Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee
Thursday, January 21st, 2016 – 1:30PM
Intergovernmental Center,
The 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 19th, 2015

V. New Business

1. Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update

2. Request for Proposals (RFP) Status Update
   • Intersection Control Evaluations (ICE) Studies
   • Riverfront Drive Corridor Study
   • Belgrade Avenue Corridor Study

3. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

VI. December 3, 2015 MAPO Policy Board Minutes (Informational)

VII. Other Business

VIII. Adjournment
A meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Mankato Area Planning Organization was held on November 19, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. in the Minnesota Valley River Room of the Intergovernmental Center. Present were Michael Fischer – City of North Mankato Community Development, Landon Bode for Jeff Johnson – City of Mankato Public Works Director, Paul Vogel – MAPO Executive Director, Lisa Bigham – District 7 Minnesota Department of Transportation, Jake Huebsch – MAPO Transportation Planner, Jerry Kolander for Shari Allen – ISD 77, Al Forsberg – Blue Earth County Engineer, Mark Anderson – City of Mankato Transit, Seth Greenwood – Nicollet County Engineer, Brad Potter – City of Eagle Lake, Karl Friedrichs – Lime Township, Mandy Landkamer – Nicollet County, Ed Pankratz, Mankato Township. Others present were: Bobbi Retzlaff – Minnesota Department of Transportation & Kirby Becker – Minnesota Department of Transportation.

I. Call to Order

Vice Chair Greenwood called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Introductions

Introductions were made.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Potter moved and Mr. Anderson seconded a motion to approve the agenda. With all voting in favor, the agenda was approved.
MAPO TAC Meeting Summary

IV. Approval of Minutes, September 17, 2015

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

V. New Business

1. Long Range Transportation Plan
   MAPO staff provided an update on the Long Range Transportation Plan and discussed the public open house which took place on October 15, 2015 and had approximately 40 people in attendance. Staff described the public comment period and process relating to the verbal and written comments from the public, MnDOT, TAC and FHWA. The public comment period ran from 10/2/2015 through 11/3/2015. In total approximately 130 comments were received with the majority of those being minor, grammatical errors or clarification. Staff provided a summary of comments received to the MAPO TAC. One specific comment that was discussed during the meeting was the Highway 66 turn back project involving Blue Earth County and MnDOT. After discussions with the MnDOT District 7 Engineer, it was determined to identify the turn back project in the Range of Alternatives within the plan, but indicate the turn back agreement was done prior the Long Range Transportation Plan. Furthermore, the project was not identified in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), therefore it doesn’t need to be included in the MAPO’s Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).

   Mr. Forsberg moved and Mr. Anderson seconded a motion recommending adoption of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization’s (MAPO) Long Range Transportation Plan to the MAPO Policy Board. With all voting in favor, the motion passed.

2. 2015 UPWP Budget Amendment
   Staff explained that the MAPO’s 2015 budget is $329,687 and the 2015 projected amount spent is anticipated to be $293,906. The projected amount spent by the MAPO deviates 5 percent from the total approved agreement with MnDOT therefore, staff requested a formal motion approving the budget change.

   Mr. Friedrichs moved and Mr. Potter seconded a motion recommending approval of the MAPO’s 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Budget Amendment. With all voting in favor, the agenda was approved.

3. FHWA Approved Functional Classification Map
   Staff presented the FHWA approved functional classification showing the updated functional classification system in the MAPO planning area.
4. **Received Transportation Alternatives Projects**
   Staff explained that the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a competitive grant opportunity for local communities and regional agencies to fund projects for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, historic preservation, Safe Routes to School and more. Mr. Bode from Mankato and Mr. Fischer from North Mankato provided an overview of their submitted projects.

5. **Presentation by MnDOT Central Office Staff on Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan & Minnesota 20-Year State Highway Investment Plan.**
   Kirby Becker from the MnDOT presented on Minnesota 20-Year State Highway Investment Plan which is one of the state’s direction-setting plans. MnDOT staff provided an overview and background of the plan as well proved an opportunity for TAC members to give input to help shape the direction of the plan update.

   **VI. Other Business**

   None

   **VII. Adjournment**

   Mr. Anderson moved and Mr. Fischer seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. With all voting in favor, the motion carried unanimously.

   ____________________________
   Chair, Mr. Johnson
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update
No: 5.1

Agenda Item: Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update

Recommendation Action(s): Informational

Summary: On December 3, 2015 MAPO staff presented the final Long Range Transportation Plan to the MAPO Policy Board. Staff highlighted the comments received from the public and area partners including the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration. The Policy Board approved the Long Range Transportation. The Plan is available online on the MAPO webpage at http://www.mankatomin.gov/city-services-a-z/city-services-a-m/mankato-north-mankato-area-planning-organization-mapo/2045-long-range-transportation-plan.

Attachments:
None
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Request for Proposals (RFP) Status Update No: 5.2

Agenda Item: Request for Proposals (RFP) Status Update

Recommendation Action(s): Informational/Discussion

Summary: The 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) includes the development and execution of three RFP’s. On January 12, 2016 the Intersection Control Evaluations RFP was released and the MAPO will be accepting proposals until Friday, February 12th. The Riverfront Drive and Belgrade Avenue RFP’s are expected to be released in the first quarter of 2016. Prior to the release of the Riverfront Drive and Belgrade Avenue RFP staff would like to solicit feedback from the MAPO TAC and Policy Board along with input from the local jurisdiction. Once the RFP is complete it will be sent to MnDOT Central Office for review and comment.

Attachments:
1) Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) RFP
2) Draft Riverfront Drive RFP

NOTE: Required Affidavits, Certificates, Assurances and Federal Clauses are not included in Attached RFP’s
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO)

Intersection Control Evaluation Studies

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

Issue Date: 1/12/2016

Deliver To: Jake Huebsch
Transportation Planner

Respond By: 4:30 pm 2/12/2016
Late proposals will not be accepted

Direct Questions To:
Jake Huebsch
MAPO Transportation Planner
507-387-8630
jhuebsch@mankatomn.gov
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Introduction

The development of a three Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) studies is proposed.

The completed Intersection Control Evaluation studies will select the optimal control for three intersection based on an objective analysis. These guidelines provide direction and recommendations to facilitate and implement community transportation goals and to improve transportation facilities and services by:

- Improving the multi-modal transportation circulation of people and goods, using both motorized and non-motorized transportation modes and facilities.
- Providing a safe, efficient, accessible, cost-effective and aesthetically pleasing transportation system.
- Providing a balanced approach to the consideration and selection of access strategies and concepts during planning, project identification and initiation processes that contemplate the addition, expansion or full control of intersections.

The studies will be prepared cooperatively by and between the selected consultant, the public and the participants of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO). The primary participants of these studies include the MAPO Policy Board and Technical Advisory Committee, Cities of Mankato, North Mankato, Counties of Blue Earth and Nicollet and the Minnesota Department of Transportation. The City of Mankato will contract with the selected consultant on behalf of the MAPO, and staff of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization will perform contract oversight and coordination.

Scope of Work

In order to achieve the project goal, the following tasks are anticipated to be performed by the chosen consultant:

| Phase I. Conduct Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Planning Study |

Meetings and Consultations
The Consultant will travel to and participate in 3 meetings during all phases of the Study to review and summarize project scope and methodology, complexity, existing conditions, available data and related requirements.

The Consultant will travel to and present information about the Study, its methodology and its final recommendations at two meeting of the MAPO’s Transportation Advisory Committee and one meeting of the MAPO Policy Board.
The Consultant will provide documentation of meetings and data provided and will produce materials for committee updates as needed by members of the MAPO TAC and Policy Board.

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.

**Intersection Control Evaluation**

The Consultant will review and summarize existing information, collect additional data and conduct field work as needed, to assess the following three intersections using the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) methodology

http://www.dot.state.mn.us/trafficeng/safety/ice/index.html


1. *Howard Drive / Lor Ray Drive*
2. *Pohl Road / Stadium Road*
3. *Pohl Road / Balcerzak Drive*

*MAP of Proposed Intersections is Available in Appendix A*

**Scoping Phase**

1. Identify Intersections to be Analyzed by ICE
2. Collect Traffic Data
   - Counts taken should consider the school year – both pre and post secondary. Counts should be taken when Minnesota State University, Mankato, Mankato School District ISD 77, and South Central College are in session.
3. Perform Warrant Analysis
4. Analyze Alternatives
   - Safety
   - Capacity
   - Additional factors
5. Recommend Alternatives

**Alternative Section**

6. Prepare concept designs for recommended alternatives
7. Identify right of way needs and other factors to be part of the ICE evaluation process
8. Develop cost estimated for recommended alternatives
9. Re-evaluate and select preferred alternatives
10. Write formal ICE Report
**Phase II. ICE Report Documents**

The Consultant will prepare and present ICE reports for each intersection listed, to provide a comprehensive record of steps performed, data collected, analysis conducted and identification of recommended alternatives.

Deliverables will include 3 (three) printed copies of each ICE Study as well as an electronic copy of each document in word or pdf format.

**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 at meetings as needed and/or electronic submission of progress reports as directed
- Contract work is anticipated to start by 3/1/2016
- ICE reports should be completed by 10/31/2016
- Contract will be effective 12 months from contract execution date (date contract is signed by all required parties).

