in the Update’s development. The PIP shall also describe and define the roles of the various decision-making and advisory bodies involved in the Plan’s development. This shall include utilizing public input early in the process to inform development of the LRTP Update’s **Areas of Emphasis** (described earlier in this RFP).

At significant and agreed-upon points before and during the development of the LRTP Update, the Consultant shall plan and conduct a variety of public input activities with a broad range of stakeholders, including consultation with representatives from all MAPO area jurisdictions, in accordance with the MAPO’s PPP. The project’s public engagement process must provide appropriate opportunities for public participation and input during the LRTP Update process. The Consultant shall undertake outreach efforts to various populations within the MAPO region, including those populations typically under-represented in the transportation planning process. The Consultant shall generate presentation materials for all meetings, including any slides, handouts, display boards, survey materials, etc. All materials shall be reviewed and approved by the MAPO beforehand. The project’s public engagement component shall include a process to identify project **Areas of Emphasis**. This process (described earlier in this RFP) shall be conducted early in the project life, as the results shall influence the entire project. Respondents are encouraged to submit innovative strategies to achieve this goal.

High-ranking responses shall illustrate how their proposal shall utilize a multi-pronged effort combining established and emerging methods and shall ultimately produce effective and representative public engagement and visioning. The Consultant shall develop and deliver all necessary presentation materials and handouts for all events, meetings, and presentations.

In addition to and combined with the **Areas of Emphasis** process, the Consultant shall coordinate and host at least **four (4) Open Houses**. The **first Open House** meeting will be held early in the planning process with the purpose of introducing the LRTP Update, educating and listening to the public, and providing further input opportunity for the public to identify transportation issues. The **second Open House** meeting must be conducted at approximately one fourth of the way through the process to share proposed goals and objectives and a preliminary listing of the potential range of alternatives, based on future system forecasts and input received during the first half of the project. The **third Open House** meeting must be held at approximately three-fourths of the way through the process to share refined project documents, goals, and listing of the range
of alternatives, as well as to illustrate how public input from the first two Open Houses has been integrated into the planning process. The **fourth and final Open House** must be held near the end of the planning process to present a Draft LRTP Update to the community and seek feedback. Feedback from each **Open House** will be analyzed by the **Project Management Team** and integrated into the LRTP Update as appropriate.

A robust social media component must be folded into the entire project’s public engagement process. This must include, at minimum, a project website and coordinated social media campaign. In addition to social media, the project should also employ methods of public engagement such as paid advertisements in print mediums such as the Mankato Free Press and other appropriate newspapers, flyers, mailers to select targeted stakeholders, surveys, wiki-mapping web-based input-gathering sites, and email outreach. The Consultant shall be expected to coordinate with the Public Information departments of municipalities within the MAPO on potential opportunities to utilize public engagement services/mediums/methods implemented by municipalities, as well as announcements for public events and engagement efforts. Further advertising may be undertaken with radio and television advertisements, if viable. Respondents are encouraged to submit innovative public engagement strategies and methods with their responses.

**Provision of Materials**
At points throughout the study, MAPO staff shall deliver informational presentations and conduct outreach to stakeholders. At the MAPO’s discretion, MAPO staff may conduct these efforts without Consultant staff present. During these occasions and at the MAPO’s request, the Consultant shall supply MAPO staff with presentation and outreach materials.

**MAPO Member Municipalities**
Over the course of the project the Consultant shall maintain a continued dialog with each MAPO member municipality and obtain input and review from each respective agency. The amount and nature of these communications may differ depending on the specific stage or aspect of the Update in question. Throughout the development of the Update, the Consultant shall communicate with different MAPO member agencies to ensure the Update is developed in a manner which is context-sensitive and has local support.

**MAPO TAC meetings**
At relevant and requested times over the course of the project, the Consultant shall participate in at minimum **seven (7) meetings with the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**. TAC meetings are typically held the third Thursday of each month or on an as-needed basis. During these meetings, the Consultant shall solicit feedback and guidance on findings, proposed priorities, and draft recommendations. Insight and instruction from the MAPO TAC shall serve as a major guiding component to the development of the LRTP Update.

Held separately from the meetings described above, the Consultant shall coordinate and lead a **Project Kickoff meeting** between the Consultant, MAPO staff, and select MAPO stakeholders. The **Project Kickoff meeting** shall serve to establish early guidance on project scope, approach, roles, objectives, and methodology.

**MAPO Policy Board meetings**
At relevant and requested times during the course of the project, the Consultant will participate in at minimum **four (4) meetings with the MAPO Policy Board**. Policy Board meetings are
typically held the first Thursday of each month or on an as-needed basis. During these meetings, the Consultant will present draft sections for review, evaluation, comment, and recommendation. The MAPO Policy Board shall serve as a major guiding component to the development of the LRTP Update.

At relevant and requested times, the Consultant shall coordinate and participate in at least two (2) meetings with appropriate entities within MnDOT and FHWA. These conferences will be used to present findings to MnDOT and FHWA and solicit guidance from those entities in order to maintain compliance with all applicable state and federal requirements.

Deliverables under Task V shall include, but shall not be limited to, a Public Involvement Plan (PIP), identification of Areas of Emphasis, elements of public engagement as described above, and presentation materials.

**Scope of Work Task VI: Financial Resources**

The Consultant shall develop a Financial Resources deliverable for the period through 2045 that describes revenue projections and assumptions supporting the projections. This analysis is crucial to the financial accuracy of the plan. The financial element of the LRTP Update shall include the following:

- Public and private sources reasonably expected to be made available.
- Innovative financing techniques to funding existing project costs as well as the capital and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs of proposed projects (i.e., techniques may include new starts, taxing districts including overlay districts, new funding sources, local option tax, and private funding).
- Demonstration of Fiscal Constraint (per CFR 450.104). The LRTP Update must demonstrate fiscal constraint by including sufficient financial information to confirm that projects in the document can be implemented using committed or available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance that the federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. The Consultant shall be expected to prepare a logical, straight-forward methodology for forecasting revenues, estimating costs, and balancing needs with available funding and expected expenditures.

This task shall be led by the Consultant. However, the Consultant shall use any data available from MAPO’s member jurisdictions, MnDOT, and other agencies involved in planning and funding transportation projects. This task will assess the financial resources that may be available for funding transportation improvements during the LRTP Update planning period. The work will consist of the identification and evaluation of existing and prospective transportation improvement funding sources, assessment of funding levels available during each of the interim years of the LRTP Update planning period, and assembly of broad schedules of funding capacity between the present and 2045 to help guide the development of the LRTP Update. Based on the above information, the Consultant shall forecast project scheduling and potential financial resources into four primary bins:

- **Bin 1: short-term (2021-2025)**
- **Bin 2: mid-term (2026-2035)**
- **Bin 3: long-term (2036-2045)**
- **Bin 4: Illustrative**
The Illustrative bin shall be developed to categorize projects that can be scheduled with variability depending on circumstance. This shall be designed to allow flexibility to respond to opportunities for funding and project efficiencies as they arise. The financial forecast shall be overlaid and integrated into the entire updated project list to ensure the project list is usable and financially realistic.

The Consultant shall document that funds are or will be available to match the costs of transportation improvement projects recommended for inclusion in the LRTP Update. This includes both capital and operations and maintenance funding. This approach will help ensure construction can be reasonably expected to be completed in the LRTP Update timeframe. The Consultant shall ensure that the final plan is fiscally constrained, continues to be multimodal in nature, and the recommended projects are consistent with the LRTP Update’s vision, goals, and objectives. This task shall include integration of public comments and consistency with local plans. The Consultant shall ensure that all federal, state, and local requirements are met with regard to the LRTP Update’s financial components and demonstration of fiscal constraint.

Deliverables under Task VI include, but shall not be limited to, a comprehensive Financial Resources Deliverable section of the LRTP Update, a project schedule, forecasting documentation, and a clear demonstration of fiscal constraint.

Scope of Work Task VII: Efficient Transportation Decision Making

Efficient Transportation Decision Making creates linkages between land use, transportation, and environmental resources through early interactive involvement of permitting and planning agencies. This involvement is expected to save resources and improve decision making by resolving project impact at an early stage. The Consultant shall develop the information needed for review and comment by MAPO, federal, state, and local stakeholder agencies.

The Consultant shall, in consultation with MAPO, develop and deliver a list of appropriate and cognizant agencies to be involved in the LRTP Update development early in the process and maintain a continued dialog with each agency in obtaining input and review of each respective agency. The Consultant will develop a master contact list for these agencies. The Consultant shall review input and comments from these agencies and provide a recommended course of action to address their comments. The Consultant shall develop recommendations for improved transportation decision making within the MAPO area from the perspectives of optimizing land use, municipal decision making at the development-approval stage, and long-term maintenance and upkeep of the transportation system.

Deliverables under Task VII include a list of appropriate local/regional agencies and recommendations.

Scope of Work Task VIII: Environmental Justice and Title VI

The requirements of Environmental Justice (EJ), as outlined by FHWA, are intended to ensure that the process of transportation planning is consistent with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. These provisions will be incorporated into the LRTP Update, and adhered to throughout the public involvement task of the project. The Consultant will coordinate with MAPO’s Title VI/EJ policies and PPP. The Consultant will ensure all federal, state, and local EJ requirements
are abided by. The Consultant shall take proactive measures to engage public stakeholders throughout the project, including those communities typically under-represented in the transportation planning process.

**Scope of Work Task IX: Project Completion / Plan Adoption**

The Consultant shall perform work necessary to ensure final adoption of the LRTP Update by the MAPO Policy Board no later than **December 3, 2020**. To achieve this goal, the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) must approve and recommend adoption of the LRTP Update at or before their **November 19, 2020** meeting. The final adoption schedule is illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 9, 2020</td>
<td>Consultant delivers draft plan for MAPO TAC review and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15, 2020</td>
<td>Consultant delivers presentation on draft plan to MAPO TAC at their regular meeting and solicits comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15 – Nov. 11, 2020</td>
<td>Consultant incorporates TAC comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 11, 2020</td>
<td>Consultant delivers finalized draft to MAPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 19, 2020</td>
<td>MAPO TAC motions to recommend adoption of LRTP Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 3, 2020</td>
<td>Consultant delivers final presentation to MAPO Policy Board, Policy Board adopt LRTP Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion of this task shall involve:

- Consideration to the Public Review/Public Comment processes required for adoption. This will entail forethought and planning regarding the advance scheduling needs of Public Comment period(s), Open Houses, and prior presentations to the MAPO TAC and Policy Board for the draft LRTP Update to ensure adoption by the deadline.
- Development and delivery of a comprehensive public comment log to identify public comments received. Log must be grouped by common theme and include the date received and a section on how/why the plan was/was not updated to reflect the comment.
- Development of specific objectives for each of the overall goals for the LRTP Update.
- Preparation of the final document, including charts, figures, diagrams, and maps.
- Ensuring the final document is reviewed and/or approved by all appropriate entities (local, regional, State, and Federal) with adequate time.
- Delivery of draft LRTP Update to MAPO TAC and Policy Board by dates specified above.

**Final Deliverables**

After recommendation to adopt and adoption of the draft LRTP Update by the MAPO TAC and Policy Board, respectively, the Consultant will prepare and present a complete and approved LRTP Update. This shall include:

- A comprehensive record of steps performed, data collected, and analysis conducted.
- Final Long Range Transportation Plan Update –LRTP UPDATE (PDF and print versions)
- LRTP UPDATE Executive Summary (PDF and print versions)
- Deliverables shall include fourteen (14) printed copies of the LRTP Update as well as an electronic copy of each document in both Microsoft Word and PDF format.
- All data, reports, materials, and analyses compiled and developed over the course of the study including presentations, stakeholder contact information, maps, logos, photos, and
graphical elements. Consultant shall provide documentation of MAPO ownership of all such elements.

- All documents/deliverables must be converted to the highest level of accessibility. This includes readability of PDF documents by Adobe Reader’s and Adobe Acrobat’s “Read Aloud” feature. Documents will be made available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities or for persons who are hearing or speech impaired.
- In the eventuality that a member of the public requests a translated document, the Consultant will supply an electronic copy of such document in the language(s) requested in both Word and PDF formats.

Additional Requirements & Contract Schedule/Duration

In addition to addressing the above services for the project, the Consultant is also expected to:

- Clearly communicate in a responsive manner and coordinate with MAPO staff and local partners
- Provide regular project updates via attendance to meetings as needed and/or electronic submission of progress reports as directed
- Promptly deliver draft work products, deliverables, and sections of the plan by agreed upon deadlines.
- Contract work is anticipated to start by May 2019
- LRTP Update should be adopted by December 3, 2020
- Contract will be effective until December 31, 2020

Proposal Content

Responders are asked to report how they will address each task, detail staff and firm qualifications related to each task, and describe task deliverables. Responders are encouraged to propose augmented, supplemental, or alternate tasks/activities if they will substantially improve the results of the project, within the stated budget and time parameters listed within this RFP.

The following will be considered minimum contents of the proposal and must be submitted in the order listed:

1. Responder’s company name, business address, the contact person’s name, telephone number, fax number and email address.
2. A statement of the objectives, goals and tasks to show or demonstrate the Responder’s view of the nature of the project.
3. A description of the proposed project approach and methodology to be utilized, deliverables to be provided by the Responder, and a description of the proposed project management techniques.
4. A detailed description of the Responder’s background and experience with similar work. This should include examples of similar work indicating the Responder’s level of involvement in the project, and the key personnel involved with the project.
5. A list of the key personnel who will be assigned to the project and their area of responsibility. Provide statements for each of the key personnel detailing their training, work experience, and qualifications relevant to the proposed work. No change in personnel assigned to the project will be permitted without the approval of the MAPO.
6. A work plan identifying the major tasks to be accomplished. The work plan must present the Responder’s approach, task breakdown, and deliverable due dates.
7. A budget including the hourly rates and fringe rates for all key personnel who will perform the tasks outlined above, as well as the agency’s indirect rate.
8. A detailed funding breakdown describing how the project budget will be spent. The budget shall be divided by work task with clear descriptions of how dollars will be allocated within each work task. High-ranking proposals will clearly illustrate cost allocations between Consultant staffing/project management/administrative costs and those costs related directly to production of deliverables.

9. Three references from clients within the past 5 years for whom the Consultant has performed similar work.

10. Completed forms, certifications, affidavits, disclosures, and documents required under any other section of this RFP.

Proposal Submission
All proposals must be sent to:

Charles Androsky
Transportation Planner
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
10 Civic Center Plaza
Mankato, MN 56001

All responses must be received no later than 4:30 p.m. Central time on February 18, 2019. Submit original and seven (7) copies of the proposal. Proposals must be bound and sections must be organized by labeled divider tabs to allow quick reference by the review panel. A principal member of the firm must sign each copy of the proposal in ink. Proposals are to be submitted in a sealed mailing envelope or package, clearly marked “Proposal: Long Range Transportation Plan Update for the MAPO” on the outside. The MAPO reserves the right to distribute all proposal materials within its various advisory and governing bodies, as well as make all materials public.

Proposal Evaluation
A “Best Value Selection” method will be used to review proposals submitted in response to this RFP. Representatives of MAPO and selected TAC members will evaluate all proposals received by the deadline. A 100-point scale will be used to create the final evaluation and selection. The factors and weighting on which proposals will be judged are:

Technical Approach (40 points)
1. Specialized expertise, capabilities and technical competence, as demonstrated by the Responder’s expressed project understanding, proposed project approach and methodology, project work plan, and project management techniques. (15)
2. Project background and experience, as demonstrated by the Responder’s ability, familiarity and experience with handling similar projects, and the qualifications and related experience of key staff members. (15)
3. The Responder’s record of past performance, including quality of work (10)

Cost (30 points)
1. Overall cost to complete the LRTP Update (30)

Organization, personnel and expertise (20 points)
1. Qualifications of personnel assigned to project (10)
2. Experience of personnel assigned to project (10)
General quality of response and responsiveness to terms and conditions (10 points)

Proposals will be evaluated and a successful Responder will be notified by March 2019.

Selection Timeline

It is anticipated that evaluation, selection, contract negotiation, and project start will be completed according to the below schedule. Note the date ranges are advisory and may be adjusted if unforeseen delays arise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2, 2019</td>
<td>First day of RFP posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11, 2019</td>
<td>Last date MAPO staff will answer RFP questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 2019</td>
<td>Deadline for RFP responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2019</td>
<td>Evaluation and scoring of RFP responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2019</td>
<td>Successful bidder notified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2019</td>
<td>Contract negotiations finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2019</td>
<td>MAPO Policy Board, MnDOT, FHWA approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May 2019</td>
<td>Project initiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MAPO and the successful Responder will then meet to negotiate the final deliverable and contract. If MAPO and the successful Responder are unable to agree upon a scope of services and compensation within a reasonable time (as determined by MAPO at its sole discretion), then MAPO may declare negotiations to be at an impasse, and may commence negotiations with the next highest-ranked Responder.

Request for Clarification

In the event MAPO believes that additional clarification of a proposal is needed in order to make a determination regarding the proposal, the MAPO shall submit a request for clarification by email to the Responder. The Responder will have two working days to respond via email to provide the additional requested information. Responses will also be posted on the MAPO website, see Proposal Questions section for additional information and process.

Proposal Questions

No interpretation of the meaning of the RFP will be made to any Responder verbally. Responders are encouraged to promptly notify MAPO of any apparent major inconsistencies, problems or ambiguities in this RFP. Any questions regarding this RFP must be submitted by e-mail only to:

Charles Androsky, Transportation Planner
candrosky@mankatomn.gov

No other project personnel are allowed to discuss the RFP before the proposal submission deadline. Contact regarding this RFP with any personnel not listed above could result in disqualification.

All questions and answers will be posted on the MAPO’s web page: www.mnmapo.org
Questions will be posted verbatim as submitted, without reference to the person or firm that submitted it. All prospective Responders will be responsible for checking the MAPO’s web page for any addendums to this RFP and any questions that have been answered.

Questions and responses will be accepted one week prior to the RFP close date.

Failure of any Responder to review any such addendum or interpretation shall not relieve such Responder from any obligation under their proposal as submitted. All addenda so issued will become part of the agreement documents.

Proposal Protest Procedure
1. A formal letter of protest must be received at the 10 Civic Center Plaza Mankato, MN 56001 to the attention of the Paul Vogel, Executive Director, within ten (10) business days of the date of the award notification letter. The letter must state specifically the reason for the protest and include any documentation needed to substantiate the claim(s).
2. The MAPO will have ten (10) business days from the date of receipt of the protest letter in which to make a written response. The MAPO may extend the period for purposes of investigating the protest, if it is warranted, by notifying the complainant in writing of their intentions within the above mentioned response time.
3. If the complainant, after receiving the final written response from the MAPO, is not satisfied that the reason for protest has been sufficiently resolved, he/she may file a request for an appeal to be heard by the MAPO Policy Board. Such request must be written and received within the (10) business days from the date of the MAPO’s response letter. The letter shall be made to the attention of the Executive Director, who will schedule the hearing for the next available MAPO Policy Board meeting, and inform the complainant in writing of said date and time.
4. The MAPO will not receive any service or product described in the PROPOSAL document from the successful Proposal until the protest has been resolved.

