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## Screening Board Data

DO YOU REMEMBER the picture (left) on the cover of last year's spring book?

Well, here is a picture (bottom) of the replacement structure on Sibley CSAH 9 located at Middle Branch of Rush River.


DATE: May 15, 1998

## TO: County Engineers District State Aid Engineers

SUBJECT: County Engineers' Screening Board Report
Enclosed herewith is a copy of the 1998 Spring County Engineers' Screening Board Report. This report has been prepared by the County State Aid Needs Unit, State Aid Division, Minnesota Department of Transportation.

The unit price data included in this booklet has been analyzed by the County State Aid Highway General Subcommittee and will be recommended to the Screening Board to be used in the 1998 C.S.A.H. Needs Study.

The additional mileage requests in the report have been reviewed by the Mileage Subcommittee and their recommendations are included in the individual sections.

If you have any comments, questions, or recommendations regarding this report, please forward them to your District Representative with a copy to this office prior to the meeting which is scheduled for June 10-11, 1998.

If you have a scenic picture or photo that represents your county which could be used for a future book cover, please send it to our office. We would appreciate your ideas.

Sincerely,


Kenneth M. Hoeschen, Manager
County State Aid Needs Unit
Enclosure: 1998 County Screening Board Report

## 1998 County Screening Board Data

A Casualty of the Floods of ' 97


DO YOU REMEMBER the picture (left) on the cover of last year's spring book?

Well, here is a picture (bottom) of the replacement structure on Sibley CSAH 9 located at Middle Branch of Rush River.
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## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD

| Chuck Schmit | (97-98) | - Cook County | - District 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mick Alm | (98-99) | - Norman County | - District 2 |
| Dave Schwarting | (97-98) | - Sherburne County | - District 3 |
| Merle Early | (98-99) | - Stevens County | District 4 |
| Ken Anderson | (96-99) | - Chisago County | - Metro |
| Roger Gustafson | (98-01) | - Carver County | - Metro |
| Greg Paulson | (98-99) | - Goodhue County | - District 6 |
| Marlin Larson | (97-98) | - Cottonwood County | - District 7 |
| Rick Kjonaas | (98-99) | - McLeod County | District 8 |
| Jon Olson | Permanent | - Anoka County | Urban |
| Dave Zech (Acting) | Permanent | - Dakota County | Urban |
| Vern Genzlinger | Permanent | - Hennepin County | - Urban |
| Paul Kirkwold, Chairman | Permanent | - Ramsey County | - Urban |
| Dick Hansen | Permanent | - St. Louis County | - Urban |
| Don Wisniewski | Permanent | - Washington County | - Urban |
| Dave Olsonawski, Secretary |  | - Hubbard County |  |

## 1998 SCREENING BOARD ALTERNATES

Lee Engstrom
Tara Ratzlaff
Rich Heilman
Dave Robley
Brad Larson
Mitch Rasmussen
Gary Stribley
Barry Anderson

- Itasca County
- Red Lake County
- Isanti County
- Douglas County
- Scott County
- Rice County
- Jackson County
- Yellow Medicine County

District 1
District 2
District 3
District 4
Metro
District 6
District 7
District 8

## 1998 CSAH GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE

| Brad Larson, Chairman | (June, 98) | - Scott County |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jack Cousins | (June, 99) | - Clay County |
| Rick Kjonaas | (June, 00) | - McLeod County |

## 1998 CSAH MILEAGE SUBCOMMITTEE

| Paul Kirkwold, Chairman | (Oct., 98) | - Ramsey County |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Al Goodman | (Oct., 99) | - Lake County |
| Craig Falkum | (Oct., 00) | - Wabasha County |

## CSAH VARIANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Bill Groskurth Don Wisniewski
Dave Schwarting

- Freeborn County
- Washington County
- Sherburne County
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## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA <br> JUNE, 1998

## Introduction

The primary tasks of the Screening Board at this meeting are to establish unit prices to be used for the 1998 County State Aid Highway Needs Study, and to review the recommendations of the Mileage Subcommittee relative to the mileage requests submitted.

As in other years, in order to keep the five-year average unit price study current, we have removed the 1992 construction projects and added the 1997 construction projects. The abstracts of bids on all State Aid and Federal Aid projects, let from 1993 through 1997, are the basic source of information for compiling the data used for computing the recommended 1998 unit prices. As directed by the 1986 Screening Board, urban design projects have been included in the five year average unit price study. The gravel base unit price data obtained from the 1997 projects was transmitted to each county engineer for their approval. Any necessary corrections or changes received from the county engineers were made prior to the Subcommittee's review and recommendation.

Minutes of the General Subcommittee meeting hela April 20, 1998 are included in the "Reference Material" section of this report. Brad Larson, Scott County, Chairman of the General Subcommittee along with the other members of the Subcommittee will attend the Screening Board meeting to review and explain the recommendations of the group.

The recommendations of the Mileage Subcommittee are included in the individual mileage request section of the report.
Chairman Paul Kirkwold, Ramsey County, and the other members of the Mileage Subcommittee will be in attendance to answer any questions relative to their recommendations.

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA JUNE, 1998 

Trend of C.S.A.H Unit Prices (Based on State Averages from 1982-1997)

The following graphs and tabulations indicate the unit price
trends of the various construction items. As mentioned earlier, all unit price data was retrieved from the abstracts of bids on State Aid and Federal Aid Projects. Three trends are shown for each construction item: annual average, five-year average, and needs study average.

Please note that urban design projects were included in the study beginning with the 1982 projects.

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA 

JUNE, 1998
TREND OF C.S.A.H. UNIT PRICES FOR SUBBASE - CLASS 3 \& 4

1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Design Projects

| Year | Quantities | Cost | Annual Average | 5-Year Average | (Rural Design Only) Needs Study Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | 474,716 | \$1,633,375 | \$3.44 | \$3.30 | \$3.43 |
| 1983 | 838,004 | \$3,015,160 | \$3.60 | \$3.54 | \$3.27 |
| 1984 | 645,084 | \$2,605,291 | \$4.04 | \$3.66 | \$3.54 |
| 1985 | 729,577 | \$2,804,858 | \$3.84 | \$3.70 | \$4.04 |
| 1986 | 798,321 | \$2,871,121 | \$3.60 | \$3.72 | \$3.84 |
| 1987 | 1,015,708 | \$4,147,919 | \$4.08 | \$3.84 | \$3.54 |
| 1988 | 981,435 | \$3,316,895 | \$3.38 | \$3.79 | \$3.75 |
| 1989 | 1,584,966 | \$6,024,671 | \$3.80 | \$3.74 | \$3.41 |
| 1990 | 850,693 | \$3,154,601 | \$3.71 | \$3.73 | \$3.73 |
| 1991 | 1,770,188 | \$7,167,715 | \$4.05 | \$3.84 | \$3.64 |
| 1992 | 1,285,948 | \$5,309,585 | \$4.13 | \$3.86 | \$4.03 |
| 1993 | 654,741 | \$2,823,272 | \$4.31 | \$3.98 | \$4.00 |
| 1994 | 658,778 | \$2,928,115 | \$4.44 | \$4.10 | \$4.19 |
| 1995 | 944,079 | \$4,619,762 | \$4.89 | \$4.30 | \$4.39 |
| 1996 | 327,780 | \$1,512,522 | \$4.61 | \$4.44 | \$4.94 |
| 1997 | 604,533 | \$3,256,041 | \$5.39 | \$4.75 | \$4.52 |

Trend of CSAH Unit Prices-Subbase 3-4
1982-1997 includes Rural \& Urban Projects


Annual Av. © 5-Year Av. Needs Av.

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA 

JUNE, 1998
IREND OF C.S.A.H. UNIT PRICES FOR GRAVEL BASE-2211 CLASS 5 \& 6
1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Design Projects

| Year | Quantities | Cost | Annual Average | 5-Year Average | Needs Study Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | 2,467,051 | \$8,167,357 | \$3.31 | \$3.15 | \$3.43 |
| 1983 | 1,938,168 | \$7,113,486 | \$3.67 | \$3.38 | \$3.27 |
| 1984 | 1,862,681 | \$8,042,583 | \$4.32 | 3.58 | \$3.56 |
| 1985 | 2,574,482 | \$10,479,018 | \$4.07 | 3.72 | \$4.31 |
| 1986 | 2,296,457 | \$8,768,366 | \$3.82 | \$3.82 | \$4.07 |
| 1987 | 2,856,606 | \$11,084,646 | \$3.88 | \$3.94 | \$3.82 |
| 1988 | 3,413,807 | \$12,092,134 | \$3.54 | \$3.88 | \$3.88 |
| 1989 | 3,290,437 | \$12,704,852 | \$3.86 | \$3.82 | \$3.56 |
| 1990 | 3,712,962 | \$14,400,029 | \$3.88 | \$3.80 | \$3.87 |
| 1991 | 3,461,225 | \$14,666,244 | \$4.24 | \$3.88 | \$3.89 |
| 1992 | 4,660,355 | \$21,080,095 | \$4.52 | \$4.04 | \$4.24 |
| 1993 | 3,818,839 | \$16,847,613 | \$4.41 | \$4.20 | \$4.54 |
| 1994 | 2,966,410 | \$13,430,054 | \$4.53 | \$4.32 | \$4.40 |
| 1995 | 3,004,556 | \$14,567,960 | \$4.85 | \$4.50 | \$4.50 |
| 1996 | 4,543,279 | \$21,583,793 | \$4.75 | \$4.60 | \$4.85 |
| 1997 | 3,628,624 | \$19,166,107 | \$5.28 | \$4.77 | \$4.71 |

## Trend of CSAH Unit Prices-Base 5 \& 6 <br> 1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Projects



Annual Av. ©5-Year Av. Needs Av.

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA 

JUNE, 1998
TREND OF C.S.A.H. UNIT PRICES FOR BITUMINOUS - 2331
1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Design Projects

| Year | Quantities | Cost | Annual Average | 5-Year Average | (Rural Design Only) Needs Study Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | 1,911,929 | \$33,405,746 | \$17.47 | \$15.85 | \$19.27 |
| 1983 | 2,141,604 | \$39,959,758 | \$18.66 | \$17.40 | \$17.39 |
| 1984 | 2,115,153 | \$42,616,496 | \$20.15 | \$18.55 | \$18.61 |
| 1985 | 2,491,261 | \$49,596,550 | \$19.91 | \$19.13 | \$20.10 |
| 1986 | 2,546,367 | \$42,789,582 | \$16.80 | \$18.60 | \$19.91 |
| 1987 | 2,483,491 | \$38,875,784 | \$15.65 | \$18.15 | \$16.71 |
| 1988 | 2,582,858 | \$40,775,683 | \$15.79 | \$17.55 | \$15.51 |
| 1989 | 2,962,563 | \$42,987,747 | \$14.51 | \$16.46 | \$15.53 |
| 1990 | 2,524,687 | \$37,142,266 | \$14.71 | \$15.46 | \$14.29 |
| 1991 | 2,391,952 | \$37,557,020 | \$15.70 | \$15.24 | \$14.39 |
| 1992 | 2,930,927 | \$44,944,076 | \$15.33 | \$15.17 | \$15.42 |
| 1993 | 2,620,040 | \$41,816,913 | \$15.96 | \$15.22 | \$14.98 |
| 1994 | 2,201,449 | \$33,334,062 | \$15.14 | \$15.38 | \$15.65 |
| 1995 | 2,175,113 | \$35,576,062 | \$16.36 | \$15.67 | \$14.92 |
| 1996 | 2,865,550 | \$46,655,678 | \$16.28 | \$15.80 | \$15.99 |
| 1997 | 2,362,630 | \$40,374,978 | \$17.09 | \$16.17 | \$16.14 |

Trend of CSAH Unit Prices - Bit. 2331
1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Projects


## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

JUNE, 1998
TREND OF C.S.A.H. UNIT PRICES FOR BITUMINOUS - 2341

1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Design Projects

| Year | Quantities | Cost | Annual Average | 5-Year Average | (Rural Design Only) Needs study Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | 191,268 | \$3,749,375 | \$19.66 | \$17.66 | \$20.63 |
| 1983 | 146,503 | \$3,199,774 | \$21.84 | \$19.54 | \$19.39 |
| 1984 | 172,277 | \$4,028,081 | \$23.39 | \$20.42 | \$21.44 |
| 1985 | 223,479 | \$5,451,659 | \$24.39 | \$22.10 | \$23.06 |
| 1986 | 258,737 | \$4,976,856 | \$19.24 | \$21.58 | \$24.39 |
| 1987 | 299,548 | \$5,666,289 | \$18.92 | \$21.19 | \$17.95 |
| 1988 | 355,070 | \$6,001,226 | \$16.90 | \$19.96 | \$17.64 |
| 1989 | 307,106 | \$4,980,376 | \$16.22 | \$18.76 | \$16.15 |
| 1990 | 270,025 | \$4,575,717 | \$16.95 | \$17.58 | \$15.82 |
| 1991 | 255,721 | \$4,243,941 | \$16.59 | \$17.10 | \$16.23 |
| 1992 | 468,235 | \$8,804,005 | \$18.80 | \$17.23 | \$16.05 |
| 1993 | 461,842 | \$8,204,134 | \$17.76 | \$17.48 | \$18.48 |
| 1994 | 611,244 | \$10,807,452 | \$17.68 | \$17.72 | \$17.25 |
| 1995 | 428,378 | \$8,141,155 | \$19.00 | \$18.06 | \$17.14 |
| 1996 | 696,682 | \$13,035,480 | \$18.71 | \$18.33 | \$18.04 |
| 1997 | 728,103 | \$14,457,466 | \$19.86 | \$18.67 | \$18.38 |

## Trend of CSAH Unit Prices - Bit. 2341 <br> 1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Projects



## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

JUNE, 1998
TREND OF C.S.A.H. UNIT PRICES FOR GRAVEL SURFACE - 2118
1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Design Projects

| Year | Quantities | Cost | Annual Average | 5-Year Average | (Rural Design Only) Needs Study Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | 169,755 | \$514,181 | \$3.03 | \$3.09 | \$3.19 |
| 1983 | 176,024 | \$669,773 | \$3.81 | \$3.37 | \$3.00 |
| 1984 | 283,698 | \$1,027,910 | \$3.62 | \$3.50 | \$3.76 |
| 1985 | 194,555 | \$769,340 | \$3.95 | \$3.54 | \$3.62 |
| 1986 | 257,323 | \$951,855 | \$3.70 | \$3.64 | \$3.95 |
| 1987 | 252,093 | \$957,420 | \$3.80 | \$3.76 | \$3.68 |
| 1988 | 393,590 | \$1,400,145 | \$3.56 | \$3.70 | \$3.80 |
| 1989 | 417,908 | \$1,548,428 | \$3.71 | \$3.71 | \$3.55 |
| 1990 | 531,937 | \$2,244,411 | \$4.22 | \$3.83 | \$3.70 |
| 1991 | 332,482 | \$1,431,490 | \$4.31 | \$3.93 | \$4.22 |
| 1992 | 368,606 | \$1,555,978 | \$4.22 | \$4.01 | \$4.31 |
| 1993 | 310,653 | \$1,212,579 | \$3.90 | \$4.08 | \$4.34 |
| 1994 | 351,774 | \$1,341,281 | \$3.74 | \$4.09 | \$3.88 |
| 1995 | 247,659 | \$1,168,838 | \$4.72 | \$4.15 | \$3.73 |
| 1996 | 253,345 | \$1,020,275 | \$4.03 | \$4.09 | \$4.72 |
| 1997 | 227,024 | \$1,044,112 | \$4.60 | \$4.14 | \$3.98 |

