Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee
Thursday, January 17, 2019 – 1:30 p.m.
Intergovernmental Center,
Minnesota River Room
10 Civic Center Plaza, Mankato, MN 56001

I. Call to Order
II. Introductions
III. Approval of Agenda
IV. Approval of Minutes – November 15, 2018
V. *New Business
   *A StreetLight teleconference is scheduled for 2:00 p.m. Agenda item order may be adjusted depending on discussion lengths.
     1. Update: ADA Transition Plan (Bolton & Menk, Inc.)
     2. Teleconference: StreetLight Data
     3. Warren Street Corridor Study Request for Proposal (RFP)
     4. Review of 2020-2023 TIP Candidate Projects
VI. Other Business, Discussion & Updates
    1. Long Range Transportation Plan Update
    2. Review of TAC Purpose and Function
VII. December 6, 2018 MAPO Policy Board meeting minutes (informational)
VIII. TAC Comments
IX. Opportunity for Public Comment
X. Adjournment
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
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Update: ADA Transition Plan
No: 5.1

**Agenda Item**: Update: ADA Transition Plan

**Recommendation Action(s)**: Informational and discussion. It is recommended the TAC provide project feedback, technical input, and any potential items of consideration to MAPO staff and the consultant.

**Summary**: The MAPO’s ongoing America’s with Disabilities Act (ADA) is nearing final stages of completion. An informational presentation will be provided by the project consultant, with feedback sought from the MAPO TAC.

**Attachments**: Presentation slides (handout)
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Teleconference: StreetLight Data
No: 5.2

Agenda Item: Teleconference: StreetLight Data

Recommendation Action(s): Informational and Discussion

Summary:
A remote presentation will be delivered by Bill Slater, North Central Sales Director with StreetLight, Inc.

At the November 15, 2018 TAC meeting it was discussed that the opportunity had been raised for the MAPO to purchase a discounted subscription to StreetLight Data (StreetLight), an analytics platform for traffic data analysis.

MnDOT has executed a “parent” contract with StreetLight, one result being that the MAPO (among Minnesota municipalities and Regional Development Commissions) may purchase access to the StreetLight InSight platform on a per user license basis.

The price is $5,000 per user and allows access for one year from the time of sign-up, provided MnDOT renews its license on October 1, 2019.

The 2019 UPWP has already been approved and budgeted. The subscription would be funding by member billing. The billing allocation for the software would be proportionate to the billing allocation of local membership dues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>StreetLight license contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Earth County</td>
<td>$1,900 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mankato</td>
<td>$1,850 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Mankato</td>
<td>$650 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicollet County</td>
<td>$600 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Warren Street Corridor Study Request for Proposal (RFP)
No: 5.3

**Agenda Item:** Warren Street Corridor Study Request for Proposal (RFP)

**Recommendation Action(s):** It is recommended the MAPO TAC review the draft RFP for the upcoming Warren Street Corridor Study and recommend its release to the MAPO Policy Board.

**Summary:**
The MAPO’s 2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) includes the Warren Street Corridor Study as a primary work item. The study will evaluate alternatives for management of existing and future traffic, alternate intersection designs, and pedestrian connectivity.

Input on the RFP scope of work was solicited from MAPO partners. The RFP directs consultants to submit proposals outlining strategies for project management, data collection/analysis, public input, environmental requirements, and final delivery of work items.

The scope includes consideration of existing and proposed land use, past planning documents and studies, access management, existing facilities, pedestrian channelization, safety improvements, and a traffic operations analysis document, among other work items.

The MAPO’s standard “Best Value Selection” method will be used to review proposals submitted in response to the RFP. 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), 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 and Twitter account
- Notice in the Mankato Free Press
- Email distribution to the MAPO Policy Board and TAC
- Email distribution to MAPO Consultant Email List, including Bolton & Menk, I&S Group, Kimley-Horn, SEH, SRF, WSB, WSN, and Wenck & Associated
- City of Mankato Public Information
- Posted on League of Minnesota Cities online RFP board
- Posted on Association of Minnesota Counties online RFP board
- Posted on Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations online RFP board

Staff recommends the MAPO TAC discuss the draft Warren Street Corridor Study RFP and make a motion to recommend to the MAPO Policy Board approval to release the RFP.

**Attachments:**
Draft Warren Street Corridor Study RFP
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO)

Warren Street Corridor Study

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

Issue Date: **February 26, 2019**

Deliver To: Charles Androsky
Transportation Planner

Respond By: **4:30 p.m. March 29, 2019**
*Late proposals will not be accepted*

Direct Questions To:
Charles Androsky
MAPO Transportation Planner
(507) 387-8389
candrosky@mankatomin.gov
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Community Background
The Mankato/North Mankato metropolitan statistical area (MSA) is centrally located in south central Minnesota, positioned in the scenic beauty of the Minnesota River Valley, with convenient access to Minneapolis-St. Paul, 75 miles to the northeast. The Mankato/North Mankato population is 53,488 (according to the 2010 Census) with an urbanized area over 58,000 and a planning area population over 61,000. Major industries include:

- Health Care
- Printing & Related Support Activities
- Educational Services
- Social Assistance
- Machinery Manufacturing
- Nursing & Residential Care Facilities
- Telecommunications
- Ambulatory Health Care Services
- Food Manufacturing
- Primary Metal Manufacturing
- Transportation Equipment Manufacturing
- Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing
- Administrative and Support Services
- Agricultural Services

The Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO)
Under the authority of 23 CFR §450.310(a) the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) is the federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (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. Formed in 2012, the MAPO has successfully produced a wide and diverse range of transportation plans, studies, and reports.

Project
The MAPO hereby solicits proposals from qualified firms for a Warren Street Corridor Study (Study) that services the region and is compliant with all applicable local, state, and federal legislation. The geography of the study is defined as the Warren Street traffic corridor from Riverfront Drive to Highland Park (via Cedar and Highland Avenue) in Mankato. The Study will evaluate alternatives for management of existing and future traffic flow along Warren Street, with discussion on alternatives, access management, intersection control options, alternative intersection designs, pedestrian connectivity including mid-block crossings, potential changes in cross sections and lane configurations from existing conditions, and possible

The full Warren Street Corridor in the City of Mankato (Blue Earth County) runs from Riverfront Drive to Stadium Road. It serves as a transportation corridor that spans from downtown Mankato’s City Center to Minnesota State University, Mankato. The roadway is classified as a minor arterial with traffic volumes ranging from 5,200 AADT to 10,100 AADT.

The Study will include intersection control evaluations (ICEs) of Warren Street at Riverfront Drive, Front Street, Second Street, Broad Street, and Glenwood Avenue. Additionally a Traffic Capacity and Operation Analysis will be conducted for Warren Street for the entire segment studied. The Study will evaluate alternatives for management of existing and future traffic flow along Warren Street, with discussion on alternatives, access management, intersection control options, alternative intersection designs, pedestrian connectivity including mid-block crossings, potential changes in cross sections and lane configurations from existing conditions, and possible
impacts on parallel streets associated with the alternatives. At project outset the Consultant shall draft a Timeline and Workflow Document (described in Scope of Work Task I) which will outline dates, work periods, public engagement periods, review periods, and deadlines for all aspects of the project. The Timeline and Workflow Document will also consider development and delivery of technical memos addressing the following areas: Existing Conditions, Traffic Analysis, Issues, Alternative Development, and Alternative Evaluation. These memos should developed with input and approval of project partners and designed with congruous language, visual elements, and flow, as they shall comprise sections of the final adopted Study.

The Study’s final objective will be to determine a range of alternatives for potential multimodal improvements throughout the Warren Street segment studied by performing a high-level operational analysis of major intersections, pedestrian movements, transit operations, and traffic flow to ensure the most efficient and community-supported design is implemented for the reconstruction of Warren Street, which is scheduled for 2021.

The Study will fully adhere to all applicable federal, state, and local guidance and requirements, including those of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and similar legislation.

The Study will be prepared cooperatively by and between the selected Consultant, the public, and the participants of the MAPO. 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 City of Mankato will contract with the selected consultant on behalf of the MAPO, and staff of the MAPO will perform contract oversight and coordination. The budget for this project is not to exceed $70,000.