Termination
If the Contractor is (1) adjudged to be bankrupt; (2) makes a general assignment for the benefit of creditors; (3) has a receiver on account of insolvency; (4) is guilty of substantial violation of any provision of the Contract; (5) fails to promptly pay employees or obligations incidental to proper performance of the Contract; or (6) persistently disregards or permits disregard by employees of laws, ordinances or instructions of the MAPO Policy Board or its designated representative, then the MAPO Policy Board may, at its opinion, terminate the Contract without further obligation on the part of the MAPO Policy Board to the Contractor except for the expenses incurred prior to the termination. If the MAPO Policy Board or its designated representative believes any action or non-action of the Contractor represents an immediate threat to public safety, the MAPO Policy Board may suspend service for so long a period as they deem necessary.

MAPO Not Obligated to Complete Project
This RFP does not obligate the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) to award a Contract or complete the project, and MAPO reserves the right to cancel the solicitation if it is considered to be in its best interest.

Disposition of Responses
All materials submitted in response to this RFP will become property of MAPO and will become public record after the evaluation process is completed and an award decision made. If the
responder submits information in response to this RFP that it believes to be trade secret materials, as defined by Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statues §13.37, the responder must:

- Clearly mark all trade secret materials in its response at the time the response is submitted,
- Include a statement with its response justifying the trade secret designation for each item, and
- Defend any action seeking release of the materials it believes to be trade secret, and indemnify and hold harmless MAPO, its agents and employees, from any judgements or damages awarded against the MAPO in favor of the party requesting the materials, and any and all costs connected with that defense. This indemnification survives the MAPO’s award of Contract. In submitting a response to this RFP, the responder agrees that this indemnification survives as long as the trade secret materials are in possession of MAPO. MAPO is required to keep all basic documents related to its Contracts, including responses to RFPs for a minimum of seven years.

MAPO will not consider the prices submitted by the responder to be proprietary or trade secret materials.

- Rights to Data: When FHWA provides Federal assistance to support the costs of a research, development, demonstration, or a special studies project, FHWA generally seeks sufficient rights in the data developed so that the results can be made available to any FHWA recipient, sub recipient, third part contractor, is executed.

**Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal**

Small businesses, minority-owned business, and women-owned businesses are encouraged to respond to this solicitation. Larger firms are encouraged to sub-contract with small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses when economically feasible. A DBE goal of ____ has been assigned.

**Required Statement for All Notices, RFP, and Contracts**

The FHWA is or will be providing federal assistance for this project in an estimated expected amount of $144,000 (80% of project cost); the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number is 20.205.
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Appendix B Required Contract Clauses

FEDERAL CONTRACT CLAUSES
The Contractor agrees to comply with the following federal requirements, and agrees to pass through these requirements to its subcontractors and third party contractors, as applicable.

A. ACCESS TO RECORDS AND REPORTS
   2 CFR §200.336

Access to Records - The following access to records requirements apply to this Contract:
   The Contractor will maintain all books, documents, papers, accounting records, and other evidence pertaining to cost incurred in connection with work and services performed under this contract. The Contractor must make such materials available at its office at all reasonable times during the term of this contract, and for six years from the date of final payment under this contract, for inspection by the MAPO. Copies of such materials will be furnished to the MAPO upon one week notice during the term of this contract and for six years from the date of final payment under this contract.

B. NO GOVERNMENT OBLIGATION TO THIRD PARTIES

No Obligation by the Federal Government - (1) The MAPO and Contractor acknowledge and agree that, notwithstanding any concurrence by the Federal Government in or approval of the solicitation or award of the underlying contract, absent the express written consent by the Federal Government, the Federal Government is not a party to this contract and shall not be subject to any obligations or liabilities to the MAPO, Contractor, or any other party (whether or not a party to that contract) pertaining to any matter resulting from the underlying contract. (2) The Contractor agrees to include the above clause in each subcontract financed in whole or in part with Federal assistance provided by FHWA. It is further agreed that the clause shall not be modified, except to identify the subcontractor who will be subject to its provisions.

C. PROGRAM FRAUD AND FALSE OR FRAUDULENT STATEMENTS AND RELATED ACTS

Program Fraud and False or Fraudulent Statements or Related Acts - (1) The Contractor acknowledges that the provisions of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986, as amended, 31 U.S.C. § 3801 et seq. and U.S. DOT regulations, "Program Fraud Civil Remedies," 49 C.F.R. Part 31, apply to its actions pertaining to this Project. Upon execution of the underlying contract, the Contractor certifies or affirms the truthfulness and accuracy of any statement it has made, it makes, it may make, or causes to be made, pertaining to the underlying contract or the FHWA assisted project for which this contract work is being performed. In addition to other penalties that may be applicable, the Contractor further acknowledges that if it makes, or causes to be made, a false, fictitious, or fraudulent claim, statement, submission, or certification, the Federal Government reserves the right to impose the penalties of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 on the Contractor to the extent the Federal Government deems appropriate. (2) The Contractor agrees to include the above clause in each subcontract financed in whole or in part with Federal assistance provided by FHWA. It is further agreed that the clause shall not be modified, except to identify the subcontractor who will be subject to the provisions.

All invoices submitted to the MAPO for payment shall include the following certification signed by the Contractor’s Project Manager:

"I certify to the best of my knowledge the belief that this request for payment is true, complete, and accurate, and the expenditures are for the purposes and objectives set forth in the project contract. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information, or the omission of any material fact, may subject me and my employer to criminal or civil penalties for fraud, false statements, false claims, or otherwise."

D. CIVIL RIGHTS REQUIREMENTS

Civil Rights - The following requirements apply to the underlying contract:

(1) Nondiscrimination - In accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, section 303 of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 6102, section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12132, and Federal transit law at 49 U.S.C. § 5332, the Contractor agrees that it will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, age, or disability. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with applicable Federal implementing regulations and other implementing requirements FHWA may issue.

(2) Equal Employment Opportunity - The following equal employment opportunity requirements apply to the underlying contract:
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course of the Project. The Contractor agrees to take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with any implementing requirements FHWA may issue.

(b) **Age** - In accordance with section 4 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 623 and Federal transit law at 49 U.S.C. § 5332, the Contractor agrees to refrain from discrimination against present and prospective employees for reason of age. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with any implementing requirements FHWA may issue.

(c) **Disabilities** - In accordance with section 102 of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 12112, the Contractor agrees that it will comply with the requirements of U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. "Regulations to Implement the Equal Employment Provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act," 29 C.F.R. Part 1630, pertaining to employment of persons with disabilities. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with any implementing requirements FHWA may issue.

(3) The Contractor also agrees to include these requirements in each subcontract financed in whole or in part with Federal assistance provided by FHWA, modified only if necessary to identify the affected parties.

**E. BREACHES AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

**Disputes** - Disputes arising in the performance of this contract which are not resolved by agreement of the parties shall be decided in writing by the authorized representative of (Recipient)'s [title of employee]. This decision shall be final and conclusive unless within [ten (10)] days from the date of receipt of its copy, the Contractor mails or otherwise furnishes a written appeal to the [title of employee]. In connection with any such appeal, the Contractor shall be afforded an opportunity to be heard and to offer evidence in support of its position. The decision of the [title of employee] shall be binding upon the Contractor and the Contractor shall abide by the decision.

**Performance During Dispute** - Unless otherwise directed by the MAPO, Contractor shall continue performance under this Contract while matters in dispute are being resolved.

**Claims for Damages** - Should either party to the Contract suffer injury or damage to person or property because of any act or omission of the party or of any of his employees, agents or others for whose acts he is legally liable, a claim for damages therefor shall be made in writing to such other party within a reasonable time after the first observance of such injury of damage.

**Remedies** - Unless this contract provides otherwise, all claims, counterclaims, disputes and other matters in question between the MAPO and the Contractor arising out of or relating to this agreement or its breach will be decided by arbitration if the parties mutually agree, or in a court of competent jurisdiction within the State of Minnesota.

**Rights and Remedies** - The duties and obligations imposed by the contract documents and the rights and remedies available thereunder shall be in addition to and not a limitation of any duties, obligations, rights and remedies otherwise imposed or available by law. No action or failure to act by the MAPO or Contractor shall constitute a waiver of any right or duty afforded any of them under the contract, nor shall any such action or failure to act constitute an approval of or acquiescence in any breach thereunder, except as may be specifically agreed in writing.

**F. DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE)**

49 CFR Part 26

**Disadvantaged Business Enterprises**

a. This contract is subject to the requirements of Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 26, Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in Department of Transportation Financial Assistance Programs. The national goal for participation of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) is 10%. A separate contract goal of _________% has been established for this procurement. Small businesses, minority-owned business, and women-owned businesses are encouraged to respond to this solicitation. Larger firms are encouraged to sub-contract with small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses when economically feasible.

- Responders are directed to read the DBE Special Provisions, as posted at [http://www.dot.state.mn.us/consult/index.html](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/consult/index.html) under the Prof/Tech Notices section and attached as Appendix B. The DBE Special Provisions explains how to comply with the DBE requirements. In particular, see language regarding document(s) that a responder must submit with its proposal. The form required in the proposal can be found on page 12 of this document. To view a listing of certified DBE’s, please contact the MnDOT Office of Civil Rights at 651-366-3073, TTY 651-282-5799, or visit their website at [http://www.dot.state.mn.us/civilrights](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/civilrights).

b. The Contractor shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the performance of this contract. The Contractor shall carry out applicable requirements of 49 CFR Part 26 in the award and administration of this DOT-assisted contract. Failure by the Contractor to carry out these requirements is a material breach of this contract, which may result in the termination of this contract or such other remedy as MAPO deems appropriate. Each subcontract the Contractor signs with a subcontractor must include the assurance in this paragraph (see 49 CFR 26.13(b)).
e. The Contractor will be required to report its DBE participation obtained through race-neutral means throughout the period of performance.

d. The Contractor is required to pay its subcontractors performing work related to this contract for satisfactory performance of that work no later than 30 days after the Contractor’s receipt of payment for that work from the MAPO. In addition, [the contractor may not hold retainage from its subcontractors.] [is required to return any retainage payments to those subcontractors within 30 days after the subcontractor’s work related to this contract is satisfactorily completed.] [is required to return any retainage payments to those subcontractors within 30 days after incremental acceptance of the subcontractor’s work by the MAPO and contractor’s receipt of the partial retainage payment related to the subcontractor’s work.]

e. The Contractor must promptly notify MAPO whenever a DBE subcontractor performing work related to this contract is terminated or fails to complete its work, and must make good faith efforts to engage another DBE subcontractor to perform at least the same amount of work. The Contractor may not terminate any DBE subcontractor and perform that work through its own forces or those of an affiliate without prior written consent of MAPO.

G. PROCUREMENT OF RECOVERED MATERIALS
2 CFR §200.322

Procurement of Recovered Materials - The following requirements apply to the underlying contract:
The MAPO and the Contractor must comply with Section 6002 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The requirements of Section 6002 include procuring only item designated in guidelines of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) at 40 CFR 247 that contain the highest percentage of recovered materials practicable, consistent with maintaining a satisfactory level of competition, where the purchase price of the items exceeds $10,000 or the value of the quantity acquired during the preceding fiscal year exceeded $10,000.

H. DISCLAIMER

Disclaimer – All final documents resulting produced under this contract shall include the following statement on the title page:
“The preparation of this report has been funded in part by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration. The contents of this document reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts or accuracy of the data presented therein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the U.S. Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.”

I. TERMINATION FOR CAUSE AND FOR CONVENIENCE
2 CFR Part 200, Appendix II(B)

Termination of Agreement - Either the Contractor or MAPO may, by giving written notice specifying the effective date which shall not be less than thirty (30) days from the date such notice is given, terminate this Agreement in whole or in part. In the event of termination, all property and finished or unfinished documents and other writing prepared by the Contractor under this Agreement shall be delivered to MAPO and Contractor shall be entitled to compensation for time expended and expenses incurred to the date of termination.

J. FEDERAL CHANGES

Federal Changes – Contractor shall at all times comply with all applicable State and Federal regulations, policies, procedures and directives. Contractor’s failure to so comply shall constitute a material breach of this contract.

K. REMEDIES
2 CFR Part 200, Appendix II(A)

Remedies - Contracts for more than $150,000 must address administrative, contractual, or legal remedies in instances where contractors violate or breach contract terms, and provide for such sanctions and penalties as appropriate.

L. CLEAN AIR AND CLEAN WATER

Clean Air Act and Federal Water Pollution Control Act - Contracts for more than $150,000 must contain a provision that requires the Contractor to agree to comply with all applicable standards, orders, or regulations issued pursuant to the Clean Air Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended. Violations must be reported to the FHWA and the Regional Office of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

OTHER REQUIRED CONTRACT CLAUSES
The Contractor agrees to comply with the following additional requirements.
M. CONDITIONS OF PAYMENT

All services provided by the Contractor under this contract must be performed to the satisfaction of the MAPO and in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations. The Consultant will not receive payment for work found by the MAPO to be unsatisfactory or performed in violation of federal, state, or local law.

N. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE

Drug-Free Workplace (MAY 2001)

(a) Definitions. As used in this clause—

Controlled substance means a controlled substance in schedules I through V of section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812) and as further defined in regulation at 21 CFR 1308.11-1308.15.

Conviction means a finding of guilt (including a plea of nolo contendere) or imposition of sentence, or both, by any judicial body charged with the responsibility to determine violations of the Federal or State criminal drug statutes.

Criminal drug statute means a Federal or non-Federal criminal statute involving the manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of any controlled substance.

Drug-free workplace means the site(s) for the performance of work done by the Contractor in connection with a specific contract where employees of the Contractor are prohibited from engaging in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance.

Employee means an employee of a Contractor directly engaged in the performance of work under a Government contract. Directly engaged is defined to include all direct cost employees and any other Contractor employee who has other than a minimal impact or involvement in contract performance.

Individual means an offeror/contractor that has no more than one employee including the offeror/contractor.

(b) The Contractor, if other than an individual, shall—within 30 days after award (unless a longer period is agreed to in writing for contracts of 30 days or more performance duration); or as soon as possible for contracts of less than 30 days performance duration—

(1) Publish a statement notifying its employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the contractor's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violations of such prohibition;

(2) Establish an ongoing drug-free awareness program to inform such employees about—

(i) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(ii) The contractor's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(iii) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(iv) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace.

(3) Provide all employees engaged in performance of the contract with a copy of the statement required by subparagraph (b)(1) of this clause;

(4) Notify such employees in writing in the statement required by subparagraph (b)(1) of this clause that, as a condition of continued employment on this contract, the employee will—

(i) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(ii) Notify the employer in writing of the employee's conviction under a criminal drug statute for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than 5 days after such conviction.

(5) Notify the Contracting Officer in writing within 10 days after receiving notice under subdivision (b)(4)(ii) of this clause, from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. The notice shall include the position title of the employee;

(6) Within 30 days after receiving notice under subdivision (b)(4)(ii) of this clause of a conviction, take one of the following actions with respect to any employee who is convicted of a drug abuse violation occurring in the workplace:

(i) Taking appropriate personnel action against such employee, up to and including termination; or

(ii) Require such employee to satisfactorily participate in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency; and

(7) Make a good faith effort to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of subparagraphs (b)(1) through (b)(6) of this clause.

(c) The Contractor, if an individual, agrees by award of the contract or acceptance of a purchase order, not to engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance while performing this contract.

(d) In addition to other remedies available to the Government, the Contractor's failure to comply with the requirements of paragraph (b) or (c) of this clause may, pursuant to FAR 23.506, render the Contractor subject to suspension of contract payments, termination of the contract for default, and suspension or debarment.
Appendix C Required Affidavits and Certifications

Affidavit of Noncollusion
Conflict of Interest Checklist and Disclosure Form
Affirmative Action Certification
Immigration Status Certification
Certification of Restriction on Lobbying
Certificate of Liability Insurance
Certification of Primary Participant Regarding Debarment, Suspension and other Responsibility Matters

DESCRIPTION OF REQUIRED FORMS

Affidavit of Noncollusion
Responders must complete the “Affidavit of Noncollusion” found in this Appendix and include it with the response. The successful responder will be required to submit acceptable evidence of compliance with workers’ compensation insurance coverage requirements prior to execution of the Contract. The successful responder will be required to submit pre-award audit information and comply with audit standards.

Organizational Conflicts of Interest
The responder warrants that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, and except as otherwise disclosed, there are no relevant facts or circumstances, which could give rise to organizational conflicts of interest. An organizational conflict of interest exists when, because of existing or planned activities or because of relationships with other persons, a vendor is unable or potentially unable to render impartial assistance or advice to MAPO, or the successful responder’s objectivity in performing the Contract work is or might be otherwise impaired, or the successful responder has an unfair competitive advantage. The responder agrees that, if after award, an organizational conflict of interest is discovered, an immediate and full disclosure in writing must be made to MAPO, which must include a description of the action, which the successful responder has taken or proposes to take to avoid or mitigate such conflicts.

If an organization conflict of interest is determined to exist, MAPO may, at their discretion, cancel the Contract. In the event the respondent was aware of an organizational conflict of interest prior to the award of the Contract and did not disclose the conflict to the contracting officer, MAPO may terminate the Contract for default. The provisions of this clause must be included in all subcontracts for work to be performed similar to the service provided by the prime contractor, and the terms “contract,” “contractor,” and “contracting officer” modified appropriately to preserve MAPO’s rights. Responders must complete the “Conflict of Interest Checklist and Disclosure Form” and submit it along with the response, but not as a part of the response.

Affirmative Action Data
For all Contracts estimated to be in excess of $100,000, responders are required to complete the “Affirmative Action Certification” page and include it with the response.

Immigration Status Certification
By order of the Governor (Governor’s Executive Order 08-01), vendors and subcontractors MUST certify compliance with the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) and certify use of the E-Verify system established by the Department of Homeland Security. E-Verify program information can be found at http://www.dhs.gov/ximage/programs.

If any response to a solicitation is or could be in excess of $50,000, vendors and subcontractors must certify compliance with items 1 and 2 of the Immigration Status Certification by completing the required form and submitting it with their proposal.

In addition, prior to the delivery of the product or initiation of services, vendors must obtain this certification from all subcontractors who will participate in the performance of the contract. All subcontractor certifications must be kept on file with the contract vendor and made available to the state upon request.
Restrictions on Lobbying
Contractors that apply or bid for an award of $100,000 or more must completed the required certification that is will not and has not used Federally appropriated funds to pay any person or organization for influencing an officer or employee of any agency, a member of Congress, officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with obtaining any Federal contract, grant, or any other award covered by 31 U.S.C. 1352. The Contractor must disclose any lobbying with non-Federal funds that takes place in connection with obtaining any Federal award. The offeror must submit the required form with their proposal.

Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §10A.06, no person may act as or employ a lobbyist for compensation that is dependent upon the result or outcome of any legislation or administrative action.

Standard of Performance, Insurance and Indemnity
All services to be performed by Contractor hereunder shall be performed in a skilled, professional and non-negligent manner. Contractor shall obtain and maintain at his/her/its cost and expense:

a. **Comprehensive general liability insurance** that covers the consultant services performed by Contractor for MAPO with a combined single limit of liability of at least One Million Dollars ($1,000,000.00).

b. **Errors and omissions or equivalent insurance** that covers the contractor services performed by Contractor for MAPO with a combined single limit of liability of at least One Million Dollars ($1,000,000.00).

c. **Worker’s compensation insurance** covering Contractor (if an individual) and all of Contractor’s employees with coverages and limits of coverage required by law.

Contractor shall indemnify and hold harmless MAPO from and against all errors, omissions and/or negligent acts causing claims, damages, liabilities and damages arising out of the performance of his/her/its services hereunder.

Contractor certifies that Contractor is in compliance with all applicable worker’s compensation laws, rules and regulations. Neither Contractor (if an individual) nor Contractor’s employees and agents will be considered MAPO employees. Any claims that may arise under any worker’s compensation laws on behalf of any employee of Contractor and any claims made by any third party as a consequence of any act or omission on the part of Contractor or any employee of Contractor are in no way MAPO’s obligation or responsibility. By signing this Agreement, Contractor certifies that Contractor is in compliance with these laws and regulations.

**Contractor shall deliver to MAPO, concurrent with the execution of this Agreement, one or more certificate(s) of insurance evidencing that Consultant has the insurance required by this Agreement in full force and effect.** MAPO shall be named as additional insureds under such policy(ies). The insurer will provide at least thirty (30) days prior written notice to MAPO, without fail, of any cancellation, non-renewal, or modification of any the policy(ies) or coverage evidenced by said certificate(s) for any cause, except for nonpayment of premium. The insurer will provide at least ten (10) days prior written notice to MAPO, without fail, of any cancellation of any of the policy(ies) or coverage evidenced by said certificate(s) for nonpayment of premium. Contractor shall provide MAPO with appropriate endorsements to its policy(ies) reflecting the status of MAPO as an additional insured and requiring that the foregoing required notice of cancellation, material alteration or non-renewal be provided MAPO by the insurance company providing such insurance policy to Contractor.

The Contractor shall require any subcontractor permitted by MAPO under Section 3 hereof to perform work for Contractor on the Project to have in full force and effect the insurance coverage required of the Contractor under this Agreement before any subcontractor(s) begin(s) work on the Project. Contractor shall require any such subcontractor to provide to Contractor a Certificate of Insurance evidencing that such subcontractor has the insurance required by this Agreement in full force and effect. The Contractor and MAPO shall be named as additional insureds under such policies. The insurer will provide 30 day written notice to MAPO and Contractor, without fail, of any cancellation, non-renewal, or modification of the policy(ies) or coverage evidenced by said certificate(s) for any cause, except for nonpayment of premium. The insurer will provide at least ten (10) days prior written notice to MAPO without fail, of any cancellation of any of the policy(ies) or coverage evidenced by said certificate(s) for nonpayment of premium. MAPO shall also be provided with appropriate endorsements to its policy(ies) reflecting the status of MAPO as an additional insured and requiring that the foregoing required notice of cancellation, material alteration or non-renewal be provided MAPO by the insurance company providing such insurance policy(ies).
Affidavit of Noncollusion

I swear (or affirm) under the penalty of perjury:

1. That I am the Responder (if the Responder is an individual), a partner in the company (if the Responder is a partnership), or an officer or employee of the responding corporation having authority to sign on its behalf (if the Responder is a corporation);

2. That the attached proposal submitted in response to the ___________________ Request for Proposals has been arrived at by the Responder independently and has been submitted without collusion with and without any agreement, understanding or planned common course of action with, any other Responder of materials, supplies, equipment or services described in the Request for Proposal, designed to limit fair and open competition;

3. That the contents of the proposal have not been communicated by the Responder or its employees or agents to any person not an employee or agent of the Responder and will not be communicated to any such persons prior to the official opening of the proposals; and

4. That I am fully informed regarding the accuracy of the statements made in this affidavit.

Responder’s Firm Name: __________________________________________

Authorized Signature: __________________________________________

Date: ______________________

Subscribed and sworn to me this: ___________ day of ________________

Notary Public: __________________________________________

My commission expires: ______________________
Conflict of Interest Checklist and Disclosure Form

Purpose of this Checklist. This checklist is provided to assist proposers in screening for potential organizational conflicts of interest. The checklist is for the internal use of proposers and does not need to be submitted, however, the Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest form should be submitted in a separate envelope along with your proposal.

Definition of “Proposer”. As used herein, the word “Proposer” includes both the prime contractor and all proposed subcontractors.

Checklist is Not Exclusive. Please note that this checklist serves as a guide only, and that there may be additional potential conflict situations not covered by this checklist. If a proposer determines a potential conflict of interest exists that is not covered by this checklist, that potential conflict must still be disclosed.

Use of the Disclosure Form. A proposer must complete the attached disclosure form and submit it with their Proposal. If a proposer determines a potential conflict of interest exists, it must disclose the potential conflict to MAPO; however, such a disclosure will not necessarily disqualify a proposer from being awarded a Contract. To avoid any unfair “taint” of the selection process, the disclosure form should be provided separate from the bound proposal, and it will not be provided to selection committee members. MAPO personnel will review the disclosure and the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation measures to determine if the proposer may be awarded the contract notwithstanding the potential conflict. By statute, resolution of conflict of interest issues is ultimately at the sole discretion of MAPO.

Material Representation. The proposer is required to submit the attached disclosure form either declaring, to the best of its knowledge and belief, either that no potential conflict exists, or identifying potential conflicts and proposing remedial measures to ameliorate such conflict. The proposer must also update conflict information if such information changes after the submission of the proposal. Information provided on the form will constitute a material representation as to the award of this Contract. MAPO reserve the right to cancel or amend the resulting contract if the successful proposer failed to disclose a potential conflict, which it knew or should have known about, or if the proposer provided information on the disclosure form that is materially false or misleading.

Approach to Reviewing Potential Conflicts. MAPO recognizes that proposer’s must maintain business relations with other public and private sector entities in order to continue as viable businesses. MAPO will take this reality into account as it evaluates the appropriateness of proposed measures to mitigate potential conflicts. It is not MAPO’s intent to disqualify proposers based merely on the existence of a business relationship with another entity, but rather only when such relationship causes a conflict that potentially impairs the proposer’s ability to provide objective advice to MAPO. MAPO would seek to disqualify proposers only in those cases where a potential conflict cannot be adequately mitigated. Nevertheless, MAPO must follow statutory guidance on Organizational Conflicts of Interest.

Statutory Guidance. Minnesota Statutes §16C.02, subd. 10 (a) places limits on state agencies ability to contract with entities having an “Organizational Conflict of Interest”. For purposes of this checklist and disclosure requirement, the term “Vendor” includes “Proposer” as defined above. Pursuant to such statute, “Organizational Conflict of Interest” means that because of existing or planned activities or because of relationships with other persons: (1) the vendor is unable or potentially unable to render impartial assistance or advice to the state; (2) the vendor’s objectivity in performing the contract work is or might otherwise be impaired; or (3) the vendor has an unfair advantage.

Additional Guidance for Professionals Licensed by the Minnesota Board of Engineering. The Minnesota Board of Engineering has established conflict of interest rules applicable to those professionals licensed by the Board (see Minnesota Rules part 1805.0300) Subpart 1 of the rule provides “A licensee shall avoid accepting a commission where duty to the client or the public would conflict with the personal interest of the licensee or the interest of another client. Prior to accepting such employment the licensee shall disclose to a prospective client such facts as may give rise to a conflict of interest”.

An organizational conflict of interest may exist in any of the following cases:

- The proposer, or its principals, own real property in a location where there may be a positive or adverse impact on the value of such property based on the recommendations, designs, appraisals, or other deliverables required by this Contract.

- The proposer is providing services to another governmental or private entity and the proposer knows or has reason to believe, that entity’s interests are, or may be, adverse to the state’s interests with respect to the specific project covered by this contract. Comment: the mere existence of a business relationship with another entity would not ordinarily need to be disclosed. Rather, this focuses on the nature of services commissioned by the other entity. For example, it would not be appropriate to propose on an MAPO project if a local government has also retained the proposer for the purpose of persuading MAPO to stop or alter the project plans.
The Contract is for right-of-way acquisition services or related services (e.g. geotechnical exploration) and the proposer has an existing business relationship with a governmental or private entity that owns property to be acquired pursuant to the Contract.

The proposer is providing real estate or design services to a private entity, including but not limited to developers, whom the proposer knows or has good reason to believe, own or are planning to purchase property affected by the project covered by this Contract, when the value or potential uses of such property may be affected by the proposer’s performance of work pursuant to this Contract. “Property affected by the project” includes property that is in, adjacent to, or in reasonable proximity to current or potential right-of-way for the project. The value or potential uses of the private entity’s property may be affected by the proposer’s work pursuant to the Contract when such work involves providing recommendations for right-of-way acquisition, access control, and the design or location of frontage roads and interchanges. Comment: this provision does not presume proposers know or have a duty to inquire as to all of the business objectives of their clients. Rather, it seeks the disclosure of information regarding cases where the proposer has reason to believe that its performance of work under this contract may materially affect the value or viability of a project it is performing for the other entity.

The proposer has a business arrangement with a current MAPO employee or immediate family member of such employee, including promised future employment of such person, or a subcontracting arrangement with such person, when such arrangement is contingent on the proposer being awarded this Contract. This item does not apply to pre-existing employment of current or former MAPO employees, or their immediate family members. Comment: this provision is not intended to supersede any MAPO policies applicable to its own employees accepting outside employment. This provision is intended to focus on identifying situations where promises of employment have been made contingent on the outcome of this particular procurement. It is intended to avoid a situation where a proposer may have unfair access to “inside” information.

The proposer has, in previous work for the state, been given access to “data” relevant to this procurement or this project that is classified as “private” or “nonpublic” under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, and such data potentially provides the proposer with an unfair advantage in preparing a proposal for this project. Comment: this provision will not, for example, necessarily disqualify a proposer who performed some preliminary work from obtaining a final design Contract, especially when the results of such previous work are public data available to all other proposers. Rather, it attempts to avoid an “unfair advantage” when such information cannot be provided to other potential proposers. Definitions of “government data”, “public data”, “non-public data” and “private data” can be found in Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13.

The proposer has, in previous work for the state, helped create the “ground rules” for this solicitation by performing work such as: writing this solicitation, or preparing evaluation criteria or evaluation guides for this solicitation.

The proposer, or any of its principals, because of any current or planned business arrangement, investment interest, or ownership interest in any other business, may be unable to provide objective advice to the state.
Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest

Having had the opportunity to review the Organizational Conflict of Interest Checklist, the proposer hereby indicates that it has, to the best of its knowledge and belief:

_____________________________ Determined that no potential organizational conflict of interest exists.

_____________________________ Determined a potential organizational conflict of interest as follows:

Describe nature of potential conflict:

Describe measures proposed to mitigate the potential conflict:

_________________________________________  __________________________________
Signature                                    Date

If a potential conflict has been identified, please provide name and phone number for a contact person authorized to discuss this disclosure form with MAPO personnel.

_________________________________________  __________________________________
Name                                        Phone
Affirmative Action Certification

If your response to this solicitation is or could be in excess of $100,000.00, complete the information requested below to determine whether you are subject to the Minnesota Human Rights Act (Minnesota Statutes 363A.36) certification requirement, and to provide documentation of compliance if necessary. It is your sole responsibility to provide this information and—if required—to apply for Human Rights certification prior to the due date and time of the bid or proposal and to obtain Human Rights certification prior to the execution of the contract. The State of Minnesota is under no obligation to delay proceeding with a contract until a company receives Human Rights certification.

BOX A – For companies which have employed more than 40 full-time employees within Minnesota on any single working day during the previous 12 months. All other companies proceed to BOX B.

Your response will be rejected unless your business:

☐ Has a current Certification of Compliance issued by the Minnesota Department of Human Rights (MDHR) -or- Has submitted an affirmative action plan to the MDHR, which the Department received prior to the date and time the responses are due.

Check one of the following statements if you have employed more than 40 full-time employees in Minnesota on any single working day during the previous 12 months:

☐ We have a current Certificate of Compliance issued by the MDHR. Proceed to Box C. Include a copy of you Certification with your response

☐ We do not have a current Certificate of Compliance; However, we submitted an Affirmative Action Plan to the MDHR for approval, which the Department received on __________________________(date). If the date is the same as the response due date, indicate the time your plan was received: ____________________(time). Proceed to Box C.

☐ We do not have a Certification of Compliance, nor has the MDHR received an Affirmative Action Plan from our company. We acknowledge that our response will be rejected. Proceed to Box C. Contact the MDHR for assistance. (See below for contact information)

Please note: Certificates of Compliance must be issued by the MDHR. Affirmative Action Plans must be approved by the Federal government, a county or a municipality must still be received, reviewed and approved by the MDHR before a Certification can be issued.

BOX B – For those companies not described in BOX A

Check below

☐ We have not employed more than 40 full-time employees on any single working day in Minnesota within the previous 12 months. Proceed to BOX C.

BOX C – For all companies

By signing this statement, you certify that the information provided is accurate and that you are authorized to sign on behalf of the responder. You also certify that you are in compliance with federal affirmative action requirements that may apply to your company. (These requirements are generally triggered only by participating as a prime or subcontractor on federal projects or contracts. Contractors are alerted to these requirements by the federal government.)

Name of Company: __________________________________________ Date __________________________________________

Authorized Signature: ______________________________________ Telephone number: __________________________

Printed Name: __________________________________________ Title: __________________________

For assistance with this form, contact:

Minnesota Department of Human Rights, Compliance Services Section

Mail: 190 East 5th St., Suite 700 St. Paul, MN 55101
Web: www.humanrights.state.mn.us
Email: employerinfo@therightsplace.net

TC Metro: (651) 296-5663 Toll Free: 800-657-3704
Fax: (651) 296-9042 TTY: (651) 296-1283
Immigration Status Certification

By order of the Governor (Governor’s Executive Order 08-01), vendors and subcontractors MUST certify compliance with the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) and certify use of the E-Verify system established by the Department of Homeland Security.

E-Verify program information can be found at http://www.dhs.gov/ximgtn/programs.

If any response to a solicitation is or could be in excess of $50,000.00, vendors and subcontractors must certify compliance with items 1 and 2 below. In addition, prior to the delivery of the product or initiation of services, vendors MUST obtain this certification from all subcontractors who will participate in the performance of the Contract. All subcontractor certifications must be kept on file with the Contract vendor and made available to the state upon request.

1. The company shown below is in compliance with the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 in relation to all employees performing work in the United States and does not knowingly employ persons in violation of the United States immigration laws. The company shown below will obtain this certification from all subcontractors who will participate in the performance of this Contract and maintain subcontractor certifications for inspection by the state if such inspection is requested; and

2. By the date of the delivery of the product and/or performance of services, the company shown below will have implemented or will be in the process of implementing the E-Verify program for all newly hired employees in the United States who will perform work on behalf of the State of Minnesota.

I certify that the company shown below is in compliance with items 1 and 2 above and that I am authorized to sign on its behalf.

Name of Company: ______________________________________ Date: ______________________________

Authorized Signature: ______________________________________ Telephone Number: __________________

Printed Name: ______________________________________ Title: ________________________________

If the Contract vendor and/or the subcontractors are not in compliance with the Immigration Reform and Control Act, or knowingly employ persons in violation of the United States immigration laws, or have not begun or implemented the E-Verify program for all newly hired employees in support of the Contract, the state reserves the right to determine what action it may take. This action could include, but would not be limited to cancellation of the Contract, and/or suspending or debarring the Contract vendor from state purchasing.

For assistance with the E-Verify Program
Contact the National Customer Service Center (NCSC) at 1-800-375-5283 (TTY 1-800-767-1833).

For assistance with this form, contact:
Mail: 112 Administration Building, 50 Sherburne Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
E-Mail: MMDHelp.Line@state.mn.us
Telephone: 651-296-2600
Persons with a hearing or speech disability may contact us by dialing 711 or 1-800-627-3529
Certification of Restriction on Lobbying

In accordance with Section 1352 of Title 31, United States Code, it is the policy of the bidder/company named below that:

1. No Federal or state appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid by or on behalf of the bidder/company, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any Federal or state agency, or a member of Congress or the state legislature in connection with the awarding of any Federal or state contract, the making of any Federal or state grant, the making of any Federal or state loan, extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal or state contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any Federal agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, “Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,” in accordance with its instructions.

3. The bidder/company shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants and contracts and subcontracts under grants, subgrants, loans, and cooperative agreement), which exceeds $100,000, and that all such subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

4. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by Section 1352, Title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each failure.

Name of Bidder / Company Name ____________________________________________________________

Type or print name ______________________________________________________________________

Signature of authorized representative __________________________ Date ___ / ___ / ___

_____________________________________________________________(Title of authorized official)
**CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE**

---

**CONTACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>FAX</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSURER(S) AFFORDING COVERAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAIC #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**COVERAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURER</th>
<th>TYPE OF INSURANCE</th>
<th>AD&amp;D SUBJ</th>
<th>INS. WD</th>
<th>POLICY NUMBER</th>
<th>LIMITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAIMS-MADE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCCUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENL AGGREGATE LIMIT APPLIES PER:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUTOBILIA LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANY AUTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OWNED AUTOS ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIRED AUTOS ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONOWNED AUTOS ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCHEDULED AUTOS ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAIMS-MADE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PRODUCTS-COMMCOM AGG**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL COVERAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INJR</th>
<th>AD&amp;D SUBJ</th>
<th>INS. WD</th>
<th>POLICY NUMBER</th>
<th>LIMITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES**

**CERTIFICATE HOLDER**

**CANCELLATION**

- SHOULD ANY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED POLICIES BE CANCELLED BEFORE THE EXPIRATION DATE THEREOF, NOTICE WILL BE DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY PROVISIONS.

---

© 1988-2018 ACORD CORPORATION. All rights reserved.

ACORD 25 (2016/03) The ACORD name and logo are registered marks of ACORD
Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters – Primary Covered Transactions

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS--
PRIMARY COVERED TRANSACTIONS

Instructions For Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective primary participant is providing the certification set out below.

2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency's determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.

3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department or agency to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

5. The terms covered transaction, debarred, suspended, ineligible, lower tier covered transaction, participant, person, primary covered transaction, principal, proposal, and voluntarily excluded, as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of the rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the department or agency to which this proposal is being submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.

6. The prospective primary participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency entering into this transaction.

7. The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion- Lower Tier Covered Transaction," provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.

8. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Nonprocurement Programs.

9. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.

10. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 6 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS--
PRIMARY COVERED TRANSACTIONS

(1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded by any Federal department or agency;
(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification;

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State or local) terminated for cause or default.

(2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

____________________________________ _______________________________ Signature/Authorized Certifying Official Typed Name and Title

____________________________________ ________________________________ Applicant/Organization Date Signed
Appendix D TAC & Policy Board Membership

Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization Policy Board

Tim Auringer – City of Eagle Lake
Bob Freyberg – City of North Mankato
Jack Kolars – Nicollet County
Mike Laven – City of Mankato
Mark Piepho – Blue Earth County (chair)
Dan Rotchadl – Mankato Township

Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee

Sheri Allen – Mankato Area Public Schools (District #77)
Ronda Allis – MnDOT (District 7)
Jennifer Bromeland – City of Eagle Lake
Paul Corcoran – Minnesota State University, Mankato
Scott Fichtner – Blue Earth County
Karl Friedrichs – Lime Township
Michael Fischer – City of North Mankato
Seth Greenwood – Nicollet County
Scott Hogen – Mankato Area Public Schools (District #77)
Travis Javens – City of Skyline
Jeff Johnson – City of Mankato
Curt Kloss – Leray Township
Mandy Landkamer – Nicollet County
Loren Lindsey – Belgrade Township
Open – South Bend Township
Ed Pankratz – Mankato Township
Sam Parker – Region Nine Development Commission
Craig Rempp – City of Mankato, Transit
Dan Sarff – City of North Mankato
Ryan Thilges – Blue Earth County (chair)
Paul Vogel – City of Mankato
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Resolution Supporting MnDOT 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)
No: 5.4

Agenda Item: Resolution Supporting MnDOT 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)

Recommendation Action(s): Motion and approval by MAPO Policy Board to Adopt Resolution Supporting MnDOT 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)

Summary:
MnDOT has released its 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1). MnDOT will continue to update its PM1 targets annually, while PM2 (Pavement and Bridges) and PM3 (Travel Time Reliability) will be updated by MnDOT every four years. Similar to the Performance Measure Targets released for 2018, the MAPO was given the option to either support the state’s targets or establish its own targets. The MAPO must either support the state's targets or establish its own by February 27, 2019.

MnDOT’s 2019 PM1 targets are below:

<p>| Safety Measures and Targets – Calendar Year 2019 Adopted Targets (5-year averages) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>372.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate (per 100 million VMT)</td>
<td>0.662 per 100 million VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100 million VMT)</td>
<td>2.854/100 Million VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>267.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff recommends MAPO Policy Board motion to approve the attached resolution supporting the state targets. This item was brought before the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their meeting held November 15, 2018 and was recommended for approval.

Attachments:
Resolution Supporting MnDOT 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets
RESOLUTION OF THE MANKATO/NORTH MANKATO AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MAPO)

Adopting Safety Performance Targets

Whereas, the U.S. Department of Transportation established five performance measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) as detailed in 23 CFR 490, Subpart B, National Performance Measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program;

Whereas, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) established performance targets for each of the five HSIP performance measures in accordance with 23 CFR 490.209; and

Whereas, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) must establish performance targets for each of the HSIP performance measures; and

Whereas, MPOs establish HSIP targets by either agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of the State DOT HSIP target or commit to a quantifiable HSIP target for the metropolitan planning area; and

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) agrees to plan and program projects so that the projects contribute to the accomplishment of MnDOT's calendar year 2019 HSIP targets as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>372.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate (per 100 million VMT)</td>
<td>0.662 per 100 million VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100 million VMT)</td>
<td>2.854/100 Million VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>267.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a true and correct copy of the resolution presented to and adopted by the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization at a duly authorized meeting thereof, held on the 6th day of December, 2018 as shown by the minutes of said meeting in my possession.

____________________________________
Chair                                      Date

____________________________________
Executive Director                        Date
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Resolution Adopting Updated MAPO Public Participation Plan
No: 5.5

Agenda Item: Resolution Adopting Updated MAPO Public Participation Plan

Recommendation Action(s): Motion and approval by MAPO Policy Board to Adopt Public Participation Plan

Summary:
At its September 6, 2018 meeting the MAPO Policy Board motioned to release the MAPO’s Public Participation Plan (PPP) update for 45-day public comment. The comment period ran from September 11, 2018 to November 2, 2018.

Hard copies of the PPP were distributed to the City of Mankato, City of North Mankato, City of Eagle Lake, county administrative buildings of Blue Earth and Nicolette, the Blue Earth County Library in Mankato, and the Taylor Library in North Mankato. In addition, the PPP was placed on both the MAPO’s and the Blue Earth County websites along with an email distribution sent to local, state and federal partners linking to the PPP. An announcement of the comment period was advertised though the MAPO Twitter account, a Public Notice was placed in the Mankato Free Press newspaper, and an official news release was sent out from the Public Information department from the City of Mankato.

Public comments included recommendations for minor language adjustments and designation of an ADA Coordinator for the MAPO.

Staff recommends the MAPO Policy Board motion to approve the attached Resolution adopting the MAPO’s updated Public Participation Plan.

This item was brought before the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their meeting held November 15, 2018 and was recommended for approval.

Attachments:
Draft updated MAPO Public Participation Plan
Summary of public comments received over 45-day public comment period
Resolution of Adoption
MANKATO/NORTH MANKATO AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MAPO)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN & STAFF GUIDE

Recommended for adoption by the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
11/15/18

Adopted by the MAPO Policy Board
12/6/18
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization

Public Participation Plan

Adopted 12/6/2018

All questions, comments, document and service requests may be directed via phone, fax, email, or in person to:

Paul Vogel
Executive Director
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
10 Civic Center Plaza
Mankato, MN 56001

Phone: (507) 340-3733
Fax: (507) 388-7530
Email: pvogel@mankatomn.gov

The contents of this document reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts or accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the United States Department of Administration, the State of Minnesota Department of Transportation, the United States Federal Highway Administration, or the United States Federal Transit Administration. The report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

Documents, meeting minutes, agendas and other information may be accessed on the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization website at:

www.mnmapo.org

To request this document in other languages, please call (507) 387-8389

Para solicitar este documento en otros idiomas, llame al (507) 387-8389

Si aad u codsato dukumintigan luqadaha kale, fadlan wac (507) 387-8389
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You don’t need to be an expert to participate in the planning process. Chances are you used some form of transportation today. Whether you traveled by foot, bicycle, wheelchair, bus, or car, you have knowledge and insight into local transportation needs and priorities. Your participation ensures that transportation investments are developed with input from the people who know the MAPO area best.

What is Transportation Planning?
Transportation planning is the foundation for making sound investments into our transportation infrastructure. The MAPO works to direct transportation funding (from the gas tax as well as other federal, state and local sources) into creating a transportation system that improves mobility for people and goods across all modes of travel, on whether on foot, by bike, bus, rail, car or by air or on water.

The MAPO’s transportation planners, policy board and advisory committee members work with local stakeholders to identify issues, gather and give information and analyze and recommend improvements aimed at creating a transportation system that operates efficiently both today and in the future.

Transportation planning is a cooperative process designed to foster involvement by all relevant stakeholders. Our work at the MAPO not only requires but also depends on public involvement.

What is Public Involvement?
Public involvement is how we connect with you to give information and to understand your perspective on the issues you care about.

Public involvement means that multiple stakeholders are involved in our area’s transportation planning and decision-making processes. It is a two-way process that gives residents and business owners an opportunity to provide input and also lets our planning staff provide information, answer questions and understand your perspective on the issues you care about. This exchange leads to better decisions and gives community ownership of the resulting plans and recommendations.
Why Should I Get Involved and who is a Stakeholder?

There are numerous reasons to get involved:

- Every household and business depends on safe transportation infrastructure to move both people and goods.

- Our region’s mobility, quality of life, economic growth and competitiveness rely on the multi-modal transportation network.

- The funding to build and maintain our transportation system comes from a range of sources, including your tax dollars.

Stakeholders are people or organizations that could be affected by the recommendations in a plan or study or could influence its implementation. They include (but are not limited to):

- Neighborhood representatives
- Local transportation providers
- Local businesses and associations
- Airport and port authorities
- Freight shippers and carriers
- Advocacy groups for or users of alternate modes such as bicycling or transit
- People with low incomes and their representatives
- People with disabilities and their representatives
- Federal and state transportation agencies
- Low-literacy populations
- Local officials and jurisdictional representatives
- Children, the elderly, and New American populations
- Federally-recognized Native American tribal interests

Who Should Participate?

Our transportation system has many stakeholders. Broadly, major stakeholders live and work in the Mankato region, including (but not limited to):

- City of Mankato
- City of North Mankato
- City of Eagle Lake
- City of Skyline
- Blue Earth County
- Nicollet County
- Belgrade Township
- South Bend Township
- Lime Township
- LeRay Township
- Mankato Township
WHAT IS THE MANKATO/NORTH MANKATO AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION?

The Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) builds regional agreement on transportation investments that balance pedestrian, bicycle, public transit, roadway, and other transportation needs while supporting regional environmental, land use, and economic goals. It was established in 2012 in response to the 2010 U.S. Census which designated the Mankato/North Mankato area as an urbanized area requiring the formation of a metropolitan planning agency under 23 USC 134 and 49 USC 5303. The purpose of the MAPO is to meet and maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive metropolitan transportation planning process.

The MAPO is represented by the following units of government:

- City of Mankato
- City of North Mankato
- City of Eagle Lake
- City of Skyline
- Blue Earth County
- Nicollet County
- Belgrade Township
- Lime Township
- South Bend Township
- LeRay Township
- Mankato Township
The MAPO is directed by a six (6) member Policy Board. The MAPO is advised by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which reviews and formulates recommendations to the Policy Board regarding the, Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and other plans and studies prepared by the MAPO. Figure 2 below shows the current membership of the MAPO’s Policy Board and TAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAPO ORGANIZATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Auringer – City of Eagle Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Freyberg – City of North Mankato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Kolars – Nicollet County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Laven – City of Mankato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Piepho – Blue Earth County (chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Rotchadl – MAPO Townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAPO Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Vogel, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Androsky, Transportation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: MAPO membership
MAPO Vision Statement
The MAPO has adopted the following vision statement which guides the development of all its work products:

_Through continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive planning, the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization will promote a regional transportation system that is safe, increasingly efficient, integrated, and multi-modal. This system will support economic development, be designed in a manner that promotes and markets the community, encourages sustainable growth, and improves mobility and access for both area and non-area residents and businesses._

The MAPO’s Requirements as an MPO
As the designated MPO for the Mankato/North Mankato area, the MAPO is required to perform the transportation planning and programming activates as specified within 23 CFR 450:

- Maintain a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The LRTP sets forth a vision for the area’s transportation system with a minimum planning horizon of twenty years. It includes strategies to accomplish these goals and proposed projects with short, mid and long term timeframes. It also includes a financial plan that demonstrates how these projects can be implemented using the resources that are reasonably expected to be available over the life of the plan.

- Develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is a short-range (four-year) program of the area’s transportation improvements and must include all projects receiving federal funding, as well as those defined as “regionally significant” as agreed by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Mankato Transit, and the MAPO. The TIP is a mechanism for allocating limited financial resources among the capital and operating needs of the area, based on the transportation priorities, goals and projects identified in the LRTP.

- Implement a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). In order to ensure the timely implementation of a comprehensive, continuous, and coordinated (3-C’s) transportation planning process, each year the MAPO adopts a UPWP that spells out the MAPO’s
transportation planning activities and administrative activities, budgets and funding sources for each project for the next two years. Public involvement in the development for the UPWP is not explicitly required of the MAPO; however, specific plans and studies identified in the UPWP represent the planning priorities for the Mankato/North Mankato metropolitan area and are developed in consultation with the MAPO Policy Board, Transportation Advisory Committee, representatives of local jurisdictions and state and federal agencies. The production of each year's UPWP is presented as a discussion item at both TAC and Policy Board meetings. The public is encouraged to provide feedback on the UPWP in person, through email, telephone, or online comment.

- Facilitate Public Involvement. The requirements of 23 CFR 450.316 direct the MAPO to develop and use a Public Participation Plan to ensure that citizens and stakeholders are given reasonable opportunities to participate in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

**What is the MAPO's Public Participation Plan?**

Federal regulations have been put in place to require continuous, cooperative and coordinated transportation planning for urban areas where populations exceed 50,000 people in order to receive Federal transportation funding. This public participation plan is intended to fulfill federal regulations as outlined in 23 USC 134 and 23 CFR 450.

This document serves as a framework of guidelines for the MAPO's public involvement process. Public involvement procedures are also required by federal regulations to be periodically reviewed regarding the effectiveness of the process and to ensure open access was provided to all.

This public participation plan will be reviewed and updated as needed at the beginning of each Long Range Transportation Plan. It will also be reviewed and updated due to new federal regulations or guidelines. Amendments will be reviewed and approved by the MAPO Policy Board.

Metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) are required to provide at least 45 days for public comment before the Public Participation Plan is adopted or revised.

Public involvement is a key element to successful metropolitan transportation planning and is guided by legal requirements and best practices for public involvement. The MAPO recognizes the importance of informing the public about opportunities to influence the direction of the planning process and its eventual outcomes as it can aid in more successful implementation of metropolitan transportation planning and projects. The MAPO is committed to keeping the general public informed and advised on all matters relative to transportation planning, programming and funding early and often in the planning process.

This Public Participation Plan outlines different ways to involve people in transportation planning. It is important to the MAPO to involve individuals and organizations representing a wide variety of experiences and perspectives in regards to transportation planning.
2018 Update
In development of the 2018 update to the Public Participation Plan, the MAPO conducted an internal review of in-house public input processes and measurements of effectiveness. Additionally, the MAPO conducted an external survey of peer organizations and industry standards. The internal review included an audit of previous and current MAPO public involvement procedures, as well as an assessment of their effectiveness. The external review included a survey of new technologies and methods available, industry trends, and methods employed by similar organizations.

Among a cosmetic and modernization overhaul of text, maps, and statutes, the 2018 Update includes implementation of a variety of new practices and tools, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Practices and Tools Employed in 2018 Update</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Creation/implementation of MAPO Twitter account (@MinnesotaMAPO)</td>
<td>• Addition of Opportunity for Public Comment as consistent agenda item at MAPO Policy Board meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addition of public comment section to MAPO website</td>
<td>• Addition of federally-recognized Native American tribal interests to key transportation stakeholder groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More specific and understandable displays at public open houses and engagement sessions, e.g. “What’s New?” displays at TIP events.</td>
<td>• Expansion of MAPO stakeholders email list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measuring Effectiveness
The 2018 Update also includes implementation of a range of metrics to gauge efficacy of MAPO public engagement efforts. Due to the broad and disparate nature of public involvement, documentation of each and every incidence of public input is not realistic. However, the new metrics provide a set of guideposts for MAPO staff to track and measure efficacy of public involvement efforts moving forward. MAPO staff shall make efforts to document incidences as they apply to the below metrics (where practical) and employ this data at the next update.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Participation Opportunities</td>
<td>Number of MAPO public forums, workshops, and community meetings at which displays, presentations, discussions, and feedback occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of verbal comments received at open discussions, public hearings, and other opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants at public forums, workshops, and community meetings held in historically underserved areas or with such populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number and origin of participants at MAPO meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of draft plans, reports, and other preliminary documents or surveys posted on MAPO website for public comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps developed with updated, community-specific demographic and socioeconomic data within the MAPO boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of MAPO Twitter followers/Twitter engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of visitors to MAPO website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives of the MAPO’s Public Participation Plan (PPP)

The MAPO fully realizes that public involvement is critical to the successful development and implementation of any transportation plan. The principal objectives of the MAPO’s Public Participation Plan are consistent with the requirements outlined in 23 CFR 450.316:

- To establish a consistent means of notification and involvement for the public.
- To actively seek input and involvement from a wide variety of individuals, groups, and organizations affected by the transportation system.
- To establish and facilitate effective public involvement early in the planning process, before key decisions are made and while there is ample opportunity to influence decisions.
- To promote informed and thoughtful public input throughout the decision-making process by providing access to information in a timely manner.
- To fully consider and document public input. Circumstances affecting this process include type and scope of input, the specific project under consideration, and context. For example, input pertaining to relatively minor modifications may be incorporated at MAPO staff discretion. Comments for more significant or transformative changes will be brought to the MAPO TAC and Policy Board for review. All comments to the TIP and LRTP will be presented to the TAC and Policy Board for consideration. To utilize public involvement in the development of transportation plans, programs, and projects which represent identified local, regional, and state priorities and needs pertaining to multiple modes of transportation.
- To develop a public participation plan in consultation with interested parties and to update periodically as deemed necessary.
- To employ to the maximum extent practicable, visualization techniques which may include: photos, drawings, flowcharts, maps, models, photo manipulation, scenario planning tools, computer simulations, videos, or visual preference surveys.
- To require a minimum public comment period of forty five (45) days before the MAPO’s PPP is adopted, revised, or updated.
- To solicit and consider the needs of those who have been traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, including households with low income, minorities and people with disabilities, and assure participation in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and Executive Order 12898 related to Environmental Justice.
- To provide for the early involvement of various transportation interest groups (i.e. traffic, bicyclists, pedestrians, rideshare, parking, transportation, safety and enforcement agencies, rail operators, airport, private transportation providers, public officials, freight shippers, environmental groups, and permit agencies).
- To coordinate the MAPO’s PPP with statewide public participation plans to enhance public consideration and understanding of the area’s transportation issues, plans, and programs.
- To evaluate, on a periodic basis, the MAPO’s PPP to verify that the process is open to all individuals with interest and that the procedures of this policy are being implemented and followed in accordance with federal regulation and that the objectives set forth herein are administered appropriately by the MAPO.
STAKEHOLDERS

Identifying and Informing Stakeholders
The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (2015) requires MPOs to develop their public participation plans, “in consultation with an expanded list of ‘interested parties’.” In Appendix A is a list of stakeholder groups the MAPO has identified as important participants in the public participation process. Stakeholders are those affected by how, when and where transportation investment occurs.

Stakeholders serve as important sources for information and the MAPO recognizes the importance of ensuring their voices are heard and fully considered. Consulting with the stakeholders throughout the planning process allows the MAPO staff to analyze transportation conditions and identify the wants and needs of those affected. Stakeholders will be added to the MAPO public participation contact list to notify them of public participation opportunities during the Long-Range Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Plan, and other projects and studies. Refer to Appendix A for list of stakeholders.

Public Participation Contacts
The MAPO maintains a list of stakeholders, individuals and organizations from whom public participation is sought. Public contacts include citizens, affected public agencies, and representatives of transportation agency employees, private providers of transportation, other interested parties and segments of the community affected by transportation plans, programs and projects. The MAPO will seek input from public contacts during appropriate stages of the Long-Range Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Plan, and other special updates and projects.