## Trend of CSAH Unit Prices Gravel Surface 2118 <br> 1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Projects



## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

JUNE, 1998
IREND OF C.S.A.H. UNIT PRICES FOR GRAVEL SHOULDERS - 2221
1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Design Projects

| Year | Quantities | Cost | Annual Average | 5-Year Average | (Rural Design Only) Needs Study Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | 760,901 | \$3,111,555 | \$4.09 | \$3.61 | \$3.78 |
| 1983 | 838,572 | \$3,504,333 | \$4.18 | \$3.88 | \$4.08 |
| 1984 | 812,267 | \$3,565,540 | \$4.39 | \$4.06 | \$4.12 |
| 1985 | 988,140 | \$4,411,565 | \$4.47 | \$4.21 | \$4.39 |
| 1986 | 1,094,004 | \$4,402,874 | \$4.03 | \$4.23 | \$4.46 |
| 1987 | 1,118,478 | \$4,505,873 | \$4.03 | \$4.20 | \$4.02 |
| 1988 | 1,050,781 | \$4,300,402 | \$4.09 | \$4.19 | \$4.02 |
| 1989 | 1,174,522 | \$4,531,872 | \$3.86 | \$4.08 | \$4.11 |
| 1990 | 1,089,251 | \$4,452,591 | \$4.09 | \$4.02 | \$3.85 |
| 1991 | 937,460 | \$4,217,785 | \$4.50 | \$4.10 | \$4.08 |
| 1992 | 1,264,986 | \$6,210,827 | \$4.91 | \$4.29 | \$4.49 |
| 1993 | 1,118,334 | \$5,707,149 | \$5.10 | \$4.49 | \$4.78 |
| 1994 | 1,037,627 | \$4,811,871 | \$4.64 | \$4.66 | \$5.05 |
| 1995 | 1,068,078 | \$5,301,656 | \$4.96 | \$4.84 | \$4.63 |
| 1996 | 1,142,751 | \$5,955,808 | \$5.21 | \$4.96 | \$4.90 |
| 1997 | 973,705 | \$5,472,209 | \$5.62 | \$5.10 | \$5.16 |

## Trend of CSAH Unit Prices Gravel Shld. 2221 <br> 1982-1997 Includes Rural \& Urban Projects



Annual Av. $\Rightarrow 5-$ Year Av. 2 Needs Av.
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1998 C.S.A.H. Gravel Base Unit Price Data

The map (figure A) indicates each couvt'’'s 1997 CSAH needs study gravel base unit price, the gravel base data in 1993-1997 five-year average unit price study for each county, and an inflat avel base unit price which is the Subcommittee's recommendation for 199. is directed by the 1986 Screening Board, all urban design projects were also included in the five year average unit price study for all counties.

The following procedure, initially adopted at the 1981 Spring Screening Board meeting, was implemented by the Subcommittee at their April 20, 1998 meeting to determine the 1998 gravel base unit prices:

If a county has at least 50,000 tons of gravel base in its current five-year average unit price study, that five-year average unit price, inflated by the factors shown in the inflation factor report, is used.

If a county has less than 50,000 tons of gravel base material in its five-year average unit price study, then enough subbase material from that county's five-year average unit price study is added to the gravel base material to equal 50,000 tons, and a weighted average unit price inflated by the proper factors is determined.

If a county has less than 50,000 tons of combined gravel base and subbase material in its five-year average unit price study, then enough gravel base material from the surrounding counties which do have 50,000 tons in their five-year averages is added to the combined gravel base and subbase material to equal 50,000 tons, and a weighted average unit price inflated by the proper factors is determined.

As you can see, the counties whose recommended unit prices have either a square or a circle around them have less than 50,000 tons of gravel base material in their current five-year average unit price study. Therefore, these prices were determined using either the second or third part of the procedure above and the calculation of these is shown in a special section of the "Reference Material" area of this booklet. Brad Larson, Chairman of the General Subcommittee, will attend the Screening Board meeting to discuss their recommendations.

1998 County Screening Board Data
June, 1998

## 1993-1997 C.S.A.H. Gravel Base Unit Price Data (Rural and Urban Projects Included)


4.25

10-34-212-4.01 4.26
\#'93 to '97 Gravel Base Proj. - Miles Tons (in 1000's) - 5 Year Avq. Unit Price 1998 Inflated Gravel Base Unit Price
(As Recommended by General Subcommittee)
Not enouqh qravel base material in the 5 year average, so some subbase was used to reach the $\mathbf{5 0 , 0 0 0}$ ton minimum.

Not enouqh qravel base and subbase material in the 5 year average, so some

## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

JUNE, 1998<br>Unit Price Inflation Factor Study

Because of the drastic fluctuation in unit prices in recent years, the Subcommittee is recommending continuing the inflation of the cost, in the five-year average unit price study for the determination of needs study prices.

Since the gravel base and subbase prices are the basis for the other needs study construction item unit prices, the needs unit concentrated on these two items to generate inflation factors.

The inflation factors arrived at were computed by dividing the average unit price of the latest year in the five-year average by the average unit price of the year involved. These calculations are shown in the charts below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Quantity | Cost | Annual <br> Average | Inflation Factor |  |
| 1993 | 3,818,839 | \$16,847,613 | \$4.41 | \$5.28/\$4.41 = | 1.20 |
| 1994 | 2,966,410 | \$13,430,054 | \$4.53 | \$5.28/\$4.53 = | 1.17 |
| 1995 | 3,004,556 | \$14,567,960 | \$4.85 | \$5.28/\$4.85 = | 1.09 |
| 1996 | 4,543,279 | \$21,583,793 | \$4.75 | \$5.28/\$4.75 = | 1.11 |
| 1997 | 3,628,624 | \$19,166,107 | \$5.28 |  |  |


| Year | Quantity | Cost | Annual Average | Inflation Factor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1993 | 654,741 | \$2,823,272 | \$4.31 | \$5.39/\$4.31 = | 1.25 |
| 1994 | 658,778 | \$2,928,115 | \$4.44 | \$5.39/\$4.44 = | 1.21 |
| 1995 | 944,079 | \$4,619,762 | \$4.89 | \$5.39/\$4.89 = | 1.10 |
| 1996 | 327,780 | \$1,512,522 | \$4.61 | \$5.39/\$4.61 = | 1.17 |
| 1997 | 604,533 | \$3,256,041 | \$5.39 |  |  |

In order to reflect current prices in the 1993-1997 five-year average unit price study, each project's gravel base and subbase costs were multiplied by the appropriate factor.
This is shown in two tabulations (Subbase and Gravel Base) in the "Reference Material" section of the report.

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA JUNE, 1998 

## C.S.A.H. Roadway Unit Price Report

The following tabulation of roadway construction prices shows the average unit prices in the 1997 C.S.A.H. needs study, the 1993-1997 C.S.A.H. five-year average unit prices, the 1997 average and the Subcommittee's recommended unit prices for use in the 1998 needs study.

The Subcommittee's recommended prices were determined at their meeting on April 20, 1998. Minutes documenting these proceedings are included in the "Reference Material" portion of this booklet.

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA 

JUNE, 1998<br>\section*{C.S.A.H. Roadway Unit Price Report}



| Rural \& Urban Design |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grav. Base CI $5 \& 6 /$ Ton | $\$ 4.71$ | 4.77 | $\$ 5.28$ | $*$ |


| Rural Design |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subbase Cl 3 \& 4/Ton | $\$ 4.52$ | $\$ 4.72$ | G5.39 | G.B. |
| Bit.Base \& Surf. 2331/Ton | 16.14 | 15.99 | 17.01 | G.B. +11.73 |
| Bit.Surf. 2341/Ton | 18.38 | 18.32 | 19.68 | G.B. +14.40 |
| Con.Surf. 2301/Sq.Yd. | 15.46 | $\cdots$ | 15.56 | 15.56 |
|  |  |  | (1997 Mn/DOT) |  |
| Gravel Surf. 2118/Ton | 3.98 | 4.13 | 4.60 | G.B. -0.68 |
| Gravel Shldr. 2221/Ton | 5.16 | 5.08 | 5.62 | G.B. +0.34 |


| Urban Design |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subbase Cl $3 \& 4 /$ Ton | $\$ 4.71$ | $\$ 5.29$ | $\$ 5.38$ | G.B. |
| Bit.Base \& Surf. 2331/Ton | 18.32 | 19.41 | 20.83 | G.B. +15.55 |
| Bit.Surf. 2341/Ton | 20.06 | 20.56 | 21.57 | G.B. +16.29 |
| Con.Surf. 2301/Sq.Yd. | 19.86 | $\cdots$ | 20.75 | 20.75 |

[^0]
# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA JUNE, 1998 

## C.S.A.H. Miscellaneous L Price Report

The following report lists the miscellaneous unit prices used in the 1997 C.S.A.H. needs study, those recommended by Mn/DOT or average 1997 construction prices, and the unit prices recommended by the C.S.A.H. Subcommittee for use in the 1998 CSAH needs study.

Documentation of the Subcommittee's recommendations can be found in the minutes of their meeting on April 20, 1998 which are printed in the "Reference Material" section of this booklet.

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA 

JUNE, 1998

C.S.A.H. Miscellaneous Unit Price Report

Construction Item $\qquad$

Prices
Recommended
For 1998 By
MnIDOT
or Average 1997
Construction Prices

1998
CSAH Unit Price
Recommended by CSAH
Subcommittee

| Other Urban Design |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Storm Sewer - Complete/Mi. | $\$ 238,000$ |  | $\$ 245,000$ | $\$ 245,000$ |
| Storm Sewer - Partial/Mi. | 74,000 |  | 76,000 | 76,000 |
| Curb \& Gutter Const./Lin.Ft. | 7.50 | (MSAS) | 7.42 | 7.50 |


| Bridges |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-149 Ft.Long/Sq.Ft. | \$55.00 | \$71.00 | \$60.00 |
| 150-499 Ft.Long/Sq.Ft. | 55.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 |
| 500 Ft \& Longer/Sq.Ft. | 55.00 | 66.00 | 60.00 |
| Widening/Sq.Ft. | 150.00 | ** | *** |
| RR over Hwy-1 Track/Lin.ft. | 5,000 | N/A | 5,000 |
| Each Add.Track/Lin.ft. | 4,000 | N/A | 4,000 |


| Railroad Protection |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Signs | $\$ 1,400$ | $\$ 1,400$ | $\$ 1,400{ }^{*}$ |
| Signals | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 |
| Signals \& Gates | 125,000 | $\$ 100,000-\$ 150,000$ | 125,000 |

** WILL USE RECONDITIONING COST AS REPORTED

* $\$ 1,000$ Per Signs \& $1 / 2$ Paint Cost



## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

June, 1998

## Criteria Necessary For County State Aid Highway Designation

In the past, there has been considerable speculation as to which requirements a road must meet in order to qualify for designation as a County State Aid Highway The following section of the Minnesota Department of Transportation Rules which was updated in July, 1991, definitely sets forth what criteria are necessary.

## Portion of Minnesota Rules For State Aid Operations

State Aid Routes shall be selected on the basis of the following criteria:
Subp. 2. A county state-aid highway may be selected if it:
(A) is projected to carry a relatively heavier traffic volume or is functionally classified as collector or arterial as identified on the county's functional classification plans as approved by the county board;
(B) connects towns, communities, shipping points, and markets within a county or in adjacent counties; provides access to rural churches, schools, community meeting halls, industrial areas, state institutions, and recreational areas; or serves as principal rural mail route and school bus route; and
(C) provides an integrated and coordinated highway system affording, within practical limits, a state-aid highway network consistent with projected traffic demands.

## June, 1998

## History of C.S.A.H. Additional Mileage Requests <br> Approved by the County Engineers' Screening Board

| Aitkin | 6.10 |  | 0.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.74 |  | 8.25 | 37.45 | Anoka |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anoka | 2.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.07 | Becker |
| Becker | 10.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beltrami | 7.53 * | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.10 | ** |  |  |  | 9.79 | Beltrami |
| Benton | 3.18 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.18 | Benton |
| Big Stone | 1.40 | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.56 | Big Stone |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blue Earth | 15.29 * |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.54 | Blue Earth |
| Brown | 7.44 | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.57 | Brown |
| Carlton | 3.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.62 | Cariton |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.05 | Carver |
| Carver | 2.49 | 0.48 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.80 | ** |  |  |  | 10.70 | Cass |
| Cass | - 7.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 |  |  |  |  | 2.80 | - |  |  |  | 15.05 | Chippewa |
| Chippewa | 15.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chisago | 3.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.44 | Chisago |
| Clay | 2.00 | 0.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.10 | Clay |
| Clearwater | 0.30 * | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | Clearwater |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cook | 3.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.60 | Cook |
| Cottonwood | 5.17 | 1.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | --- |  |  | 6.47 | Cottonwood |
| Crow Wing | 13.00 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.00 | Crow Wing |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.38 | Dakota |
| Dakota | 1.65 * | 2.47 |  |  |  | 2.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 | Dodge |
| $\frac{\text { Dodge }}{\text { Douglas }}$ | 10.65 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.65 | Douglas |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Faribault |
| Faribault | 0.37 | 1.20 | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.22 | Fillmore |
| Fillmore <br> Freeborn | 1.12 | 0.65 | 1.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 1.60 | Freeborn |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Goodhue |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | Goodhue |
| Grant | 5.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.42 | Grant |
| Hennepin | 4.50 | 0.24 | 0.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -- |  |  | $\square$ |  |  | 5.59 | Hennepin |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Houston |  | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  | Houston |
| Hubbard | 1.85 | 0.26 | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}2.80 \\ \hline-\quad 1.80\end{array}$ | İsanti |
| Isanti | 1.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA
June, 1998
History of C.S.A.H. Additional Mileage Requests
Approved by the County Engineers' Screening Board

| County | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1958- } \\ & 1970 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1971- \\ & 1976 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1977- \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | Total Miles To Date | County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Itasca |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | Itasca |
| Jackson | 0.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.10 | Jackson |
| Kanabec |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | Kanabec |
| Kandiyohi | 0.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kittson | 6.60 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.44 | Kandiyohi |
| Koochiching | 9.27 * |  |  |  |  |  | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.60 9.39 | Kittson |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Koochiching |
| Lac Qui Parle | 1.93 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.93 | Lac Qui Parle |
| Lake | $4.82{ }^{*}$ | 0.56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.31 |  |  |  |  | 15.69 | Lake |
| Lake of 'Woods | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.65 |  |  |  |  | 8.54 | Lake of 'Woods |
| Le Sueur | 2.70 | 0.83 |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lincoln | 6.55 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.55 | Le Sueur |
| Lyon | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{6.50}{}$ | Lincoln |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lyon |
| Mc Leod | 0.09 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.91 | Mc Leod |
| Mahnomen | $\frac{1.42}{15.00}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.42 | Mahnomen |
| Marshall | 15.00* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.00 | Marshall |
| Martin | 1.52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeker | 0.80 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.52 | Martin |
| Mille Lacs |  | 0.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | Meeker |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morrison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.70 |  |  |  | 9.70 | Morrison |
| Mower | 13.11 * |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.20 | Mower |
| Murray | 3.52 | 1.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.62 | Murray |
| Nicollet |  |  |  | 0.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.60 | Nicollet |
| Nobles | 13.71 | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.06 | Nobles |
| Norman | 1.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.31 | Norman |
| Olmsted | 15.32 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Otter Tail |  |  | 0.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.32 | Olmsted |
| Pentington | 0.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.84 | Otter Tail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pine | 9.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.25 | Pine |
| Pipestone | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 | Pipestone |
| Polk | 4.00 | 1.55 | 0.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.22 | Polk |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ----- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - --- --- - - - - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