**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 herein.

The Proposal shall be submitted on 8.5”x11” paper in no less than 12 point font, not exceed 12 pages in length. Graphic illustrations may be included on 11”x17” paper. Appendices may be attached to the proposal and contain resumes and examples of similar work and experience. All proposal materials should be bound in a single submission.

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

1. Responder’s company name, business address, the contact person’s name, telephone number, fax number and email address
2. A statement of the objectives, goals and tasks to show or demonstrate the Responder's view of the nature of the project.
3. A description of the proposed project approach and methodology to be utilized, deliverables to be provided by the Responder, and a description of the proposed project management techniques.
4. A detailed description of the Responder’s background and experience with similar work. This should include examples of similar work indicating the Responder’s level of involvement in the project, and the key personnel involved with the project.
5. A list of the key personnel who will be assigned to the project and their area of responsibility. Provide statements for each of the key personnel detailing their training,
work experience and qualifications relevant to the proposed work. No change in personnel assigned to the project will be permitted without the approval of the MAPO.

6. A work plan identifying the major tasks to be accomplished. The work plan must present the Responder’s approach, task breakdown, and deliverable due dates.

7. A budget including the hourly rates and fringe rates for all key personnel who will perform the tasks outlined above, as well as the agency’s indirect rate.

8. 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.

Proposal Submittal
All proposals must be sent to:

Jake Huebsch
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 Friday, February 12, 2016. Submit original and 4 copies of the proposal. 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: Intersection Control Evaluation Planning 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:

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. 25%

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. 25%

3. The Responder’s record of past performance, including quality of work, ability to control costs, and ability to meet schedules. 20%

4. The availability of personnel and other specialized resources to perform the work within the specified time limit. 20%

5. Total price compared to other proposals. 10%
Proposals will be evaluated and a successful Responder will be notified by Friday, February 27th, 2016.

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 next page Proposal Questions 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:

Jake Huebsch, Transportation Planner
jhuebsch@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

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.

Required Statement for All Notices, RFP, and Contracts

The FTA is or will be providing federal assistance for this project in an estimated expected amount of $20,000; the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number is 20.505.—

Rest of page intentionally left blank
Appendix A
Map of Proposed Intersections
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO)

Riverfront Drive Corridor Study

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

Issue Date: __________

Deliver To: Paul Vogel
MAPO Executive Director

Respond By: 4:30 pm ____________

Late proposals will not be accepted

Direct Questions To:
Paul Vogel
MAPO Executive Director
507-387-8613
pvogel@mankatomin.gov
I. COMMUNITY BACKGROUND

The Mankato / North Mankato MSA is centrally located in south central Minnesota, nestled in the scenic beauty of the Minnesota River Valley, with convenient access to Minneapolis-St. Paul just 75 miles away. Recently, it was reported that Mankato's economic growth leads Minnesota and is among the top in the nation. The Mankato/North Mankato population is 53,488 (according to the 2010 Census) with the MAPO urbanized area of 58,265 and a planning area population of approximately 61,700. Major industries include:

- Health Care
- Printing & Related Support Activities
- Educational Services
- Social Assistance
- Printing Support and Related Support Activities
- 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 is renowned for great parks and trails. Rivers, lakes, ravines, bluffs, natural prairies and forested areas offer breathtaking landscapes and provide a scenic backdrop for an area steeped in historic significance.

The MAPO is represented by the cities of Mankato, North Mankato, Eagle Lake, and Skyline; Blue Earth and Nicollet counties; and Belgrade, Lime, South Bend, LeRay and Mankato townships. MAPO is directed by a six-member policy board (consisting of elected officials) and advised by a Technical Advisory Committee.
II. SCOPE OF WORK

The following is the minimum work requested under this RFP. Before proceeding with work tasks, the selected consultant will be required to prepare a final work plan for inclusion into a contract agreement.

A. REQUESTED STUDY

This is a request to qualified planning and engineering firms in conducting a transportation corridor study. The study of the Riverfront Drive corridor in Mankato, MN will evaluate alternatives for management of existing and future traffic flow along Riverfront Drive, with discussion on alternatives lane configurations, such as four lane to three lane conversions, access management, intersection control options, alternative intersection designs, pedestrian connectivity within the various land use districts along the roadway, and possible impacts on parallel streets associated with the alternatives.

The Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) will fund the study. The study will have cooperative federal oversight from the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Blue Earth County and MNDOT will also be cooperative partners in the study as several roadways under the jurisdiction of Blue Earth County and MNDOT intersect with Riverfront Drive.

In accordance with FHWA, FTA, and MNDOT policies, the MAPO will be responsible for the development of this study. The desire is to engage the services of a qualified transportation/civil-engineering firm to carry out this work.

The study should contain technical memos addressing the following areas: Existing Conditions, Traffic Analysis, Issues, Alternative Development, and Alternative Evaluation.

Description of Project Components:

This corridor study should include:

• Establish a purpose and need for the project
• Review of existing land use
• Development of future land use projections based on existing plans, including the City Center Renaissance Family of Plans, City Land Use Plan, and the Old Town Master Plan. Note, the Old Town Master Plan will be undertaken by the City of Mankato concurrently with this planning process.
• Access management
• Analysis of existing facilities
• Preparation of 25-year traffic scenarios.
• Provide an array of alternatives for roadway profiles, including areas where on-street parking may be expanded, the accommodated and possibly on-street bicycle facilities, accommodating new and expansion of existing sidewalks, and streetscaping.
• Evaluation of possible alternative intersection alignments and traffic control at the existing signalized intersections.
• Evaluation of possible traffic calming measures that will address concerns regarding traffic characteristics, such as speed. This is referred to as examining contextual traffic characteristics.
• Evaluation of enhanced pedestrian crossing options along the corridor especially focused in the City Center and at intersections considered in the Safe Routes to School Plan for Independent School District #77.

Traffic Operations Analysis
• Analysis and Compilation of Crash Data
• Environmental and social impacts
• Evaluation of advantages and disadvantages and cost comparisons of the various alternatives
• Examining impacts to freight movements along and through the corridor.
• Impacts of the alternatives on regional and county roadway systems that connect into Riverfront Drive and impacts to connecting and parallel local streets.
• 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
• Analysis of existing functional classification under FHWA guidelines and future functional classification.
• A recommended implementation plan with cost estimates.

In addition to the elements above, the proposed study shall provide an array of alternatives that will address the needs for traffic flow and level of service along with land use considerations, pedestrian connectivity, and contextual traffic characteristics for the next 25 years and beyond along this corridor. The study shall include details of each alternative, including right-of-way utilization, roadway plan and profiles, alternative intersection alignments and traffic control, estimated costs, analysis of the effects and needed improvements, and the adequacy and need of the traffic control on connecting roadways and intersections. Adjacent property owner concerns shall be addressed, including access, pedestrian safety, addition and/or loss of parking, etc. Impacts on parklands, schools, and and/or other particular concerns will be addressed.

The consultant will analyze existing traffic conditions for Riverfront Drive, major intersections along and other roadways that may handle appreciable traffic passing through, entering or exiting the corridor, determine existing capacities, identify locations with existing or short term potential for capacity and safety deficiencies, access management and control to adjacent properties, and propose alternatives for correcting these deficiencies.

**Contextual Summary of Study Area:**
The Riverfront Drive corridor is a major transportation corridor through Mankato that runs from the Highway 14 interchange at the north to the Woodland Avenue intersection to the south, near the frontage road exit from Highway 169/60. The roadway is classified as a four lane minor arterial with traffic volumes ranging from 8,300 AADT to 20,700 AADT.

Prior to bypass construction, Riverfront Drive was the route of US Highways 60, 14, and 22. The roadway was a turn back from MnDOT to the City of Mankato during the 1970’s and 1980’s as the bypasses were complete. Up until recently, the roadway was classified as a principal arterial until reclassified by MnDOT as a minor arterial. Note, the City of Mankato objected to the reclassification, but the FHWA upheld the reclassification.
Riverfront Drive can be considered to have contextual settings, each with unique and sometimes interrelated issues. A first segment can be considered between Highway 14 and Madison Avenue. The area is a mixture of commercial and industrial uses with some residual residential. Direct property access is common along this segment. The area is experiencing transition of land uses and some redevelopment activities. Concerns expressed in this area have been a.m. and p.m. traffic issues at the Highway 14 exit ramps to Riverfront Drive, speed of traffic, and pedestrian crossings - particularly for students that attend Franklin Elementary. An Intersection Control Evaluation has been performed for the Riverfront Drive/Highway 14 ramps. On-street parking is not allowed along this segment of Riverfront.