A copy of the MAPO public participation contact list will be available for review at the Intergovernmental Center and upon request. A select list will be available on the MAPO website. Any individual or organization may request to be added or removed from the contact list for future meeting notifications and document distribution.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE REQUIREMENTS

A 1994 Presidential Executive Order directed every Federal agency to make environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing the effects of all programs, policies, and activities
on minority populations and low income populations. The U.S. Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration have identified three fundamental environmental justice principles:

- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social economic effects on minority populations and low income populations.
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in receipt of benefits by minority and low income populations.

The MAPO will conduct additional analysis of plans/programs to ensure they do not result in disproportionate impacts. The MAPO will reach out to minority and low income populations by:

- Identifying minority and low income populations through US Census information and mapping the Census information.
- Developing contacts, mailing lists, and other means of notification to participate.
- Consultation with minority or low income groups/organizations.
- Providing the opportunity for public comments.
- Having alternative formats of documents available upon request.
- Having accessible locations (those defined as “accessible” by federal ADA standards) for public hearings and meetings.

ADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) requires all public materials, meetings/hearings, and facilities to be made fully accessible to the public on an equal basis. Below is a list of participation activities aimed at increasing participation from persons with disabilities:

- Outreach to individuals through groups, developing contacts, mailing lists, and other means of notification to participate.
- Consultation with individuals with disabilities.
- Providing the opportunity for public comments.
- Having alternative formats of documents available upon request.
- Having accessible locations for public hearings and meetings.

Any persons requiring a document in an alternative format, an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication, or a modification of policies or procedures to participate in a MAPO-related activity may contact either the City of Mankato’s ADA Coordinator or MAPO staff. Anyone who has a complaint that a MAPO-related activity is not accessible to persons with disabilities should contact the City of Mankato’s ADA Coordinator.
MAPO STAFF GUIDE TO INVOLVE THE PUBLIC IN ITS PLANS, MEETINGS AND STUDIES

Policy Board Meetings
The MAPO is directed by a six (6) member Policy Board. The Board is comprised of local elected officials within the MAPO planning area. Policy Board members represent the interests of their member jurisdictions and the MAPO planning area as a whole. A Public Notice will be printed in the Mankato Free Press stating the purpose, time and location of the meeting as well as staff contact information at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting. The MAPO website will list the upcoming scheduled MAPO Policy Board meetings, including time, location and materials.

All Policy Board meetings will be held at locations that:
- Sufficiency hold the meeting attendees
- Are accessible to persons with disabilities
- Are located on or near public transportation routes
- Provide sufficient parking for meeting attendees

Unless notified otherwise, all Policy Board meetings will be held at the Intergovernmental Center (IGC) in downtown Mankato. Meeting attendees may make oral comments, submit written comments, or send comments to the MAPO staff at (507) 340-3733 or pvogel@mankatomin.gov.

Upon request, a sign language interpreter will be made available for hearing impaired persons. Persons with limited English proficiency (LEP) may request aid from the MAPO staff. Any requests should be submitted to the MAPO staff at (507) 340-3733 or pvogel@mankatomin.gov at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

MAPO staff will display/project the meeting packet. Staff will also provide hard copies of materials. When possible, the MAPO will use visualization techniques such as maps, models, photographs, or project renderings to aid in greater understanding of projects, plans or other topics of discussion at each meeting.

Policy Board meetings are held on the first Thursday of each month. Meetings may be canceled if no actionable items are required by the MAPO Policy Board

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings
The MAPO is advised by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) comprised of local transportation stakeholders, representatives, and experts. TAC members utilize their technical backgrounds to assist in the transportation planning process of the MPO. The TAC is responsible for reviewing planning studies, programs, and projects accomplished through the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) as well as ranking projects for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and making technical recommendations to the Policy Board. The MAPO website will list upcoming scheduled MAPO TAC meetings along with time and location. TAC meetings are held on the third Thursday of each month. Meetings may be canceled if there are no actionable items for the TAC. Meeting materials will also be posted to the website at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.
All TAC meetings will be held at locations that:
- Sufficiently hold the meeting attendees
- Are accessible to persons with disabilities
- Are located on or near public transportation routes
- Provide sufficient parking for meeting attendees

Unless notified otherwise, all TAC meetings will be held at the Intergovernmental Center (IGC) in downtown Mankato. Meeting attendees may make oral comments, submit written comments, or send comments to the MAPO staff at (507) 340-3733 or pvogel@mankatomin.gov

Upon request, a sign language interpreter will be made available. Persons with limited English proficiency (LEP) may request aid from MAPO staff. Any requests should be submitted to MAPO staff at (507) 340-3733 or pvogel@mankatomin.gov at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

The MAPO staff will display/project the meeting packet. Staff will also provide hard copies of materials. When possible, the MAPO will use visualization techniques such as maps, models, photographs, or project renderings to aid in greater understanding of projects, plans or other topics of discussion at each meeting.

TAC meetings are held on the third Thursday of each month. Meetings may be canceled if no actionable items are required by the MAPO TAC.

MAPO Website
The MAPO’s website, www.mnmapo.org, is the MAPO’s primary source for the timely delivery of information to the public. Project specific information, maps, meeting agendas and minutes, and announcements of opportunities to comment and view draft versions will be provided on-line. Hard copy requests should be made by calling (507) 340-3733 or emailing pvogel@mankatomin.gov for pick-up at the Intergovernmental Center (IGC) or mailing.

Email and Direct Mail
The MAPO is developing and maintaining a large stakeholder/interest person list that is used to distribute communications and public information. An overview of groups can be found in Appendix A.

Public Meetings, Open Houses, & Pop-Up Events
Public meetings and/or open houses are held for many of the MAPO’s plans and studies. These opportunities are provided at key decision points during the planning process to involve the public in identifying issues, reviewing data collection and analysis, and developing solutions and recommendations. The MAPO will use a variety of methods to inform stakeholders of Policy Board meetings, special meetings and open houses. Methods may include:
- Sending the meeting notice to stakeholder distribution list as shown in Appendix A. (This list will continually be updated).
- Post information on the homepage of the MAPO website.
- Publish a meeting notice at least seven (7) days in advance in the Mankato Free Press Newspaper.
- Create a meeting informational poster and display at the (IGC).
- Provide meeting informational posters to Mankato Transit agency for distribution (i.e. on buses or in transit facilities).

The MAPO may also employ pop-up events as part of its public engagement efforts. Pop-up events are typically unadvertised or under-advertised when compared to traditional public meetings or open houses. These efforts are often “popped up” in larger events to obtain a survey of stakeholders as they gather near or pass through a selected area. Pop-up events can be used to obtain a more unbiased, proportionately-representative sample for studies. Pop-ups can be located at events such as farmers markets, musical or sports events, or areas within a selected geography being studied (i.e. a grocery store along a corridor being studied.)

**Documentation**
Copies of all planning documents will be available in digital format at [www.mnmapo.org](http://www.mnmapo.org). Hardcopies will be distributed to MAPO member communities, agencies, and other stakeholders by request. Additionally, hardcopies will be available upon request and can be picked up at Intergovernmental Center. Requests for alternative formats will be accommodated when possible.

Comments or questions can be submitted to:
**Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization**
10 Civic Center Plaza
Mankato, MN 56001
Telephone: (507) 940-3733
Fax: (507) 387-7530
Email: pvogel@mankatomn.gov
Website: [www.mnmapo.org](http://www.mnmapo.org)

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT STEPS FOR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANS (LRTP)**

The MAPO is required to adopt a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) which outlines short and long-range policy, goals and potential transportation improvements for the Mankato / North Mankato APO Planning Area. The LRTP defines a minimum of a 20 year vision of improvements to preserve current infrastructure and identify transportation network deficiencies. Its goals and objectives are based on federal legislation, regional transportation issues, agency meetings, and public comment. The LRTP must be updated every five years. Opportunities for members of the public to influence the design of the LRTP include:
• Engage with MAPO staff regarding the Plan through in-person contact, email, telephone, or through online comment
• Attend and provide input at the numerous public engagement events held in development of the LRTP
• Communicate public input to representatives of the MAPO TAC and Policy Board

In an effort to ensure a multimodal transportation planning process, the MAPO also addresses modal elements of the LRTP including active transportation modes such bicycle, pedestrian and transit. The public involvement procedures outlined in this section apply equally to each of its modal elements.

**LRTP Public Involvement Process**
The MAPO’s public involvement process for the development of its Long Range Transportation Plan 2045 update will:

- Identify roles, responsibilities and key decision points.
- Include LRTP-specific public involvement goals along with associated strategies, tools and techniques to provide diverse opportunities to review and comment with timeframe that provide timely notice of public participation activities and ensure a minimum public comment period of 30 days before the final LRTP is adopted.
- Employ visualization techniques and utilize electronic formats and means as well as public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times in order to provide reasonable access to information about long-range area transportation issues and LRTP planning processes.
- Coordinate with statewide public involvement procedures and consider other related planning activities as well as the design and delivery of transportation services within the metropolitan area.
- Identify stakeholders in keeping with federal requirements and seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low income and minority households.
- Demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the LRTP.
- Periodically review the effectiveness of these procedures and strategies to ensure a full and open participation process.

**Plan Development – Phase I**
The first (of four) planning phase focuses on laying the groundwork for the plan. Public involvement steps will:

- Devise a documented public participation process that incorporates the requirements listed above.
- Identify stakeholders groups (See Appendix A).
- Inform the MAPO Policy Board and Technical Advisory Committee members.
- Inform interested persons and community stakeholders identified during other MAPO planning.
- Obtain (or verify) current contact information for all stakeholders identified above.
- Develop and maintain a broad mailing and email list of interested and affected parties whose input will be actively sought during the LRTP development process.
• Develop a LRTP 2045 Update Page or link accessible from the MAPO website as the primary resource for current information about the LRTP.

Plan Execution – Phase II

The second planning phase focuses on collecting information, analyzing data and identifying solutions. Public involvement will be coordinated with the other planning activities undertaken at this time, and steps will:

• Develop 2045 LRTP Goals, Objectives and Strategies.
• Develop and distribute informational pieces and media content.
• Develop maps and other visualization tools to describe aspects of the LRTP.
• Write and distribute press releases and electronic content to communicate with the public at large at identified plan milestones and key decision points and to promote public involvement opportunities.
• Update content on the MAPO website on an ongoing basis.
• Use the MAPO's stakeholder list and media channels to publicize the public involvement opportunities and to provide a link to the MAPO website and other online sources of information.
• Meet with officials and staff from the MAPO Planning Area jurisdictions to obtain information about transportation priorities and get details on short, mid, and long-term transportation goals for each.
• Obtain information about transportation and other related plans, including comprehensive plans, conservation plans and maps, and available inventories of historic and natural resources.
• Consult with federal, state, and other agencies and officials responsible for planning activities in the MAPO planning area that are affected by transportation, including land use management, economic development, natural resources, historic, education, public health, private transportation providers and environmental protection.
• Present at regularly-scheduled MAPO TAC and Policy Board meetings.
• Hold meetings or consult with representatives of traditionally underserved (minority, low income, disabled, elderly) populations about their transportation priorities, short- and long-term issues, as well as the content and process for the LRTP update.
• Seek opportunities to give presentations to community organizations and groups, preferably at their regularly scheduled meetings, about their transportation priorities, short- and long-term issues, as well as the content and process for the LRTP update.
• Conduct Environmental Justice/Community Impact assessments of projects proposed for the LRTP on groups or areas with potential impacts.
• Present information in a variety of formats (including visualization tools) and encourage comments using multiple methods (group or one-one-one discussions, comment cards, etc.).

The MAPO may also:

• Design participation exercises to involve the TAC and Policy Board in determining area transportation priorities and in developing related objectives and strategies.
• Develop posters for the MAPO to display in Mankato and North Mankato public libraries with information about issues, content and process for the LRTP update.
• Produce a one-page handout about the LRTP update goals and objectives, issues and public involvement opportunities.
• Write and distribute a series of plan newsletters, to be distributed electronically at identified plan milestones and key decision points.

**Plan Delivery – Phase III**

The third planning phase focuses on preparing the draft plan, distributing it for public review, consultation and coordination with state and federal transportation authorities, incorporating input received, and presenting the final plan for approval. Public involvement will be coordinated with the other planning activities undertaken at this time, and specific steps include:

• Compile Draft LRTP.
• Include a review of all public involvement activities as a separate chapter and summarize the main messages or themes of the comments obtained.
• Demonstrate explicit consideration of the public input that was received, including discussion of how this input was incorporated into the plan. Include this type of discussion not only in this chapter, but also address it in relevant sections throughout the document.
• Include visualization tools, such as maps, graphs and illustrations, to explain aspects of the plan or the data collected for the plan.
• Present Draft LRTP to Policy Board and TAC.
• Motion to approve releasing the draft LRTP for required 30-day public comment period. The required period of 30 days was determined in consultation with FHWA, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and MnDOT. The purpose of the comment period is to give stakeholders and members of the public a reasonable opportunity to review, and comment on the plan before it is finalized.
• Publish and distribute Draft LRTP.
• Publish legal notice in the Mankato Free Press on, or immediately prior to, the start of the required public comment period.
• Post the Draft LRTP document on the MAPO website.
• Distribute link to the Draft LRTP document to TAC and Policy Board members as well as MnDOT, FTA and FHWA contacts for review and comment before the end of the public comment period.
• Make the Draft Plan available to the public in both hard copy (printed) and electronic (PDF) formats at the following locations: MAPO website (PDF), Intergovernmental Center office (hard copy), the Blue Earth County Public Library in Mankato and the Taylor Public Library in North Mankato (hard copy). Copies will also be provided upon request.
• Schedule and promote a public meeting or open house to review plan and take comments on the Draft plan.
• Provide a link to the draft plan for the MAPO’s stakeholder list and media channels to publicize the comment period and open house.
• Conduct consultation with state & federal agencies. Review and take comments on the Draft document. Hold consultation prior to the end of the 30-day comment period. Incorporate comments received.
• If the Final LRTP will differ significantly from the Draft version that was made available for public comment and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts, approval of the Final LRTP will be delayed until an additional opportunity for public comment is provided.
• The length of such an additional comment period, if determined to be necessary, will be determined in consultation with FHWA, FTA and MnDOT.
• The same techniques to promote the revised draft will be utilized as outlined above for the Draft LRTP.
• Present the final LRTP to the TAC and Policy Board for approval after the 30-day public comment period has ended. Report on public comments received and how/if the plan was amended to address comments received
• Make the final LRTP publicly available and provide copies of the approved LRTP to MnDOT, FHWA and FTA.
• Maintain copies in both electronic (PDF) and hard copy (printed) formats at the following locations (copies will also be provided upon request): Intergovernmental Center (hard copy), MAPO website (PDF), public libraries (hard copy).
• Conduct a review of public involvement activities to quantify and analyze effectiveness of public involvement efforts. Make notes for use during next LRTP update.

**Plan Implementation – Phase IV**
The fourth and final planning phase focuses on making the final plan available to the public and on seeking opportunities to promote the plan to the elected officials, employees and residents of MAPO-area jurisdictions that can facilitate the implementation of its recommendations. Steps include:

• Distribute Final LRTP to area jurisdictions and interested stakeholders.
• Seek opportunities to present information about the LRTP to the elected officials, employees and residents of MAPO area jurisdictions that can facilitate the implementation of its recommendations.
• Work to implement the LRTP objectives in the development of the MAPO’s Annual Work Programs and planning efforts and in the projects proposed for inclusion in the MAPO TIP.
• Periodically review and amend/update as needed to incorporate federal transportation legislation and state initiatives. This includes the typical 5-year update.

**LRTP Amendment Procedures**
All projects in the MAPO TIP must be consistent with the approved LRTP. If not, the LRTP must be amended or the project cannot be programmed in the TIP. The MAPO will work with MnDOT, FHWA and FTA to determine if the LRTP amendment is considered significant. LRTP amendments will be released for 30-day public comment if they are significant in nature. LRTP amendments will include, but are not limited to:

• Placing a legal notice in the Mankato Free Press.
• Using contact email list, website notice and flyer notification in public facilities such as public libraries.
• Depending on the extent of the update, more significant public engagement efforts and procedural actions may be necessary.
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT STEPS FOR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

The MAPO encourages, and is required to incorporate, public involvement when developing its TIP. This document schedules and programs federal funding for surface transportation projects in the MAPO Area, as well as those projects determined to be of regional significance. The TIP is updated annually and has a four (4) year programming horizon.

TIP Development and Approval Process

The annual process of soliciting projects, developing a draft program of funded projects and approving the final TIP has several public involvement requirements, based on federal transportation planning legislation (23 CFR 450.316). Project selection related public involvement actions include:

- Announce start of TIP process at TAC and Policy Board meetings and review project timeline.
- Administer TIP project solicitation process with eligible jurisdictions. Make all project applications available upon request.
- Use the MAPO stakeholder email list to publicize and distribute a link to the MAPO website regarding the prospective TIP projects. Stakeholders will be asked to provide comments to staff regarding the prospective TIP projects.
- Create an informational display that shows proposed projects. Place displays at key locations in the MAPO area including but not limited to IGC, North Mankato City Hall, public libraries in Mankato and North Mankato. Displays will include location of project(s), cost and description. Displays will include staff contact information and instructions for submitting comments.
- Schedule a public meeting or informational booth to explain the TIP process, introduce proposed projects and take comments in person.
- Use the MAPO stakeholder email list, MAPO website/social media, and Mankato Free Press newspaper to publicize the public meeting.
- Report on any comments received about proposed projects to TAC and Policy Board prior to project scoring session at scheduled monthly meeting.

Draft TIP Related Involvement Actions

- Post the Draft TIP document on the MAPO website.
- Distribute link to the Draft TIP document to TAC, Policy Board, Local Units of Government, MAPO members as well as MnDOT, FTA and FHWA contacts for review and comment prior to the TAC and Policy Board meetings.
- Present the Draft TIP document to the TAC and Policy Board with the requested action to release the TIP for the required 30-day public comment period.
- Publish legal notice in the Mankato Free Press on or immediately prior to the start of the required 30-day public comment period.
- Host an Open House event for the draft TIP with visually clear and interesting displays.
• Make Draft TIP available to the public in both hard copies (printed) and electronic (PDF) formats at the following locations: MAPO website (PDF), Intergovernmental Center office (hard copy), and the Blue Earth County Public Library in Mankato and the Taylor Public Library in North Mankato (hard copy). Copies will also be provided upon request.
• Schedule and staff a public meeting or open house, prior to the end of the 30-day comment period, to review projects and take comments on the Draft TIP.
• Consult with state and federal agencies prior to the end of the 30-day comment period, to review projects and take comments on the Draft TIP.
• Use the MAPO’s stakeholder email list and website page to publicize the comment period and open house and to provide a link to the Draft TIP.
• If the Final TIP will differ significantly from the Draft version that was made available for public comment and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts, approval of the Final TIP will be delayed until an additional opportunity for public comment is provided.
• The length of such an additional comment period, if determined to be necessary, will be determined in consultation with FHWA, FTA and MnDOT.
• The same techniques to promote the revised draft will be utilized as outlined above for the Draft TIP.
• In addition to the extension of public comment, the MAPO staff is required to disseminate information regarding what specifically has changed and why, and to include this information in the final TIP.