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

Scope of Work
The Scope of Work specifies the tasks that shall be issued in part or whole to the Consultant. During contract negotiations 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. Responders may 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 Consultant shall prepare a Final Work Plan, to be included in the contract. All work will be completed and submitted to MAPO by November, 2020, to allow the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) adequate time to review and recommend adoption at their November 19, 2020 meeting, and the MAPO Policy Board to review and formally adopt at their December 3, 2020 meeting (see final adoption schedule in Scope of Work Task VII: Project Completion and Delivery).

The Study shall include long-range and short-range strategies/investments that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods along the Corridor. In keeping with the intent and requirements of
the FAST Act (or current transportation bill), and the requirements stipulated by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the State of Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), the Study shall be multimodal in nature. This shall entail consideration for all applicable modes of transportation, including pedestrian, ADA assistance vehicles, transit, and bicycle travel. A detailed scope of the Study shall be determined early in the project by engagement between the Consultant and MAPO staff, TAC, Policy Board, and member municipalities.

The Study shall include a strong public involvement component to provide interested parties opportunities to participate. This Study shall also be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies responsible for: land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, public health, conservation, historic preservation and other appropriate agencies.

The overall Study process and decisions shall be guided by the MAPO TAC and Policy Board. Outlined below is the Scope of Work that shall 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. 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 completing the Warren Street Corridor Study on-budget and by the deadline. The **Timeline and Workflow Document** will provide a schedule to perform all work necessary to ensure final adoption of the Study by the MAPO Policy Board no later than their meeting scheduled **December 3, 2020**.

The Consultant shall provide a draft final document to the Policy Board to adopt at this meeting. This will entail consideration to scheduling the requisite agency approvals, public comment periods, open houses, consultation with MnDOT/FHWA entities, as well as presenting the finalized draft document to the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review and comment at their meeting scheduled **September 9, 2020** (see final adoption schedule in Scope of Work Task VII: Project Completion and Delivery). The MAPO TAC and Policy Board function through the standard advisory-action relationship, whereas adoption of the final document by the Policy Board must be at the recommendation of the MAPO TAC. In development of the **Timeline and Workflow Document**, the Consultant shall take the below factors into account, at minimum:

- Scheduling of development and delivery of technical memos addressing the following areas: **Existing Conditions**, **Traffic Analysis**, **Issues**, **Alternative Development**, and **Alternative Evaluation**. These memos should developed with input and approval of project partners and designed with congruous language, visual elements, and flow, as they shall comprise sections of the final adopted Study.
- Scheduling of all internal and external meetings and public engagement/outreach events and campaigns. This schedule shall include a project kickoff meeting with input from MAPO stakeholders, regular project management team (PMT) meetings, public engagement meetings/open houses, and appropriate updates/presentations to the MAPO TAC and Policy Board over the course of the study. The schedule shall also include...
deadlines for all sections/deliverables of the Study with consideration to order and critical path to ensure all elements of the Study are accomplished on time and stay within budget. Consideration shall be given to public comment/input/engagement efforts necessary for developing each technical memo.

- Identification of current federal and state transportation requirements and guidance.
- Identify specific, context-sensitive issues that should be addressed in the Study.
- Literature review and generation of Existing Literature Summary Document.
- Determine roles of MAPO and partner agency staff.
- Establish data collection and analysis needs and methods for obtaining data.
- Establish partner/stakeholder contact list.
- Identification of internal stakeholder meeting schedule.
- Identification of approval agencies and scheduling for when guidance and approval shall be obtained.

Deliverables under Scope of Work Task I include, but shall not be limited to, a Timeline and Workflow Document.

Scope of Work Task II. Project Management
The Consultant shall ensure proper management of the entire project including staff, equipment, and documentation, as well as to any subcontracted firms. The Consultant shall prepare written progress reports, documentation of travel and expense receipts, and preparing and submitting invoices. The Consultant shall maintain a project website and provide information to MAPO for posting on its website. The Consultant shall also organize and host biweekly (every two weeks) progress meetings with MAPO, including preparation of meeting agendas and taking and reporting meeting minutes.

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 will 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 Warren Street Corridor Study 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 to ensure strong communication and coordination through the life of the contract. Communication will 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 shall meet with MAPO staff and member municipalities 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. 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 the 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 in 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.

Subcontracts
The primary Consultant is expected to perform either the entirety or the majority of all aspects of the Warren Street Corridor Study. However, at points agreed upon and authorized beforehand by the MAPO, certain technical aspects of the Study 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 any/all subcontracted consultants. All guidance, requirements, and performance standards provided in this RFP shall apply to the primary Consultant and to any/all subcontracted firms, in the event the MAPO authorizes this practice. The primary Consultant shall be held responsible for any/all practices and work products developed by any/all subcontracted firms.

Deliverables under Scope of Work Task II include, but shall not be limited to, rights and ownership of all educational, graphical, and technical/data elements developed over the course of Study.

Scope of Work Task III: Data Collection
The Consultant shall compile and review all documents, plans, policies, and data pertaining to the Warren Street Corridor. These documents include, but are not limited to:

- Base-and horizon-year socio-economic data developed by federal, state, and local sources
- State and federal statutes
- Plans and studies previously conducted by the MAPO including the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
- Municipal Complete Streets Plans, corridor plans, land use plans, redevelopment plans, existing ICE 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.
• Municipal Capital Improvement Plans.
• Pavement and Bridge Condition ratings and data.
• City of Mankato and Blue Earth County Capital Improvements Plans
• Mankato Transit System’s Transit Development Plan
• Applicable plans/studies/findings at the state and federal levels, including those relating to Toward Zero Deaths.
• Relevant studies and plans conducted by Blue Earth County
• Recent analysis and work products developed by the City of Mankato regarding the segment of the corridor from Balcerzak Drive to Stadium Road and intersection control evaluations (ICE) reports for Warren Street at Balcerzak Drive and Warren Street at Maywood Drive, as linked at the below web address: https://city.mankatomin.gov/streetprojects/detail/63.

The Consultant shall review and summarize these documents and data in terms of their impact and relevance to the Warren Street Corridor Study, particularly State and Federal legislation and include any potential conflicts or inconsistences that must be addressed. This review shall be delivered in the form of an Existing Literature Summary Document.

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 Warren Street Corridor Study tasks. MAPO will provide the Consultant a list of available GIS layers, maps, and data and will supply requested materials, when feasible, to the Consultant.

As necessary and to the city’s ability, the City of Mankato will provide 48-hour traffic counts at various location along to corridor to support the objectives of the study. The City will also provide, as necessary and to the city’s ability, intersection turning movement video at various intersections as identified by the Consultant utilizing count-cam equipment. The Consultant shall investigate the viability of obtaining this and similar project-specific data via StreetLight or similar software.

Any new data and information collected or developed by the Consultant will be appended to the appropriate study report and will become the property of the MAPO.

Existing information, data and documents known to be available for Consultant review and use include (City of Mankato and Blue Earth County staff will assist the Consultant in identifying and gathering the documents listed below):

• Adopted community plans and studies.
• GIS data/layers, as available from City, County and State sources.
Other technical materials or data as available and permissible.

The Consultant shall identify, obtain, compile, review, and utilize a wide range of documents and data in support of the Warren Street Corridor Study. Whenever possible, documents and data will 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 review all current and newly-enacted transportation legislation at all levels of government that may impact the Study. 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.

Deliverables under Scope of Work Task III include, but shall not be limited to, an **Existing Literature Summary Document** and an **Electronic Inventory**.