A second segment of Riverfront Drive is located between Madison Avenue and the Veterans Memorial Bridge. This segment runs through a historic area of Mankato, with several blocks on the National Registry of Historic Places. This area is characterized by many small retail and service businesses with some larger office tenant spaces that are being marketed. Industrial areas along the mainline railroad are located to the east of Riverfront Drive along with Riverfront Park, which hosts larger community/concert events. To the west is 2nd Street, which is mainly residential with some institutional and service uses. 2nd Street has seen an increase in traffic as several streets in the adjoining neighborhood (Broad and 4th Streets) were converted from one-way pairs to 2-way traffic along with medians constructed in Madison Avenue. The purpose of these improvements was to redirect commuter traffic to 2nd Street and Riverfront Drive. Concerns expressed in this area have been speed of traffic, pedestrian crossings – particularly associated with events at Riverfront Park, on-street parking (note, on-street parking was expanded in 2006 with the elimination of a left turn lanes and installation of streetscaping), and truck turning movements into the industrial areas. Options have also been discussed regarding the reuse of the former quarry located to the west of the intersection of Madison Avenue and Riverfront Drive, with the possibility of providing an access from Riverfront Drive into the former quarry area for redevelopment purposes and also possibly realigning the intersection at Riverfront, Madison, and 3rd Avenue. During the 1st half of 2016, the City of Mankato will be undertaking a master planning process in this area, which should compliment and provide additional information for the corridor study.

A third segment of Riverfront Drive is located between the Veterans Memorial Bridge and Sibley Parkway. This segment of Riverfront Drive was developed in the 1980’s and bypassed the former alignment along Front Street, which was partially closed with the construction of a hotel, Civic Center, and enclosed retail mall. This segment of Riverfront is four lane with a median and turn lanes provided. Direct property access is limited and no on-street parking is permitted. This area has experienced much redevelopment activity in the last 25 years, with construction of the Verizon Wireless Civic Center, Hilton Garden Inn Hotel, Tailwind Redevelopment at Cherry and Warren Streets, Sibley Parkway extension, and other large projects along 2nd Street. Concerns expressed in this area include pedestrian crossings – particularly in the core area between Main Street and Poplar and during civic center events, speed of traffic, and lack of pedestrian facilities in certain areas.

A fourth segment is between Sibley Parkway and the terminus of the study – Woodland Avenue. Part of this segment between Sibley Parkway and Marshall Street is part of the Riverfront Drive bypass and from Marshall Street to the terminus is along the former Front Street corridor. This segment has seen some redevelopment activities and retention of a neighborhood service area between Owatonna Street and Park Lane.
Concerns expressed in this area include speed of traffic, pedestrian crossing issues – particularly associated with West High School and at Sibley Street associated with Roosevelt elementary students crossing from the Sibley Park Neighborhood, and traffic congestion issues. The traffic congestion issues are associated with the intersections of Stoltzman/Riverfront, Poplar/Riverfront, and the off and on-ramps to Highway 169/60 in the vicinity of Owatonna Street and Poplar. MnDOT in coordination with the City of Mankato are undertaking an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) study for these intersections. The traffic issues at these intersections seem to be related to a.m. and p.m. peaks and to West High School related traffic.

The above is not meant to fully define the study for the proposer nor is intended to relay all the issues that may be defined during a course of a study. The above is only intended to provide a context to the corridor and to provide background information on past issues and projects underway.

B. DATA ACQUISITION

The consultant will identify the information and data needed to accomplish all facets of the planning effort; will gather and evaluate information and data already available; and, will collect or develop any additional information required to accomplish the work tasks. Any existing data used in this effort will be adequately referenced to allow plan users and reviewers the ability to identify and obtain the referenced data and information. 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, MAPO staff will assist the consultant in identifying and gathering the documents listed below):

- Adopted community plans and studies, land use information, zoning
- Adopted Long Range Transportation Plan and associated data.
- Intersection Control Evaluations.
- Traffic counts, accident data, HPMS data, signal warrants, aerial photos, major street network classifications, sign inventories, traffic signal data, GIS/CADD property and ROW 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
- City building permits, County permits, utility records, etc.
- Socioeconomic data and projections compiled by the MAPO staff and the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED).
- GIS data/layers, as available from City, County and State.
C. PLANNING ANALYSIS

Existing Conditions:
Riverfront Drive is minor arterial in Mankato extending from Highway 14 interchange to The Highway 169/60 interchange and contains 3.5 miles of local roadway.

The City will provide data on roadway and right-of-way widths, public utilities, crash data, traffic control, and traffic volumes and turning movement count if available, and 2013 aerial photography and contours, GIS database, and other information where available. 2015 aerial photography and contours may be available during the term of the study depending on scheduled updates.

The MAPO will furnish studies, documents, and information, including the MAPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan and the most recent 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Plan.

Future Conditions:
The consultant will work with the City of Mankato and MAPO to prepare 25 year traffic projections for Riverfront Drive, major intersections and other roadways that could handle impact traffic movements in the corridor. Traffic projections shall be subject to review and concurrence by City of Mankato and MPO staff and shall at a minimum include a traffic analysis with a no-build option and a redevelopment option for various segments of Riverfront Drive.

The consultant’s analysis should determine future capacities, identifying locations with future potential for capacity and safety deficiencies, along with costs for correcting these deficiencies. Included in the analysis, the consultant should examine the community impacts resulting from an increase in traffic flow.

Alternative Analysis:
The consultant’s analysis shall consider the elements described under Description of Project Components above in this RFP in regards to alternatives intersection alignments and configurations, lane adjustments, pedestrian crossings, non-motorized traffic accommodations, intersection control, etc. The alternative analysis should also include a focus on Complete Streets improvements for the length of Riverfront Drive, including possible transit orientated alternatives for the City Center, including Old Town. The consultant should also be aware that one alternative that will be explored is the possible realignment of the Madison Avenue/Riverfront Drive and 3rd Avenue intersection area. The nearby quarry area is being proposed for reclamation and possible redevelop and realignment may be possible.

The analysis of the elements shall include impacts to levels of service for Riverfront Drive and intersecting and parallel roadways.

Recommendations:
The recommendations of an array of multi-modal alternatives should provide reasonable detail including but not limited to, number and width of lanes, vertical and horizontal alignments to determine right-of-way widths and slope easements, intersection configuration including turn lanes and traffic control, drainage, major water and sewer and utility relocations,
bicycle, pedestrian, and transit (if applicable) facilities etc. Each alternative should include a matrix of impacts.

D. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

This plan development process will entail public involvement that will be consistent with the MAPO’s Public Involvement Plan. The consultant will include a brief public involvement plan in its response to this RFP. The proposed involvement plan will be reviewed and approved during the negotiation of a final contract. The proposed plan should include at least the following:

- Mechanisms for informing and educating the public about the plan development process and any significant issues under consideration.
- Mechanisms for gathering public response to the consultant’s recommendations and alternatives. Plans for informing and gathering input from units of local government, including appropriate boards and commissions.
- Mechanisms for presenting proposed actions and alternatives at public meetings/hearings.
- Mechanisms for documenting involvement, as well as analyzing and summarizing responses received during all phases of the plan development process.
- Examples of materials/processes the consultant proposes to use to communicate to and solicit input from the public (media releases, handouts, websites, displays, questionnaires/surveys, graphics, etc.).
- Innovative public involvement techniques and visualizations.
- The Public Involvement Plan will have a clear identification of methods by which traditionally underserved populations are involved in the Plan development, as well as an analysis of how low income and minority populations are being impacted by proposed projects. The Plan will have a summary of outreach methods, as well as a dispensation of any comments received from such populations.

Minimum meeting requirements include:

The consultant will provide weekly updates, via telephone with the MAPO staff and monthly written memorandums for review by the MAPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Board. The project will involve a minimum of three (3) personal appearances at appropriate times throughout the development of the project with the TAC and City of Mankato and a minimum of two (2) personal appearances at the Policy Board and City Council of Mankato.

At the minimum, one public meeting should be held midway in the study process, after an array of Draft alternatives have been developed, to gather the opinions and concerns of the public. The input from the public meeting shall be recorded and all concerns and suggestions will be included and addressed in the corridor study.

After the draft study report has been reviewed and commented on by the City of Mankato, MAPO, Blue Earth County, and MNDOT management, a second public meeting should be held to present the alternatives to the public and gather the opinions and concerns of all parties.

The consultant will then seek study approval or acceptance from the City of Mankato and the MPO Policy Board respectively.
E. PROJECT SCHEDULE
The proposed schedule for this project is:
RFP Submittal Deadline __________
RFP Review Completion & Ranking ____________
Selection and Notification of Firm ____________
Negotiation of Scope of Work and Work Fee ______________
Anticipated Notice to Proceed ___________
Final Project Report& Presentations ____________

III. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Proposals are due by 4:30 P.M. on _____________ to the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization, Attn: Mr. Paul Vogel, Executive Director, 10 Civic Center Plaza, Mankato, MN 56001. The Proposer must submit one (1) unbound original, three (3) bound copies, and an electronic version of the proposal on a flash drive. Proposals are to be submitted in a sealed mailing envelope or package, clearly marked “Proposal: Mankato/North Mankato MAPO 2045 Transportation Plan” on the outside.