Final TIP Related Public Involvement Actions
• Present Final TIP document to the TAC and Policy Board for approval, after the 30-day public comment period has ended, and report on public comments received.
• Make the final TIP document available to the public in both hard copies (printed) and electronic (PDF) formats at the following locations: MAPO website (PDF), Intergovernmental Center (hard copy), and public libraries (hard copy). Copies will also be provided upon request.
• Conduct a review of Public Involvement activities to quantify and analyze their effectiveness for use during next TIP cycle.

TIP Amendment Process
Any changes to programmed projects will be reviewed by MnDOT District 7 staff in consultation with the MAPO staff, and jointly determined to be either an Administrative Modification or a Formal Amendment.

For all project changes, the amended TIP must remain fiscally constrained with the revenues that can reasonably be expected to be available.

The process outlined below is consistent with 23 CFR 450.316 and incorporates the criteria specified in the FHWA and MnDOT Guidance for STIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications.

An Administrative Modification is a minor revision or technical correction to a programmed project. Administrative Modifications do not require formal public involvement actions, but the MAPO’s practice is to briefly describe these changes in the ‘Project Updates’ section of the TAC and MAPO
meeting materials for the month they occur, and to update the online TIP project tables as these revisions occur.

Note: The MAPO will use the most recent guidance provided from FHWA and MnDOT for STIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications. The MAPO will update the following guidance in the Public Participation Plan once new guidance is provided. The most recent guidance is from April 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Project</th>
<th>Amendment needed if the increase is more than:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $1 Million to $3 Million</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $3 Million to $10 Million</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $10 Million to $50 Million</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50 Million to $100 Million</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Over $100 Million</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No amendment is needed for a project of $1 Million or less if the percentage increase does not result in a total cost greater than $1 Million.

- A phase of work (preliminary engineering, right-of-way, construction, etc.) is added to the project and increases the project cost. No formal amendment (or administrative modification) is needed for adding a phase of work that does not increase project cost.
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvements Program (CMAQ) Transportation Enhancements (TEA), or Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds are added to a project.
- The project scope is changed (e.g., for a bridge project – changing rehab to replace; e.g., for a highway project – changing resurface to reconstruct).
- There is a major change to project termini (more than work on bridge approaches or logical touchdown points).

For TIP amendments, MAPO will consult with MnDOT staff to determine if a 30-day public comment period is required. As a minimum MAPO will:
- List the proposed amendment as a voting item on the published agenda for meetings of both the (TAC) and Policy Board meetings.
- Provide public notice of the proposed changes to the TIP project by listing “opportunity for public Comment” on the published meeting for notice and by including the amendment as a voting item on the published agenda, as least one week prior to the scheduled action on the amendment.
After the proposed project change has been approved by the TAC and Policy Board, staff will email a copy of the signed resolution to MnDOT District 7 staff for inclusion in the ATIP and STIP.

**STIP ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS**

Are needed when:

- A project is moved into the current STIP year from a later year. Justification is needed under “Comments” to explain which specific projects are deferred to maintain fiscal constraint.
- Minor changes to wording or minor corrections (i.e., project numbers).

NOTE: No amendment will be accepted for projects that “may” receive future congressional funding (funds must be identified in an approved Transportation Act or Appropriation Bill).

For all project changes, the amended TIP must remain fiscally constrained within the revenues that can reasonably be expected to be available. The MAPO will follow federal transportation planning legislation (23 CFR 450.316) for guidance and STIP amendments.

**APPENDIX A**

**Key Transportation Stakeholder Groups**

**Citizens/General Public**

People who live and work in the MAPO area:

- Those directly impacted by the results and recommendations of the plan or study, i.e., those inside or in proximity to the study area
- Individuals and groups who request project notifications
- Community clubs and neighborhood groups
- Civic groups and service organizations
- Other groups with demonstrated interest
- Persons of low-literacy
- Federally-recognized Native American tribal interests

**Governmental and Public Agencies**

Government agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MAPO area that are affected by transportation:

- Local elected officials from the cities, counties, and townships within the MAPO Planning Area
- Formal and informal groups representing jurisdictional transportation related interests (e.g., traffic safety, parking, parks and recreation, etc.)
- City and County planning commissions
- State and Federal officials including legislators representing the study area
- State and Federal agencies, including the planning and modal divisions of MnDOT, FHWA and FTA
- Regional Development Commission

**Public Transit Interests**

- Mankato Transit Agency
• Organizations and individuals who represent the needs of transit-dependent persons

Private Transportation Interests
• Private transit operators such as Land to Air Express

Multimodal Freight Interests
Representatives of both freight-generating businesses (shippers) and providers of multi-modal freight transportation services, including:
• Trucking firms
• Railroads and rail operators
• Mankato Regional Airport

Non-motorized/Active Transportation Interests
Representatives of non-motorized (active) modes of transportation, including:
• Users of pedestrian facilities, affiliated interest groups
• Users of bicycling facilities, affiliated interest groups
• State Public Health departments
• Health promotion and active lifestyle advocacy groups

Human Service Interests
Representatives of traditionally underserved populations:
• Disabled individuals. The disabled population, for planning purposes, includes persons defined by the U.S. Census as having sensory, physical, mental, self-care, and employment disabilities.
• Low income individuals. Low income individuals are defined as a person whose median household income is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines. Using U.S. Census data, areas where low income populations are greater than the MAPO planning area average will be identified as areas of potential disproportionate impact.
• Minority populations. Minority populations are defined as non-white persons or persons with Hispanic or Latino origin. Areas within the MAPO planning boundaries where minority populations are higher than the planning area average (according to the 2010 U.S. census) will be identified as areas of potential disproportionate impact.
• Limited English Proficiency (LEP) clients. In August 2000, President Clinton signed Executive Order 13166, Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency. This order requires agencies receiving federal funds to include LEP persons in the planning process. Following President Clinton’s Executive Order, the Attorney General for Civil Rights issued a document Department of Justice (DOJ) LEP Guidance to assist agencies with “taking reasonable steps to ensure ‘meaningful’ access to the information and services they provide.” The DOJ LEP Guidance has a list of factors to consider for taking “reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access” which include:
  o The number or proportion of LEP persons that may be impacted by a project or program.
  o The frequency with which LEP persons come in contact with the project or program.
  o The importance of the service provided by the project or program.
  o The resources available to the receiving agency.
LEP persons may contact the MAPO office at (507) 387-8613 to request interpretive services. For additional information, please refer to the MAPO’s Title VI document.

Elderly Populations
- The MAPO defines “elderly” as persons 60 years of age and older for planning purposes. Areas where the number of elderly populations has been determined to be greater than the planning area average will be identified as areas of disproportionate impact. Locations of elderly and disabled populations (i.e. assisted-living facilities, senior centers) are to be identified to help recognized areas of need for transportation and infrastructure improvements.

Resource Preservation and Protection Interests
Representatives of agencies, organizations and groups involved with land use management, conservation and resources protection (including environmental/natural, historical and archeological resources):
- MnDNR
- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- Other natural resources groups/agencies
- Historical/archeological preservation groups/agencies

Business and Economic Development
State and local economic development groups, business representatives, including:
- Greater Mankato Growth
- Business representatives

Education Interest
Representatives of all elementary, middle school, high school and higher educational institutions, including:
- Staff from ISD 77
- Elected school board members
- Interested K-12 parents
- Post-Secondary Education administrators, interested staff, students and neighborhood residents, student associations and courses with an urban planning or transportation focus at the following local intuitions:
  - Minnesota State University Mankato
  - Bethany Lutheran College
  - South Central College
  - Rasmussen College

Local Media
We send public meeting notices as well as project-specific press releases to local and regional media contacts including:
- Newspaper, television and area radio stations
APPENDIX B

Key Federal Transportation Requirements for Public Participation

The following requirement statements were taken from existing language in the 23 CFR 450 and 49 CFR 613:

Coordination & Consultation

- Consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the planning area that are affected by transportation in the development of LRTP and TIPs.
- Coordinate with the public involvement and consultation processes for statewide transportation planning.

Accessibility & Information

- Hold public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times.
- Make public information available in electronically-accessible format.
- Provide reasonable public access to technical and policy information used in the development of plans and programs.
- Employ visualization techniques to describe MTPs and TIPs.

Timeliness

- Provide timely information about transportation issues and processes to all concerned stakeholders, including affected public agencies, private transportation providers, and other interested parties and segments of the community affected by transportation plans, programs, and projects.
- Provide adequate public notice of public involvement activities and time for public review and comment.

Public Comment

- Demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the LRTP and TIP.
- Provide an additional opportunity for public comment if the final LRTP or TIP differs significantly from the version that was initially made available for comment.
- Include as part of the final plan or program a report or summary on the disposition of significant written or oral comments received on draft plans and programs.

Social

- Seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, including low income and minority households, persons with disabilities, and the elderly.
Evaluation

- Review the effectiveness of the public participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.

23 CFR 450.104: Definitions

Consultation means that one or more parties confer with other identified parties in accordance with an established process and, prior to taking action(s), considers the views of the other parties and periodically informs them about action(s) taken.

Cooperation means that the parties involved in carrying out the transportation planning and programming processes work together to achieve a common goal or objective

Coordination means the cooperative development of plans, programs, and schedules among agencies and entities with legal standing and adjustment of such plans, programs, and schedules to achieve greater consistency, as appropriate.

23 CFR 450.316: Interested parties, participation, and consultation

(a) The MPO shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

(1) The MPO shall develop the participation plan in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for:

(i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;

(ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;

(iii) Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs;

(iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;

(v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;

(vi) Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;

(vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services;

(viii) Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan transportation plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment by the MPO and raises new material issues that interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts;
(ix) Coordinating with the statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes under subpart B of this part; and

(x) Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.

(2) When significant written and oral comments are received on the draft metropolitan transportation plan and TIP (including the financial plans) as a result of the participation process in this section or the interagency consultation process required under the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A), a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of comments shall be made as part of the final metropolitan transportation plan and TIP.

(3) A minimum public comment period of 45 calendar days shall be provided before the initial or revised participation plan is adopted by the MPO. Copies of the approved participation plan shall be provided to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes and shall be posted on the World Wide Web, to the maximum extent practicable.

(b) In developing metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs, the MPO should consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA that are affected by transportation (including State and local planned growth, economic development, tourism, natural disaster risk reduction, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight movements) or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities. In addition, the MPO shall develop the metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs with due consideration of other related planning activities within the metropolitan area, and the process shall provide for the design and delivery of transportation services within the area that are provided by:

(1) Recipients of assistance under title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53;

(2) Governmental agencies and non-profit organizations (including representatives of the agencies and organizations) that receive Federal assistance from a source other than the U.S. Department of Transportation to provide non-emergency transportation services; and

(3) Recipients of assistance under 23 U.S.C. 201-204.

(c) When the MPA includes Indian Tribal lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.

(d) When the MPA includes Federal public lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the Federal land management agencies in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.

(e) MPOs shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process(es) that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies, as defined in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section, which may be included in the agreement(s) developed under § 450.314.  

23 CFR 450.324(j & k): Development and content of the metropolitan transportation plan

(a) The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. In formulating the transportation plan, the MPO shall consider factors described in § 450.306 as the factors relate to a minimum 20-year forecast period. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be the date of a conformity determination issued by
the FHWA and the FTA. In attainment areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be its date of adoption by the MPO.

(b) The transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.

(c) The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan at least every 4 years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas and at least every 5 years in attainment areas to confirm the transportation plan’s validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon. In addition, the MPO may revise the transportation plan at any time using the procedures in this section without a requirement to extend the horizon year. The MPO shall approve the transportation plan (and any revisions) and submit it for information purposes to the Governor. Copies of any updated or revised transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.

(d) In metropolitan areas that are in nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide, the MPO shall coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP).

(e) The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data used in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.

(f) The metropolitan transportation plan shall, at a minimum, include:
(1) The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan;
(2) Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities (e.g., pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities), and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan.
(3) A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with § 450.306(d).
(4) A system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in § 450.306(d), including:
   (i) Progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data; and
   (ii) For metropolitan planning organizations that voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios, an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of the transportation system and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the identified performance targets.
(5) Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods;
(6) Consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs that meet the requirements of this subpart, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide.

(7) Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters. The metropolitan transportation plan may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestion threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area’s transportation system.

(8) Transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(a), as appropriate;

(9) Design concept and design scope descriptions of all existing and proposed transportation facilities in sufficient detail, regardless of funding source, in nonattainment and maintenance areas for conformity determinations under the EPA’s transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). In all areas (regardless of air quality designation), all proposed improvements shall be described in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates;

(10) A discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The MPO shall develop the discussion in consultation with applicable Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation;

(11) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented. For purposes of transportation system operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain the Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53).

(i) For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO(s), public transportation operator(s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under §450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.

(ii) The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. The financial plan may include an assessment of the appropriateness of innovative finance techniques (for example, tolling, pricing, bonding, public private partnerships, or other strategies) as revenue sources for projects in the plan.

(iv) In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 or with other Federal funds; State assistance; local sources; and private participation. Revenue and cost estimates that support
the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect “year of expenditure dollars,” based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s).

(v) For the outer years of the metropolitan transportation plan (i.e., beyond the first 10 years), the financial plan may reflect aggregate cost ranges/cost bands, as long as the future funding source(s) is reasonably expected to be available to support the projected cost ranges/cost bands.

(vi) For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP.

(vii) For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.

(viii) In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced (i.e., by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and the FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint; however, in such cases, the FHWA and the FTA will not act on an updated or amended metropolitan transportation plan that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.

(12) Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g).

(g) The MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate:

(1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or

(2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.

(h) The metropolitan transportation plan should integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP required under 23 U.S.C. 148, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan required under 49 U.S.C. 5329(d), or an Interim Agency Safety Plan in accordance with 49 CFR part 659, as in effect until completion of the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, and may incorporate or reference applicable emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security, as appropriate, to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

(i) An MPO may, while fitting the needs and complexity of its community, voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios for consideration as part of the development of the metropolitan transportation plan.

(1) An MPO that chooses to develop multiple scenarios under this paragraph (i) is encouraged to consider:

(i) Potential regional investment strategies for the planning horizon;

(ii) Assumed distribution of population and employment;

(iii) A scenario that, to the maximum extent practicable, maintains baseline conditions for the performance areas identified in § 450.306(d) and measures established under 23 CFR part 490;

(iv) A scenario that improves the baseline conditions for as many of the performance measures identified in § 450.306(d) as possible;

(v) Revenue constrained scenarios based on the total revenues expected to be available over the forecast period of the plan; and

(vi) Estimated costs and potential revenues available to support each scenario.
(2) In addition to the performance areas identified in 23 U.S.C. 150(c), 49 U.S.C. 5326(c), and 5329(d), and the measures established under 23 CFR part 490, MPOs may evaluate scenarios developed under this paragraph using locally developed measures.

(j) The MPO shall provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under § 450.316(a).

(k) The MPO shall publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.

(l) A State or MPO is not required to select any project from the illustrative list of additional projects included in the financial plan under paragraph (f)(11) of this section.

(m) In nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, the MPO, as well as the FHWA and the FTA, must make a conformity determination on any updated or amended transportation plan in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). A 12-month conformity lapse grace period will be implemented when an area misses an applicable deadline, in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). At the end of this 12-month grace period, the existing conformity determination will lapse. During a conformity lapse, MPOs can prepare an interim metropolitan transportation plan as a basis for advancing projects that are eligible to proceed under a conformity lapse. An interim metropolitan transportation plan consisting of eligible projects from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP may proceed immediately without revisiting the requirements of this section, subject to interagency consultation defined in 40 CFR part 93, subpart A. An interim metropolitan transportation plan containing eligible projects that are not from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP must meet all the requirements of this section. [81 FR 34135, May 27, 2016, as amended at 81 FR 93473, Dec. 20, 2016; 82 FR 56544, Nov. 29, 2017]

23 CFR 450.326(a): Development and content of the transportation improvement program (TIP)

(a) The MPO, in cooperation with the State(s) and any affected public transportation operator(s), shall develop a TIP for the metropolitan planning area. The TIP shall reflect the investment priorities established in the current metropolitan transportation plan and shall cover a period of no less than 4 years, be updated at least every 4 years, and be approved by the MPO and the Governor. However, if the TIP covers more than 4 years, the FHWA and the FTA will consider the projects in the additional years as informational. The MPO may update the TIP more frequently, but the cycle for updating the TIP must be compatible with the STIP development and approval process. The TIP expires when the FHWA/FTA approval of the STIP expires. Copies of any updated or revised TIPs must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA. In nonattainment and maintenance areas subject to
transportation conformity requirements, the FHWA and the FTA, as well as the MPO, must make a conformity determination on any updated or amended TIP, in accordance with the Clean Air Act requirements and the EPA’s transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A).

(b) The MPO shall provide all interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed TIP as required by § 450.316(a). In addition, in nonattainment area TMAs, the MPO shall provide at least one formal public meeting during the TIP development process, which should be addressed through the participation plan described in § 450.316(a). In addition, the MPO shall publish or otherwise make readily available the TIP for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web, as described in § 450.316(a).

(c) The TIP shall be designed such that once implemented, it makes progress toward achieving the performance targets established under § 450.306(d).

(d) The TIP shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the metropolitan transportation plan, linking investment priorities to those performance targets.

(e) The TIP shall include capital and non-capital surface transportation projects (or phases of projects) within the boundaries of the metropolitan planning area proposed for funding under 23 U.S.C. and 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 (including transportation alternatives; associated transit improvements; Tribal Transportation Program, Federal Lands Transportation Program, and Federal Lands Access Program projects; HSIP projects; trails projects; accessible pedestrian walkways; and bicycle facilities), except the following that may be included:

(2) Metropolitan planning projects funded under 23 U.S.C. 104(d), and 49 U.S.C. 5305(d);
(3) State planning and research projects funded under 23 U.S.C. 505 and 49 U.S.C. 5305(e);
(4) At the discretion of the State and MPO, metropolitan planning projects funded with Surface Transportation Program funds;
(5) Emergency relief projects (except those involving substantial functional, locational, or capacity changes);
(6) National planning and research projects funded under 49 U.S.C. 5314; and
(7) Project management oversight projects funded under 49 U.S.C. 5327.

(f) The TIP shall contain all regionally significant projects requiring an action by the FHWA or the FTA whether or not the projects are to be funded under title 23 U.S.C. Chapters 1 and 2 or title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 (e.g., addition of an interchange to the Interstate System with State, local, and/or private funds and congressionally designated projects not funded under 23 U.S.C. or 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53). For public information and conformity purposes, the TIP shall include all regionally significant projects proposed to be funded with Federal funds other than those administered by the FHWA or the FTA, as well as all regionally significant projects to be funded with non-Federal funds.