**Scope of Work Task IV: Data Analysis and Study Development**

The Consultant shall draft and develop final data analysis and plan development documents for inclusion in the Warren Street Corridor Study. Depending on scope, these analyses may take the form of individual technical memos or as components of a linking narrative structure. Areas to be addressed in the Study include, but shall not be limited to:

- Technical memos addressing the following areas: **Existing Conditions**, **Traffic Analysis**, **Issues**, **Alternative Development**, and **Alternative Evaluation**. These memos should developed with input and approval of project partners and designed with congruous language, visual elements, and flow, as they shall comprise sections of the final adopted Study.
- Intersection Control Evaluations (ICEs) of **Warren Street at Riverfront Drive**, **Front Street**, **Second Street**, **Broad Street**, and **Glenwood Avenue**.
- Review of existing and proposed land use.
- Review of past planning documents and studies.
- Recommendation(s) to channelize pedestrians or improve crossing safety at intersections.
- Access management.
- Analysis of existing facilities.
- Provide an array of alternatives for roadway cross sections, including travel lane configurations, parking, and pedestrian and bicycle accommodations.
- Preparation of Intersection Control Evaluations (ICE) at the intersections of Warren Street at Riverfront Drive, Front Street, Broad Street and Glenwood Avenue.
- Evaluation of possible alternative intersection traffic control.
- Intersections of Warren Street at Riverfront Drive, Front Street, Broad Street and Glenwood Avenue.
- A **Traffic Capacity and Operations Analysis** document.
- Analysis and Compilation of Crash Data.
- Investigation of the feasibility of construction of alternatives within existing rights-of-way and right-of-way needs for other contemplated alternatives.
- Analysis of resulting capacity and level of service at major intersections.
- A recommended **Implementation Plan** with cost estimates.
- Evaluation of the Warren Street Corridor within the segment studied.
• Connection of all collected data to existing GIS and performance of geographic analysis.
• 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.

Deliverables under Scope of Work Task IV include, but shall not be limited to, technical memos addressing the following areas: **Existing Conditions**, **Traffic Analysis**, **Issues**, **Alternative Development**, and **Alternative Evaluation**. Intersection Control Evaluations (ICEs) of **Warren Street at Riverfront Drive**, **Front Street**, **Second Street**, **Broad Street**, and **Glenwood Avenue**, development of final data analysis and plan development documents acceptable to the MAPO based on the items outlined above, a **Traffic Capacity and Operations Analysis** document, and an **Implementation Plan** document.

**Scope of Work Task V: Public Input and 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. Adherence to the MAPO’s PPP will help ensure compliance with federal 3-C regulations. Early in the project, the Consultant will develop 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. At meaningful and agreed-upon points before and during the development of the Warren Street Corridor Study, the Consultant will plan and conduct a variety of public input activities with a broad range of stakeholders, including consultation with representatives from all pertinent 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 Corridor Study process. The Consultant shall undertake outreach efforts to involve various populations and stakeholders within the MAPO region, including Minnesota State University, Mankato, as well as those populations typically under-represented in the transportation planning process. This will include on-site engagement efforts, as well as ongoing telephone and electronic communication to solicit and integrate input. The Consultant shall generate presentation materials for all meetings, including any slides, handouts, display boards, survey materials, etc.

**One-on-One Local Agency Meetings**

The Consultant shall be expected to hold a series of one-on-one agency meetings with MAPO partner agencies to establish a clear vision of community concerns and opportunities and discuss elements of the Corridor as they relate to each respective agency.

A thorough and effective social media component must be threaded throughout 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 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 continued communication with MAPO member municipalities 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 Study in question. Throughout the development of the Study, the Consultant shall communicate and coordinate with each MAPO member agency as needed to ensure the Study is developed in a manner which is context-sensitive and has local support.

The project’s public engagement process must include at least three (3) Open Houses. The first Open House meeting will be held early in the planning process with the purpose of introducing the Warren Street Corridor Study, educating and listening to the public, and providing an input opportunity for the public to identify transportation issues. The second Open House meeting must be conducted at the approximate halfway point of 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 near the end of the planning process to present a finalized draft of the Study to the community and seek feedback.

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

At relevant times over the course of the project, the Consultant will attend at minimum three (3) 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 will solicit feedback and guidance on preliminary findings, proposed priorities, and draft recommendations, as identified during the planning process. Insight and instruction from the MAPO TAC shall serve as a major guiding component to the development of the Warren Street Corridor Study. TAC meetings shall be coordinated and attended by the Consultant in addition to the project kickoff meeting.

At relevant times during the course of the project, the Consultant shall attend at minimum three (3) 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 of the development of the Study.
Deliverables under Scope of Work Task V include, but shall not be limited to, a public involvement schedule and all labors and materials associated with public involvement efforts, in addition to outreach/consultation with the MAPO bodies outlined above.

**Scope of Work Task VI: 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 Warren Street Corridor Study, and adhered to throughout the public involvement task of the project. The Consultant will coordinate with MAPO’s Title VI/EJ policies and PPP. Respondents are encouraged to submit innovative strategies to maximize EJ principles and engagement for groups typically under-represented in the transportation planning process.

**Scope of Work Task VII: Project Completion / Plan Adoption**
The Consultant shall perform all work necessary to obtain final adoption of the Warren Street Corridor Study by the MAPO Policy Board no later than their meeting scheduled December 3, 2020. To achieve this goal, the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) must approve the Study at or before their November 19, 2020 meeting. The Consultant shall deliver a finalized draft Study for the TAC to review before their November 19, 2020 meeting, as well as any necessary presentation materials and handouts to explain how the plan was developed in accordance with the MAPO vision, values, and available funding sources. The final adoption schedule is below: Note adoption schedule may be amended at MAPO discretion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 9, 2020</td>
<td>Consultant delivers draft Study for MAPO TAC review and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15, 2020</td>
<td>Consultant delivers presentation on draft Study to MAPO TAC at their regular meeting and solicits comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15 – Nov. 10, 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 Warren Street Corridor Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 3, 2020</td>
<td>Consultant delivers final presentation to MAPO Policy Board, Policy Board adopts Warren Street Corridor Study</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) for the Draft Study to ensure adoption by deadline.
- Scheduling of meetings and review periods to obtain guidance and approval from applicable municipal, MAPO, MnDOT, and federal entities.
- Development and delivery of a public comment log to identify public comments received. Log must be grouped by common theme and include a section on how/why the plan was/was not updated to reflect the comment.
- Preparation of the final document, including charts, figures, diagrams, and maps.
• Delivery of draft Corridor Study to MAPO TAC and Policy Board at or before dates specified above.

Map of Proposed Corridor Study: Warren Street Corridor from Riverfront Drive to Highland Park (via Cedar and Highland Avenue) in Mankato
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Final Deliverables
After approval and adoption of the Warren Street Corridor Study by the MAPO TAC and Policy Board, respectively, the Consultant will prepare and present a complete and approved Warren Street Corridor Study. This shall include:

• A comprehensive record of steps performed, data collected, and analysis conducted.
• Final Corridor Study – [Warren Street Corridor Study](#) (PDF and print versions)
• Executive Summary – [Warren Street Corridor Study - Executive Summary](#) (PDF and print versions)
• Deliverables will include three (3) (one for MAPO, City of Mankato, and Blue Earth County) printed copies of the Warren Street Corridor Study as well as an electronic copy of each document in both Microsoft Word and PDF format.
• Copies and ownership/use rights of data and materials compiled and developed over the course of the study including presentations, stakeholder contact information, maps, logos, photos, and graphical elements.
All documents/deliverables must be converted to the highest level of accessibility, where feasible. This includes readability of PDF documents by Adobe Reader’s and Adobe Acrobat’s “Read Aloud” feature.

In the eventuality that a member of the public requests a translated document, the Consultant shall 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 the MAPO staff and local partners
- Provide regular project updates via attendance to meetings as needed and/or electronic submission of progress reports as directed
- Contract work is anticipated to start by **June/July, 2019**
- Warren Street Corridor Study should be completed by **November, 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 alternate tasks or 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. An illustrative **Work Plan** identifying the major tasks to be accomplished. The work plan must present the Responder’s approach, task breakdown, and due dates of deliverables. Included within the **Work Plan**, consultants are encouraged to submit a tentative draft project timeline detailing a schedule of project activities including work periods per topic/section with deadlines, Kickoff Meeting, PMT meetings, Open Houses, one-on-one agency meetings, social media blasts, presentations to MAPO TAC and Policy Board, and activities related to final adoption.
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. Three references from clients within the past 5 years for whom the Consultant has performed similar work.
9. Completed forms and documents required under any other section of this RFP.

Selection Timeline

It is anticipated that evaluation, selection, contract negotiation, and project start will be completed according to the below schedule. Note the dates are advisory and may be adjusted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2019</td>
<td>First day of RFP posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22, 2019</td>
<td>Last date MAPO staff will answer RFP questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 2019</td>
<td>Deadline for RFP responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>Evaluation and scoring of RFP responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May, 2019</td>
<td>Successful bidder notified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/June, 2019</td>
<td>MAPO Policy Board, MnDOT, FHWA approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June/July, 2019</td>
<td>Contract negotiations finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June/July 2019</td>
<td>Project initiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After evaluation 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.