## June, 1998

History of C.S.A.H. Additional Mileage Requests
Approved by the County Engineers' Screening Board

| County | $\begin{aligned} & 1958- \\ & 1970 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1971- \\ & 1976 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1977- } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1983 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | Total Miles <br> Io Date | County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pope | 3.63 | 1.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.83 | Pope |
| Ramsey | 10.12* | 0.61 |  | 0.21 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.86 | Ramsey |
| Red Lake |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 | Red Lake |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Redwood | 3.41 |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.54 | Redwood |
| Renville |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | Renville |
| Rice | 1.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.70 | Rice ............ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.04 | Rock |
| Rock | 0.50 |  | 0.54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.80 | Roseau |
| Roseau | 6.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.14 | St. Louis |
| St. Louis | 19.14 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scott | 12.09 * | 5.15 | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.86 | Scott |
| Sherburne | 5.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.42 | Sherburne |
| Sibley | 1.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.50 | Sibley |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.93 | Stearns |
| Stearns Steele | 0.78 |  | 3.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.55 | Steele |
| Steele | $\frac{1.55}{1.00}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | Stevens |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Swift | 0.78 |  | 0.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.02 | Swift |
| Todd | 1.90 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | --- |  |  | - |  |  |  | 2.36 | Todd |
| Traverse | 0.20 | 0.56 |  |  | 1.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wabasha | 0.43 * | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.73 | Wabasha |
| Wadena |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | Wadena |
| Waseca | 4.53 | 0.14 |  |  |  | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | $\cdots$ |  | - | 4.72 | Waseca |
| Washington | 2.33 | 0.40 | 0.33 |  | 1.33 |  |  |  | 8.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.52 |  | 30.96 | Washington |
| Watonwan |  | 0.04 | 0.68 |  |  | 0.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.91 | Watonwan |
| Wilkin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - - |  |  |  |  | 0.11 |  | $\cdots$ |  | 0.11 | Wilkin |
| Winona | 7.40 * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.40 | Winona |
| Wright | 0.45 |  | 1.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.83 | Wright |
| Yellow Medicine |  | 1.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.39 | Yellow Medicine |
| Totals | 339.03 | 25.65 | 11.39 | 0.81 | 2.93 | 3.55 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 23.47 | 0.30 | 0.32 | 0.12 | 2.20 | 17.96 | 21.83 | 16.74 | 18.52 | 8.25 | 493.27 | Totals |

* Includes Some Trunk Highway Turnback Mileage Added Prior to the Turnback Law in 1965
** Great River Road Mileage Added to system by Administrative Decision of the State Aid Division Director.


# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA 

June, 1998
"BANKED" CSAH MILEAGE
The Screening Board, at its June, 1990 meeting, revised the mileage resolution to read as follows:
Mileage made available by an internal revision after July 1, 1990 will be held in abeyance (banked) for future designation.

The following mileage presently represents the "banked" mileage available. Only mileage made available by commissioners orders received before May 1, 1998 is included.

| County | Banked Mileage | $\overline{Y e a r N} \mathrm{de}$ Availe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Becker | 0.40 | 199 |
| Big Stone | 2.50 | 1993 |
| Blue Earth | 0.10 | 1991 |
| Carlton | 0.46 | 1992 \& 1994 |
| Clay | 5.00 | 1993 \& 1997 |
| Clearwater | 0.60 | 1997 |
| Dakota | 7.98 | 1994,96 \& 98 |
| Dodge | 0.07 | 1994 |
| Douglas | 1.90 | 1992 |
| Faribault | 2.54 | 1993 |
| Hennepin | 5.22 | 1994, 96 \& 97 |
| Hubbard | 0.52 | 1996 \& 1997 |
| Isanti | 0.22 | 1992 |
| Itasca | 0.15 | 1997 |
| Kandiyohi | 0.20 | 1993 |
| Koochiching | 0.25 | 1994 \& 1995 |
| Lincoln | 1.10 | 1996 |
| McLeod | 0.30 | 1997 |
| Mille Lacs | 1.10 | 1992 |
| Nicollet | 1.75 | 1993 \& 1997 |
| Nobles | 0.21 | 1997 |
| Norman | 1.00 | 1997 |
| Olmsted | 0.73 | 1997 \& 1998 |
| Pennington | 1.65 | 1995 |
| Pine | 0.09 | 1998 |
| Pipestone | 0.10 | 1996 |
| Polk | 1.50 | 1997 |
| Ramsey | 1.56 | 1995, 96 \& 1998 |
| Red Lake | 0.50 | 1994 |
| Redwood | 0.20 | 1995 |
| Renville | 2.65 | 1992, 96 \& 97 |
| Rice | 0.90 | 1994 |
| Rock | 1.60 | 1993 |
| Roseau | 0.80 | 1991 |
| St. Louis | 0.76 | 1996 |
| Sibley | 0.01 | 1995 |
| Stearns | 1.07 | 1992 \& 1997 |
| Wabasha | 0.33 | 1993 |
| Waseca | 0.01 | 1995 |
| Wadena | 0.07 | 1991 \& 1994 |
| Wright | 1.67 | 1992, 93 \& 97 |
| Yellow Medicine | 0.68 | 1993 \& 1995 |
| Total | 50.45 |  |

An updated report showing the available mileages will be included in each Screening Board booklet.

DATE: $4 / 2 / 98$
TO: Manager, State Aid Needs Unit
FROM: $\qquad$ , District State Aid Engineer


SUBJECT: Request for Approval of a System Revision
(Municipality) (county) of
BLUE EARTH
Attached is a request and supporting data for a revision to the State Aid System. The proposed route meets the following criteria (indicated by an " $X$ ") necessary for designation:

## C.S.A.H. CRITERIA

Projected to carry a relatively heavier traffic volume,
or is functionally classified as collector or arterial
Connects towns, communities, shipping points, and markets within a county or in adjacent counties,
or provides access to rural churches, schools, community meeting halls, industrial areas, state institutions and recreational areas,
or serves as a principal rural mail route and school bus route.
Provides an integrated and coordinated highway system affording, within practical limits, a State Aid highway network consistent with projected traffic demands.

## M.S.A.S. CRITERIA

Projected to carry a relatively heavier traffic volume, or is functionally classified as collector or arterialConnects the points of major traffic interest within an urban municipality.Provides an integrated street system affording, within practical limits, a State Aid street network consistent with projected traffic demands.
M.S.A.S. Miles Available

+ Revoked
- Requested
$=$ Balance $\qquad$

RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OR DENIAL: Manager, State Aid Needs Unit

## Date

# MILEAGE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT <br> TO THE <br> COUNTY STATE AID HIGHWAY SCREENING BOARD 

Date: May, 1998
Subcommittee: Paul Kirkwold, Ramsey County, Chair
Alan Goodman, Lake County
Craig Falkum, Wabasha County
Request: Blue Earth County - 20.86 miles
The Mileage Subcommittee reviewed the Blue Earth County request on April 23, 1998. Others in attendance were Alan Forsburg, Blue Earth County Engineer; Doug Haeder, District State Aid Engineer and of course Ken Hoeschen, CSAH Needs Unit Manager.

Based upon a review of the information provided, discussions with Alan and Doug and the field review the Subcommittee makes the following recommendation:
addition of CR 116 from TH 60 to TH 68-2.2 miles. addition of CR 190 from CSAH 82 to CSAH 8 - $\mathbf{1 . 3 6}$ miles.

This recommendation is based upon:

1. Blue Earth County has recently completed a comprehensive transportation study that included a jurisdiction component. That component recommends the transfer of 5.39 Miles of CSAH to CR; 7.4 miles of CSAH to MnDOT and 3.41 miles of CSAH to MSA. The study also recommends several County Roads become CSAH and 17.69 miles of TH be turned back to the county.
2. The jurisdictional realignment is based upon a functional classification component of the study which has been approved by the region and the state. The functional classification study recommends all routes classified as "local" should be under township or municipal jurisdiction, routes classified as "collector" are either county or municipal and routes classified as "arterial" should be county or state. The study further recommends all county routes classified as "collector", either major or minor should be on
the CSAH system. This recommendation was the foundation of the Blue Earth County request.
3. The Mileage Subcommittee reviewed several of the proposed routes and did not agree with all the recommendations of the Blue Earth County study. Field review of the two routes recommended supported the addition of these routes to the CSAH system and concurred with the functional class assignment of major collector and minor arterial respectively.
4. CR 116 from TH 60 to TH 68-2.2 miles; is functionally classified a major collector. Its location west of Mankato serves as a cutoff for those who wish to travel south on TH 61 or TH 169 without entering the Mankato area.
5. CR 190 from CSAH 82 to CSAH 8-1.36 miles; is functionally classified as a minor arterial and serves a major access to the Mankato State University athletic complex.
6. The Subcommittee suggests the County review all its routes classified as minor collector and determine which ones are appropriate for CSAH designation and make these adjustments internally with the assistance of the District State Engineer.
7. The Subcommittee further suggests the screening board review the relationship of functional classification and CSAH designation.


DATE: $\qquad$
TO: Manager, State Aid Needs Unit FROM: $\qquad$ . District Sate Aid Engineer SUB.JECT: Request for Approval of a System Revision (Munisipelty) (County) of $\qquad$


Attached is a request and supporting data for a revision to the State Aid System. The proposed route meets the following criteria (indicated by an ' $X^{\prime}$ ) necessary for designation:

## C.S.A.H. CRITERIA



Projected to carry a relatively heavier traffic volume. or is functionally classified as collector or arterial

Connects towns, communities, shipping points, and markets within a county or in adjacent counties, or provides access to rural churches, schools, community meeting hails, industrial areas, state institutions and recreational areas, or serves as a principal rural mail route and school bus route.

M.S.A.S. CRITERIA


Projected to carry a relatively heavier traffic volume or is functionally classified as collector or arterial
$\square$ Connects the points of major traffic interest within an urban municipality.
Provides an integrated street system affording, within practical limits, a State Aid street network consistent with projected traffic demands,


# MILEAGE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT TO THE COUNTY STATE AID HIGHWAY SCREENING BOARD 

Date: May, 1998
Subcommittee: Paul Kirkwold, Ramsey County, Chair
Alan Goodman, Lake County
Craig Falkum, Wabasha County
Request: Dakota County - 54.38 miles
The Mileage Subcommittee reviewed the Dakota County request on April 24, 1998. Others in attendance were Dave Everds, County Engineer Leslie Vermillion, Dave Zech and Pete Sorenson, Dakota County; Greg Coughlin, Metro State Aid Office and of course Ken Hoeschen(a.k.a HB), CSAH Needs Unit Manager.

Based upon a review of the information provided, discussions with the Dakota County staff and Greg and the field review the Subcommittee makes the following recommendation:
addition of the mileage as requested with exception of, Co. Rd 81, CSAH 66-TH $52 \quad 3.84$ miles Co. Rd 79, CSAH 86 - CASH $66 \quad 8.04$ miles Co. Rd 96, West Co. Limits to TH $3 \mathbf{5 . 8 7}$ miles Co. Rd 28, TH3 - CSAH 73(partial) $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ miles

This recommendation is based upon:

1. Dakota County has recently completed a review of its transportation system as part of their Comprehensive Plan Update mandated by the Minnesota Legislature. The County has been actively involved in jurisdictional realignment since 1986. This activity has resulted in transfers of several Trunk Highways and County Routes.
2. Significant change has occurred in Dakota County that has not been experienced in most portions of the state. The population has increased 8 fold from 1950 to 1998 and is expected to increase another $20 \%$ in the next

20 years. The level of road usage has increased $243 \%$ in the 16 year period 1980 to 1996.
3. The Mileage Subcommittee reviewed all of the proposed routes of which 10 are classified minor arterials and 3 collectors. The ADT of the segments varied from several hundreds to tens of thousands. Several of the segments have recently been constructed and some are currently on the MSA system. Details of each segment are provided in the Dakota County request which is attached.
4. The Dakota County request is based upon two prevailing criteria, spacing and functional classification. The designation of the original system in the 50 's did not and does not fit with the County's development and traffic patterns. The field review and subsequent discussions by the Subcommittee concurred with the rationale in all circumstances accept four.
5. Co. Rd 81, CSAH 66 to TH 52-3.84 miles; is functionally classified a collector. Its location west of TH 52 serves as a north south connector to the city of Coates. The County indicated the appropriate alignment of this route is west of its present location along the CR 79 alignment. This would occur if the county is successful in its negotiations with the U of M . Currently the Subcommittee feels the route does not contribute as a CSAH route because of its proximity to TH 52 .
6. Co. Rd 79 , CSAH 86 to CSAH $66-8.04$ miles; is functionally classified as a collector and is the single north/south route between TH 3 and TH56. The Dakota County plan recommends the route be reclassified a minor arterial but the route does not cross the $U$ of $M$ property to the north and is unable to connect to a major activity center. The Subcommittee feels Co. Rd 79 cannot be justified on spacing criteria alone and does not contribute as a CSAH route. The County may wish to revisit this issue when the negotiations with the $U$ of $M$ are successful.
7. Co. Rd 96, West Co. Limits to TH 3-5.87 miles; is functionally classified as a collector. The eastern portion has some role in serving as a Northfield by pass although there is little evidence this function has any significance. The remainder of the route parallels TH 19, one mile to the south and terminates at Rice County CSAH 46. The Subcommittee feels
this route does not meet appropriate spacing criteria to function as a CSAH in this rural setting.
8. Co. Rd 28, TH3 to CSAH 73, Babcock(partial) -1.00 mile; is functionally classified as collector. This segment serves two functions. First to act as a frontage road from TH 3 and second, to provide access to residential properties. The segment does not provide for westerly continuation in that it terminates at TH 3 with approximately a $11 / 2$ mile break to the west between TH 3 and TH 149. The Subcommittee does not feel this segment adds benefit to the CSAH system.

## Dakota County Minnesota

 DAKOTA COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT14955 GALAXIE AVENUE, 3rd FLOOR, APPLLE VALLEY, MN 55124-8579
(612) 891-7100 st-west berding to their location in the County.


Work Within County Right of Way A permit is necessary for any work being done within Dakota County right- of- way.
Permits may be obtained from the Highway Department (661) $891-7 / 100$.