(g) The TIP shall include, for each project or phase (e.g., preliminary engineering, environment/NEPA, right-of-way, design, or construction), the following:

(1) Sufficient descriptive material (i.e., type of work, termini, and length) to identify the project or phase;
(2) Estimated total project cost, which may extend beyond the 4 years of the TIP;
(3) The amount of Federal funds proposed to be obligated during each program year for the project or phase (for the first year, this includes the proposed category of Federal funds and source(s) of non-Federal funds. For the second, third, and fourth years, this includes the likely category or possible categories of Federal funds and sources of non-Federal funds);
(4) Identification of the agencies responsible for carrying out the project or phase;

(5) In nonattainment and maintenance areas, identification of those projects that are identified as TCMs in the applicable SIP;

(6) In nonattainment and maintenance areas, included projects shall be specified in sufficient detail (design concept and scope) for air quality analysis in accordance with the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A); and

(7) In areas with Americans with Disabilities Act required paratransit and key station plans, identification of those projects that will implement these plans.

(h) Projects that are not considered to be of appropriate scale for individual identification in a given program year may be grouped by function, work type, and/or geographic area using the applicable classifications under 23 CFR 771.117(c) and (d) and/or 40 CFR part 93. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, project classifications must be consistent with the “exempt project” classifications contained in the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). In addition, projects proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C. Chapter 2 that are not regionally significant may be grouped in one line item or identified individually in the TIP.

(i) Each project or project phase included in the TIP shall be consistent with the approved metropolitan transportation plan.

(j) The TIP shall include a financial plan that demonstrates how the approved TIP can be implemented, indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the TIP, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. In developing the TIP, the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s) shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that are reasonably expected to be available to support TIP implementation in accordance with § 450.314(a). Only projects for which construction or operating funds can reasonably be expected to be available may be included. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies funded under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, and other Federal funds; and regionally significant projects that are not federally funded. For purposes of transportation operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(6)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53). In addition, for illustrative purposes, the financial plan may include additional projects that would be included in the TIP if reasonable additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available. Revenue and cost estimates for the TIP must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect “year of expenditure dollars,” based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s).

(k) The TIP shall include a project, or a phase of a project, only if full funding can reasonably be anticipated to be available for the project within the time period contemplated for completion of the project. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, projects included in the first 2 years of the TIP shall be limited to those for which funds are available or committed. For the TIP, financial constraint shall be demonstrated and maintained by year and shall include sufficient financial information to demonstrate which projects are to be implemented using current and/or reasonably available revenues, while federally supported facilities are being adequately operated and maintained. In the case of proposed funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified in the financial plan consistent with paragraph (h) of this section. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, the TIP shall give priority to eligible TCMs identified in the approved SIP in
accordance with the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A) and shall provide for their timely implementation.

(l) In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a TIP to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced (i.e., by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and the FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint. However, in such cases, the FHWA and the FTA will not act on an updated or amended TIP that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.

(m) Procedures or agreements that distribute suballocated Surface Transportation Program funds to individual jurisdictions or modes within the MPA by pre-determined percentages or formulas are inconsistent with the legislative provisions that require the MPO, in cooperation with the State and the public transportation operator, to develop a prioritized and financially constrained TIP and shall not be used unless they can be clearly shown to be based on considerations required to be addressed as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process.

(n) As a management tool for monitoring progress in implementing the transportation plan, the TIP should:

(1) Identify the criteria and process for prioritizing implementation of transportation plan elements (including multimodal trade-offs) for inclusion in the TIP and any changes in priorities from previous TIPs;
(2) List major projects from the previous TIP that were implemented and identify any significant delays in the planned implementation of major projects; and
(3) In nonattainment and maintenance areas, describe the progress in implementing any required TCMs, in accordance with 40 CFR part 93.

(o) In metropolitan nonattainment and maintenance areas, a 12-month conformity lapse grace period will be implemented when an area misses an applicable deadline, according to the Clean Air Act and the transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). At the end of this 12-month grace period, the existing conformity determination will lapse. During a conformity lapse, MPOs may prepare an interim TIP as a basis for advancing projects that are eligible to proceed under a conformity lapse. An interim TIP consisting of eligible projects from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming metropolitan transportation plan and TIP may proceed immediately without revisiting the requirements of this section, subject to interagency consultation defined in 40 CFR part 93. An interim TIP containing eligible projects that are not from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP must meet all the requirements of this section.

(p) Projects in any of the first 4 years of the TIP may be advanced in place of another project in the first 4 years of the TIP, subject to the project selection requirements of §450.332. In addition, the MPO may revise the TIP at any time under procedures agreed to by the State, MPO, and public transportation operator(s) consistent with the TIP development procedures established in this section, as well as the procedures for the MPO participation plan (see §450.316(a)) and FHWA/FTA actions on the TIP (see §450.330).


APPENDIX C
Techniques to Inform and Involve the Public
There are a variety of techniques to inform and involve the public. Public involvement can be more effective if multiple techniques are utilized providing a greater opportunity for outreach. It is also important to utilize a variety of techniques which target different groups and individuals.

Below are guidelines and examples for public participation in planning, studies and meetings by the MAPO.

- Early and continuous communication:
  - Notify individuals and groups by mail that the plan is being developed and that they can provide comments to the MAPO staff in regards to the plan.
  - Publish a public notice in the Mankato Free Press and on the MAPO website announcing the plan development and meeting dates/locations. Include the MAPO contact information in the public notice.
  - Notify individuals and groups to give an update on the planning process.
  - Notify individuals and groups when the final plan is published.
  - Publish a public notice in the Mankato Free Press and on the MAPO website and social media sites announcing when the final plan is published.

- Implementation of multiple forms of public participation:
  - Refer to the public participation techniques in Figure 3 for additional techniques to gain a greater turnout for involvement.

- Accessibility of technical and policy information through a variety of means:
  - Publish technical and policy information on the MAPO website.
  - Provide copies of technical and policy information at public libraries.
  - Provide copies of technical and policy information at Intergovernmental Center.
  - Provide hard copies of technical and policy information by request to interested parties.

- Adequate notice to the public of involvement opportunities and activities:
  - Publish public notices in the Mankato Free Press at least one (1) week prior to public meetings; include the time and location of the meeting as well as contact information in the notice.
  - Distribute press releases to all local media at least one (1) week in advance of public meetings; include the time and location of the meeting as well as contact information in the notice.
  - Mail and email notices to transportation interests at least one (1) week in advance of public meetings; include the time and location of the meeting as well as contact information in the notice.

- Adequate time for public review and comment throughout project planning:
  - Post public notices at least one week prior to all public meetings.
o Post meeting agendas on the MAPO website at least one week prior to all public meetings.

o Provide a draft of the plan at public libraries and Intergovernmental Center.

Techniques selected for utilization will be decided on during the development of the scope of work. Techniques will be monitored throughout the project to evaluate the effectiveness; techniques can be adjusted to increase the potential effectiveness while reviewing. When reviewing the effectiveness of techniques, the following items can assist in evaluating the effectiveness of the public participation techniques:

- Comment cards at meetings or workshops
- Evaluation forms
- Surveys
- Percentage of surveys returned
- Informal feedback
- Telephone comments
- Citizen letters
- Email follow-ups
- Questionnaires
- Public meeting attendance
- Recorded comments made during meetings, workshops, focus groups, etc.

Additional public involvements techniques are available on the following page in Figure 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Involvement Technique</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>To inform the public on updates and other information in regards to the MAPO’s plans and studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice</td>
<td>Public notices are published in the Mankato Free Press a minimum of seven (7) seven days’ notice prior to the meeting or hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Release</td>
<td>To announce meetings, announce when project, plan or program drafts and final drafts are available for viewing, and to announce opportunities for public involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>To reach a wider audience in announcement for opportunities for public involvement, meetings, when project, plan, or program drafts and final drafts are available for viewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Mailing</td>
<td>Used when seeking input from certain individuals, organizations, or special interest groups on a particular issue or topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>MAPO staff updates their site with agendas and minutes from committee meetings and posts drafts, final plans, and programs. Through use of the MAPO website, the public may obtain contact information for comments or questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings, Open Houses, and Pop-Up Events</td>
<td>MAPO staff or representatives will engage with the public at advertised events (public meetings and open houses) or unadvertised events (pop-up events)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email and Written Correspondence</td>
<td>To communicate within the parties of the MAPO and the public for daily use and for communicating with the public in answering questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established or Informal Networks of Contacts</td>
<td>A contact list will be maintained by the MAPO which will be utilized when seeking the public’s input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Responses to Frequently Asked Questions</td>
<td>Publishing responses to Frequently Asked Questions on the MAPO website can give quick answers to common questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booths at Public Festivals and Events</td>
<td>MAPO, when possible, will host information booths at public festivals and events as a means to gather their input and provide answers to any questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion Survey</td>
<td>Surveys can be made available to the public by mail, on the MAPO website, when seeking the public’s opinion on transportation projects, plans, and other studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>MAPO staff will conduct focus groups as appropriate with invited members of project-specific stakeholders when identifying issues and gathering other data. The results and comments are included in their respective planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization Techniques</td>
<td>Visualization techniques such as Visual Preference Surveys (VPS), maps, figures, and photos are helpful and will be used when possible to aid in explaining transportation plans or programs. VPS could be used for the design of light fixtures, cross walks, etc. The public would be given photos or drawings of varying designs which they score based on their preferred design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Lists</td>
<td>MAPO staff maintain a list of public participation contacts (email and mailing address) to include representatives of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minority and low income populations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Elderly and disabled populations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transportation providers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Federal, State, Regional &amp; Local government agencies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Members of MAPO committees; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special Interests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: MAPO Planning Boundary Map
APPENDIX E: Population Diversity
APPENDIX F: Low Income Population
APPENDIX G: Population of Persons Aged 60 Years and Older
APPENDIX H

Limited English Proficient Populations (LEP) Information

The MAPO staff reviewed the 2010 U.S. Census Report and determined that 2,365 people in the MAPO Urbanized Area (between the ages of 5-64) speak a language other than English. Of those 2,365 persons, 1,014 speak Spanish, 768 speak Indo-European (other than Spanish and English), and 583 speak Asian or other Pacific Islander Languages. Of the 2,365 persons speaking a language other than English, 319 have Limited English Proficiency; that is, they speak English “less than very well”. The breakdown for the 319 people include 123 Spanish, 70 Indo-European and 126 Asian and Pacific Island Languages. Additional information is available in the MAPO’s Title VI plan.

APPENDIX I

Comments Received during Public Comment Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 15 – consider changing the word “Allowing” 4th bullet – to something like “Providing”</td>
<td>9/11/18</td>
<td>Changed word as suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed an increase in pedestrian and bicycle traffic on Stoltzman between Stadium drive and the hockey rink. Can a separate walking/biking path be placed separate from the road to make it safer for pedestrians, cyclists, and cars?</td>
<td>9/12/18</td>
<td>Comment responded to and referred to Blue Earth County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATV/snowmobile trails much needed, especially south of Mankato</td>
<td>9/13/18</td>
<td>Comment responded to and referred to Blue Earth County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of language regarding ADA Coordinator requirements</td>
<td>10/4/18</td>
<td>Inserted language regarding ADA Coordinator requirements (pg. 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Draft MAPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) comments received during public comment period September 11, 2018 to November 2, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 15 – consider changing the word “Allowing” 4th bullet – to something like “Providing”</td>
<td>9/11/18</td>
<td>Changed word as suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed an increase in pedestrian and bicycle traffic on Stoltzman between Stadium drive and the hockey rink. Can a separate walking/biking path be placed separate from the road to make it safer for pedestrians, cyclists, and cars?</td>
<td>9/12/18</td>
<td>Comment responded to and referred to Blue Earth County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATV/snowmobile trails much needed, especially south of Mankato</td>
<td>9/13/18</td>
<td>Comment responded to and referred to Blue Earth County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of language regarding ADA Coordinator requirements</td>
<td>10/4/18</td>
<td>Inserted language regarding ADA Coordinator requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION OF THE MANKATO/NORTH MANKATO AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MAPO)

Adoption of MAPO Public Participation Plan

Whereas, the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) is the body responsible for making transportation policy decisions and for directing the transportation planning and funding programming within the Mankato/North Mankato urbanized area; and

Whereas, in its capacity as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the MAPO has established a comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing (3-C) transportation planning process to facilitate federal funding for MAPO-area jurisdictions and transit operators; provides technical assistance and planning expertise to metropolitan transportation interests; and develops a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs), among other plans and studies; and

Whereas, the requirements of 23 CFR 450.316 direct the MAPO to develop and use a participation plan that defines the procedures by with the MAPO will engage the public and provide reasonable opportunities for a wide range of stakeholders to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process; and

Whereas, the MAPO’s Public Participation Plan (PPP) was updated by the MAPO in consultation with interested parties as well as agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the planning area that are affected by transportation; and

Whereas, a public comment period of at least 45 calendar days was provided and publicized before the revised participation plan was adopted by the MAPO; and

Whereas, comments were received, responded to, and incorporated into the revised PPP as appropriate;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the MAPO Policy Board adopts the 2018 update of its Public Participation Plan and directs MAPO staff to implement the tools and techniques set forth therein as part of the MAPO’s transportation planning process in the development of its administrative work products, LRTPs, TIPs, and short-range plans and studies.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a true and correct copy of the resolution presented to and adopted by the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization at a duly authorized meeting thereof, held on the sixth day of December, 2018 as shown by the minutes of said meeting in my possession.

____________________________________
Chair

____________________________________
Executive Director
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Re-designation of MAPO Representative to MnDOT Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7) No: 5.6

**Agenda Item:** Re-designation of MAPO Representative to MnDOT Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7)

**Recommendation Action(s):** Re-designation of MAPO representative to ATP-7

**Summary:**
As part of MnDOT’s Area Transportation Partnership District 7 (ATP-7) operating procedures, the MAPO must annually re-designate a representative and an alternate to the ATP.

At the meeting held November 15, 2018, the MAPO TAC approved Seth Greenwood to serve as the MAPO representative to the ATP-7, as well as designated Paul Vogel or his designee as an alternate representative.

Staff recommends the MAPO Policy Board motion to designate Seth Greenwood to serve as the MAPO representative to the ATP-7, as well as designate Paul Vogel or his designee as an alternate representative.

**Attachments:**
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Approval of 2019 Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7) Solicitation Flowchart
No: 5.7

Agenda Item: Approval of 2019 Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7) Solicitation Flowchart

Recommendation Action(s): Approval of MnDOT ATP-7 Solicitation Flowchart

Summary:
Annually the MAPO and ATP-7 work with regional partners to develop a joint solicitation flowchart for both the Area Transportation Improvement Plan (ATIP) and the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). MAPO staff coordinated with the ATP-7 to develop the attached flowchart, which outlines both ATP and MAPO deadlines and tasks in joint development of the Area Transportation Improvement Plan (ATIP) and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), respectively.

Staff recommends the MAPO Policy Board motion to approve the 2019 ATP-7 Solicitation Flowchart.

This item was brought before the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their meeting held November 15, 2018 and was recommended for approval.

Attachments:
ATP-7 Solicitation Flowchart
**ATP-7 solicitation flowchart**

**Nov. 1 – Nov 16, 2018**
RDOs and MAPO meet with LOI applicants.

**Nov. 19, 2018**
ATP-7 FY 23 solicitation kicks off (STP-Small Urban, STP-Rural, and TA full application)

**Jan. 4, 2019**
FY 23 solicitation closes

**February 1**
Specialty Offices* submit list of draft projects to ATP/D7

**Mid – January to late - February 2019**
RDOs and MAPO conduct regional rankings and submit to subcommittees; Subcommittees meet to review and rank applications (STP-Rural, STP-Small Urban, TA (after Feb 15)); submit recommendations to ATP/D7 for inclusion in Draft ATIP

**March 8, 2019**
ATP7 meets to review and recommend Draft ATIP

**Late March/ Early April 2019**
RDOs conduct public meeting

**April 3**
Specialty Offices* submit list of final projects to ATP/D7

**April 15, 2019**
Draft ATIP submitted to CO

**July 15, 2019**
Final ATIP submitted to CO

---

*Specialty offices include: BROS (Bridge Off-System); ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act); Greater MN Noise Walls; Historic Properties; ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems); Rail; Rest Areas; Weigh Stations

RDO = Regional Development Organization; MAPO = Mankato Area Planning Organization; TAP = Transportation Alternatives Program; STP = Surface Transportation Program; CO = Central Office; ATIP = Area Transportation Improvement Plan

---

**Specialty offices**

- **BROS** (Bridge Off-System)
- **ADA** (Americans with Disabilities Act)
- **Greater MN Noise Walls**
- **Historic Properties**
- **ITS** (Intelligent Transportation Systems)
- **Rail**
- **Rest Areas**
- **Weigh Stations**

**Regional Development Organizations** (RDO)

- **MANKATO AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION** (MAPO)

**Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)**

**Surface Transportation Program (STP)**

**Area Transportation Improvement Plan (ATIP)**

**Central Office (CO)**

---

**ATP-7 Solicitation Flowchart Timeline**

- **October 2018**
  - STIP funding guidance available
  - HSIP project programming (MnDOT and local jurisdictions)

- **November/December 2018**
  - ATP-7 FY 23 solicitation kicks off (STP-Small Urban, STP-Rural, and TA full application)

- **January/February 2019**
  - FY 23 solicitation closes
  - MAPO TAC meets to review 2023 TIP Candidate Projects
  - MAPO Policy Board meets to review and approve 2023 Candidate TIP Projects

- **March 2019**
  - Mid – January to late - February 2019
  - RDOs and MAPO conduct regional rankings and submit to subcommittees; Subcommittees meet to review and rank applications (STP-Rural, STP-Small Urban, TA (after Feb 15)); submit recommendations to ATP/D7 for inclusion in Draft ATIP

- **April 2019**
  - March 8, 2019
  - ATP7 meets to review and recommend Draft ATIP
  - Late March/ Early April 2019
  - RDOs conduct public meeting

- **July/August/September 2019**
  - April 3
  - Specialty Offices* submit list of final projects to ATP/D7
  - April 15, 2019
  - Draft ATIP submitted to CO

- **July 2019**
  - Final ATIP submitted to CO

---

**2018-2019 Candidate Projects**

- **January 2019**
  - MAPO TAC meets to review 2023 TIP Candidate Projects

- **February 2019**
  - MAPO Policy Board meets to review and approve 2023 Candidate TIP Projects

- **July 2019**
  - MAPO Policy Board adopts 2019-2023 TIP and submits MnDOT Central Office

- **August/Sept 2019**
  - MAPO Policy Board adopts 2019-2023 TIP and submits MnDOT Central Office

---

**Key Dates**

- **October 2018**
  - TA LOI released

- **November/December 2018**
  - ATP-7 FY 23 solicitation kicks off

- **January/February 2019**
  - FY 23 solicitation closes
  - RDOs conduct public meeting

- **March 2019**
  - RDOs and MAPO meet with LOI applicants
  - Specialty Offices* submit list of draft projects to ATP/D7
  - MAPO Policy Board meets to review and approve 2023 Candidate TIP Projects

- **April 2019**
  - Specialty Offices* submit list of final projects to ATP/D7

- **July 2019**
  - Final ATIP submitted to CO

---

**RDO** = Regional Development Organization; **MAPO** = Mankato Area Planning Organization; **TAP** = Transportation Alternatives Program; **STP** = Surface Transportation Program; **CO** = Central Office; **ATIP** = Area Transportation Improvement Plan
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Resolution Authorizing Submission of Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC) Phase 1 Planning Grant Application
No: 5.8

**Agenda Item**: Resolution Authorizing Submission of Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC) Phase 1 Planning Grant Application

**Recommendation Action(s)**: Motion by MAPO Policy Board to approve Resolution

**Summary**:
In effort to assist Greater Minnesota communities in coordinating transportation at a regional level, MnDOT’s Office of Transit and Active Transportation (OTAT) has initiated a grant program titled “Greater Minnesota Regional Transportation Coordinating Councils.” A RTCC with a geography associated with the south central Minnesota area would operate as a regional forum to facilitate coordination between transportation providers, customers, and the private sector with the goals of filling transportation gaps, streamlining access to transportation, and providing individuals more options of where and when to travel. The program provides funds through two separate sequential solicitations: Phase 1 - Organizational Planning/Development (“Planning”), and Phase 2 - Organizational Implementation (“Implementation”).