Proposal Submittal

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 March 29, 2019. Submit original and three (3) 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: Warren Street Corridor Study for the MAPO” on the outside.

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 project (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 May 2019.

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 Statutes §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 Race-Gender Neutral (RGN) 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 $56,000. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number is 20.205.
Appendix A: Map of MAPO Planning Boundary
Appendix B: Required Contract Clauses

The Contractor agrees to comply with the following 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 State or Federal Government - (1) The MAPO and Contractor acknowledge and agree that, notwithstanding any concurrence by the State or Federal Government in or approval of the solicitation or award of the underlying contract, absent the express written consent by the State or Federal Government, the State or 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 State or 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

29 CFR Part 1630, 41 CFR Parts 60 et seq.

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:
Order No. 11246, "Equal Employment Opportunity," as amended by Executive Order No. 11375, "Amending Executive Order 11246 Relating to Equal Employment Opportunity," 42 U.S.C. § 2000e note), and with any applicable Federal statutes, executive orders, regulations, and Federal policies that may in the future affect construction activities undertaken in the 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 or 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 Race-Gender Neutral (RGN) has been established for this procurement.

- Responders are directed to read the DBE Special Provisions, as posted at 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.

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)).

c. 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 – For contracts funded with federal funds, all final documents 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.”

For contracts funded with federal and state funds, all final documents 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, and the Minnesota Department of Transportation. 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 or the Minnesota 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. CHANGES

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. LOBBYING

Lobbying – Contracts for more than $100,000 must require the contractor and any subcontractor(s) to file a lobbying certification.
The funding threshold is based on the total contract award (i.e., prime and any subs).

L. 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.

M. 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.

N. 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.
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

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 responder 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/ximtgtn/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
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 proposers 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: ____________________________
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
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

**This Certificate is Issued as a Matter of Information Only and Confers No Rights Upon the Certificate Holder. This Certificate Does Not Affirmatively or Negatively Amend, Extend or Alter the Coverage Afforded by the Policies Below. This Certificate of Insurance Does Not Constitute a Contract Between the Issuing Insurer(s), Authorized Representative or Producer, and the Certificate Holder.**

**Important:** If the Certificate holder is an Additional Insured, the policy(ies) must have Additional Insured provisions or be endorsed. If Subrogation is Waived, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

## Producer

- **Contact:**
  - Name: [Name]
  - Phone (A/C, No, Ext): [Phone]
  - Fax (A/C, No, Ext): [Fax]
  - E-mail Address: [E-mail]

## Insurers

- **Insurer A:** [Name]
- **Insurer B:** [Name]
- **Insurer C:** [Name]
- **Insurer D:** [Name]
- **Insurer E:** [Name]
- **Insurer F:** [Name]

## Coverages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insurer</th>
<th>Type of Insurance</th>
<th>Addl. Subr. Limits</th>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Eff (MM/DD/YYYY)</th>
<th>Policy Exp (MM/DD/YYYY)</th>
<th>Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Commercial General Liability</td>
<td>Claims-Made</td>
<td>Occur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Genl. Aggregate Limit Applies Per:</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Pro-Jct</td>
<td>Loc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>General Aggregate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Product - Comp/Prop Agg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Automobile Liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Any Auto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Owned Autos Only</td>
<td>Sched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Non-Owned Autos Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Umbrella Liability</td>
<td>Occur</td>
<td>Claims-Made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excess Liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Workers’ Compensation and Employers’ Liability</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Operations / Locations / Vehicles (ACORD 101, Additional Remarks Schedule, may be attached if more space is required)

## 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.

**Authorized Representative**

© 1988-2016 ACORD Corporation. All rights reserved.

ACORD 25 (2016/03) The ACORD name and logo are registered marks of ACORD
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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: Review of 2020-2023 TIP Candidate Projects
No: 5.4

Agenda Item: Review of 2020-2023 TIP Candidate Projects

Recommendation Action(s):
Motion to recommend to Policy Board approval of project rankings for submittal to MnDOT District 7

Summary:
MnDOT District 7 has requested the MAPO review and rank the submitted applications for the Surface Transportation Program (STP) within the MAPO planning boundary. The STP program is divided into two categories: STP-Small Urban (STP-SU) and STP-Rural.

There were two applications for STP-SU funding submitted within the MAPO planning boundary. The City of North Mankato submitted an application for funding assistance for installation of a roundabout at the intersection of Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive in North Mankato. The City of Mankato submitted an application for funding assistance for installation of a roundabout at the intersection of Trunk Highway 22 at Augusta Drive in the City of Mankato. Both intersections are recommended for study and analysis within the MAPO Long Range Transportation Plan. Both intersections underwent recent evaluation and the projects applied are consistent with the conclusions of each intersections’ respective study. The ranking sheet for these projects is attached (first attachment). There were no applications for STP-Rural funding within the MAPO planning boundary.

Staff recommends the TAC motion to recommend approval of the attached STP-SU ranking sheet by the Policy Board, for eventual submittal to MnDOT District 7.

Attachments:
- STP-SU ranking sheet
- North Mankato application – Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive
- Mankato application – Trunk Highway 22 at Augusta Drive
# 2020-2023 Surface Transportation Program - Small Urban (STP - SU) applications within MAPO boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>City of North Mankato - Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive Roundabout</th>
<th>City of Mankato - TH22 at Augusta Drive Roundabout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Regional Benefit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>What are the project’s merits/benefits and intended effect upon the regional transportation network?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mobility</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>How will the project improve the mobility of people and goods?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Planning Support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Is the project identified in the MAPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan or other transportation study/document?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Multi-modalism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>How does the project encompass multiple modes of travel?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>How will the project respond to environmental impacts and mitigation measures?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Public Participation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>What public participation has been undertaken or will take place with this project?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

2020-2023 Surface Transportation Program - Small Urban (STP - SU) applications within MAPO boundary
January 4, 2019

Lisa Bigham, P.E., Assistant District Engineer – State Aid
Debra Yates, District 7 State Aid Assistant
MnDOT District 7
2151 Basset Drive
Mankato, MN 56001-6888

RE: STP Small Urban City Street Federal Funding Application
Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive Roundabout
City of North Mankato, Minnesota

Dear Lisa and Deb,

This letter is to request that North Mankato receive consideration for funding in the 2020-2023 STP Small Urban Funding Program for the Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive Roundabout project. This project is located immediately north of Highway 14, near the central business district of North Mankato. The project includes the reconstruction of the Lor Ray at Howard intersection and conversion to a roundabout.

The intersection of Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive currently experiences notable operational delays during peak hours. Future developments in the area are anticipated to increase the traffic which will further degrade the operations at the existing all-way stop controlled intersection. The intersection’s proximity to Highway 14, a regional commuter corridor, amplifies the importance of effective operations at the intersection. The proposed roundabout intersection is anticipated have sufficient capacity to efficiently serve the current and forecasted traffic volumes and reduce operational delay while providing safety benefits to both vehicles and pedestrians utilizing the intersection.

Enclosed is an application for funding for the Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive Roundabout project in the City of North Mankato. Preliminary designs have estimated the project cost as approximately $1.8 million, and the City is prepared to deliver the project during FY 2023. The City of North Mankato, and its partners, fully support this project and respectfully requests funding in the amount of $1.2 million but will accept any amount of funding awarded. City funds and possibly Municipal State Aid funds will be used to fund the remainder of the project cost.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or if you require any additional information.