Signing Policy
$\begin{aligned} & \text { No private signs are to be placed lang Count Moads and within the right-of-way that } \\ & \text { are within } 30 \text { feet of the edge of the traveled lanes. No private signs are to be placed }\end{aligned}$


Dakota County Uniform Street Naming
and House Numbering System
This system is used in all townships and in the certies of Applel Valley, Coates,
Farminton Inver Corev Heights Lakverile, Miesville, New Trier and Randolph,
East- west streets rae given

 ROSEMOUNT $\xrightarrow{20 A T E S}$


VERMILLION

## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

JUNE, 1998

## SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY RESULTING FROM THE APPROVAL OF THE SCOTT COUNTY CSAH MILEAGE REQUEST

| Scott County CSAH mileage 1/96 | 189.44 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Requested Revocations (10/96) | $(19.09)$ |
| Requested Additions (10/96) | 59.92 |
| Screening Board Denial of CSAH 31 \& 74 additions (10/96) | $(2.71)$ |
| TOTAL | 227.56 |


| Date | Type of Transaction | Mileage <br> Change | Starting <br> Mileage | Ending <br> Mileage |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $01 / 1996$ | Beginning Balance | 0.00 | 189.44 | 189.44 |
| $03 / 11 / 98$ | Revoke 7,15,16,29,33,56,80 \& 103 |  |  |  |
| 03/11/98 | Designate 2,5,15,18,21,42,59,68,78,82 <br> $86 \&(R i c e ~ C o u n t y) ~ C S A H ~ 86 ~$ | $(17.57)$ | 189.44 | 171.87 |
|  | (Mileage varies somewhat from request due to rounding <br> to 0.1 in rural areas and designation of existing roadway <br> instead of realigned route after construction.) | 49.09 | 171.87 | 220.96 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The only portions of the request left to be accomplished are the revocation of CSAH 39 and CSAH 106 (Approximately 1.52 miles) and the extension of CSAH 91 (Approximately 7.66 miles).

## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

## JUNE, 1998 <br> HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION FOR THE WASHINGTON COUNTY C.S.A.H. MILEAGE REQUEST

| Washington County CSAH Mileage (1/96) | 201.54 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Requested Revocations (6/96) | $(12.34)$ |
| Requested Additions (6/96) | 36.30 |
| Screening Board Denial of CSAH 15 addition (6/96) | $(3.00)$ |
| Screening Board Recommendation to Revoke CSAH 34 (6/96) | $(1.23)$ |
| Banked Mileage (6/96) | $(1.21)$ |
| TOTAL |  |


| Date | Type of Transaction | Mileage <br> Change | Starting <br> Mileage | Ending <br> Mileage |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $01 / 1996$ | Beginning Balance | 0.00 | 201.54 | 201.54 |
| $066 / 1996$ | Banked Mileage | $(1.21)$ | 201.54 | 200.33 |
| $01 / 08 / 97$ | Rev. 33, Ext. 5, 8, 13, 17, 19 \& 24 | 17.30 | 200.33 | 217.63 |
| $09 / 15 / 97$ | Revoke Portion 36 | $(1.17)$ | 217.63 | 216.46 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

[^1]

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA 

June, 1998

State Park Road Account

Legislation passed in 1989 amended Minnesota Statutes 1986, section 162.06, subdivision 5, to read as follows:

Subd. 5. (STATE PARK ROAD ACCOUNT.) $A \vee$ deducting for administrative costs and for the disaster account and research acc as heretofore provided from the remainder of the total sum provided for in subdivin $n 1$, there shall be deducted a sum equal to the three-quarters of one percent of the remainder. The sum so deducted shall be set aside in a separate account and shall be used for (1) the establishment, location, relocation, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of those roads included in the county state-aid highway system under Minnesota Statutes 1961, section 162.02, subdivision 6 which border and provide substantial access to an outdoor recreation unit as defined in section $86 A .04$ or which provide access to the headquarters of or the principal parking lot located within such a unit, and (2) the reconstruction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of county roads, city streets, and town roads that provide access to public lakes, rivers, state parks, and state campgrounds. Roads described in clause (2) are not required to meet county state-aid highway standards. At the request of the commissioner of natural resources the counties wherein such roads are located shall do such work as requested in the same manner as on any county state-aid highway and shall be reimbursed for such construction, reconstruction or improvements from the amount set aside by this subdivision. Before requesting a county to do work on a county state-aid highway as provided in this subdivision, the commissioner of natural resources must obtain approval for the project from the county state-aid screening board. The screening board, before giving its approval, must obtain a written comment on the project from the county engineer of the county requested to undertake the project. Before requesting a county to do work on a county road, city street, or a town road that provides access to a public lake, a river, a state park, or a state campground, the commissioner of natural resources shall obtain a written comment on the project from the county engineer of the county requested to undertake the project. Any sums paid to counties or cities in accordance with this subdivision shall reduce the money needs of said counties or cities in the amounts necessary to equalize their status with those counties or cities not receiving such payments. Any balance of the amount so set aside, at the end of each year shall be transferred to the county state-aid highway fund.

Pursuant to this legislation, the following information has been submitted by the Department of Natural Resources and the county involved.

# Highway Department 

ounty
Courthouse
P.O. Box 120

Carlton, MN 55718-0120
(218) 384-9150 • (218) 384-4281 • 1-800-862-3760

FAX (218) 384-9123

Memo To: County Board of Commissioners
From: Wayne L Olson, P.E.
Date: $\quad$ Febraary 3, 1997
Subject: Ditchbank Road

As you are aware, Perch Lake Township has been working to get Ditchbank Road rebuilt, and was allocated $\$ 400,000$ construction funds through the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. With the Fond du Lac Council decision to not provide engineering as originally expected, alternative methods of geiting at least some of the road work done have been discussed. The funding has been made available until July 1, 1998, at which time a contract must be ready to let or the allocation will be withdrawn.

Commissioner Dick Brenner and I. met with Perch Lake Township representatives to discuss options. It was determined that the most likely segment that could be done, providing the most benefit and still be funded by the State Park funds, would be from the curve at Big Lake Road and one mile west to Mission Road. The Town Board does not feel there is any way they can fund the engineering cost of even a significantly reduced project scope. Also, their priority road work is directed at roads with more residents along them.

Given the above, there seems only to be one potential option to get that one mile of the road built with the $\$ 400,000$ available. That would require County to trade Magney Drive for this portion of Ditchbank Road and the north end of Mission Road, then go ahead with the project. In order for that to be a good option, several issues would need to be cleared up or assurances given:

- The adjoining property owners and others that were concerned about the project, as well as the Tribal Council, would have to agree that the (reduced scope) project could be done. Dick Brenner and Stan Demenge (Perch Lake Twp) will be making several contacts with council members and landowners to determine feasibility of this prior to bringing the discussion to the County Board.
- The exchange would require revoking State Aid designation on Magney Drive and designating the Ditchbank/Mission Road segments.
- The project would have to be built to State Aid standards rather than State Park Road standards - this is still allowable with the same funding source.
- The Minnesota DNR would have to allow the funds to be spent on the CSAH system (and the
smaller segment) rather than Township. The County Engineer's Screening Board must approve the use of those funds on the CSAH system also.
- The County would have to commit to right of way and project engineering costs (using CSAH funds) and place this project ahead of others on the priority listing.
- The County Board and MNDDOT State Aid would need to arprove the CSAH designation changes.
- Even after the project, there would be about $1 / 2$ mile of Missic. Road that the County would have no funds to reconstruct and blacktop. This segment is in fairly good condition, but is gravel.
- If the Ditchbank/Mission Road segments were built and blacktopped, Magney Drive traffic would be reduced and would become a local road, rather than the only bituminous route to the northwest Big Lake area.

With the Ditchbank and Mission Road rebuilt, I believe both the County and Township would benefit by making the jurisdictional exchange. These issues need to be resolved as I would not want to make an exchange only to find we cannot gain acceptance of the project or fund it.

Dick will bring this issue to the Board when (if) he is satisfied with discussions with the landowners and Tribal Councilors. If you have any questions before then, give me a call.

## cc: Perch Lake Township, Stan Demenge

## County

Courthouse

P.O. Box 120

Cariton. MN 55718-0120
(218) 384-9150 • (218) 384-4281 • 1-800-862-3760

FAX (218) 384-9123

May 27, 1997
Mr John Strohkirch
State Park Development and Acquisition Manager
500 Lafayette Road
St Paul MN 55155-4039
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Subject: } & \text { State Park Road Funding } \\ & \text { Ditch Bank Road in Carlton County }\end{array}$
As you are aware, Perch Lake Township in Carlton County has received an extension of the time allowed to commit a $\$ 400,000$ State Park Road grant to rebuild (now a part of) Ditch Bank Road. In order to improve the road and use those funds, the County and Township are negotiating an exchange of roadways, looking also to assure other items can be completed in a timely manner, and still be acceptable to all parties concerned.

The exchange of roadway would put that part of Ditchbank Road currently planned for rebuild under County jurisdiction as a County State Aid Highway. In discussions earlier, you assured us that the reduced scope of work, rebuilding a portion of the road, can still be funded with the funds allocated since an important part of the roadway to the State Forest would be improved. Can this funding remain available if that part of Ditchbank Road becomes a County responsibility? This way, we would be able to build the mile along the north of section 21 with State Park funds, and eventually build the remaining CSAH with State Aid or local funds. On completion of that, both the County and Township would benefit as the existing blacktopped Magney Drive would become a strictly local road, and the County would have part of the CSAH rebuilt without using state aid funds. The new CSAH route would better serve through traffic.

The roadway changes include that the Township would take over Magney Drive, the part of CSAH 25 within Section 21, T49N, R18W, and the County would take that part of Township road along the west side and all of the north side of Section 21 . The north of section 21 is the part of Ditchbank Road eligible for rebuilding with State Park Funds. For more background, I have included a copy of the memo sent to the County Board when we were discussing issues. related to an exchange, and a map showing the proposed changes.

I will be asking the Fond du Lac Tribal Council for approval of the revised project and release of engineering work already completed. On positive comments from the preceding, as well as from you, I will be sending a formal request to change the milage and ask for Screening Board approval of spending State Park Funds on a State Aid Route.

Two other questions come to mind:
-In the near future, we will need to build and surface the remainder of the new CSAH 25 going south to where it now turns off. If our estimate of construction of that part of Ditchbank Road is less than the $\$ 400,000$, can you consider allowing State Park Funds to go as far south as possible on CSAH 25? That part along the west side of Section 21 (Wis. in Road) provides access to the Boat Landing and parking area that the DNR maintains for Big Lake.
-The consultant, Hack Engineering, that did preliminary engineering work for the Township/Tribe had plans to about $90 \%$ completion when work was stopped. They would be a logical consideration for the county to hire to complete the design for a revised project, saving engineering costs. However, they indicated they would not be able to begin any work until quite late this year. I would expect that all could still be ready for a May or June 1998 letting. However, considering the number of delays already seen for this project, I would not want to find that bids would come after the State Park Road funding has lapsed. Could there be an extension on the funding time line, assuming we are near a bid letting?

Since you have been so much help already on this project, I did not want to ask that last question, but I feel it is necessary to protect the County's interest. If there are other concerns, please let me know. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,


Wayne L Olson, PE
County Highway Engineer
cc: County Board
Stan Demenge, Perch Lake Twp
Bill Croze, ADE

# Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 

500 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-40
CARITONCOUNTY

August 4, 1997
HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

Mr. Wayne Olson
Carlton County Highway Engineer
County Courthouse
P.O. Box 120

Carlton, MN 55718-0120
Dear Wayne:
I am in concurrence with the road change proposals outlined in your May 27, 1997 letter as they relate to Ditch Bank Road in Carlton County.

We are also in favor of carrying the money over one more year to be assured of a good project.
If you need more information please give me a call.

Yours truly,

John Strohkirch
Development \& Acquisition Manager
State Parks
JS/mas
c: Steve Simmer
SAF 165

# Fond du Lac Reservation Business Committee 

1720 Big Lake Rd.
Cloquet. MN 55720
Phone (218) 879-4593
Fax (218) 879-4146


Chairman
Robert B. Peacock
Secretary/Treasurer
Peter J. Defoe

Dist. I Councilman Clifton Rabideaux

Dist. II Councilman
Daryold Blackener
Dist. III Councilman
George Dupuis

Executive Director L Jean Mulder

CARLTON COUNTY
SEP 181997
HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT
September 16, 1997

Mr. Richard J. Brenner, Commis ioner
Mr. Wayne L. Olson, County Engi. =er
Carlton County Highway Departmenc
Carlton County Courthouse
P.O. Box 120

Carlton, MN 55718-0120
Dear Gentiemen:
This is to inform you that the Fond du Lac Reservation Business Committee has considered the County's proposal to improve Ditch Bank Road from Big Lake Road to Mission Road, as set forth in your letter of May 23, 1997. The Reservation Business Committee consents to the proposed project, and authorizes Haack Engineering to release all engineering plans and design specifications developed for that segment of the Ditch Bank Road between Big lake and Mission Roads.

Yours truly,


Chairman

RBP/lao
aunty

February 25, 1998

Mr Mike Tardy, A.D.E.
Minnesota Department of Transportation
1123 Mesaba Ave
Duluth M NV 55811

## Subject: State Park Road Account Project

CSAH 25 - Ditchbank/Mission Roads
As you are aware, Carlton County has made roadway exchanges with Perch Lake Township and we have designated a part of Ditchbank Road and the remainder of Mission Road as CSAH 25, making a better fit for through traffic and CSAH designation. My letter to you and earlier to Bill Croze explained several issues to be resolved, including authorizing the County to use $\$ 400,000$ of State Park Road funds that had been designated for Township use.

At this time, all is in order to go forward, and I ask you to forward this as a request to the Screening Board to spend State Park Road Funds on CSAH 25. I enclosed a letter of concurrence from John Strohkirch, DNR Parks, along with the letter he references.

If you need further information, or if SALT needs Mr Strohkirch to write there, let me know.
Sincerely,


Wayne L Olson, P.E.
Carlton County Highway Engineer
WLO/sll

cc: John Strohkirch, DNR<br>Stan DeMenge, Perch Lake Township<br>Ken Hoeschen, SALT<br>file



# MILLE LACS COUNTY <br> DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS 

RICHARD C. LARSON, P.E. COUNTY ENGINEER
DEAN PETERSON
ASSISTANT ENGINEER
ANDY R. EVENSEN
MAINTENANCE SUPERVISÓR
TRUDY M. WEDELL
OFFICE MANAGER

565 8TH STREET N.E.
MILACA, MINNESOTA 56353
(320) 983-8201

FAX (320) 983-8383


January 14, 1998

John Strohkirch
DNR Park Development \& Real Estate
MN Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Road
Box 39
St. Paul, MN 55155-4039
Dear John:
Enclosed is a map and estimate for resurfacing CSAH 26, access to Kathio State Park, from TH 27 to TH 169. This road abuts the State Park for two-thirds of its length of 6.25 miles. This letter is a request for $\$ 247,197$ from State Park Funds for the above work.


Richard C. Larson, P.E.
Mille Lacs County Highway Engineer
DP/mp
Enclosures
cc Ken Anderson, Father Hennepin State Park $\checkmark$ Ken Hoeschen, MnDOT


LOCATED ON COUNTY STATE ADD HIGFFAY NO. 26.
FROM iNT. T.H. 27 TO T.H. 169.
FRO: 48.58 m S. AND 48.77 m E. OF NT CRN. OF N N 1/4 OF SW $1 / 4$ SEC. 36 TO 408.43m N. Or NW CRN. SEC 11, T-42-N, R-27-T.