The submittal will follow the order below and include, at a minimum, the following information:

- A cover letter, signed and dated by the person or an authorized representative of the organization making the submittal.
- A brief statement of the consultant’s understanding of the goals of this project and of the services requested in this RFP.
- A proposed work plan indicating: 1) tasks to be accomplished; 2) work schedule; 3) consultant personnel/subcontractors expected to perform each major task; 4) person/hours and costs required to accomplish each task; and, 5) the anticipated involvement, and the timing of that involvement, from the MAPO staff and MnDOT staff. The consultant shall identify possible activities to be performed by said staff in the coordination of public involvement meetings, etc. The cost for services will only be used as an indicator of the consultant’s understanding of the requirements of this RFP. As such, the proposed cost for services should be included in the consultant’s proposal. The total cost for services should include a breakdown of: 1) staff hours for each individual person assigned to the project; 2) hourly rates for each staff person; 3) fringe benefit rates; 4) overhead rates; 5) direct costs; etc.
- A public involvement plan, which details the consultant’s plan for soliciting public input and which identifies the specific mechanisms to be used in meeting the requirements presented in the Public Involvement section of this RFP.
- Qualifications of key individuals to be assigned to this project, their availability during the relevant time periods, and their recent experience on similar projects.
- References for whom the consultant and/or key personnel have performed similar work within the last ten years and three examples of work produced under similar contracts. (Examples are preferred, where the key personnel identified for this proposal were used.)
IV. CONSULTANT SELECTION

A Consultant Selection Committee will be convened to evaluate and rank the consultants that respond to this RFP. This evaluation will be based on the submitted proposals and (at the discretion of the Committee) on interviews with those consultants who appear to be particularly well qualified, as determined from their written proposals.

Format:
All respondents are required to follow the format specified below.

Cover Letter:
Please include the following in your two-page maximum cover letter:

- Identify team members (partners(s) and sub-consultants); and include the title and signature of the primary firm’s principal in charge of the project. The signatory shall be a person with official authority to bind the company.
- Describe why your team is the best qualified to perform this comprehensive planning study.
- Identify the location and address of your office location(s) (firms or teams with multiple office locations must indicate the office that will be responsible for completing the scope of work).
- Describe those conditions, constraints or problems that are unique to the scope of work that may adversely affect either the cost or work progress of the Plan.

Team Qualifications (Statement of Qualifications):
Provide qualifications, capacity and availability of the project team and technical personnel of the team to complete the Scope of Work.

- Identify all personnel to be used on this project, their area of expertise, registration, special training and office location. Identify how much of each person’s time will be spent on the project.
- Provide resumes of above personnel, including specific related project experience; identify when applicable project experience for each person was obtained. (can be put in Appendix)
- Provide a specific outline and description of the support services proposed to complete the entire project from start to finish, including subcontractors, labs, etc.
- Fee and total cost untold reimbursements

Methods and Work Plan:
Describe your methods and plan to complete the Scope of Work. Include how you will engage the community and stakeholder groups and organizations. Provide suggestions for phasing the project if different from the proposed method.

Schedule and Critical Path Timeline with Deliverables:
Provide an outline of your anticipated schedule for completing the Scope of Work beginning with issuance of a notice to proceed to submitting the final work product. The Schedule must show how final product will be completed and considered for adoption by February 2017.
**Previous Projects:**
Provide relevant information regarding at least three similar projects completed in the previous ten years. Please include the following:
- Name and location of projects.
- Names of proposed team members who worked on sample projects.
- Sample content, layout, graphics and renderings.
- Client name, contact person and phone number.
- Range of contract value.

**Evaluation of Proposals:**
The Proposals will be evaluated and ranked in accordance with the following factors:

20% - 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.

25% - 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.

25% - The Responder’s record of past performance on similar projects, including quality of work, ability to control costs, and ability to meet schedules.

10% - The availability of personnel and other specialized resources to perform the work within the specified time limit.

20% - Total cost and associated hours of work compared to other proposals.

Upon approval, negotiations will commence with the highest ranked consultant. MAPO, upon reaching agreement on a final work plan and fee, will consider the contract, with a staff recommendation for award. If agreement cannot be reached with the highest ranked consultant, negotiations will proceed with the second ranked consultant, and so forth.
V.  ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Request for Clarification
In the event the MAPO believes that additional clarification of a proposal is needed in order to make a determination regarding the proposal, 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.

Proposal Questions
Responders are encouraged to promptly notify MAPO of any inconsistencies, problems or ambiguities in this RFP. Any questions regarding this RFP must be submitted to:

Paul Vogel, Executive Director
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
507-387-8613
pvogel@mankatomn.gov

The last date MAPO staff will answer questions regarding this RFP will be 2/08/2016. Questions will be answered as they come in and sent to asking respondent.

General Information
Responders must adhere to all terms of this RFP. Late proposals will not be considered. All costs incurred in responding to this RFP will be borne by the Responder. Fax and e-mail proposals will not be considered.

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 the 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 judgments 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 a 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 the 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.

Responses to this RFP will not be open for public review until MAPO decides to pursue a Contract and that Contract is executed.

**Federal Requirements**

Any contract entered into between MAPO and the contractor shall be subject to the Required Federal Clauses, the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Special Provisions, and Required Affidavits and Certifications attached to this request for proposals.
II. SCOPE OF WORK

The following is the minimum work requested under this RFP. Before proceeding with work tasks, the selected consultant will be required to prepare a final work plan for inclusion into a contract agreement.

A. REQUESTED STUDY

This is a request to qualified planning and engineering firms in conducting a transportation corridor study. The study of the Belgrade Avenue corridor in North Mankato, MN will evaluate management of existing and future traffic flow along Belgrade Avenue, with discussion on alternative lane configurations, access management, intersection control options, alternative intersection designs, pedestrian connectivity within the various land use districts along the roadway, and possible impacts on parallel streets associated with the alternatives.

The Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) will fund the study. The study will have cooperative federal oversight from the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

In accordance with FHWA, FTA, and MNDOT policies, the MAPO will be responsible for the funding of this study. The desire is to engage the services of a qualified transportation/civil-engineering firm to carry out this work. The selected firm will coordinate all work with North Mankato City staff during the corridor study process and all content within the study will be approved by the City of North Mankato.

The study should contain a study report with the following areas covered, at a minimum: Existing Conditions, Traffic Analysis, Issues, Alternative Development, and Alternative Evaluation.

Description of Project Components:

The proposed study shall provide alternatives that will address the needs for traffic flow and level of service along with land use considerations, pedestrian/bicycle connectivity, and contextual traffic characteristics for the next 25 years and beyond along this corridor. The study shall include details of each alternative, including right-of-way utilization, roadway plans, alternative intersection alignments and traffic control, estimated costs, analysis of the effects and needed improvements, and the adequacy and need of the traffic control on connecting roadways and intersections. Adjacent property owner concerns shall be addressed, including access, pedestrian safety, addition and/or loss of parking, etc. Impacts on parklands, schools, and and/or other particular concerns shall also be addressed.

The consultant will analyze existing traffic conditions for Belgrade Avenue and at major intersections and other roadways that may handle appreciable traffic passing through, entering or exiting the corridor, determine existing capacities, identify locations with existing or short term potential for capacity and safety deficiencies, access management and control to adjacent properties, and propose alternatives for correcting these deficiencies.
This corridor study should include the following, at a minimum:

- Review of existing and proposed land use
- Review of past planning documents and studies
- Access management
- Analysis of existing facilities
- Preparation of 25-year traffic projections based on projected land use.
- 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 Belgrade Avenue/TH 169 southbound ramp intersection and the Belgrade Avenue/Lee Boulevard intersection.
- Evaluation of possible alternative intersection traffic control at the remaining major intersections.
- Traffic Operations Analysis
- Analysis and Compilation of Crash Data
- Environmental and social impacts (screening level only)
- Evaluation of advantages and disadvantages and cost comparisons of the various alternatives
- 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.

The Consultant shall propose a schedule and a methodology for a public participation process suitable for the scope of this study.

**Contextual Summary of Study Area:**

The Belgrade Avenue corridor is a transportation corridor through the North Mankato valley that runs from the Highway 169 off ramp to Lee Boulevard. Belgrade Avenue serves as the main access to the Veterans Memorial Bridge which leads into the City of Mankato. The roadway is classified as a minor arterial with traffic volumes ranging from 6,700 AADT to 9,800 AADT.

As there are various land uses along the corridor, there are two primary zoning classifications along the Belgrade Avenue. From the Veterans Memorial Bridge to Center Street, the zoning is classified as Central Business District (CBD). The 200 Block of Belgrade Avenue contains the highest concentration of businesses in a downtown setting and carries the highest AADT on four lanes of traffic. From Range Street to Center Street there is a mix of businesses, multi-family dwellings and single-family dwellings on two lanes of traffic. From Center Street to Lee Boulevard the zoning is primarily R-1, One-Family Dwelling on two lanes of traffic. The North
Mankato Municipal Building, Police Annex and Library are located on Belgrade Avenue near the Lee Boulevard intersection.

The City of North Mankato believes that the primary attention of the corridor study will focus on the 200 block of Belgrade Avenue, anticipated redevelopment at the intersections of Range, Cross, Center, and Sherman Streets, and emphasis on Belgrade’s intersections with Highway 169 and Lee Boulevard.

The City of North Mankato has initiated a Downtown Redevelopment Study for the segment of Belgrade Avenue between TH 169 and Center Street. It is anticipated that the preparation of the downtown redevelopment study will continue concurrently with the Belgrade Avenue Corridor Study.