Sincerely,

Daniel R. Sarb, P.E.
North Mankato City Engineer

DRS/drs

Enclosure

Cc:
John Harrenstein, City Administrator
Nathan Host, Public Works Director
Michael Fischer, Community Development Director
ATP-7
2020-2023 Project Identification/Reporting Form

Type of Project: (Check Appropriate Category)

- STP Rural – County Roads  ☐
- STP Small Urban – City Streets  ☒
- STP Rural – County Bridges  ☐
- STP Small Urban – City Bridges  ☐

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County or City Name (Applicant):</th>
<th>City of North Mankato</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant contact information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Daniel R. Sarff, P.E.</td>
<td>Title: City Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1960 Premier Drive, Mankato, MN 56001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 507-625-4171 ext. 2077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years funding will be accepted
(Check all years acceptable)
2020 ☐ 2021 ☐ 2022 ☐ 2023 ☒ Preferred Year: 2023

Funding

- Federal Eligible: $1,500,000 (construction)
- Federal Non-Eligible: $300,000 (engineering)
- Total Construction Cost: $1,500,000
- 80% of Federal Eligible: $1,200,000
- 20% Local match: $300,000
- Other funding amount: $300,000
- Source of Other funding: City or Municipal State Aid Funds
- Federal Amount requested: $1,200,000
**Project Information (as applicable):**

Route Number: MSAS Route 117 and 255  
Functional Class: Major Collector

From: 500’ west of Lor Ray; 240’ north of Howard  
To: 450’ east of Lor Ray; 400’ south of Howard  
Length: 0.3 miles of roadway

From Reference Post: N/A  
To Reference Post: N/A

Old Bridge Number: N/A  
Bridge Location: N/A

Section, Township and Range: Sect. 2 T108N R27W

Legislative District: District 19A  
Congressional District: District 1

**Project map attached:** ☒

**Brief Project Description:**

The project includes the full reconstruction of the intersection of Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive. The existing all-way stop controlled intersection will be converted into a single lane roundabout control. The intersection is immediately north of the interchange of Trunk Highway 14, a regional highway in the greater Mankato area, and serves connections to the City’s major industrial, commercial, and institutional areas. Also nearby is Dakota Meadows Middle School; traffic generated during peak periods due to the school currently cause notable delays at the intersection and are a driving force behind the project, as plans for a nearby elementary school are soon to be put into motion.

Howard Drive and Lor Ray Drive are major collectors that relieve local trips and provide regional mobility on Highway 14. The new roundabout intersection will provide increased mobility and safety for all users. New roadway lighting will provide better lighting levels and highlight pedestrian crossing locations. Pedestrian crossings will be signed and marked on all four legs of the roundabout intersection.
ATP 7, 2020-2023
REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE / IMPACT

Fill out the information as it applies to the project. Regional Development Commissions/MAPO will utilize this and their additional data to provide a regional ranking.

**IDENTIFY PROJECT**
Construction of roundabout at existing intersection of Lor Ray Drive and Howard Drive.

**ECONOMIC FACTORS**
See attached.

**HEALTH, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS**
See attached.

**ACCESS FACTOR**
See attached.

**PROJECT DESIGN**
See attached.

**OTHER**
See attached.

The following factors have been identified as having or potentially having Regional Significance / Impact.

**ECONOMIC FACTORS** include agriculture related, business, tourism and special facilities:
- Agriculture Related: dairy routes, elevators, livestock buying stations, sugar beet dumps, fertilizer distribution centers, anhydrous distribution centers, farm implement dealers, large livestock / poultry operations.
- Business: retail business >$1 million, wholesale business >$1 million, employee payroll >$500,000, employers of > 30, manufacturing > $1 million, service industries >$1 million, regional centers, casinos, shipping/distribution centers.
- Tourism: national, state, regional parks; historic sites, natural preservation routes, scenic by-ways, resorts / camping.
- Special Facilities: fuel pipeline, mining (kaolin, sand, gravel).

**HEALTH, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS:** hospitals, pharmacies, clinics, DAC’s, senior center / meal sites, waste hauling routes.

**ACCESS FACTORS:** Interstate, water crossings, bikeways, airports, rail, inter / intrastate bus routes, alternative route or application, intermodal, freight routes, school bus routes / sites.

**PROJECT DESIGN:** impact, local match, efficient use of funds, other sources of funds.

**OTHER:** prior commitments to STIP, mandated projects, political commitments, multiple partners in the projects, staged construction, etc.
REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE INFORMATION

Economic Factors

Howard Drive and Lor Ray Drive are major collector urban streets in the City of North Mankato. Lor Ray Drive is one of three access points to Trunk Highway (TH) 14 within the city. TH 14 is a major commuter and freight corridor to and from the greater Mankato area and intersects with US 169 just over a mile east of the project location. Within the project area, TH 14 is a physical barrier through the City’s economic center. To the south is an established office park, commercial services, and South Central College. The area to the north is an expanding and redeveloping industrial, commercial, and institutional areas. Lor Ray Drive and Howard Drive also provide access to the Caswell Park softball complex and the Caswell North Soccer Complex. These recreational facilities annually host numerous community, state, regional and national events and draw thousands of participants and visitors to the area. The intersection of Lor Ray Drive and Howard Drive is a vital local and regional access point to and from the residential, economic, institutional, and recreational areas of North Mankato.

Improvements at the intersection of Lor Ray Drive and Howard Drive are necessary to maintain and enhance the safety and mobility through the greater area, contributing to the economic vitality of the businesses in the surrounding area. The existing and future land uses within the project area demand accessibility from all modes of transportation including pedestrians, bicyclists, commuter vehicles, and freight trucks. This project has a complete streets approach that provides for and promotes all modes of transportation. This project also ties into a planned 2019 reconstruct of Commerce Drive that includes a complete streets approach, promoting mobility for all modes throughout the core economic area of North Mankato.

Health, Social, Environmental Factors

Safe and convenient accessibility and mobility for all modes is essential to the livability of an economic hub such as the City of North Mankato. Disadvantaged populations north of TH 14, specifically the two mobile home parks, rely on the accessibility of the Lor Ray Drive and Howard Drive intersection to access goods and services on the south side of TH 14. Directly south of TH 14, Lor Ray Drive provides access to majority of the healthcare clinics in North Mankato.

Lor Ray Drive and Howard Drive provide direct connections to many of the City’s educational buildings including Dakota Meadows Middle School, Crossview’s 5C’s Preschool, South Central College, and a new elementary school planned to be built at Lor Ray Drive and Carlson Drive approximately one-half mile north of the project area. Also located on Howard Drive is Fallenstein Field, and Playground, a fully accessible softball/baseball field and playground complex built for children and adults. The Fallenstein Complex provides opportunities for children and adults with all types of disabilities to actively participate in softball/baseball.

Access Factors

Lor Ray and Howard Drive provides regional and local access between TH 14 and the City’s core economic and institutional areas. TH 14 is an important east-west regional corridor connecting much of Nicollet and Blue Earth Counties with the economic hubs of the Cities of North Mankato and Mankato. TH 14 intersects with US 169, just over a mile east of the project location, connecting the project area to the Twin Cities metro region.

Mobility of this intersection and connection to Howard Drive provides relief of local trips on TH 14. Howard Drive is a major east-west collector urban street that runs parallel to TH 14 through much of
North Mankato. It provides direct access to various existing businesses and to undeveloped land that is zoned for future business development.

The intersection of Lor Ray Drive and Howard Drive, serving nearby schools, parks, and local trails, is an important junction in providing for existing demand of and promoting non-motorized mobility. The proposed roundabout will benefit these users by shortening crossing distances and decreasing pedestrians’ exposure to traffic, creating a safer crossing environment. Improved lighting of the intersection will also benefit pedestrian safety, and provide security for pedestrian activity during non-daylight hours.

The intersection also provides access to transit stops and routes, as well as school bus traffic. The nearby Dakota Meadows Middle School generates a large amount of the peak hour traffic utilizing the intersection which contributes to a considerable amount of the operation deficiencies seen at the intersection. The planned construction of an elementary school north of the intersection is further cause for upgrading the capacity of the intersection to adequately serve the forecasted traffic. Emergency services also rely on mobility of this intersection as a North Mankato Fire Station is located directly west of the intersection.

**Project Design**

Two bicycle related crashes were recorded in the five-year crash history at the intersection. The proposed roundabout will promote non-motorized user as previously stated. Of the five remaining observed crashes at the intersection, there are no crash type trends or severe crashes of note.

The Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive Roundabout project consists of:

- removal of the existing pavement and drainage structures within the project area,
- construction of an unbalanced roundabout intersection with a channelized northbound right-turn lane and two lanes of approach in the southbound direction,
- improved drainage,
- new roadway and pedestrian lighting,
- and the appropriate signing and striping.

Sidewalks and trails within the project extents will also be replaced with ADA compliant ramps and trails and tie into existing connections. The installation of a roundabout intersection will eliminate the existing skew angle of the intersection and significantly increase the operations during peak hours of traffic.