The Phase 1 Planning grant will be administered over a 12-month period and is projected to be used to procure a transportation planning consultant through a standard Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The MAPO would act as the project administrator/manager to direct consultant activities and facilitate a regional cooperative planning process to develop the foundation of a RTCC.

OTAT has communicated to MAPO staff that the MAPO is an applicable entity to apply for and administer these funds. Staff recommends the MAPO Policy Board approve the attached Resolution authorizing MAPO staff to apply.

This item was brought before the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their meeting held November 15, 2018 and was recommended for approval.

**Attachments**:
RTCC presentation slides
RTCC information sheet
MAPO Letter of Intent to apply for RTCC Phase 1 Planning funds
Resolution Authorizing Submission of Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC) Phase 1 Planning Grant Application
Southern MN Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC)
Snapshot: Current Environment

- 100+ different transportation providers
- Public, private, nonprofit/volunteer
- Vary in size, geographic area served, population served, operating hours, capacity, qualifications, structure, mission, dispatch system, driver training

Bottom line

- Service constricted by municipal boundaries
- Geographic and temporal service gaps
- Redundancies (equipment, dispatch, funding mechanisms)
- Regionally uncoordinated
- Inefficiencies
- Segmented
- Decentralized
- Fragmented
- Expensive
What is an RTCC?

Regional collaborative forum for:

**Transportation customers**
- county administration
- health/human services
- workforce development
- youth & senior
- care providers
- veterans services
- private citizens

**Transportation providers**
- Nonprofit/volunteer
- Public
- Private

What will it do?

- Develop solutions toward providing safe, efficient, affordable regional transportation service
- Work to address challenges of current system
- Streamline access
- Identify gaps, redundancies, & service inefficiencies
- Work to decrease costs for riders & customers
- Develop regional policies & procedures
- Coordinate grant/funding opportunities
- Address special regional issues
Current Solicitation

MnDOT Office of Transit and Active Transportation

PHASE 1
- Organizational Planning/Development
- Funds for planning for RTCC (up to $75k for 12 months)

PHASE 2
- Organizational Implementation
- Start producing solutions
- Phase 1 must be complete before Phase 2, which would commence immediately

PHASE 1 - Organizational Planning/Development

To be developed in planning stage:
- Geographic region served
- Goals & objectives
- Description of how the RTCC will help meet needs/strategies defined in Region Nine's 2017 Local Human Service-Public Transit Coordination Plan
- Membership, organizational structure, bylaws
- Organizational resources for implementation
- Annual budget proposal & funding scheme including how a 15-20% local match will be obtained in order to leverage MnDOT grants
- Work plan of activities to be undertaken for the first 2 years
How will it function?

- Operational details to be determined in Phase 1: Organizational Planning/Development
- Structure to be determined in Phase 1
- Meetings of administrative body composed of representatives
- Collaborate toward solutions
- Make formal recommendations to MnDOT
- Set regional policies & protocols

How will it be funded?

- Initial budget split between MnDOT (80%-85%) and local match (20%-15%)
- MnDOT will continue to be involved in administrative aspects, however MnDOT will not provide operational funds for trips
- Stakeholders and/or partners will provide percentage of funding
- Total amount dependent on how robust of RTCC (volunteer programs, travel/training, vehicle sharing, call center, etc.)
What can I do?

- Share your organization’s needs/concerns
- Provide letters of support from your organizational leadership
- Pass Resolution of Commitment to work in good faith with MAPO/MnDOT to develop Phase 1 Planning
- Serve on Application Steering Committee
- Serve on and/or engage with RTCC
Regional Transportation Coordination Councils of Minnesota

The Minnesota Departments of Transportation and Human Services, in collaboration with other state agencies, are working with the Metropolitan Council and other local governments and organizations to create regional transportation coordination councils as appropriate throughout Minnesota. Coordination between transportation providers and service agencies has been a goal and strategy to fill transportation gaps, provide more service with the same or fewer resources, streamline access to transportation and provide customers more options of where and when to travel.

Goal for Regional Transportation Coordination Councils

The state agencies would provide support for creating a statewide framework of 8-10 Regional Transportation Coordination Councils throughout Minnesota in order to break down transportation barriers and offer a seamless system of transportation services. The Regional Transportation Coordination Councils would be responsible for coordinating transportation services through a network of existing public, private and non-profit transportation providers.

Regional Transportation Coordination Councils will be developed in Greater Minnesota after consultation with stakeholders through a webinar and regional stakeholder meetings. Development of a structure for coordination in the seven-county Metropolitan Area will be guided by feedback received through the Twin Cities stakeholder meeting.

Potential Tasks of the Regional Transportation Coordination Councils

- Lead activities to and advance coordination throughout region.
- Exercise the authority to make change based on a formal governing framework.
- Employ dedicated staff to implement change.
- Provide technical assistance to facilitate human service program vehicle sharing.
- Establish transportation provider performance standards for service, vehicles, and personnel.
- Actively participate in and/or lead the FTA required local transportation coordination plan process.
- Utilize a cost accounting system to accurately reflect the full costs of providing transportation services.
- Share quality assurance data and uniform reporting among stakeholders.
- Develop or promote existing van pool or rideshare services.
- Oversee volunteer driver programs or coordination of volunteer programs.
- Establish or promote existing travel training programs.
- Provide feedback to the Minnesota Council on Transportation Access (MCOTA) as to what is working and where state level assistance may be needed.

Regional Transportation Coordination Council Benefits

- Increase efficiencies that may be achieved through more grouping of individuals traveling to the same destination or reduced duplication of services and/or vehicles.
- Enhanced access to social and health services, education and employment.
- Improved use of resources: For example, if the same services can be provided with fewer vehicles, then funds spent on insurance and capital is reduced. Other resources that could be shared include staff training, computer software, or call center staff.
- Coordination and collaboration can result in providing transportation in ways that contribute to livable communities and a vital economy.
December 7, 2018

Sue Siemers  
Greater Minnesota Mobility Management Program Coordinator  
3725 12th Street North  
St. Cloud, MN 55330  
Re: Greater Minnesota Regional Transportation Coordinating Council solicitation

Dear Ms. Siemers,

I am pleased to submit this correspondence as the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization’s (MAPO) Letter of Intent for the Greater Minnesota Regional Transportation Coordinating Council solicitation for Phase 1 - Organizational Planning Funds.

The MAPO is a multi-jurisdictional agency that conducts transportation planning in the Mankato/North Mankato area in south central Minnesota. We work to maintain a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process to provide maximum service to citizens. In addition, we assist local units of government and community leaders in the Greater Mankato Area who are working to build and improve within the region.

This letter signifies the MAPO’s interest in serving as the lead agency in initiating and facilitating an RTCC program within its planning area. The contact person shall be Charles Androsky, Transportation Planner with the MAPO. Our intention is to identify gaps, redundancies, inefficiencies, and opportunities in our region’s transportation service network and develop solutions.

Please see the enclosed document for a list of individuals and organizations whom the MAPO has contacted regarding the RTCC application and established preliminary communications, interest, and partnerships. This list of stakeholders will be expanded and developed during the Phase 1 – Planning stage of the program. This phase, “Organizational Planning” will include the formation of a steering committee comprised of regional stakeholders. This phase will include development of interest areas, goals, and timelines for the creation of a work plan. Interest areas shall include an analysis of service gaps relating to geography and other demographic groupings. Additional project goals shall include development of the RTCC’s structural documents and processes including membership, staffing, articles of incorporation, bylaws, and fiscal monitoring capabilities of budgeting and quality assurance methods.

Thank you for your attention in this matter. The MAPO looks forward to helping address regional transportation issues in our region. Please let me know if there are questions or discussion items.
Sincerely,

Paul Vogel  
Executive Director  
507-387-8613

Enclosure:

List of preliminary participating stakeholders and partnerships
RESOLUTION OF THE MANKATO/NORTH MANKATO AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MAPO)

AUTHORIZING APPLICATION SUBMISSION FOR A REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COORDINATING COUNCIL PHASE 1 PLANNING GRANT

WHEREAS; the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) is the body responsible for continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning within and around the Mankato/North Mankato metropolitan area;

WHEREAS; one of the stated goals of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization is to increase accessibility and mobility options for residents of the Mankato/North Mankato metropolitan area;

WHEREAS; the Mankato/North Mankato Planning Organization Policy Board and staff possess the competency and capability necessary for administration of MnDOT grants;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization demonstrates commitment to the Regional Transportation Coordinating Council organizational planning phase and MAPO staff are hereby authorized to submit an application to MnDOT for a RTCC Phase 1 Planning Grant and to subsequently execute a grant agreement with the State of Minnesota should the MAPO be successfully awarded such a grant.

CERTIFICATION
I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a true and correct copy of the Resolution presented to and adopted by the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization at a duly authorized meeting thereof, held on the 6th day of December, 2018, as shown by the minutes of said meeting in my possession.

ATTEST:

___________________________
Mark Piepho, Chair

___________________________
Paul Vogel, Executive Director
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Update: ADA Transition Plan
No: 6.1

Agenda Item: Update: ADA Transition Plan

Recommendation Action(s): Informational

Summary:
Drafts for MAPO member-municipalities are currently being drafted and reviewed with their respective agencies. The consultant is completing quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) checks for inventory collected and converting field-collected data into geodatabases.

A project meeting was held in October where attendees discussed the repair/upgrade scheduling format and flexibility of cost estimates in the final plans.

The next project management telephone conference is tentatively scheduled for early December 2018, and the next open house is tentatively scheduled for January 2019.

The plans for Blue Earth County, Nicollet County, North Mankato, and Mankato are in various stages of review and comment. The plan for Eagle Lake has been completed.

The project is on schedule for final delivery in March, 2019.

Attachments:
Meeting Minutes of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

November 15, 2018 | 1:30 p.m. | Intergovernmental Center, MN River Room, 10 Civic Center Plaza, Mankato, MN

TAC members present: Ronda Allis – MnDOT District 7, Landon Bode (for Jeff Johnson) - City of Mankato, David Cowan - Minnesota State University, Mankato, Michael Fischer - City of North Mankato, Karl Friedrichs - Lime Township, Seth Greenwood - Nicollet County, Scott Hogen - Mankato Public Schools, Sam Parker – Region Nine Development Commission, Craig Rempp- Mankato Transit System, Dan Sarff – City of North Mankato, Ryan Thilges - Blue Earth County, Paul Vogel – City of Mankato

Others Present: Charles Androsky - MAPO, Adrian Potter – SRF Consulting Group, Craig Vaughn - SRF Consulting Group

I. Call to Order

Mr. Thilges called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Introductions

Introductions were made.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Greenwood moved and Mr. Vogel seconded a motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

IV. Approval of Minutes – August 16, 2018

Mr. Friedrichs moved and Mr. Hogen seconded a motion to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

Mr. Thilges inquired if Agenda items 6.1 and 6.2 could be advanced to the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Fischer motioned and Mr. Greenwood seconded. Motion carried.

6.1 Final Report: Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study

Mr. Vaughn provided an overview of the study process including public engagement efforts, data collected, alternatives examined, implementation options, and steps to completion. Study elements included lane configuration options, intersection control evaluation (ICE) studies, and projections regarding future roadway performance. Mr. Vaughn reported that the project was nearing its final stages and was on-schedule for delivery.

The TAC offered suggestions regarding language to be included and adjusted within the plan and future presentations. Suggestions included clarity of future roadwork scheduled on Highway 22, addition of descriptive language and graphics, and suggested points of emphasis for the final document and future presentations.

6.2 Final Report: South Victory Drive / Hoffman Road Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Study
Mr. Potter provided an overview of the ICE study process and offered an update on the project’s current progress. This included data collection, traffic analysis, a “no-build” analysis for 20-year traffic forecasts, and preliminary development of alternatives. The project was reported as on-schedule for delivery.

The TAC offered suggestions regarding analysis of average daily traffic affecting the intersection, preservation of existing access points, incorporation of pedestrian/bicycle travel concerns, and potential leveraging of future intersection improvements with other related reconstruction projects.

V. New Business

5.1 Release of Request for Proposal (RFP) for Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update

Staff reported that the MAPO’s LRTP Update must be completed by December, 2020. The RFP for the project is scheduled for release in January 2019, with work tentatively scheduled to begin May 2019.

The RFP’s scope of work is organized into nine sections: Initiate Study, Project Management, Data Collection & Deliverables, Data Analysis and Plan Development, Public Input and Partnerships, Financial Resources, Efficient Transportation Decision Making, Environmental Justice and Title VI, and Project Completion / Plan Adoption. The MAPO’s standard “Best Value Selection” method will be used to review proposals submitted in response to the RFP, using a 100-point scale will be used to develop the final evaluation and selection.

Mr. Fischer moved and Mr. Friedrichs seconded to recommend to the MAPO Policy Board release of the LRTP RFP. Motion carried.

The MAPO TAC designated representatives to serve on the LRTP Update RFP selection subcommittee to review and rank proposals. The TAC agreed to a scoring subcommittee consisting of Mr. Androsky serving as MAPO staff, Mr. Thilges representing Blue Earth County, Mr. Greenwood representing Nicollet County, Mr. Fischer representing the City of North Mankato, and Mr. Johnson representing the City of Mankato. Ms. Allis would represent MnDOT District 7, and Mr. Parker would represent Region Nine Development Commission. One scoring subcommittee seat would remain open if another MAPO member jurisdiction expressed interest in serving.

5.2 Resolution Supporting MnDOT 2019 Performance Measure Targets (PM1)

Staff reported that MnDOT had released its 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1). Similar to the PM targets released for 2018, the MAPO was given the option to either support the state’s targets or establish its own. The MAPO must either support the state’s targets or establish its own by February 27, 2019.

Mr. Sarff inquired if the language of the Resolution may be adjusted to emphasize that the targets were “less than” goals. Staff reported that this question would be presented to MnDOT’s Office of Transportation System Management.

Mr. Vogel made a motion to recommend to the MAPO Policy Board adoption of the Resolution, provided staff clarified the language concern with MnDOT and made any adjustments as appropriate. Mr. Friedrichs seconded. Motion carried.
5.3 Resolution Adopting MAPO Public Participation Plan
Staff reported that the MAPO’s Public Participation Plan (PPP) Update had undergone 45-day public comment. Public comments included recommendations for minor language adjustments and designation of an ADA Coordinator for the MAPO.

Mr. Sarff motioned and Mr. Fischer seconded to recommend to the MAPO Policy Board adoption of the MAPO Public Participation Plan Update. Motion carried.

5.4 Re-designation of MAPO Representative to MnDOT Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7)
Staff reported that as part of MnDOT’s Area Transportation Partnership (ATP) District 7 operating procedures, the MAPO must annually re-designate a representative and an alternate to the ATP.

Ms. Allis motioned and Mr. Friedrichs seconded to designate Seth Greenwood as the MAPO’s representative to the ATP and to designate Paul Vogel or his designee as an alternate. Motion carried.

5.5 Approval of 2019 Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7) Solicitation Flowchart
Staff reported that the MAPO and ATP-7 annually work with regional partners to develop a joint solicitation flowchart for both the Area Transportation Improvement Plan (ATIP) and the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). MAPO staff coordinated with the ATP-7 to develop the flowchart.

Ms. Allis noted that there may be changes to the flowchart in coming years, depending on future decision-making within MnDOT.

Mr. Parker motioned and Mr. Greenwood seconded to approve the 2019 ATP Solicitation Flowchart. Motion carried.

5.6 Resolution Authorizing Submission of Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC) Phase 1 Planning Grant Application
Staff reported that MnDOT’s Office of Transit and Active Transportation (OTAT) has initiated a grant program titled “Greater Minnesota Regional Transportation Coordinating Councils.”

The Phase 1 Planning grant will be administered over a 12-month period and is projected to be used to procure a transportation planning consultant through a standard Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The MAPO would act as the project administrator/manager to direct consultant activities and facilitate a regional cooperative planning process to develop the foundation of a RTCC.

Mr. Friedrichs inquired if the project may be more appropriately administered by the Region Nine Development Commission. Mr. Vogel clarified that MnDOT had reached out to the MAPO regarding the project, and that Region Nine would be involved in the process.

Mr. Parker motioned and Ms. Allis seconded to recommend approval of the Resolution Authorizing Submission of RTCC Phase 1 Planning Grant Application to the MAPO Policy Board. Motion carried.
VI. Other Business, Discussion & Updates

6.1 Final Report: Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study
Item advanced to beginning of meeting.

6.2 Update: Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study
Item advanced to beginning of meeting.

6.3 Update: Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan
Staff reported that the consultant continued progress on data collection and drafts of member agency plans. Each member jurisdiction’s individual plan was in various stages of completion.

6.4 Discussion: Subscription to StreetLight Data
Staff reported that the opportunity had been raised for the MAPO to purchase a discounted subscription to StreetLight Data (StreetLight), an analytics platform for transportation data analysis.

The TAC discussed the potential benefits of either purchasing an individual subscription to the service, or checking out a “seat” through MnDOT’s parent contract. It was decided that staff would schedule a presentation on StreetLight for a future TAC meeting and the item would be further discussed at that time.

VII. TAC Comments

There were no additional TAC comments

VIII. Opportunity for Public Comment

There were no public comments.

IX. Adjournment

At approximately 3:20 Mr. Parker moved and Ms. Allis seconded a motion to adjourn. With all voting in favor, the motion carried.

____________________________
Chair, Mr. Thilges