The above is not meant to fully define the study for the proposer nor is intended to relay all the issues that may be defined during a course of a study. The above is only intended to provide a context to the corridor.

**Information to be Provided by the City of North Mankato:**

- Previously prepared plans and studies
- Anticipated future land use in areas adjacent to the Belgrade Avenue corridor
- Belgrade Avenue Redevelopment Plan (to be prepared concurrently with Corridor Study).
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**Map Disclaimer**

The information contained in the following maps is a compilation of data from various federal, state, county, regional, and municipal sources. Geographic information has limitations due to the scale, resolution, date and interpretation of the original source materials. Users should consult available data documentation to determine limitations and the precision to which the data depicts distance, direction, location or other geographic characteristics. These maps and/or data are not legal survey documents to be used for describing land for the purpose of ownership or title.

**Federal Transportation Bill Disclaimer**

The information contained in the following document references the previous Federal Surface Transportation Bill Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). On December 4th the current Federal Surface Transportation Bill “Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act” was signed into Law. Because the 2016-2019 STIP has already been adopted the MAPO will be referencing MAP-21 in this document.
Decisions about transportation investments require collaboration and cooperation between different levels of government and neighboring jurisdictions. As a document, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) reports how the various jurisdictions within the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) area have prioritized their use of limited federal highway and transit funding.

The TIP process serves to implement projects identified in the Mankato/North Mankato area long range transportation plan (LRTP). The MAPO TIP document programs project funding for metropolitan area.

Development of both the LRTP and the TIP are facilitated by the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO), the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO).

Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization

The Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) was established in 2012 in response to the 2010 U.S. Census, which designated the Mankato/North Mankato region as an urbanized area (metropolitan statistical area--MSA), requiring the formation of a metropolitan planning agency.

MAPO meets and maintains a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive metropolitan transportation planning process to provide maximum service to citizens since roads and other transportation systems don’t start and stop at jurisdictional lines. In other words, the federal government wished to see federal transportation funds spent in a manner that has a basis in metropolitan region-wide plans developed through intergovernmental collaboration, rational analysis, and consensus-based decision making.

As the federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the MAPO provides a 3C (comprehensive, coordinated and cooperative) planning process for all modes of transportation throughout the MAPO planning area. The geographical boundary of the MAPO area can be seen in Map 1 on page 3.
In the transportation planning process, the MAPO’s roles include:

- Maintaining a certified “3-C” transportation planning process: continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive.
- Coordinating the planning and implementation activities of local, regional, and state transportation agencies.
- Undertaking an effective public participation process, which ensures meaningful public input, is part of the decision-making process behind plans and programs.
- Providing leadership both in setting transportation policy and in metropolitan system planning.
- Lending technical support in planning and operations to local governments.
- Planning for an intermodal transportation system that is economically efficient, environmentally sound, provides the foundation to compete in the global economy, and will move people and goods in an efficient manner.
Map 1: Mankato/North Mankato Metropolitan Planning Area
The current federal transportation bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP 21) retains the eight planning factors identified in 23 U.S.C. § 134(f) that must be considered in the transportation planning process. The process used to select projects to be programmed through the Mankato/North Mankato TIP is based on these factors:

1) **Support economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency.

2) **Increase safety** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.

3) **Increase security** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.

4) **Increase accessibility and mobility** of people and freight.

5) **Protect and enhance the environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns.

6) **Enhance integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes, people and freight.

7) **Promote efficient system management** and operation.

8) **Emphasize preservation** of the existing transportation system.

**The Transportation Improvement Program**

The TIP is a federally mandated, annually prepared document that contains highway, transit, and other transportation projects that are being recommended for federal funding during the next four years in the metropolitan area. The projects included in each year’s TIP ultimately come from the area’s long range transportation plan (LRTP), and are aimed at meeting the long-range needs of the transportation system. Implementing agencies, however, propose projects to the MAPO on an annual basis to be coordinated into a comprehensive listing of the area’s federally funded transportation improvements planned for the short range (next 4 years). These listings include information regarding cost, specific funding sources, project timing, etc. Once in the TIP, projects represent a commitment to fund those projects on the part of the implementing agency.

TIPs are developed for each metropolitan area by the MPO, in cooperation with the state (MnDOT) and the area transit authority. They must comply with regulations issued by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit
Administration (FTA), but can be revised or amended at any time during the program year by action of the MPO. The TIP projects programmed for Mankato/North Mankato area must match those included in the Minnesota statewide transportation improvement programs (STIPs).

The MAPO and its Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), is involved in the development of the TIP, and the MAPO Policy Board reviews for approval the TIP.

The TIP and its Connection to the Long Range Transportation Plan

As stated above, the projects in the 2016-2019 TIP originate from the Mankato/North Mankato long range transportation plan (LRTP). The LRTP contains a list of short-, mid-, and long-range transportation projects that are planned for the metropolitan area over the next twenty five years.

The regional transportation goals and objectives identified in the LRTP set the broad policy framework for planning transportation improvements and the projects entering the TIP are intended to come from the LRTP or support the long-range goals and objectives established in that framework. The Mankato/North Mankato LRTP identifies how each project or program in the TIP will support the MAPO key performance areas which include: access and reliability economic vitality, safety, preservation and multimodal transport.

Federal Funding Sources

Projects included in the 2016-2019 Mankato/North Mankato Area TIP will be funded by one of the following funding categories. Funding sources are identified in the project tables (pages 6 - 7) by the acronym in parentheses after each funding name listed below. Legislation allows MnDOT to reserve the ability to determine which of these funding categories (and how much of each) will ultimately be used to fund any given project in the TIP. As such, the amounts and types of funding shown in the project tables may be subject to modification.
National Highway Performance Program (NHPP):
The National Highway Performance Program combines the former Interstate Maintenance (IM), the National Highway System (NHS), and Highway Bridge (BH) programs of SAFETEA-LU. NHPP funding is targeted at projects aimed at achieving national performance goals for improving the infrastructure condition, safety, mobility, and/or freight movement of facilities that are part of the National Highway System.

Surface Transportation Program (STP):
The Surface Transportation Program provides flexible funding that may be used by States and localities for projects on any highway designated eligible for Federal-Aid, bridge projects on any public road, on non-motorized paths, and on transit capital projects, including bus purchases. States and localities are responsible for a 20% share of STP-funded project costs.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP):
The Highway Safety Improvement Program is aimed at achieving a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads and is related to addressing conditions identified in a state’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). Funds may be used for a variety of safety improvements on any public road, and publicly owned bicycle and pedestrian pathways or trails are also eligible for HSIP dollars. The federal share is 90% (for certain projects it can be 100%), and up to 10% of a state’s HSIP funds can be used to help fund other activities including education, enforcement and emergency medical services.

Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP):
The Transportation Alternatives Program is a revision of the former Transportation Enhancements program under SAFETEA-LU and now funds projects that were previously funded under the Recreational Trails and Safe Routes to School programs. It is derived as a set-aside from each state’s annual NHPP, STP, HSIP, and CMAQ apportionments. Eligible projects include, but are not limited to, the creation of facilities for pedestrians and bikes, environmental mitigation or habitat protection as related to highway construction or operations, as well as infrastructure and non-infrastructure related Safe Routes to School activities. States and localities are responsible for 20% of TAP funds applied to projects. States may also transfer up to 50% of TAP funds to NHPP, STP, HSIP, CMAQ, and/or Metro Planning.
Federal Transit Administration (FTA):
Transit funding authorized by MAP-21 is managed in several ways. The largest amount is distributed to the states by formula; other program funds are discretionary. FTA transit allocations may be administered by the state or be granted directly to the transit agency. Projects identified as FTA-funded in the 2016-2019 Mankato/North Mankato Area TIP generally represent one of a number of subcategories that represent different funding programs administered by the FTA to provide either capital or operating assistance to public transit providers.

High Priority Project (HPP):
The High Priority Projects program provides designated funding for specific projects as were identified in the previous federal transportation bill, the *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU)*. Funds designated for an HPP project are available only for that project. There are few technical exceptions that may alter how such funds are ultimately applied, but only within the same state for which those funds were originally designated.

Local Funds (LF):
Funding identified as “LF” in the 2016-2019 Mankato/North Mankato Area TIP indicates projects that are being funded almost exclusively with local funds, but are identified as regionally significant and are therefore included in the TIP.
Chapter 2

FY 2016-2019 TIP Projects

The tables that follow on pages 9 - 12 list all the transportation projects scheduled for federal and/or state funding in the Mankato/North Mankato area. The map on page 13 depicts the location of each project. The structure of the tables is as follows:

COLUMN TITLE

LRTP Reference – Page reference to where the project can be found in the LRTP.

State Project ID – Links the project to the statewide transportation improvement program (STIP).

Agency/Route – Local jurisdiction responsible for the project and the route number where the project is occurring.

Project Type – Identifies if project is primarily road, ped/bike, transit-related, etc.

Type of Work – Identifies if project is maintenance, reconstruction, safety improvements, etc.

Project Description – Scope of project, its location, length, etc.

Original Program Year – Year the project was originally programmed for.

Project Status – Whether project is currently in the planning, engineering, or construction phase.