The larger footprint of the roundabout will require some right-of-way acquisition on all four corners of the intersection. No issues are anticipated with the acquisition process.

**Other**

The City of North Mankato currently does not have any other funding allocated to leverage in the completion of the project. The City may utilize MSA funds to assist with the local contribution of the project.
## Disturbance 7 STP Small Urban Funds
### Ranking of City Streets/Bridges
**ATP 7, 2020 - 2023**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Feature</th>
<th>Submitters</th>
<th>Pts Assigned</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Total Pts (Ranking)</th>
<th>Max Pts Available</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety and Hazard Elimination</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Prevent deaths with documented accident history</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>While there is not currently a crash history of concern, improved operations combined with a safer intersection treatment in the form of a roundabout is a proactive approach to provide for future traffic operations and safety. Planned commercial developments combined with future high density residential, a new elementary school, and an existing middle school will highly increase the pedestrian and passenger vehicle trips mixed with existing truck traffic serving the surrounding large industrial areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive safety with no accident history (incl. new or non-existing roadway)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reconstruction - no safety improvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconditioning - no safety improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume *</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&gt; 18,000 ADT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Due to planned redevelopment in the project area, the 2036 ADT is projected to be 15,900. This captures some, but not all, of the proposed redevelopment trips generated as some areas didn’t have formal plans at the time of the 2016 study. Since this study, a new interchange at Highway 41 and TH 14 was completed providing increased regional access for expansion of the industrial park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current ADT or estimated Current ADT if actual counts are not available</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16,000 - 18,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,000 - 14,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,000 - 12,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt; 2,000 ADT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,000 - 10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000 - 8,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,000 - 8,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,000 - 16,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,000 - 14,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16,000 - 18,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI - (Pavement Condition Index) See Guidance Document for examples of roadway conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Failed (0-10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lor Ray Drive, including the intersection at Howard Drive, was reconstructed in 2000. With current expansion of the industrial park, the increased heavy truck traffic is expected to accelerate the deterioration of the pavement, in turn causing further safety and drainage issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Serious (11-25)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Poor (26-40)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poor (41-55)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair (56-70)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Satisfactory (71-85)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good (86-100)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-existing pavement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leads to new business opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reduced operational delay will increase mobility in the area during peak hours, creating opportunities for existing businesses and promote new business development. The desired types of redevelopment will create pedestrian demand and will require a transportation system that safely and efficiently support such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates opportunities for existing businesses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains status quo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent or Prior Project</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No project in the current STIP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Commerce Drive Improvement project was allocated STP Small Urban funding for FY 2021 ($908,000) and FY 2022 ($251,414). Since the initial funding request was allocated for FY 2021, and the funds received for FY 2022 were the result of a redistribution of additional federal funds that became available, 6 points have been assigned in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a project in Year 1 of the STIP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a project in Year 2 of the STIP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a project in Year 3 of the STIP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a project in Year 4 of the STIP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of North Mankato, Minnesota
(Applicant Name)

**Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive Roundabout**
(Project Description)

Reduced operational delay will increase mobility in the area during peak hours, creating opportunities for existing businesses and promote new business development. The desired types of redevelopment will create pedestrian demand and will require a transportation system that safely and efficiently support such.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-jurisdictional</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3 or more entities (each contributing financially toward the required match)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Lor Ray Drive and Howard Drive are both local, major collector roadways. The city is vested in solely supporting this project as it is necessary for continued economic development that provides local jobs and services as well as demand from much of Nicollet and Blue Earth Counties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 entities (both contributing financially toward the required match)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stand-alone project</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal/Complete Streets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Promotes safe and convenient access and travel to all available modes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A new roundabout intersection control will maintain full access across all legs of the intersection, but will increase mobility and safety by reducing conflict points between pedestrians, passenger vehicles, school buses, transit buses, and heavy trucks. New intersection lighting will increase safety by providing pedestrian focused lighting where only outdated roadway lights exist today. A landscaped center median will improve the aesthetics of a gateway to the developing area, further promoting walkability and livability of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides limited access to available modes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses motor vehicle traffic only</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified in a local, regional, or state plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project is included in an Approved Capital Improvement Plan, regional, or state plan, that involved public input</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Identified in Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) Long Range Transportation Plan. Also, a 2016 ICE Report was funded by MAPO and MAPO TAC and Policy Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is included in an Approved Capital Improvement Plan, regional, or state plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project has not been identified in a plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDO/MPO Regional Significance rating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Insert value from RDO or MAPO evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MPO Regional Significance Rating to be determined by MAPO TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POINTS (100 points possible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Screening questions (avoid project "slippage"):

1. Does the project use Section 4(f) Park Lands or properties?
   - Yes [ ] No [x]

2. Does the project occur within any areas of effect on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places?
   - Yes [ ] No [x]

3. Does the project affect species or critical habitat protected by the Endangered Species Act?
   - Yes [ ] No [x]

4. Does the action require new right of way or temporary easement, access change, or relocation?
   - Yes [x] No [ ]

5. Does the project have a high risk of hazardous materials involvement?
   - Yes [ ] No [x]

6. Does the project involve placement of fill into Waters of the U.S.?
   - Yes [ ] No [x]

7. Does the project encroach into a floodplain?
   - Yes [ ] No [x]

8. Does the project significantly impact air quality in a negative manner?
   - Yes [ ] No [x]

9. Is the project anticipated to be controversial?
   - Yes [ ] No [x]

NOTE:

Right-of-way, preliminary engineering and construction engineering are not eligible for federal funding.
No project $minimum or $maximum are applied.

Signature of City Engineer: [Signature]

Date of Submittal: 1/4/2019
## Preliminary Engineer’s Estimate

**2020-2023 STP Small Urban Federal Funding Application**

**Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive Roundabout**

**City of North Mankato, Minnesota**

BMI Project No. M18.117929

### Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED QUANTITY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DIG BENCH - 2023</td>
<td>YD</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td>$62,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GRANULAR SUBGRADE (CV)</td>
<td>YD</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PAVEMENT</td>
<td>YD</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>8760</td>
<td>$332,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CONCRETE MEDIAN</td>
<td>YD</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>$41,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WALK/TRAIL</td>
<td>YD</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>$43,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ADA PEDESTRIAN CURB RAMP</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CONCRETE CURB &amp; GUTTER</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>$75,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>REMOVALS - PAVEMENT</td>
<td>YD</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>12080</td>
<td>$36,240.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - PAVING AND GRADING COSTS**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$730,150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DRAINAGE, UTILITIES AND EROSION CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED QUANTITY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRAINAGE - URBAN</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>$208,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$208,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - PAVING AND GRADING COSTS**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$278,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Signals and Lighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED QUANTITY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AT GRADE INTERSECTION LIGHTING</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$144,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - SIGNALS AND LIGHTING**

|           |                       |       |            | $144,000.00      |

### Signing & Striping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED QUANTITY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MAINLINE SIGNING</td>
<td>MILE</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$9,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAINLINE STRIPING</td>
<td>MILE</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$4,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - PAVING AND GRADING COSTS**

|           |                       |       |            | $14,400.00       |

### Miscellaneous Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED QUANTITY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MAINLINE SIGNING</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>$67,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$67,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NON QUANTIFIED MINOR ITEMS</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>$197,450.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$197,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TEMPORARY PAVEMENT AND DRAINAGE</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>$46,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$46,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

|           |                       |       |            | $333,450.00      |

### Design & Construction Engineering

|                     |                       |       |            | $300,000.00      |

**TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COST**

|           |                       |       |            | $1,800,000.00    |

**FEDERAL ELIGIBLE COST (80% OF CONSTRUCTION COST)**

|           |                       |       |            | $1,200,000.00    |

**FEDERAL FUNDS STP SMALL URBAN 2023 REQUESTED:**

|           |                       |       |            | $1,200,000.00    |

**LOCAL AND/OR MUNICIPAL STATE AID FUNDS**

|           |                       |       |            | $600,000.00      |
I, the undersigned, being the duly qualified City Clerk of the City of North Mankato, Minnesota, hereby certify that I have carefully compared the following attached Resolution No. 101-18, adopted at a Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of North Mankato held on December 17, 2018, entitled:

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FUNDING APPLICATION FOR THE LORRAY DRIVE/HOWARD DRIVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

with the original thereof on file and of record in my office, and that the same is a full, true and complete copy of said original.