RURAL LENGTH 10057.12 METERS 10.057 km MUNICIPAL LENGTH $\qquad$ METERS $\qquad$ km GROSS LENGTH 10057.12 METERS 10.057 km BRIDGES-LENGTH $\qquad$ METERS $\qquad$ km EXCEPTIONS-LENGTH
NET LENGHT 10057.12 METERS 10.057 km STATE AID DESIGN STANDARDS \#8820.9925 FOR RESURFACING USED. INDEX
SHEET 1 - TITLE SHEET SHEET 2 - TABULATION SHEET SHEET 3,4 - TYPICAL SECTIONS

ORIGINAL GRADING IN 1948
S.P. 48-509-02

| DESIGN | NATION |
| :---: | :---: |
| NI8 20 | Design speed 55 MPH Based on |
| R Value | Current Design Standards. |
| ADT (1998) $=300$ | Based on STOPPING Sight Distance Us |
| Proj. ADT (2018) $=540$ | Height of eye 3.5' \& Height of object |
| Proj. HCADT (2018) $=45$ | Design Speed not achieved at: |
| Soil Factor 100 | STA. |
| Ton Design 7 | STA. |
| Shoulder Width 0.9m | STA. __ TO STA. __ MPH |

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY REGISTERED ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

DATE $\qquad$ 1998
MILLE LACS COUNTY ENGINEER REGISTRATION NO. 8803

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL $\qquad$

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL $\qquad$ DATE $\qquad$ 1998

APPROVED
DATE $\qquad$ 1998

## GOVERNING SPECIFICATIONS

THE 1995 EDITION OF THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION "STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION" AS AMENDED BY THE NOV. 20, 1995 SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIFICATION SHALL GOVERN.

## PRELIMINARY DETAIL ESTIMATE SAP 48-626-11

| Item | Item Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit <br> Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2221.502 | Aggregate Shoulderng, CI 1 (LV) | m3 | . 2391 | \$8.00 | \$19,128.00 |
| 2340.508 | Wear Course, Type 31 | t | .-6760 | \$17.00 | \$114,920.00 |
| 2340.512 | Level Course, Type 31 | t | 6760 | \$16.50 | \$111,540.00 |
| 2580.501 | Temporary Lane Marking | m | 1609 | \$1.00 | \$1,609.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | \$247.197.00 |

March 9， 1998

Mr．Kichard Larson
Mille Lacs County Lingineer
$5658^{\text {th }}$ Street NE
Milacu，MN 56353

## RE：Request for Road Improvement Funding from the UNK State Park Road Account

Dear Sirs：
I am writing to inform you that your application for funds from the State Park Road Accoumt for improvements to CSAH 26 providing access to Mille Lacs Kathio State Park for $\$ 247,197$ has heen reviewed and was nol fiunded．We have 50 projects currently on the needs list totaling more than $\$ 14$ million．As you can see our annual allocation ol approximately $\$ 2$ million docsn＇t come close to taking carc of the total number of project request．

All projects submitted were prioritized based on salety，amount of traffic，cxisting road conditions and volume of use at the DNR facility served by the road．This project submitted in your county did not rate high enough on the statewide priority list to receive funding at this time． We will however，retain your request on file for consideration during the 1999 funding cycle．

Should you decide not to proceed with this project or have completed the project with oher funding please inform me at your carliest convenience．If this is a township road request please inform the township officials of our decision．Due to the number of people involved in these projects I am only informing the County Engineers．

Should you have questions regarding this particular project please contact me at 612／296－8289． Thank you for your corporation．

Sincerely，


Development \＆Acquisition Manager
State Parks
c：Paul Stine－MN DOT Oflice of State Aid liile－SAU 324


# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA JUNE, 1998 

## 1993-1997 Five-Year Average Subbase (Class 3 \& 4) Unit Price Data

The following map indicates the subbase (Class 3 \& 4) unit price information that is in the 1993-1997 five-year average unit price study and the inflated subbase unit price, the determination of which is explained in another write-up in this booklet. This data is being included in the report because in some cases the gravel base unit prices recommended by the Subcommittee, as shown on Fig. A, were determined using this subbase information.

FIG. D


1998 County Screening Board Data
June, 1998
1993-1997 Five Year Average Subbase (Class 3\&4) Unit Price Data
(Rural and Urban Projects Included)


## LEGEND

7-17-152-3.88 \# '93 to '97 Subbase Proj. - Miles - Tons (in 1000's) - 5 Year Avg. Unit Price 4.261998 Inflated Subbase Unit Price

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA JUNE, 1998 

## Inflated Subbase and Gravel Base Unit Prices

The next four pages indicated how the inflation factors are used on the first four years of projects in each county's five year average unit price study for both subbase and gravel base.

1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA
JUNE, 1998
Procedure for Inflating Subbase Unit Prices

| Procedure for Infating Subbase Unit Prices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11-May-98 <br> pi1231FibsaSnChsub98 <br> COUNTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} 1993 \\ \text { costs } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NFATED } \\ \text { COS3 } \\ \text { (X1,25 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1994 \\ \text { COSTS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INFLEATEO } \\ & \text { COSTS } \\ & \times 1.211 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1995 \\ \text { cosTs } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NFLATED } \\ & \text { 1995 } \\ & \text { COSTS } \\ & (\mathbf{X 1 . 1 0 )} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1996 \\ & \text { costs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { INFLATED } \\ \text { COSTSS } \\ (\mathrm{X}, 1,17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1997 \\ \text { costs } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & 1993-1997 \\ & \text { INFLATED } \\ & \text { COSTS } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL 1993-1997 QUANTITY | 1993-1997 INFLATED SUBBASE UNIT PR. |  |
| 9 | Cariton | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | \$0.00 | Carlton |
| 16 | Cook | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Cook |
| 31 | Itasca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Itasca |
| 36 | Koochiching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Koochiching |
| 38 | Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Lake |
| 58 | Pine | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Pine |
| 69 | St. Louis | 0 | 0 | 48,204 | 58,327 | 39,193 | 43,112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101,439 | 16,256 | 6.24 | St. Louis |
|  | District 1 Totals | 0 | 0 | 48,204 | 58,327 | 39,193 | 43,112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101,439 | 16,256 | 6.24 | District 1 Totals |
| 4 | Beltrami | 0 | 0 | 78,985 | 95,572 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225,654 | 321,226 | 87,186 | 3.68 | Beltrami |
| 15 | Clearwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Clearwater |
| 29 | Hubbard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Hubbard |
| 35 | Kittson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Kittson |
| 39 | Lake of the Woods | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Lake of the Woods |
| 45 | Marshall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Marshall |
| 54 | Norman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Norman |
| 57 | Pennington | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36,000. | 39,600 | 60,450 | 70,727 | 0 | 110,327 | 23,896 | 4.62 | Pennington |
| 60 | Polk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 487,904 | 487,904 | 95,254 | 5.12 | Polk |
| 63 | Red Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37,416 | 37,416 | 6,878 | 5.44 | Red Lake |
| 68 | Roseau | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Roseau |
|  | District 2 Totals | 0 | 0 | 78,985 | 95,572 | 36,000 | 39,600 | 60,450 | 70,727 | 750,974 | 956,873 | 213,214 | 4.49 | District 2 Totals |
| 1 | Aitkin | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177,065 | 177,065 | 25,134 | 7.04 | Aitkin |
| 5 | Benton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Benton |
| 11 | Cass | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Cass |
| 18 | Crow Wing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Crow Wing |
| 30 | Isanti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Isanti |
| 33 | Kanabec | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Kanabec |
| 48 | Mille Lacs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Mille Lacs |
| 49 | Morrison | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Morrison |
| 71 | Sherburne | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Sherburne |
| 73 | Stearns | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Stearns |
| 77 | Todd | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Todd |
| 80 | Wadena | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Wadena |
| 86 | Wright | 23,280 | 29,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29,100 | 5,500 | 5.29 | Wright |
|  | District 3 Totals | 23,280 | 29,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177,065 | 206,165 | 30,634 | 6.73 | District 3 Totals |
| 3 | Becker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Becker |
| 6 | Big Stone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Big Stone |
| 14 | Clay | 178,010 | 222,513 | 507,900 | 614,559 | 872,678 | 959,946 | 641,198 | 750,202 | 0 | 2,547,220 | 465,578 | 5.47 | Clay |
| 21 | Douglas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Douglas |
| 26 | Grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95,684 | 95,684 | 25,180 | 3.80 | Grant |
| 44 | Mahnomen | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Mahnomen |
| 56 | Otter Tail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Otter Tail |
| 61 | Pope | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101,160 | 111,276 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111,276 | 27,715 | 4.02 | Pope |
| 75 | Stevens | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Stevens |
| 76 | Swift | 325,298 | 406,623 | 0 | 0 | 504,898 | 555,388 | 0 | 0 | 279,757 | 1,241,768 | 288,105 | 4.31 | Swift |
| 78 | Traverse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Traverse |
| 84 | Wilkin | 235,382 | 294,228 | 0 | 0 | 161,076 | 177.184 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 471,412 | 77,996 | 6.04 | Wilkin |
|  | District 4 Totals | 738,690 | 923,364 | 507,900 | 614,559 | 1,639,812 | 1,803,794 | 641,198 | 750,202 | 375,441 | 4,467,360 | 884,574 | 5.05 | District 4 Totals |
| 2 | Anoka | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Anoka |
| 10 | Carver | 0 | 0 | 276,316 | 334,342 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 334,342 | 52,637 | 6.35 | Carver |
| 27 | Hennedin | 51.796 | 64.745 | 637.617 | 771.517 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 68,412 | 904,674 | 120.291 | 7.52 | Hennepin |

## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

## JUNE, 1998

Procedure for Inflating Subbase Unit Prices

| NO. | COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} 1993 \\ \text { costs } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NFLATED } \\ & \text { 1993 } \\ & \text { COSTS } \\ & \times 1.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1994 \\ \text { cosTs } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NFLATED } \\ & \text { CO94 } \\ & \text { COSTS } \\ & (\times 1.211 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1995 \\ \text { cosTs } \end{gathered}$ | INFLATED <br> 1995 <br> COSTS, <br> $(X 1.10)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1996 \\ \text { cosTs } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INFLATED } \\ & \text { 1996 } \\ & \text { COSTS } \\ & (X 1.17) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1997 \\ \text { cosTs } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL 1993-1997, INFLATED COSTS | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { 1993-1997 } \\ \text { QUANTITY } \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1993-1997 INFLATED SUBBASE UNIT PR. | pil23wile 450 Chsubs8 COUNTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | Dodge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Dodge |
| 23 | Fillmore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 0 |  | Frilmare |
| 24 | Freeborn | 578,592 | 723,240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 723,240 167,619 | 152,096 32,921 | 4.76 5.09 | Greeborn |
| 25 | Goodhue | 116,000 | 145,000 | 0 | 0 | 20,563 | 22,619 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167,619 | -32,921 | 0.00 | Houston |
| 28 | Houston | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Mower |
| 50 | Mower | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Olmsted |
| 55 | Olmsted | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Rice |
| 66 | Rice | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | Rice |
| 74 | Steele | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,480 | 83,028 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83,028 | 13,211 |  | Steele |
| 79 | Wabasha | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,419 | 29,740 | 2,180 | 31,920 | 6,859 | 4.65 | Wabasha |
| 85 | Winona | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0. | 0 |  | Winona |
|  | District 6 Totals | 694,592 | 868,240 | 0 | 0 | 96,043 | 105,647 | 25,419 | 29,740 | 2,180 | 1,005,807 | 205,087 | 4.90 | District 6 Totals |
| 7 | Blue Earth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Blue Earth |
| 8 | Brown | 0 | 0 | 414,955 | 502,096 | 139,741 | 153,715 | 115,676 | 135,341 | 57,009 | 848,161 | 196,354 | 4.32 | Brown |
| 17 | Cottonwood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Cottonwood |
| 22 | Faribault | 93,900 | 117,375 | 179,036 | 216,634 | 971,344 | 1,068,478 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,402,487 | 186,319 | 7.53 | Faribault |
| 32 | Jackson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 724,408 | 796,849 | 645,764 | 755,544 | 609,296 | 2,161,689 | 55,564 |  | Jackson |
| 40 | Le Sueur | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.00 | Le Sueur |
| 46 | Martin | 503,887 | 629,859 | 482,728 | 584,101 | 609,581 | 670,539 | 0 | 0 | 502,225 | 2,386,724 | 392,585 | 6.08 | Martin |
| 52 | Nicollet | 163,967 | 204,959 | 0 | 0 | 81,6i30 | 89,793 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 294,752 | 57.868 | 5.09 | Nicollet |
| 53 | Nobles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Nobles |
| 67 | Rock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 463,382 | 463,382 | 70,962 | 6.53 | Rock |
| 72 | Sibley | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | Sibley |
| 81 | Waseca | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184,603 | 184,603 | 30,139 |  | Waseca |
| 83 | Watonwan | 0 | 0 | 234,396 | 283,619 | 9,409 | $\begin{array}{r}10,350 \\ \hline 2789\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16,287 \\ 777727 \end{array}$ | $19,056$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31,654 \\ 1.848 .169 \end{array}$ | $344,679$ $8,086,477$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58,166 \\ 1,447,957 \end{array}$ |  | District 7 Totals |
|  | District 7 Totals | 761,754 | 952,193 | 1,311,115 | 1,586,450 | 2,536,113 | 2,789,724 | 777,727 | 909,941 | 1,848,169 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538,223 | 86,627 | 6.21 | Chippewa |
| 12 | Chippewa | 430,578 0 | 538,223 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Kandiyohi |
| 37 | Lac Qui Parle | 122,582 | 153,228 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153,228 | 37,455 | 4.09 | Lac Qui Parle |
| 41 | Lincoln | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Lincoln |
| 42 | Lyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 69364 | 0.00 | Lyon |
| 43 | Mc Leod | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272,601 | 299,861 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 299,861 | 69,364 | 4.32 | Meeker |
| 47 | Meeker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Meeker |
| 51 | Murray | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Murray |
| 59 | Pipestone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 00 | Redwood |
| 64 | Redwood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Redwood |
| 65 | Renville | 0 | 0 | 67,097 | 81,187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81,187 | 20,510 | O | Yellow Medicine |
| 87 | Yellow Medicine | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 213.956 | 5.01 | District 8 Totals |
|  | District 8 Totals | 553.160 | 691,451 | 67,097 | 81,187 | 272,501 | 299,861 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,072,499 | 213,956 |  | District ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Chisago |
| 13 19 | Dakota | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,728 | 9,042 | 0 | 9,042 | 1,005 | 9.00 | Dakota |
| 62 | Ramsey | 0 | 0 | 881 | 1,066 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33,800 | 34,866 | 4,300 | 8.11 | Ramsey |
| 82 | Washington | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | Washington |
| 82 | District 9 Totals | 0 | 0 | 881 | 1,066 | 0 | 0 | 7,728 | 9,042 | 33,800 | 43,908 | 5,305 | 8.28 | District 9 Totals |


| STATE TOTALS | $\$ 2,823,272$ | $\$ 3,529,093$ | $\$ 2,928,115$ | $\$ 3,543,020$ | $\$ 4,619,762$ | $\$ 5,081,738$ | $\$ 1,512,522$ | $\$ 1,769,652$ | $\$ 3,256,041$ | $\$ 17,179,544$ | $\mathbf{3}, 189,911$ | $\$ 5,39$ | STATE TOTALS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