Air Quality Conformity – Determination of project impacts on air quality made after consultation with MPCA, Mn/DOT and FHWA.

Type of Funds – Identifies the federal funding programs intended to be the primary funding sources for the project.

Fed $ (Non-AC) - Funding from the federal government, that is not an advanced construction project.

Fed AC $ – Federal dollars set for a project, but not paid until the following year.

State T.H. or Bond $ – State of Minnesota funding for projects.

Other $ – Funding coming from other sources, including local city, county, transit agency, or WISDOT funds.

Project Total $ – Total anticipated cost of the project.
### Table 1: FY 2016 Federal & State Funded Transportation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRTP Reference</th>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ROUTE SYSTEM</th>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILES</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>TYPE OF WORK</th>
<th>PROPOSED FUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>FHWA</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>BOND</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>TRF-0028-16A</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>SECT 5307: CITY OF MANKATO RR TRANSIT OPERATING ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>OPERATE BUS</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>1,751,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>435,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,315,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>TRF-0028-16B</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>SECT 5307: CITY OF MANKATO RR TRANSIT PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>OPERATE BUS</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>TRS-0028-16</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>CITY OF MANKATO PURCHASE 1 BUS (CLASS 400) AND BUS RELATED EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>PURCHASE BUS</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>135,795</td>
<td>108,636</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082</td>
<td>MSAS 111</td>
<td>150-070-001AC</td>
<td>NORTH MANKATO <strong>AC</strong> MSAS 111, LOOKOUT DRIVE AND TH 14 WEST BOUND RAMP, CONSTRUCT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>GRADE AND SURFACE</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>MSAS 117</td>
<td>137-117-001</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MANKATO</td>
<td>MSAS 117, ON MAY STREET FROM RIVERFRONT DRIVE TO NORTH 6TH STREET, RECONSTRUCT ROADWAY (FED $ CAPPED)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>GRADE AND SURFACE</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>1,072,120</td>
<td>679,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>392,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-28</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>US 14</td>
<td>0702-116AC3</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td><strong>LGA</strong> US 14, CSAH 12 &amp; TH 14 BRIDGE #07587 &amp; RAMPS (LGA PAYBACK TO COUNTY 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NEW BRIDGE</td>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>2,225,962</td>
<td>2,225,962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-28</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>US 14</td>
<td>0702-121</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>US 14 NEAR JCT OF CSAH 55 AND LE RAY AVE, CONCRETE PAVEMENT REHAB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>CONCRETE P AVEMENT REHAB</td>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-28</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>US 14</td>
<td>0702-1215</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td><strong>SEC164 DPS</strong> US 14, 0.41 MI W OF CSAH 56 TO 0.19 MI E OF CSAH 17, NEAR EAGLE LAKE, INTERSECTION MODIFICATIONS &amp; IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION</td>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-17</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>US 169</td>
<td>5211-59</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td><strong>FMP</strong> US 169, FROM 0.6 MI N OF TH 14 TO 0.1 MI S OF TH 99, GRADE, SURFACE AND MEDIAN WORK, REPLACE BR 8846 WITH NEW BR 52X07 &amp; EXTEND CULVERTS 52X02</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>GRADE AND SURFACE</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-17</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>US 169</td>
<td>5211-61</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>US 169, FROM 1.0 MI N OF TH 14 TO 1.5 MI S OF SOUTH JCT TH 99, MILL AND CONCRETE OVERLAY &amp; SIGNING</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>MILL AND OVERLAY</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>11,300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,269,877</td>
<td>5,443,798</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>623,755</td>
<td>11,400,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>1,802,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: FY 2017 Federal & State Funded Transportation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO: MANKATO-NORTH MANKATO AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>FY 2016 - FY 2019 STIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRTP REFERENCE</td>
<td>SEQ #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-30</td>
<td>1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-21</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-28</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total         |       |               |               |      |        |                      |       |         |             |                | 10,873,237 | 2,725,876 | 623,755 | -   | -  | 7,523,606 |

2016–2019 MAPO Area Transportation Improvement Program
### Table 3: FY 2018 Federal & State Funded Transportation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRT REFERENCE</th>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ROUTE SYSTEM</th>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILES</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>TYPE OF WORK</th>
<th>PROPOSED FUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>FHWA</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>BOND</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>TRF-0028-18A</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>SECT 5307: CITY OF MANKATO RR TRANSIT OPERATING ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>OPERATE BUS</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>1,751,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>435,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,315,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>TRF-0028-18B</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>SECT 5307: CITY OF MANKATO RR TRANSIT PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>OPERATE BUS</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>263,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>TRS-0028-18</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>CITY OF MANKATO PURCHASE 1 BUS (CLASS 400) AND BUS RELATED EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>PURCHASE BUS</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>148,390</td>
<td>118,712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172</td>
<td>MSAS 116</td>
<td>150-116-009AC</td>
<td>2018 MANKATO</td>
<td><strong>AC</strong> MSAS 116, ON LOOKOUT DRIVE FROM NORTHRIDGE DRIVE TO HOWARD DRIVE IN NORTHERN MANKATO, RECONSTRUCT (PAYBACK 1 OF 1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>GRADE AND SURFACE</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>1,580,000</td>
<td>1,580,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-25</td>
<td>MSAS 138</td>
<td>137-138-001</td>
<td>2018 MANKATO</td>
<td>MSAS 138, ALONG WARREN STREET FROM BALCERZAK DRIVE TO STADIUM RD, CONSTRUCT SIDEWALK AND ADDITIONAL PEDESTRIAN CHANNELIZATION AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>PED./BIKE IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>721,485</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>321,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,463,875</td>
<td>2,098,712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>623,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,741,408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016–2019 MAPO Area Transportation Improvement Program
Table 4: FY 2019 Federal & State Funded Transportation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRTP REFERENCE</th>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ROUTE SYSTEM</th>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILES</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>TYPE OF WORK</th>
<th>PROPOSED FUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>FHWA</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>BOND</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>TRF-0028-19A</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>SECT 5307: CITY OF MANKATO RR TRANSIT OPERATING ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>OPERATE BUS</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>1,751,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>435,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,315,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-33</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>TRF-0028-19B</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>MNDOT</td>
<td>SECT 5307: CITY OF MANKATO RR TRANSIT PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>OPERATE BUS</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,006,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>623,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,382,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 2: Location of 2016-2019 TIP Projects
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Project Selection

The most recent federal funding and authorization bill for transportation, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) was signed into law in July 2012, bringing significant changes to the levels of federal funding that are available to the various jurisdictions within the MAPO planning area. Even though the flexibility created in previous transportation bills to direct money to the highest local priorities and across different modes has, for the most part, been retained, the amount of funding now available to local jurisdictions has been reduced. Federal priority has been shifted to the preservation of nationally significant infrastructure, and so more funding is now going to the states to maintain and operate those facilities that make up the national highway system.

As with the previous federal transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU (2005), MAP-21 continues to call for the prioritization of projects on a statewide basis, which leads to the development of a Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The statewide program is informed by those projects developed at the local level. Therefore, the state and local projects programmed in the STIP must be reflected in the local TIPs.

As the designated MPO for the Mankato/North Mankato area, the MAPO is responsible for developing a list of priority transportation projects for the Mankato metropolitan area for the purpose of programming funding through MAP-21. It is required to work in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Transportation, Mankato Transit Authority, and local units of government to identify area transportation priorities and produce the annual TIP. The drafting of this document is done in conjunction with the development of a larger regional program carried out with regional partners of the Minnesota Department of Transportation District 7 Area Transportation Partnership (ATP).

MnDOT District 7 Area Transportation Partnership

The State of Minnesota uses a mechanism called the Area Transportation Partnership (ATP) for distributing federal transportation funds throughout the state. The Mankato/North Mankato Metropolitan Area is served by the MnDOT’s District 7 ATP, which is made up of local elected officials, planners, engineers, modal representatives, tribal governments, and other agencies from MnDOT District 7 that serve the thirteen counties of Blue Earth, Brown, Cottonwood, Faribault, Jackson, LeSueur, Martin, Nicollet, Nobles, Rock, Sibley, Waseca, and Watonwan counties (Figure 1, page 15). Similar to the MAPO, the purpose of the ATP is to prioritize projects in the larger region for receiving federal funding. This priority list is combined with priority lists from
other ATPs around the state that ultimately make up the STIP.

Under the ATP 7, there are ATP subcommittees that represent each of the funding areas that the ATP helps program: TAP, STP-Small Urban, STP-Rural, and Transit. Representatives from the subcommittees include: counties; cities; transit; MnDOT; Region Nine RDC; Southwest RDC and the MAPO.