I further certify that a majority of the members of the City Council were present throughout the meeting, and that the Resolution was passed by a majority vote of all members of the Council.

Witness my hand and the official seal of said City of North Mankato this 3RD day of January 2019.

April Van Genderen
City Clerk
City of North Mankato, Minnesota
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FUNDING APPLICATION FOR THE LORRAY
DRIVE/HOWARD DRIVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, approximately $2.4 million in federal funds are available in Fiscal Year
2023 for the improvement of streets and bridges in cities with population over 5,000 in MnDOT
District 7 through the Surface Transportation Program (STP – Small Urban), and

WHEREAS, the City of North Mankato has determined that the improvement of the Lor
Ray Drive/Howard Drive intersection is necessary and meets the eligibility requirements of the
STP-Small Urban funding program, and

WHEREAS, an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) has been previously prepared for
this intersection and the recommendation of the ICE was the construction of a roundabout to
replace the four-way stop intersection.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF NORTH MANKATO, MINNESOTA that an application for STP – Small Urban federal
funding be prepared and submitted for improvements to the Lor Ray Drive/Howard Drive
intersection, including the construction of a roundabout.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of North Mankato agrees to act as
sponsoring agency for the STP – Small Urban federal funding and has reviewed and approved
the project as proposed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of North Mankato, if awarded the federal
funds for said project, agrees to secure and guarantee the local share of costs associated with this
project and agrees to see this project through to its completion, with compliance of all applicable
laws, rules and regulations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of North Mankato agrees to design and
construct said project and agrees to operate and maintain the facilities constructed with federal
transportation funds for the useful life of the improvement.

Adopted by the City Council this 17th day of December 2018.

Mayor

Attest: City Clerk
January 3, 2019

Dear Surface Transportation Program – Small Urban Review Committee,

The Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (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 metropolitan transportation planning process to provide maximum service to citizens. Additionally, we assist local units of government and community leaders in the Greater Mankato Area who are working to build and improve the Greater Mankato Area.

I am pleased to write in support of the City of North Mankato’s application for funding for their Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive roundabout project. The project is identified as an Intersection Capacity Expansion Project within the MAPO Long Range Transportation Plan. The intersection was also subject to an Intersection Control Analysis (ICE) in 2016, wherein a roundabout control was identified as the highest-ranking control alternative based on the criteria outlined within the ICE.

The MAPO strongly suggests the review committee approve the City of North Mankato’s application, as the project conforms to the goals of the MAPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan and the findings of the MAPO’s Intersection Control Evaluation.

On behalf of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization,

Paul Vogel
Executive Director
(507) 340-3733
# ATP-7
## 2020-2023 Project Identification/Reporting Form

**Type of Project:** (Check Appropriate Category)

- STP Rural – County Roads  
- STP Rural – County Bridges  
- STP Small Urban – City Streets  ☒  
- STP Small Urban – City Bridges  ☐

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County or City Name (Applicant):</th>
<th>Mankato</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant contact information:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Michael McCarty</td>
<td>Title: Assistant City Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 10 Civic Center Plaza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 507-387-8643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years funding will be accepted (Check all years acceptable)</th>
<th>2020 ☐ 2021 ☐ 2022 ☐ 2023 ☒ Preferred Year: 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Eligible:</td>
<td>$693,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Non-Eligible:</td>
<td>$1,407,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost:</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of Federal Eligible:</td>
<td>$554,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Local match:</td>
<td>$138,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other funding amount:</td>
<td>$1,407,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Other funding:</td>
<td>MnDOT TH funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Amount requested:</td>
<td>$554,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number: Augusta Drive</th>
<th>Functional Class: Major Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From: Intersection with TH22</td>
<td>To: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Reference Post: Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>To Reference Post: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Bridge Number: N/A</td>
<td>Bridge Location: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section, Township and Range: 3,4 T 108N, R 26 W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative District: House – 19B, Senate 19</td>
<td>Congressional District: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project map attached:** ☒

**Brief Project Description:**
Construction of Roundabout at the intersection of TH 22 and Augusta Drive as determined by the TH 22 Corridor Study. August Drive is scheduled to be added to the MSAS system prior to the project commencing.
ATP 7, 2020-2023
REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE / IMPACT

Fill out the information as it applies to the project. Regional Development Commissions/MAPO will utilize this and their additional data to provide a regional ranking.


ECONOMIC FACTORS: The August Drive intersection serves as the primary intersection for over 750 residential units. It also serves as a secondary access to commercial, office and industrial areas in Mankato. The office and industrial area of this corridor have seen increased growth over the past 2 years and are expected to continue to develop. The need for a safe, efficient intersection is needed allow for the movement of freight and employees.

HEALTH, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS: Improvements to this intersection will reduce points of conflict and improve safety. This intersection has experienced 15 crashes in the past 5 years with one being an incapacitating injury. Most of these crashes are right-angle crashes due to poor gap availability for the minor approach. This intersection is above the statewide critical crash rate with a critical crash rate of 0.51 and an observed crash rate of 1.0.

ACCESS FACTOR: Currently the high volumes on TH 22 limit the available gaps for the minor approach vehicles turning onto or crossing TH 22. This results in limited access with a P.M. peak LOS D for this intersection. Volumes at the intersection currently warrant a traffic signal. However for safety reasons, a roundabout is recommended as a long term improvement.

PROJECT DESIGN: This project is being designed by MnDOT as a part of the overall TH 22 corridor improvements. Since this intersection is not an MSAS route, in order to better leverage local funds, STP funds are being sought to make the improvement. This will allow for an efficient use of funds for a small urban roadway to be improved as a part of a trunk highway improvement. The non-local share of the project will be funded by MnDOT.

OTHER: Since this project is on a trunk highway the City is subject to the cost participation policy. This road is not currently an MSAS route, but will be designated as a route prior to the project. The use of STP funds will allow this project to be constructed in a timely fashion providing the needed safety improvement to the intersection without negatively impacting the City of Mankato’s overall surface transportation program. By using STP funding for this intersection improvement MSAS fund can be invested in maintaining the existing route network within the City.

The following factors have been identified as having or potentially having Regional Significance / Impact.

ECONOMIC FACTORS include agriculture related, business, tourism and special facilities:
- Agriculture Related: dairy routes, elevators, livestock buying stations, sugar beet dumps, fertilizer distribution centers, anhydrous distribution centers, farm implement dealers, large livestock / poultry operations.
- Business: retail business >$1 million, wholesale business >$1 million, employee payroll >$500,000, employers of > 30, manufacturing > $1 million, service industries >$1 million, regional centers, casinos, shipping/distribution centers.
- Tourism: national, state, regional parks; historic sites, natural preservation routes, scenic by-ways, resorts / camping.
- Special Facilities: fuel pipeline, mining (kaolin, sand, gravel).

HEALTH, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS: hospitals, pharmacies, clinics, DAC’s, senior center / meal sites, waste hauling routes.
**ACCESS FACTORS:** Interstate, water crossings, bikeways, airports, rail, inter / intrastate bus routes, alternative route or application, intermodal, freight routes, school bus routes / sites.