岂

## JUNE, 1998

Procedure For Inflating Gravel Base Unit Prices

| Precoure Foriniling Gravel Base unit Prices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL $1993-1997$ INFLATED cosTs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { 1993-1997 } \\ & \text { SUANTITY } \end{aligned}$ | INFLATED GRAVEL BASE UNIT PRICE | dimel123Pilo_45achbaress <br> COUNTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO. | COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} 1993 \\ \text { COSTS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NFLATED } \\ \text { 1993 } \\ \text { cOSTS } \\ \text { X } 1.201 \end{gathered}$ | 1994 costs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IFLATED } \\ & \text { 1994, } \\ & \text { COSTS } \\ & (X, 17) \end{aligned}$ | costs 1995 cos | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NFLATED } \\ & \text { COSTS } \\ & \text { (X1.09) } \end{aligned}$ | costs <br> 1996 <br> cosit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INFLTED } \\ & \text { COSTIS } \\ & \text { (X1,11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1997 \\ \text { costs } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Carlton | \$167,471 | \$200,965 | \$435,007 | \$508,958 | \$0 | (1) 80 | \$406,279 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Cook | 553,841 | 664,609 | 0 | 0 | 139,037 | 151,550 | +406,342 | \$450,970 | $\$ 153,967$ 271,910 | $\$ 1,314,660$ $1,158,379$ | 308,268 250,840 | \$4.27 | Canton |
| 31 | Itasca | 390,776 | 468,931 | 509,112 | 595,661 | 377,619 | 411,605 | 386,120 | 428,593 | 890,728 | 2,795,518 | 604,994 | 4.62 | Cook |
| 36 | Koochiching | 431,360 | 517,632 | 337,324 | 394,669 | 61,540 | 67,079 | 3,000 | 4,330 | 982,342 | 1,965,052 | 604,994 316,970 | 4.62 6.20 | Itasca |
| 38 | Lake | 0 | 0 | 253,501 | 296,596 | 139,361 | 151,903 | 154,124 | 171,078 | 262,738 | 882,315 | 170,450 | 5.18 | Kach |
| 58 | Pine | 562,049 | 674,459 | 176,897 | 206,969 | 136,878 | 149,197 | 192,434 | 213,602 | 364,513 | 1,608,740 | 335,523 |  |  |
| 69 | St. Louis | 635,191 | 762,229 | 656,617 | 768,242 | 495,201 | 539,769 | 762,166 | 846,004 | 482,479 | 3,398,723 | 6フก¢17 | 5.07 |  |
|  | District 1 Totals | 2,740,688 | 3,288,825 | 2,368,458 | 2,771,095 | 1,349,636 | 1,471,103 | 1,967,465 | 2,183,887 | 3,408,677 | 13,123,587 | 562 | 4.94 | Sistict 1 Totals |
| 4 | Bettrami | 237,270 | 284,724 | 746,675 | 873,610 | 4,930 | 5,374 | 63,618 | 70,616 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Clearwater | 204,995 | 245,994 | 254,883 | 298,213 | 164,073 | 178,840 | 120,044 | 133,249 | 951,172 | z.185 0 | 122,182 | 5.18 | Beltrami |
| 29 | Hubbard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219,371 | 239114 | 455344 | 130,249 | 231,142 | , | 293,517 |  | learwater |
| 35 | Kittson | 0 | 0 | 220 | 257 |  | 23,114 | 455,344 | 505,432 | 25,445 | - 04,991 | 178,980 | 4.30 | Hubbard |
| 39 | Lake of the Woods | 539,381 | 647,257 | 231,424 | 270,766 | 206,952 | 57 |  | 11,844 | 242,539 | 422,491 | 76,309 | 5.54 | kittson |
| 45 | Marshall | 449,086 | 538,903 | 189,900 | 222,183 | 347,018 | 225,578 | 1391.444 | 0 | 147,003 | 1,290,604 | 193,405 | 6.67 | Lake of the Woods |
| 54 | Norman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161,248 | 175,760 | 392,963 | +436,189 | 0 | 2,683,839 | 562,269 | 4.77 | Marshall |
| 57 | Pennington | 174,720 | 209,664 | 0 | 0 | 255,635 | 278,642 | 149,868 | 166,353 | 122,872 | 734,821 | 128,651 | 5.71 | Norman |
| 60 | Polk | 714,578 | 857,494 | 20,150 | 23,576 | 3,200 | 3,488 | 332,601 | 369,187 | 26,641 900,270 | 681,300 | 147,294 | 4.63 | Pennington |
| 63 | Red Lake | 315,000 | 378,000 | 41,062 | 48,043 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 657 | 2,154,015 | 343,743 | 6.27 | Polk |
| 68 | Roseau | 236,545 | 283,854 | 62,837 | 73,519 | 239,424 | 260,972 | 209,561 | 232.613 | 657,427 | $1,083,470$ 850,958 | 248,105 | 4.37 | RedLake |
|  | District 2 Totals | 2,871,575 | 3,445,890 | 1,547,151 | 1,810,167 | 1,755,843 | 1,913,869 | 3,126,113 | 3,469,5 ¢ | 3,304,511 | 13,944,423 | 2,779,828 | 4.59 5.02 | Roseau District 2 Totals |
| 1 | Aitkin | 213,017 | 255,620 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 220,119 | 244,332 | 761012 | 1,260,964 |  |  |  |
| 5 | Benton | 79,230 | 95,076 | 385,991 | 451,609 | 0 | 0 | 484,708 | 538,026 | 261,122 | 1,345,833 | 274,813 |  | Aitkin |
| 11 | Cass | 99,534 | 119.441 | 392,515 | 459,243 | 358,312 | 390,560 | 460,109 | 510,721 | - 0 |  | 274,813 | 4.90 | Benton |
| 18 | Crow Wing | 23,956 | 28,747 | 139,343 | 163,031 | 0 | 0 | 338,510 | 375,746 |  | 1,479,965 | 304,956 | 4.85 | Cass |
| 30 | Isanti | 185,772 | 222,926 | 82,661 | 96,713 | 107,092 | 116,730 | 273,715 | 303,824 | 122,104 | 60y,628 | 126,276 | 5.46 | Crow Wing |
| 33 | Kanabec | 162,644 | 195,173 | 0 | 0 | 176,829 | 192,744 | 309,855 | 343,939 | 174,127 | 806,849 | 152,670 | 5.28 | Isanti |
| 48 | Mille Lacs | 53,900 | 64,680 | 209,417 | 245,018 | 0 | 192,70 | 240,712 | 343,939 $\mathbf{2 6 7 , 1 9 0}$ | 174,127 280,810 | 905,983 857,698 | 247,856 | 3.66 4.37 | Kanabec |
| 49 | Morrison | 6,279 | 7,535 | 29,013 | 33,945 | 153,085 | 166,863 | 133,160 | 147,808 | 20,558 | 376,709 | -66,219 | 4.37 | Mille Lacs |
| 71 | Sherburne | 57.310 | 68,772 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,360 | 7,060 | 103,800 | 179,632 | -36,301 | 3.89 5.39 | Morrison |
| 73 | Stearns | 161,553 | 193,864 | 393,089 | 459,914 | 67.751 | 73,849 | 441,848 | 490,451 | 137,571 | 1,355,649 | 268,110 | 5.39 | Sherburne |
| 77 | Todd | 123,893 | 148,672 | 123,487 | 144,480 | 151,318 | 164,937 | 64,940 | 72,083 | 297,616 | +827,788 | 268,110 | 5.06 | Steams |
| 80 | Wadena | 64,119 | 76,943 | 74,280 | 86,908 | 0 | 0 | 162,437 | 180,305 | 355,144 | 699,300 | 218,977 142,658 | 3.78 4.90 |  |
| 86 | Wright | 83.452 | 100,142 | 54,642 | 63,931 | 246,894 | 269,114 | 380,700 | 422,577 | 362,066 | 1,217,830 | 190,097 | 6.41 | Wadena <br> Wright |
|  | District 3 Totals | 1,314,659 | 1,577,591 | 1,884,438 | 2,204,792 | 1,261,281 | 1,374,797 | 3,517,173 | 3,904,062 | 2,942,586 | 12,003,828 | 190,097 $\mathbf{2 , 5 2 1 , 4 1 6}$ | 6.41 4.76 | Wright <br> District 3 Totais |
| 3 | Becker | 465,268 | 558,322 | 29,690 | 34,737 | 449,698 | 490,171 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Big Stone | 83,674 | 100,409 | 48,700 | 56,979 | 14,370 | 15,663 | 380,731 | 422,611 | 418,406 69,906 | 1,501,636 | 406,448 |  | Becker |
| 14 | Clay | 52,060 | 62,472 | 200,736 | 234,861 | 230,724 | 251,489 | 164,130 | 182,184 | 157,650 | 888,656 |  | 5.62 | Big Stone |
| 21 | Douglas | 47,480 | 56,976 | 8,100 | 7,137 | 166,561 | 181,551 | 286,039 | 317,503 | 116,660 | 888,656 679,827 | 157,856 174,126 | 5.63 3.90 | Clay |
| 26 | Grant | 0 | 0 | 106,050 | 124,079 | 0 | 0 | 216,000 | 239,760 | 210,830 | 679,827 574,669 | 174,126 168,850 | 3.90 3.40 | Douglas |
| 44 | Mahnomen | 0 | 0 | 161,676 | 189,161 | 0 | 0 | 462,858 | 513,772 | 21,960 | 724,893 | 165,778 | 4.37 | Mahnomen |
| 56 | Otter Tail | 321,117 | 385,340 | 335,085 | 392,049 | 48,470 | 52,832 | 656,781 | 729,027 | 5,550 | 1,564,798 | 392,615 | 3.99 |  |
| 61 | Pope | 270,308 | 324,370 | 196,490 | 229,893 | 210,774 | 229,744 | 122,181 | 135,621 | 96,668 | 1,016,296 | 288,903 | 3.52 | Otter Tail |
| 75 | Stevens | 285,075 | 342,090 | 34,340 | 40,178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96,66 | $1,016,296$ 382,268 |  | 3.53 | Pope |
| 76 | Swift | 141,148 | 169,378 | 0 | 0 | 151,493 | 165,127 | 74,829 | 83,060 | 180,710 | 582,268 | 97,300 130,729 | 3.93 | Stevens |
| 78 | Traverse | 203,980 | 244,776 | 0 | 0 | - 0 | 165,127 | 74,829 0 | 83,060 | 180,710 | 598,275 244,776 | 130,729 47000 | 4.58 | Swif |
| 84 | Wilkin | 63,058 | 75,670 | 94,193 | 110,206 | 273,689 | 298,321 | 140,385 | 155,827 | 139.860 | 779.884 | 144,310 |  | Traverse |
|  | District 4 Totals | 1,933,168 | 2,319,803 | 1,213,060 | 1,419,280 | 1,545,779 | 1,684,898 | 2,503,934 | 2,779,365 | 1,418,200 | 9,621,546 | 2,311,887 | 5.40 4.16 | Wikin |
| 2 | Anoka | 304,097 | 364,916 | 134,015 | 156,798 | 125,545 | 136,844 | 41,762 | 46,356 | 135,941 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Carver | 0 | 0 | 261,644 | 306,123 | 0 | 0 | 561,206 | 622,939 | 135,941 | 929,062 | 118,672 | 7.46 | Anoka |
| 27 | Hennepin | 470,680 | 564,816 | 660,896 | 773,248 | 931,457 | 1,015,288 | 822,464 | 912,935 | 477,638 | 3.743.925 | 495.716 |  |  |

# Procedure For Inflating Gravel Base Unit Prices 


$\stackrel{1}{\omega}$

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARП DATA 

June, $2=$<br>\section*{Calculation of Gravel Base Unit Prices for Counties Without 50,000 Tons}

The following three pages indicate the procedures used to calculate the 1998 CSAH Needs Study Gravel Base Unit Prices for those eleven counties who do not have at least 50,000 tons of gravel base material in their 5-year average Unit Price Study.

## 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA

Calculation of Gravel Base Unit Prices For Counties without 50,000 Tons



|  | Inflated |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Surrounding Counties | Cost | - | Quantity |  |
| Cilkin | $\$ 779,884$ | - | 144,310 |  |
| Grant | 574,669 | - | 168,850 |  |
| Stevens | 382,268 | - | 97,300 |  |
| Big Stone | 665,568 | - | $\underline{137,972}$ |  |
|  | $\$ 2,402,389$ |  | 548,432 |  |


| District 6 | TONS | INFLATED UNIT PRICE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DODGE | 22 | X | 6.56 | $=$ | 144.32 |
| Subbase | 0 | X | 0.00 | = | 0.00 |
| Surrounding | $\underline{28}$ | $\underline{X}$ | 6.31 | 三 | $\frac{176.68}{321.00}=$ |

Surrounding Counties-
Goodhue
Olmsted
Mower
Freeborn
Steele
Rice
Infiated
Cost
$\$ 2,476,773$
$1,649,622$
$1,242,610$
923,858
476,408
$1,038,725$
$\$ 7,807,996$

Quantity

```
        452,490
        252,460
        153,501
        143,627
        63,076
        172,853
    $1,238,007 = $6.31
```

| District 7 | TONS |  | INFLATED UNIT PRICE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BROWN | 16 | X | $5.92=$ | 94.72 |  |
| Subbase | 34 | $\underline{X}$ | $4.32 \equiv$ | 146.88 |  |
|  | 50 |  |  | $241.60=$ | \＄4．83 |
| District 7 | TONS | INFLATED UNIT PRICE |  | 211.14 |  |
| SIBLEY | 34 | X | $6.21=$ |  |  |
| Subbase | 0 | X | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Surrounding | 16 | X | $6.14 \equiv$ | 98.24 |  |
| Surounding | 50 |  |  | $309.38=$ | 6.19 |
|  | Inflated |  | Quantity |  |  |
| Surrounding Counties－ | Cost | － |  |  |  |
| LeSueur | \＄917，610 | － | $176,418$ |  |  |
| Nicollet | 467，289 | － | 92，558 |  |  |
| McLeod | 1，602，453 |  | 287，137 |  |  |
| Carver | 929，062 |  | 118，362 |  |  |
| Scott | $\begin{array}{r} 3,376,771 \\ \$ 7,293,185 \end{array}$ |  | 512，680 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1，187，155 | \＄6．14 |  |
| District 7 | TONS | INFLATED UNIT PRICE |  |  |  |
| WASECA | 30 | X | $6.32=$ | 189.60 |  |
| Subbase | 20 | $\underline{X}$ | 6.13 三 | 122.60 |  |
|  | 50 |  |  | $312.20=$ | \＄6．24 |
| District 7 | TONS | INFLATED UNIT PRICE |  |  |  |
| WATONWAN | 31 | X | $6.55=$ | 203.05 |  |
| Subbase | 19 | $\underline{X}$ | 5.93 三 | 112.67 |  |
|  | 50 |  |  | $315.72=$ | \＄6．31 |
| District 8 | TONS | INFLATED UNIT PRICE |  |  |  |
| LAC QUI PARLE | 22 | X | $4.58=$ | 100.76 |  |
| Subbase | 28 | $\underline{X}$ | 4.09 三 | 114.52 |  |
|  | 50 |  |  | $215.28=$ | \＄4．31 |
| District 8 | TONS | INFLATED UNIT PRICE |  |  |  |
| RENVILLE | 22 | X | $6.20=$ | 136.40 |  |
| Subbase | 21 | X | $3.96=$ | 83.16 |  |
| Surrounding | 7 50 | X | 5.20 三 | $\frac{36.40}{255.96}=$ | 2 |
|  | Inflated |  |  |  |  |
| Surrounding Counties－ | Cost | － | Quantity |  |  |
| Chippewa | \＄650，740 | － | 109，399 |  |  |
| Kandiyohi | 644，631 | － | 131，878 |  |  |
| Meeker | 368，632 |  | 88，558 |  |  |
| McLeod | 1，602，453 |  | 287，137 |  |  |
| Nicollet | 467，289 |  | 92，558 |  |  |
| Redwood | $\underline{1,259,151}$ |  | 250，104 |  |  |
|  | \＄4，992，896 |  | 959，634＝ | \＄5．20 |  |



| District 9 |
| :--- |
| CHISAGO |
| Subbase |
| Surrounding |
|  |
| Surrounding Counties - |
| Pine |
| Kanabec |
| Isanti |
| Anoka |
| Washington |


| TONS | INFLATED UNIT PRICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | X | 5.79 |
| 0 | X | 0.00 |
| 10 | X | 5.18 |
| 50 |  |  |
| Inflated |  |  |
| Cost | - | Quantity |
| \$1,608,740 |  | 335,523 |
| \$905,983 |  | 247,856 |
| 806,849 |  | 152,670 |
| 840,855 |  | 112,672 |
| 764,865 |  | 103,343 |
| 4,927,292 |  | 952,064 |