Although projects from the thirteen counties and the MAPO are competing, in a sense, for the limited federal funding that comes to MnDOT District 7, the process used by the ATP aims to provide a degree of equity. Proposed projects are first reviewed by the ATP subcommittees. The subcommittees develop and recommends to the full ATP a draft Area Transportation Improvement Program (ATIP) based on funding targets, local priorities, and ATP-approved investment guidelines per mode. After ATP review and approval, the Draft ATIP is sent to MnDOT Central Office for compilation of the Draft STIP. The Draft STIP is again reviewed and potentially revised by the ATP. During this review period, the general public has the opportunity to comment on the ATIP. After all reviews are complete, the ATIP is submitted to MnDOT for inclusion in the final STIP.
Eligibility for Roadway and Transit Projects

Federal funds can be spent on any road functionally classified as a local collector or higher (i.e. major and minor arterials). MAP-21 provides funding for roadway projects through Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding programs and transit projects through Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding programs. FHWA-funded projects can be maintenance-, expansion-, safety-, or operations-related, as well as enhancement-related (bike & pedestrian improvements, scenic byways, etc.). Planning, technology and various other intermodal projects (ports, airports, etc.) are also eligible for FHWA funds. A portion of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding can also be “flexed” for transit improvements, which the ATP 7 has agreed to do in recent years in order to assist regional transit operators in maintaining their vehicle fleets.

Proposed Project Selection Process

The TIP process should result in projects that reflect the goals, objectives, and priorities of the Mankato/North Mankato area. As such, MAPO staff work with area jurisdictions to ensure that the projects that end up in the TIP are consistent with those goals, objectives, and priorities.

Before the projects are submitted to the MAPO, staff members meet with members of eligible jurisdictions to discuss their transportation improvement priorities and how those priorities fit within the goals and objectives spelled out in the MAPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Following these meetings, jurisdictions are asked to submit an official project application for each project. Staff review and score these applications and present their rankings to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in the first quarter of each year. The TAC then prioritizes the project proposals based on the criteria expressed in the scoring system described below. The scoring system weighs the merits of each project based on the evaluation criteria listed in Table 5 (page 16).

Proposed Project Evaluation and Prioritization

The MAPO project evaluation process establishes a framework for decision-makers to guide them in prioritizing projects submittals. The process was designed to help ensure that projects are consistent with the goals and objectives of the metro area and that limited financial resources are used in the most effective manner possible. Projects are separately prioritized by mode of transportation, specifically by road, transit, and rail. As mentioned above, rail projects are ranked separately. Projects funded through the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) are also ranked separately, as explained on
the following pages.

The MAPO’s process for evaluating and prioritizing area transportation projects is as follows:

- **Pre-Application Meetings (October)** – MAPO staff meet with each jurisdiction eligible for federal funding prior to project solicitation to review the MAPO’s Long Range Plan and other plans to examine which projects are identified as most important to the area’s transportation network.

- **Project Solicitation (November & December)** – MAPO sends out applications to all eligible jurisdictions, which have a period of time from the beginning of November to the middle of December to submit their applications.

- **MAPO Project Review & Scoring (January)** – MAPO staff, as a team, review and score each project submittal based on the following evaluation criteria and point system listed in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mobility</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>How will the project improve the mobility of people and goods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Planning Support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>How will the project incorporate the MAPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan or other MAPO studies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Multi-modalism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>How does the project encompass multiple modes of travel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>How will the project respond to environmental impacts and mitigation measures?</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Prioritization Meeting (February)** – MAPO staff presents projects and scores to the TAC. The TAC then scores the projects based on the evaluation criteria and approves a project ranking list. Next, the staff presents the projects and the TAC scores to the MAPO Policy Board for their review and approval.

- **MAPO Prioritized List (March)** – MAPO forwards the prioritized list of projects to MnDOT ATP 7 for inclusion into the ATIP and eventually into the STIP.
Projects funded through the Transportation Alternatives Program
Several discretionary funding programs authorized under SAFETEA-LU are now combined under the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) of MAP-21. This includes funding for the former Transportation Enhancements, Recreational Trails, Safe Routes to School programs. Construction, planning, and design for these types of projects are all eligible activities under TAP, as well as projects related to environmental mitigation, or the maintenance and preservation of historic transportation facilities. Similar to STP funds, TAP funds are allocated to the State DOT and then sub-allocated to the local level. MnDOT District 7 ATP has developed an application process and TAP sub committee made up of elected officials and transportation professionals that is facilitated by MnDOT District 7 Staff. The selected TAP projects are subject to the approval of the MnDOT District 7 ATP, but any selected TAP projects that are located within the MAPO area are automatically included in the MAPO’s TIP.
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Community Impact Assessment

In 1994, Presidential Executive Order 12898 mandated that every federal agency incorporate environmental justice in its mission by analyzing and addressing the effects of all programs, policies, and activities on minority and low income populations. Drawing from the framework established by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as well as the 1969 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) set forth the following three principles to ensure non-discrimination in its federally funded activities:

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

Therefore, Environmental Justice/Community Impact Assessment is a public policy goal of ensuring that negative impacts resulting from government activities do not fall disproportionately on minority or low income populations. While it is difficult to make significant improvements to transportation systems without causing impacts of one form or another, the concern is whether proposed projects negatively affect the health or environments of minority or low income populations. In the past, the impacts on these groups were often overlooked as potential criteria for project evaluation.

A community impact assessment highlights those transportation projects that could potentially have a negative impact on disenfranchised neighborhoods. Map 3 on the following page identifies the high-concentration areas of minority and low-income populations in the Mankato/North Mankato planning area and shows their location relative to the projects that are listed in this TIP.

Only three projects - the City of Mankato’s Safe Routes to School Project (137-591-003), Blue Earth County CSAH 12 road construction (007-612-021) and City of Mankato’s sidewalk and pedestrian along Warren Street (137138-001) represent the extension or creation of infrastructure. The City’s project is improving pedestrian facilities along existing roadways and the county’s project is creating a new roadway where there is currently minimal development. In all three cases these improvements are expected to benefit, rather than hinder, low-income individuals living in the area.
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Map 3: Project Locations and Concentrations of Minority Populations
Map 4: Project Locations and Low-Income Populations
As the federally designated MPO for the Mankato/North Mankato area, the MAPO must demonstrate fiscal constraint when programming funding for projects in the TIP. Under 23 CFR § 450.324(h), the MAPO is required to include a financial plan for the projects being programmed in the TIP, as well as demonstrate the ability of its jurisdictions to fund these projects while continuing to also fund the necessary operations and maintenance (O&M) of the existing transportation system. To comply with these requirements, the MAPO has examined past trends regarding federal, state, and local revenue sources for transportation projects in the area in order to determine what levels of revenue can be reasonably expected over the 2016-2019 TIP cycle. The resulting revenue estimates were then compared with the cost of the projects in the TIP, which are adjusted for inflation to represent year-of-expenditure.

Federal Funding Levels

Federally funded transportation projects within the MAPO area are programmed regionally through the MnDOT District 7 ATP process (see page 14 for more information). The District 7 ATP receives a targeted amount of federal funding for the District 7 MnDOT region which is further directed using a state-established formula and funding targets. Although subject to flexibility, these targets are used during development of the Mankato/North Mankato TIP, the MnDOT District 7 ATIP, and the MN state STIP help establish the priority list of projects. Table 6 on the following page identifies the funding targets that have been established for the MnDOT ATP 7 Region in the 2016-2019 TIP cycle.

Figure 2: FHWA & FTA Federal Funding to the District 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MAPO Funding</th>
<th>ATP 7 Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>$33,409,406</td>
<td>$195,484,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Annual Funding Targets for the District 7 ATP (FHWA & FTA formula funds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Target Federal Formula $ 2016-2019</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Crossings (administered statewide)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (Urban)</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (Rural)</td>
<td>$436,000</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp. Alternatives (formerly Enhancements)</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Small Urban</td>
<td>$1,580,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Rural</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN/DOT (SPP Pavement, SPP Bridge, DRMP - STP)</td>
<td>$55,100,000</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$62,236,000*</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total does not include Rail Crossing funding, which is handled centrally through MnDOT for entire state.

Financial Plan: Highway Investments

Table 7 on page 24 represents the MAPO Area’s financial plan for funding the highway projects being programmed in the 2016-2019 MAPO TIP. The table identifies individual funding sources as specified by each of the jurisdictions to be expected and available during the next four years based on revenue forecast with the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Assessment of Fiscal Constraint

The MAPO has assessed the ability of the area’s highway jurisdictions to meet their financial commitments with regards to the projects being programmed in the TIP while also continuing to fund their ongoing operations and maintenance (O&M). To demonstrate fiscal constraint, project costs were compared with budget data from previous years. Project costs have been adjusted to reflect an inflation rate of 4% per year (as they are also presented in the project tables on pages 8-12) to account for the effects of inflation at the year of expenditure. Revenue estimates were held flat over this same period, as budget increases cannot be reasonably assumed at this time.
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Table 7: Total Highway & Local Project Costs: 2016-2019 MAPO TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>EXPENSES (4-year total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT District 7</td>
<td>$21,425,962**</td>
<td>$4,660,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,085,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Earth County</td>
<td>$8,054,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,054,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicollet County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankato</td>
<td>$1,072,120</td>
<td>$516,407</td>
<td>$721,485</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,310,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mankato</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,580,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$23,128,082</td>
<td>$13,231,107</td>
<td>$2,301,485</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,660,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: 2016 – 2019 STIP.
** Note Project 5211-61 for 11.3M is only partially within the MAPO Planning Area

Table 8: Estimated Funding Revenue: 2016-2019 MAPO TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>2016-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT District 7</td>
<td>$18,480,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Earth County</td>
<td>$26,672,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicollet County</td>
<td>$2,543,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankato</td>
<td>$30,678,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mankato</td>
<td>$6,071,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$84,447,475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source Mankato/North Mankato Long Range Transportation Plan.