**PROJECT DESIGN:** impact, local match, efficient use of funds, other sources of funds.

**OTHER:** prior commitments to STIP, mandated projects, political commitments, multiple partners in the projects, staged construction, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Feature</th>
<th>Submitters Pts Assigned</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Total Pts (Ranking)</th>
<th>Max Pts Available</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety and Hazard Elimination</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Prevent deaths with documented accident history</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>The 5-year crash history of this intersection is 15 crashes: 11 right angle with 1 incapacitating. With projected traffic volumes and speeds there is a high probability that a fatality may occur at this intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proactive safety with no accident history (incl. new or non-existing roadway)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reconstruction - no safety improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconditioning - no safety improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume *</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&gt; 18,000 ADT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2017 ADT was 13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current ADT or estimated Current ADT if actual counts are not available</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000 - 18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14,000 - 16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,000 - 14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,000 - 12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,000 - 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000 - 8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,000 - 6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000 - 4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 2,000 ADT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI - (Pavement Condition Index) See Guidance Document for examples of roadway conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Failed (0-10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2017 RQI is fair condition, RQI predicted to be 2.0 by year 2029 and remaining service life for 2017 is 0-4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Serious (11-25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Very Poor (26-40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poor (41-55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair (56-70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfactory (71-85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good (86-100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Non-existing pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Leads to new business opportunities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>development of existing commercial/office/industrial space. Creating additional utilization of additional infrastructure and reducing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creates opportunities for existing businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintains status quo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent or Prior Project</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No project in the current STIP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adams Street 137-080-002; 2019 Timberwolf Drive 137-139-001 2022, Pohl Road 137-140-001; 2022,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Have a project in Year 1 of the STIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Have a project in Year 2 of the STIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Have a project in Year 3 of the STIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Have a project in Year 4 of the STIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-jurisdiction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 or more entities (each contributing financially toward the required match)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MnDot and City of Manakto will fund this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 entities (both contributing financially toward the required match)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stand-alone project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal/Complete Streets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Promotes safe and convenient access and travel to all available modes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project will connect multi-modal facilities that currently exist on all four legs of the intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provides limited access to available modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Addresses motor vehicle traffic only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified in a local, regional, or state plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project is included in an Approved Capital Improvement Plan, regional, or state plan, that involved public input</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>In the current CHIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project is included in an Approved Capital Improvement Plan, regional, or state plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project has not been identified in a plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDO/MPO Regional Significance rating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Insert value from RDO or MAPO evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POINTS (100 points possible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Screening questions (avoid project "slippage"):

1. Does the project use Section 4(f) Park Lands or properties?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

2. Does the project occur within any areas of effect on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

3. Does the project affect species or critical habitat protected by the Endangered Species Act?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

4. Does the action require new right of way or temporary easement, access change, or relocation?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

5. Does the project have a high risk of hazardous materials involvement?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

6. Does the project involve placement of fill into Waters of the U.S.?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

7. Does the project encroach into a floodplain?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

8. Does the project significantly impact air quality in a negative manner?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

9. Is the project anticipated to be controversial?
   - Yes  [ ] No [ ]

NOTE:

Right-of-way, preliminary engineering and construction engineering are not eligible for federal funding.

No project $minimum or $maximum are applied.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS FOR AREA TRANSPORTATION PARTNERSHIP (ATP) GRANTS

WHEREAS, Mn/DOT District 7 has announced the solicitation for federally funded Surface Transportation Program (STP) for local projects to be considered by the District 7 Area Transportation Partnership (ATP) for state fiscal year 2023; and

WHEREAS, in order to be considered, the final applications must be submitted no later than January 4, 2019; and

WHEREAS, city staff have identified the various intersection improvements along TH 22 as projects that may qualify for funding under this program; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF MANKATO, MINNESOTA that the City Manager be and hereby is authorized to execute and submit applications for funding under the ATP Surface Transportation Program (STP) for local projects for the Adams Street extension project.

This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

Passed this 10th day of December, 2018.

Eric T. Anderson
Mayor

ATTEST: Renae Kopischke
Renae Kopischke
Executive Assistant
Meeting Minutes of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) Policy Board

December 6, 2018 | 6:00PM | Intergovernmental Center, MN River Room, 10 Civic Center Plaza, Mankato MN

Policy Board members present: Tim Auringer, Dennis Dieken Bob Freyberg, Mark Piepho, Dan Rotchadl

Others Present: Paul Vogel, Courtney Kramlinger, Michael Fischer, Adrian Potter – SRF, Craig Vaughn – SRF.

I. Call to Order

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

II. Introductions

Introductions were made.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Rotchadl moved and Mr. Auringer seconded a motion to amend the agenda by beginning with items 5.3 – 5.8 then moving to items 5.1 and 5.2. With all voting in favor, the amended agenda was approved.

IV. Approval of Minutes – September 6, 2018

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

V. New Business

5.1 Final Report: Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study

Mr. Vaughn of SRF presented the final report on the Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study. It was reported that traffic through the corridor is primarily local traffic and Augusta and Basset have a higher accident rate. Mr. Vaugh presented four corridor alternatives.

Mr. Auringer inquired about the nature of project feedback regarding potential installation of roundabouts (RAB). Mr. Vaugh recalled the majority of feedback was generally in favor of RAB as they effectively manage access, speed, and lend to less severe crashes. Staff reiterated the majority of traffic through the corridor is local traffic compared to visitor traffic. The Board discussed pedestrian crossing difficulties.
Mr. Freyberg asked if there were discussions with Public Safety on RAB. It was reported there wasn’t a focus on a Public Safety component, but notification was provided of the open house. It was anticipated RAB would result in a higher crash rate, but less severe crashes.

Mr. Dieken asked if it would be possible for a right-in right-out off of Highway 22 by the former Gander Mountain/Gordman’s property (1940 Adams Street). It was noted it would be anticipated that MnDOT would not approve this proposition due to the proximity of the RAB and intersection of Highway 22 and Highway 14 traffic controls. Staff noted in the future, it could be looked at potentially revising access from Adams Street to help with the reuse or redevelopment of the property.

5.2 Final Report: South Victory Drive / Hoffman Road Intersection Control Evaluation Study
Mr. Potter of SRF presented the report of the ICE study for South Victory Drive and Hoffman Road. Mr. Potter highlighted safety issues with this intersection noting crash rates are higher than the State average. Many of the crashes are due to poor judgement of traffic gaps when turning left. Mr. Potter presented three alternatives to the intersection design. The decision matrix was presented and it was noted that some columns may have more weight than others. For example, it is known there are a lot of teenage/less experienced drivers moving through this intersection due to the proximity of East High School, some may struggle with a RAB multi-lane design.

The ICE report is being finalized. Mr. Potter will provide information on how many of the crashes at this intersection were severe.

Staff noted there was community feedback on a lack of public engagement. It was noted the ICE study is a technical report that is meant to show what is possible and to provide background information, and data for next steps.

5.3 Release of Request for Proposal (RFP) for Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update
Mr. Rotchadl made a motion and Mr. Dieken seconded to approve the Release of Request for Proposal (RFP) for Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update. Motion carried.

5.4 Resolution Supporting MnDOT 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)
Mr. Rotchadl made a motion and Mr. Freyberg seconded to approve the Resolution Supporting MnDOT 2019 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1). Motion carried.

5.5 Resolution Adopting Updated MAPO Public Participation Plan
Staff presented the updated MAPO Public Participation Plan. The update employs new tools for public participation, including use of Twitter, MAPO website, and an expanded stakeholder email list. The update also includes implementation of metrics to measure efficacy of MAPO public engagement efforts.
Mr. Rotchadl made a motion and Mr. Auringer seconded to approve the MAPO Public Participation Plan. Motion carried.

5.6 Re-designation of MAPO Representative to MnDOT Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7)
Staff presented recommendation to designate Seth Greenwood to serve as the MAPO representative to the ATP-7 and designate Paul Vogel or his designee as an alternate representative, unless the Board had interest in serving.

Mr. Rotchadl made a motion and Mr. Freyberg seconded to approve the Re-Designation of MAPO Representative to MnDOT Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7). Motion carried.

5.7 Approval of 2019 Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7) Solicitation Flowchart

Mr. Auringer made a motion and Mr. Rotchadl seconded to approve the 2019 Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-7) Solicitation Flowchart. Motion carried.

5.8 Resolution Authorizing Submission of Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC) Phase 1 Planning Grant Application

Mr. Freyberg made a motion and Mr. Rotchadl seconded to approve the Resolution Authorizing Submission of Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC). Motion carried.

VI. Other Business, Discussion & Updates

6.1 Update: ADA Transition Plan

VII. TAC Comments (November 15, 2018 meeting minutes)
The minutes from the November 15, 2018 MAPO TAC meeting were distributed.

VIII. Policy Board Comments

Mr. Piepho opened the floor for Policy Board Comments. The Policy Board recognized Mr. Freyberg for his longstanding service and thanked him for his expertise, time, and guidance.

IX. Opportunity for Public Comment

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

X. Adjournment

At approximately 7:25 p.m. Mr. Rotchadl moved and Mr. Auringer seconded to adjourn. Motion carried.
Chair, Mr. Piepho