231.6 0
51.8 $283.40=$
\$5.18

# 1998 COUNTY SCREENING BOARD DATA 

JUNE, 1998

## Needs Adjustments for Variances Granted on CSAHs

The adjustments shown below are for those variances granted for which projects have been awarded prior to May 1, 1998 and for which no adjustments have been previously made. These adjustments were computed using guidelines established by the Variance Subcommittee. The guidelines are a part of the Screening Board resolutions.

| County | Project | Variance From | Recommended <br> 1998 Needs <br> Adjustments |  | Approx. 1999 Apport $\qquad$ Loss * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crow Wing | 18-622-05 | Design Speed | \$ | 248,400 | \$ 5,623 |
| Hennepin | 27-637-03 | Street Width |  | 117,300 | 2,656 |
| Lincoln | 41-617-21 | Design Speed |  | 69,050 | 1,563 |
| St. Louis | 69-744-01 | Street Width |  | 95,100 | 2,153 |
| TOTAL |  |  | \$ | 529,850 | \$11,995 |

If the counties involved have any questions regarding these adjustments, the State Aid Office can be contacte directly. Also the calculation of the adjustments will be available at the various district meetings and th Screening Board meeting.

* Based on $\$ 22.64$ earning factor for each $\$ 1,000$ of 25 year money needs.


## 1998 County Screening Board Data

June, 1998

## Advancement of CSAH Construction Funds from the General CSAH Construction Account.

Resolutions adopted at the October, 1995 County Screening Board meeting indicate the guidelines to be used to advance CSAH construction funds to individual counties. Below is a summary of action taken since these resolutions were adopted.

## HISTORY OF CSAH CONSTRUCTION FUND BALANCES

| Total 1995 Advance/Repaid in 1996-\$3,151,414 |
| :---: |
| Total 1996 Advance/Repaid in 1997-\$13,526,279 |
| Total 1997 Advance/Repaid in 1998-\$17,976,381 |

1998 SUMMARY TO DATE

| County | \$'s Reserved By <br> Resolution | \$'s Actually <br> Encumbered |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Becker | $\$ 1,200,000$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Dodge | 700,000 | $\$ 0$ |
| Fillmore | $2,474,276$ | $2,345,221$ |
| Hubbard | $1,100,000$ | $1,100,000$ |
| McLeod | $1,200,000$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Nobles | 550,000 | $\$ 0$ |
| Olmsted | $1,034,000$ | $1,034,000$ |
| Pope | 562,000 | 562,000 |
| Red Lake | 600,000 | $\$ 0$ |

Note: The maximum dollar amount of State Aid advances which can be made in 1998 is $\$ 38,675,811$.

Office of Bridges and Structuras
Waters Edge Building
1500 West County Road B2, Suite 200
Roseville, MN 55113-3105

$$
\text { Date: April } 14,1998
$$

To: Kemuelh Stiaus
Manager, Municipal State Aid Strect Needs Section
From: Mike Leuer
State Aid Hydraulic Technician
Phone: 582-1184
Subject: State Aid Storm Sewer
Construction Costs for 1997

We have completed our analysis of storm sewer construction costs incurred for 1997 and the following assumptions can be utilized for planning purposes per roadway mile:
approximately $\$ 245,000$ for new construction, and
approximately $\$ 76,000$ for adjustment of existing systems

CC: J.L. Boynton (file)

## STATE OF MINNESOTA

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Office Memorandum

MS 470, Transportation Building
TO: Kenneth Straus/Diane Gould Needs Unit

FROM: Robert G. Swanson, Director Railroad Administration

DATE: January 6, 1998

PHONE: 296-2472

SUBJECT: Projected Railroad Grade Crossing Improvements - Cost for 1998

We have projected 1998 costs for railroad-highway work at grade crossing improvements. For planning purposes, we recommend using the following figures:

| Railroad Grade Crossings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flashing Light Signals (Single Track - Low Speed)* |  |  |
| (Average Price) | per system | \$80,000.00 |
| Flashing Light Signals and Gates: |  |  |
| (Multiple Track - High \& Low Speed)** (Average Price) | per System | \$100-150,000.00 |
| Signs (Advance warning signs \& crossbucks <br> Pavement Markings <br> (Tape) <br> (Paint) | per Crossing <br> per Crossing <br> per Crossing | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1000.00 \\ \$ 5,500.00 \\ \$ 750.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Crossing Surfaces: <br> (High Type Crossing Surface) Complete reconstruction of the crossing. Labor and Materials | per track ft | \$800.00 |

* Modern signals with motion sensors - signals are activated when train enters electrical circuit deactivated if train stops before reaching crossing.
** Modern signals with grade crossing predictors - has capabilities in (*) above, plus ability to gauge speed and distance of train from crossing to give constant 20-25 second warning of approaching trains traveling from 5 to 80 MPH .


## Page 2

As part of any project in the vicinity of railroad crossings, a review of advance warning signs should be conducted. In addition, pavement markings (RxR, STOP BAR, and NO PASSING STRIPE), if required, should be installed.

We also recommend that projects are not designed so that they start or end at railroad crossings. A project should be carried through the crossing area so that the crossing does not become the transition zone between two different roadway sections or widths.

Please let me know if you have any questions, comments or concerns.
cc: Rashmi Brewer
Jerry Dempsey
John Driscoll
Tim Spencer

```
MINUTES OF THE COUNTY ENGINEER'S SCREENING BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 29 AND 30, 1997
BREEZY POINT RESORT NEAR PEQUOT LAKES
```

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m., October 29, 1997 by Chairman, Rick West, Otter Tail County Engineer.

## ATTENDANCE

Roll call of members:
Chuck Schmit, Cook District l

Lee Berget, Clearwater Dave Schwarting, Sherburne Rick West, Otter Tail Ken Anderson, Chisago Gene Ulring, Fillmore Marlin Larson, Cottonwood Luke Hagen, Lincoln Brad Larson, Scott Jon Olson, Anoka Dave Everds, Dakota Jim Grube, Hennepin Paul Kirkwold, Ramsey Dick Hansen, St. Louis Don Wisniewski, Washington

District 1
Di.strict 2

Qustrict 3
District 4
Metro
District 6
District 7
District 8
Metro
Urban
Urban
Urban
Urban
Urban
Urban

Chairman Rick West asked for a motion to approve the June 25 and June 26, 1997 Screening Board Minutes held at Cragun's Resort, Brainerd. Motion by Luke Hagen, seconded by Don Wisniewski, motion passed unanimously.

Roll call of MnDot personnel:

```
Pat Murphy, Director, Division of State Aid
Julie Skallman, Assistant State Aid Engineer
Ken Hoeschen, Manager, County State Aid Needs Unit
Ken Straus, Manager, Municipal State Aid Needs Unit
Khani Sahebjam, State Aid Office
Mike Tardy, District l State Aid Engineer
Lou Tasa, District 2 State Aid Engineer
Bob Busch,
Tallack Johnson,
Mike Pinsonneault,
Doug Haeder,
Tom Behm,
Bob Brown,
Greg Coughlin,
Greg Felt,
```

```
Acting District 3 State Aid Engineer
```

Acting District 3 State Aid Engineer
District 4 State Aid Engineer
District 4 State Aid Engineer
District 6 State Aid Engineer
District 6 State Aid Engineer
District }7\mathrm{ State Aid Engineer
District }7\mathrm{ State Aid Engineer
District }8\mathrm{ State Aid Engineer
District }8\mathrm{ State Aid Engineer
Metro Division State Aid Engineer
Metro Division State Aid Engineer
Metro Division Assistant
Metro Division Assistant
Metro Division Assistant

```
Metro Division Assistant
```

Chairman Rick West recognized Brad Larson, Scott County, the chairman of the General Subcommittee and the other representatives, Jack Cousins, Clay County and Rick Kjonaas, McLeod County, of the General Subcommittee. Chairman Rick West recognized Dave Robley, Douglas County, the chairman of the Mileage Subcommittee and the other representatives, Al Goodman, Lake County and Paul Kirkwold, Ramsey County, of the Mileage Subcommittee.

Chairman Rick West recognized the following alternates and other engineers in attendance:

| Lee Engstrom, Itasca | District 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Milton Alm, Norman | District 2 |
| Rich Heilman, Isanti | District 3 |
| Merle Early, Stevens | District 4 |
| Roger Gustafson, Carver | Metro |
| Greg Paulson, Goodhue | District 6 |
| Gary Stribley, Jackson | District 7 |
| Rick Kjonaas, McLeod | District 8 |

Others in attendance were:

| Doug Grindall, Koochiching | District 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Dick Larson, Mille Lacs | District 3 |
| Russ Larson, Wadena | District 3 |
| Duane Blanck, Crow Wing | District 3 |
| Doug Weiszhaar, Stearns | District 3 |
| Dave Heyer, Becker | District 4 |
| Graig Falkum, Wabasha | District 6 |
| Mike Sheehan, Olmsted | District 6 |
| Gary Bruggeman, Houston | District 6 |
| Barry Anderson, Yellow Medicine | District 8 |
| Gordon Regenscheid, Meeker | District 8 |
| Doug Fisher, Assistant Anoka | Metro |

## REVIEW OF SCREENING BOARD REPORT

Chairman Rick West asked Ken Hoeschen to review the screening board book. Ken reviewed the report which he has previously done out in all the Districts. Chairman Rick West suggested that any action taken on the report shall wait until Thursday, October 30, 1997.
A) General Information and Basic Needs Data - Pages 4-6, is a comparison of the Basic 1996 to the Basic 1997 25-Year Construction Needs which is broken down into three sections: 1) effect of Traffic Update, 2) effect of the Normal update; and 3) effect of the Unit Price update. Ken mentioned since the report was published an error was discovered in Chisago County. And the effect of the Unit Prices adjustment for structures. will also be made. There were no questions or comments.
B) Needs Adjustment - Pages 8-1l, noted that Washington County was adjusted and they will pick up the remaining needs next year, no comments or questions.
C) Construction Fund Balance "Needs" Deductions - Pages 12-15, Ken mentioned that the construction balance will be determined using the date of December 31, 1997 and the balance shown in the book is as of September 1, 1997, so we have an idea where everyone is at this time. No questions or comments.
D) Special Resurfacing Projects - Pages 16-18, No questions or comments.
E) Grading Cost Comparisons - Pages 20-30, Rural Design Grading Construction

Costs; Pages 32-42, Urban Design Grading Construction Cost. No comments or questions.
E) Needs Adjustments for Variances Granted on CSAHs - Page 43, which were approved at the Spring meeting, no comments or questions.
G) Bond Account Adjustments - Pages 44-45, no comments or questions.
H) After the Fact Needs - Pages 46-50, question, no comments or questions. Credit for Local Effort Needs Adjustment - Page 51, no comments or questions.
I) Non Existing CSAH Needs Adjustment - Pages 52-53, no comments.
J) Mill Levy Deductions - Pages 54-56, Pat Murphy stated the Mill Levy Deduction is approximately $\$ 600$ for a $\$ 1,000$ of needs, in comparison the 25 year needs adjustment is approximately $\$ 22$ for a $\$ 1,000$ of needs, no further comments or questions.
K) Tentative 1998 CSAH Money Needs Apportionment - Page 58 and Figure A, no comments.

Ken commented that page 59 is a copy of the letter to the commissioner that should be signed tomorrow. Recommendations for adjustments to the mileage, lane miles and money needs may be necessary before January 1,1998 and used as the basis for apportioning to the counties the 1998 Apportionment Sum.
L) Banked CSAH Mileage - Page 74, no comments or questions.
M) Mileage Requests - Pages 75-80

1) Anoka County mileage request for an additional 8.25 miles was discussed by Jon Olson with a half hour slide show presentation. Dave Robley chairman of the Mileage Subcommittee explained the reasoning for their recommendation's found on page 80.
2) Washingtion County mileage request update is reported on page 81.
N) State Park Road Account - Pages 84-91

Ken H. discussed the Douglas County request for approximately $\$ 60,000$ for improvement of the Lake Carlos State Park entrance road. The Pope County request for approximately $\$ 35,000$ for the improvement of the Glacial Lake State Park entrance road. Also, he handed out the Pine County request for approximately $\$ 450,000$ for improvement of culvert replacements and bituminous overlay in the St. Croix State Park. Lee Berget questioned why the Law had the board approve state aid routes and not other requests. No logical reasons were available.
O) Traffic Project Factors - Pages 94-95, no comments.
P) Advancement of CSAH Construction Funds from the General CSAH Construction Account - Page 96
Q) Minutes of the June 25 and June 26 Screening Board meeting, pages 97-106.
R) .- Minutes of the September 15, 1997 CSAH General Subcommittee meeting - Brad Larson highlighted the items they were directed to study.
S) Current Resolutions of the Screening Board - Pages 110-124.

Rick West brought up the Research Account money set aside every year, which will be addressed tomorrow by resolution.

Rick West asked if there were other items to be looked at. Marlin Larson handed out a request from Rock County for a Resolution Revision in the County Screening Board data book. Mark Sehr would like to see a change to the Mileage Limitation Resolution. The revision would change the paragraph found at the top of page 117 to read: That, whereas, former Municipal State Aid street mileage located in municipalities which fell below 5,000 population under the 1980 and 1990 Federal census, is allowed in excess of the normal County State Aid Highway mileage limitations, revocation of said former M.S.A.S.'s shall not create eligible mileage for State Aid Designation on other roads in the county but may be considered for State Aid Designation within that municipality.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 PM.

The meeting was reconvened by Rick West at 8:30 am Thursday, October 29, 1997.

## ACTION ON SCREENING BOOK

Rick West asked the board if there were questions of Ken $H$. on yesterdays book review, no comments being heard, Brad Larson made a motion to approve the book and the tentative apportionment for 1998, seconded by Marlin Larson, motion passed unanimously. Ken $H$. passed around the letter to the Commissioner for everyone's signature.