Financial Plan: Transit Investments

Table 9 and Table 10 on page 26 represents the Mankato Transit System financial plan for funding the transit projects listed in the 2016-2019 MAPO TIP. The tables identify specific sources of funding that the Mankato Transit has determined to be reasonably expected and available during the next four years.

Assessment of Fiscal Constraint

The MAPO has assessed the ability of the Mankato Transit System to meet their financial commitments with regards to the transit investments being programmed in the TIP while also continuing to fund their ongoing O&M. The costs of these investments have been adjusted to reflect an inflation rate of 3% per year (as they are also presented in the project tables on pages 8-12). In general, revenue estimates were not adjusted for inflation, as significant budget increases cannot be reasonably assumed at this time.
Table 9 shows the Mankato Transit System cost and project type for 2016 – 2019 TIP. When compared with the estimated revenue funding based on the MAPO Long Range Transportation Plan in Table 10, it can be seen that the Mankato Transit programmed investments for years 2016-2019 do not exceed the overall 4-year revenue average of $10,916,800. This demonstrates that the costs of the transit projects being programmed for the MAPO area within the bounds of the level of revenue that can be reasonably assumed to be available to the Mankato Transit System.

Table 9: Total Costs by Project Type: 2016-2019 MAPO TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>$2,006,000</td>
<td>$2,014,000</td>
<td>$2,014,000</td>
<td>$2,006,000</td>
<td>$8,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Purchases</td>
<td>$135,795</td>
<td>$288,130</td>
<td>$148,390</td>
<td></td>
<td>$572,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,141,795</td>
<td>$2,302,130</td>
<td>$2,162,390</td>
<td>$2,006,000</td>
<td>$8,612,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: 2016 – 2019 STIP.

Table 10: Estimated Transit Funding Revenue: 2016-2019 Mankato Area TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>2016-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue</td>
<td>$6,188,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue</td>
<td>$2,641,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox and Contract Revenue</td>
<td>$1,611,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Property Tax Levy</td>
<td>$475,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,916,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source Mankato/North Mankato Long Range Transportation Plan.
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Public Involvement

The MAPO is committed to being a responsive and participatory agency for regional decision-making. Public is given a continuous opportunity to view all TIP related materials on the MAPO website (http://www.mankatomin.gov/city-services-a-z/city-services-a-m/mankato-north-mankato-area-planning-organization-mapo) and provide comment via phone, or email.

2016-2019 Mankato/North Mankato TIP Public Participation Summary

As a newly established MPO and due to federally mandated timelines the Public Participation Process in the 2016-2019 MAPO TIP was conducted on a limited basis. MAPO worked with area partners and the Minnesota Department of Transportation to ensure the TIP matched the already approved 2016-2019 Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). As future TIP’s are developed MAPO staff will provide increased outreach throughout the TIP development process as outlined in the MAPO’s Public Participation Plan.

Public Comments Received

The MAPO received comments which can be read in the public comment log found below.

Table 11: Comments Received Through TIP Public Outreach Efforts

INSERT
The MAPO has the responsibility of monitoring and documenting the progress of projects listed in the TIP each year. Specifically, the MAPO is asked to note changes in priorities from prior years, as well as list the major projects from the previous TIP that have been either implemented or significantly delayed. Since the 2016 – 2019 TIP is MAPO’s first TIP monitoring progress will take place as future TIPs are developed.
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Common Acronyms

AC – Advance Construction
ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT – Average Daily Traffic
ARDC - Arrowhead Regional Development Commission
AQ - Air Quality
ATIP - Area Transportation Improvement Program
BR – Bridge Replacement
CBD - Central Business District
CMAQ - Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality
CO - Carbon Monoxide
CSAH - County State Aid Highway
EPA - Environmental Protection Agency
FHWA - Federal Highway Administration
FTA - Federal Transit Administration
FY - Fiscal Year
HPP - High Priority Projects
LRTP - Long Range Transportation Plan
MAP-21 - Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (2012 Federal Transportation Bill)
MAPO – Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
MnDOT - Minnesota Department of Transportation
MPCA - Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
MPO - Metropolitan Planning Organization
NAAQS - National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act
NHPP - National Highway Preservation Program (formerly the NHS program)
NHS - National Highway System program
NWRPC - Northwest Regional Planning Commission
SIP - State Implementation Plan
STIP - State Transportation Improvement Program
STP - Surface Transportation Program
STRIDE - Specialized Transportation RIDE
TAC - Transportation Advisory Committee to the MAPO
TAP - Transportation Alternatives Program (formerly Transportation Enhancements program)
TCM - Transportation Control Measures
TCP - Transportation Control Plan
TDP - Transportation Development Program
TEA-21 - Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century
TH - Trunk Highway
TIP - Transportation Improvement Program
TSM - Transportation System Management
SAFETEA-LU - Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
Public Notice

NOTICE OF 30-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

The Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO), located at the 10 Civic Center Plaza Mankato, MN 56001, has prepared a Draft Fiscal Year 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Mankato/North Mankato Metropolitan Area. The Draft TIP lists all transportation projects in the greater metropolitan area that are recommended by the MAPO Board to receive federal transportation funds for FY 2016-2019.

Public comments are being taken through March 7th on the Draft TIP and the proposed projects. To view the Draft TIP online, visit http://www.mankatomin.gov/city-services-a-z/city-services-a-m/mankato-north-mankato-area-planning-organization-mapo. To request a hard copy of the document, contact Jake Huebsch, who is taking all public comments on the document, at jhuebsch@mankatomin.gov or 507-387-8630. (Free TTY services are available through Minnesota Relay at 800-627-3529).

The Draft TIP, along with all comments received, will be considered for final approval at the MAPO Board meeting on March 10, 2015. The final version of the 2016-2019 TIP will be available to view after March 16th at http://www.mankatomin.gov/city-services-a-z/city-services-a-m/mankato-north-mankato-area-planning-organization-mapo or in person at the MAPO office.

Public comment is solicited for a 30-day period in accordance with the MAPO’s Public Involvement Plan for this Draft, as well as for the final TIP upon introduction of a major amendment.
MAPO Resolution Adopting the 2016-2019 TIP
A Regular meeting of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization Policy Board was held on December 3rd, 2015, at 6:00 p.m. in the Minnesota River Room of the Intergovernmental Center. Present Policy Board members, Dan Rotchadl, Chris Frederick, Bob Freyberg, Ryan Short and Mark Piepho. Also present was MAPO Executive Director Paul Vogel, MAPO Transportation Planner Jake Huebsch, also in attendance were members from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) that included, Al Forsberg, Mark Anderson and Jeff Johnson.

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

Motion to Approve Agenda
Mr. Rotchadl motioned to approve the agenda, Mr. Freyberg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Motion to Approve October 1st, 2015 Meeting Minutes
Mr. Rotchadl moved to approve the October 1st Policy Board meeting minutes, Mr. Short seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

New Business
Agenda 4.1 Resolution Adopting the Long Range Transportation Plan.
MAPO staff provided an update on the Long Range Transportation Plan and discussed the public open house which took place on October 15, 2015 and had approximately 40 people in attendance. Staff described the public comment period and process relating to the verbal and written comments from the public, MnDOT, TAC and FHWA. The public comment period ran from 10/2/2015 through 11/3/2015. In total approximately 130 comments were received with the majority of those being minor, grammatical errors or clarification.

Mr. Rotchadl moved and Mr. Freyberg seconded the motion approving the resolution adopting Long Range Transportation Plan. With all voting in favor, the motion passed.

Agenda 4.2 Resolution Amending 2015 Budget
Staff explained the Federal Transit Administration has delayed the deployment of a new grant application system, TrAMS, and limited the Minnesota Department of Transportation’s access to additional federal metropolitan transportation planning funds prior to January 1, 2016. The Minnesota Department of Transportation is amending the 2015 consolidated planning grant contract to include activities
identified in the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization 2016 Unified Planning Work Program to ensure the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization has uninterrupted access to federal metropolitan planning funds in 2016. Staff also explained the amount to be expended in 2015 is less than budgeted by $35,781 and because the reduction in the budget will exceed 5 percent of the total approved CPG budget for the MAPO. The MAPO’s 2015 budget is $329,687; the 2015 projected amount spent is anticipated to be $293,906.

Mr. Freyberg moved and Mr. Rotchadl seconded the motion approving the resolution amending 2015 budget. With all voting in favor, the motion passed.

**Agenda 4.3 FHWA Approved Functional Classification Map**
Staff presented the FHWA approved functional classification showing the updated functional classification system in the MAPO planning area

**TAC Comments**
Mr. Anderson provided a brief update regarding the regional transit study that is underway with Blue Earth County, Nicollet County, Le Sueur County and the City of St. Peter. The October 1st, 2015 MAPO TAC minutes were attached as informational.

**Policy Board Comments & Other Business**
None

**Adjournment**
With no further business, Mr. Rotchadl moved to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Freyberg seconded the motion. With all voting in favor the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

________________________
Chair, Mr. Piepho