## A) Mileage Request

1) Anoka County mileage request for an additional 8.25 miles was discussed briefly. Jon Olson was asked for comments. He stated that his feelings were that his request was not contingent on removing the mileage of CSAH 30 and CSAH 31 from the State Aid System. Dave Robley, Chairman of the Mileage Subcommittee had no comments. Ken Anderson wanted to clarify the ballot before voting, Rick west stated that the ballot was eitner to approve or deny the mileage request as submitted by Anoka County and the mileage subcommittee report is only a recommendation to the Screening Board for their consideration. The mileage request was voted on by secret ballot. The additional mileage request was APPROVED by a vote of 10 to 5 .
B) State Park Road Account

Dick Hansen made a motion approving Douglas County's request, seconded by Dave Everds, motion carried unanimously.

Don Wisniewski made a motion approving Pope County's request, seconded by Luke Hagen, motion carried unanimously.

Dick Hansen made a motion approving Pine County's request, seconded by

Gene Ulring, motion carried unanimously. Lee Berget asked if Pine County could handle this large of a request without an engineer, Julie stated that Greg Nikodym was helping out until an Engineer could be hired.
C) Research Account

Rick West asked for a motion to approve the resolution: Be it resolved that an amount of $\$ 1,404,121$ (not to exceed $1 / 2$ of $1 \%$ of the 1997 CSAH Apportionment sum of $\$ 280,824,171$ ) shall be set aside from the 1998 Apportionment Fund and be credited to the research account. Motion by Brad Larson, seconded by Lee Berget, motion carried unanimously.

## (D) General Subcommittee Report

Don Wisniewski made a motion to accept the General Subcommittee's recommended change to the Screening Board Resolution on page 112 to read as follows:

1) The maximum County State Aid construction dollars which can be advanced in any one year shall be the difference between the County State Aid construction fund balance at the end of the preceding calendar year plus any loan repayments due from the previous years advancing, and $\$ 50 \mathrm{million}$. Advanced funding will be granted on a first come-first served basis.

1a) In order to allow for some flexibility in the advancement limits previously stated, the $\$ 50$ million target value can be administratively adiusted by the State Aid Engineer and reported to the Screening Board at their next meeting. The motion was seconded by Dick Hansen, motion passed unanimously.

The second item looked at was the "Credit for Local Effort" Screening Board resolution. The Subcommittee recommended to leave it at the present 10 year adjustment time frame. Paul Kirkwold expressed his concerns and felt it should be studied more extensively maybe by a task force, because he was not i favor of the recommendation. Dave Everds commented the Subcommittee's study did not show a lot of variation in numbers between using 10 years and 25 years. Dave Everds made a motion to change the 10 year adjustment time to 20 years. Jon Olson seconded the motion. Lee Berget discussed the issue and agreed with the subcommittee's recommendation. After considerable discussion the motion passed 9 to 6. This motion will change the resolution on page 114 in the second paragraph to read:

The adjustment (credit for local effort) shall be the local (not State Aid or Federal Aid) dollars spent on State Aid Construction Projects for items eligible for State Aid participation. This adjustment shall be annually added to the 25 year County State Aid Highway construction needs of the county involved for a period of 20 years beginning with the first apportionment year after the documentation has been submitted.

Ken Anderson asked the Screening Board that this issue be laid to rest for awhile and not be changed again and again.

Brad Larson stated the other part of their recommendation was to leave the eligible items for credit the same as they were previously. Motion by Jon Olson, second by Dave Schwarting, motion passed.

Rick West brought up Rock County's request for a revision to the Mileage

Limitation Resolution. The request is to be able to move old MSAS mileage (now CSAH) to new locations within the same municipality. The Board discussed this issue in great length, wondering why he does not use his banked CSAH mileage, should there be a limit set below 5,000 before the change takes place (Pat Murphy stated that the legislature could temper the rules), if this change is allowed what happens when the city goes over 5,000 again. Finally, Marlin Larson moved to add the language requested by Rock County, seconded by Don Wiesnieski. Discussion followed. Jon Olson offered an amendment to the motion, to change the paragraph beginning at the next to the last line to "mileage for State Aid Designation on other roads outside the city limits of the Municipality, but may be considered for State Aid Designation within that Municipality except on routes that are County State Aid Highways within that Municipality of over 5,000 population". One issue is that if there is existing CSAH mileage within the City, there's nothing to prevent him from moving that outside the City, other than a City resolution, then he can make those CSAH miles MSAS miles therefore increasing his eligible miles. Pat Murphy commented there is no reason to complicate this issue, because state aid will police these issues. Jon Olson's motion died for a lack of a second. The original motion was voted on and carried. Which will read as follows: That, whereas, former Municipal State Aid street mileage located in municipalities which fell below 5,000 population under the 1980 and 1990 census, is allowed in excess of the normal County State Aid Highway mileage limitations, revocation of said former M.S.A.S.'s shall not create eligible mileage for State Aid Designation on other roads in the county but may be considered for State Aid Designation within that municipality.

Pat Murphy had no comments. Julie Skallman discussed the Administrative Account Expenditures and what the money has been spent on to date. The Mechanic Training will continue to be financed. The technician certification will continue to be financed for the next two seasons, so get your people registered, however no shows will be charged to the County. The State Aid web page and the Internet that is supposed to be coming was discussed. The training is moving North and should be completed this year.

The secretary thanked the outgoing Districts; 2 - Lee Berget; 4 - Rick West; 6 Gene Ulring; 8 - Luke Hagen; Metro - Brad Larson for their time and excellent work.
Rick West thanked the outgoing Mileage Subcommittee Chairman, Dave Robley for his outstanding work. Rick West will be responsible for recommending a new member for the Mileage Subcommittee from the Southern Counties - District 6, 7, \& 8 .

Meeting was adjourned by a motion by Paul Kirkwold, seconded by Luke Hagen, motion carried unanimously.

Nuaidf. Oummuarkic
David A. Olsonawski
Screening Board Secretary Hubbard County Engineer

## minutes of the csah general subcommittee meeting

April 20, 1998
The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brad Larson at 9:45 A.M., April 20, 1998 at the Transportation Building, Room 521, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Members present: Brad Larson, Chairman
Jack Cousins
Rick Kjonaas
Others in attendance:
Ken Hoeschen
Diane Gould
Mark Channer

Scott County
Clay County McLeod County

State Aid MN/DOT State Aid MN/DOT State Aid MN/DOT

The General Subcommittee met to recommend Unit Prices for the spring Screening Board meeting.

Prior to the meeting, maps showing each county's 1993-1997 five year average gravel base and subbase unit price data were sent to the Subcommittee members. The procedure used to determine gravel base prices for those counties with less than 50,000 tons was also sent to the members. After Ken presented the data and a thorough discussion on past procedures took place, the General Subcommittee recommended the gravel base unit prices as shown on the map be us ad in the 1998 CSAH Needs Study. The members expressed concern with the metric conversion and would hope to include both English and Metric in all future needs data. There was also discussion regarding the history of counties with less than 50,000 tons of gravel base material and if it continued to be the same or various counties.

The Subcommittee also reviewed the unit price data regarding the other roadway items. It was the consensus of the members to continue using the "increment method" to determine each county's subbase, bituminous base, bituminous surface, gravel surface and gravel shoulder unit prices. The "increment method" simply involves applying the difference between the 1997 state average CSAH construction unit price of Gravel Base (\$5.28) and the 1997 state average CSAH construction unit price of the other roadway items to each county's previously determined Gravel Base unit price.

Ken informed the subcommittee of the very limited number of subbase projects in 1997. Twelve of the seventeen rural design subbase projects used for 1997 were deep strength "converted" projects. There were only 2 urban design subbase projects let in 1997. For these reasons, the average subbase unit price for 1997 was higher than the average Gravel Base unit price. The Subcommittee recommended using the county's Gravel Base Unit Price for the rural and urban design subbase unit price.

The Subcommittee recommended using the updated prices for concrete surface as received from $\mathrm{Mn} /$ DOT's Estimating Section in the following formulas to develop the rural and urban design concrete prices.

Rural Des: $90 \%$ (Reg.8"Conc.@\$15.05) + $+10 \%$ (Irr.8"Conc.@ \$20.05) $=\$ 15.56$
Urban Des: $30 \%$ (Reg.9"Conc.@\$16.90) $+70 \%$ (Irr.9"Conc.@ $\$ 22.40$ ) $=\$ 20.75$
We received information from various sources for the CSAH miscellaneous unit prices.
The recommended storm sewer prices are up from last year but the subcommittee realized even higher prices had been used in some counties. The subcommittee recommended using the Storm Sewer prices provided from Mn/DOT.

The MSAS average unit price for Curb \& Gutter construction from 1997 projects was $\$ 7.42 / \mathrm{lin}$. ft. (based on approximately 350,000 lineal feet). The average price for 60,000 feet of curb and gutter on 1997 Mn/Dot projects was $\$ 8.20$. The MSAS Subcommittee's recommendation to their Screening Board will be to use $\$ 7.50 \mathrm{lin}$. ft. for curb and gutter for the 1998 needs study. The County General Subcommittee is recommending a price of $\$ 7.50$ for curb and gutter for 1998.

The MSAS Needs section provided data, based on 1997 project information received from the State Aid Bridge Office and the Bridge Estimating Office, on TH, SAP, and SP bridges. The average unit prices for the bridge construction were:
$\$ 71 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft. for 0-149 ft. long bridges
$\$ 59 /$ sq. ft. for $150-499 \mathrm{ft}$. long bridges
$\$ 66 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft. for bridges over 500 ft . long
The General Subcommittee is suggesting using $\$ 60 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft. on all bridges and $\$ 150 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft for any bridge widening needs.

Mn /DOT's Railroad Administration section projected a cost of $\$ 1000$ per crossing for signs and $\$ 800$ per crossing for pavement markings. The General Subcommittee recommended using a unit price of $\$ 1,400$ since about half of the CSAH crossings are on gravel roads which do not require the pavement markings. Railroad Administration recommended $\$ 80,000$ per signal system and $\$ 100,000$ to $\$ 150,000$ per signal and gate system. The General Subcommittee recommended using $\$ 80,000$ per signal and $\$ 125,000$ per signal and gate system. Only one RR/Hwy bridge was included from 1997 construction. Therefore; the subcommittee is recommending retaining last years prices for those type structures.

Respectfully submitted,

# CURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF THE COUNTY SCREENING BOARD 

January, 1998

BE IT RESOLVED:

## ADMINISTRATIVE

## Improper Needs Report - Oct. 1961 (Rev. Jan. 1969)

That the Office of State Aid and the District State Aid Engineer be requested to recommend an adjustment in the needs reporting whenever there is reason to believe that said reports have deviated from accepted standards and to submit their recommendations to the Screening Board with a copy to the county engineer involved.

## Type of Needs Study - Oct. 1961 (Rev. June 1965)

That the Screening Board shall, from time to time, make recommendations to the Commissioner of Transportation as to the extent and type of needs study to be subsequently made on the County State Aid Highway System consistent with the requirements of law.

## Appearance at Screening Board - Oct. 1962

That any individual or delegation having items of concern regarding the study of State Aid Needs or State Aid Apportionment Amounts, and wishing to have consideration given to these items, shall, in a written report, communicate with the Commissioner of Transportation through proper channels. The Commissioner shall determine which requests are to be referred to the Screening Board for their consideration. This resolution does not abrogate the right of the Screening Board to call any person or persons to appear before the Screening Board for discussion purposes.

## Construction Cut Off Date - Oct. 1962 (Rev. June 1983)

That for the purpose of measuring the needs of the County State Aid Highway System, the annual cut off date for recording construction accomplishments based upon the project letting date shall be December 31.

## Screening Board Vice-chairman - June 1968

That at the first County Screening Board meeting held each year, a Vice-chairman shall be elected and he shall serve in that capacity until the following year when he shall succeed to the chairmanship.

## Screening Board Meeting Dates and Locations - June, 1996

That the Screening Board Chairman, with the assistance of State Aid personnel, determine the dates and the locations for that year's Screening Board meetings.

## Screening Board Secretary - Oct. 1961

That, annually, the Commissioner of Transportation may be requested to appoint a secretary, upon recommendation of the County Highway Engineers' Association, as a non-voting member of the County Screening Board for the purpose of recording all Screening Board actions.

## Research Account - Oct. 1961

That the Screening Board annually consider setting aside a reasonable amount of County State Aid Highway Funds for the Research Account to continue local road research activity.

## Annual District Meeting - Oct. 1963 (Rev. June 1985 )

That the District State Aid Engineer call a minimum of one district meeting annually at the request of the District Screening Board Representative to review needs for consistency of reporting.

## General Subcommittee - Oct. 1986 (Rev. June, 1996)

That the Screening Board Chairman appoint a Subcommittee to annually study all unit prices and variations thereof, and to make recommendations to the Screening Board. The Subcommittee will consist of three members with initial terms of one, two and three years, and representing the north (Districts 1, 2, 3 and 4), the south (Districts 6, 7 and 8) and the metro area of the state. Subsequent terms will be for three years.

## Mileage Subcommittee - Jan. 1989(Rev. June, 1996 )

That the Screening Board Chairman appoint a Subcommittee to review all additional mileage requests submitted and to make recommendations on these requests to the County Screening Board. The Subcommittee will consist of three members with initial terms of one, two and three years and representing the metro, the north (Districts 1, 2, 3 and 4) and the south area (Districts 6, 7 and 8) of the state respectively. Subsequent terms will be for three years and appointments will be made after each year's Fall Screening Board Meeting. Mileage requests must be in the District State Aid Engineer's Office by April 1 to be considered at the spring meeting and by August 1 to be considered at the fall meeting.

1) The maximum County State Aid construction dollars which can be advanced in any one year shall be the difference between the County State Aid construction fund balance at the end of the preceding calendar year plus any repayment due from the previous years advancing and $\$ 50$ million. Advanced funding will be granted on a first come-first served basis.

1a). In order to allow for some flexiv: in the advancement limits previously stated, the $\$ 50$ million target value ion be administratively adjusted by the State Aid Engineer and reported to the Screening Board at their next meeting.
2) Total advances to the Regular Account shall be limited to the county's last regular construction allotment, and will be reduced by any scheduled regular bond principal obligations and advance encumbrance repayments. Any advances must be repaid by deducting that amount from the next years CSAH regular construction allotment.
3) Total advances to the Municipal Account shall be limited to the county's last municipal construction allotment, and will be reduced by any scheduled municipal bond principal obligations and advance encumbrance repayments. Any advances must be repaid by deducting that amount from the next years CSAH municipal construction allotment.
4) Advanced State Aid funding must .a requested by County Board Resolution. This resolution need not be project specific, but describes the maximum amount of advances the County Board authorizes for financing of approved County State Aid Highway projects in that year. This resolution must be submitted with, or prior to, the first project specific request. Once the resolution is received by SALT Division, payments will be made to the County for approved County State Aid Highway projects up to the amount requested in the resolution, after that County's construction account balance reaches zero, and subject to the other provisions of these guidelines. The resolution does not reserve funds nor establish the "first come - first served" basis. First come - first served is established by payment requests and/or by the process describe in (5).
5) Prior to entering into a contract where advanced funding will be required, the County Engineer must submit a Request Advanced Funding form. SALT will reserve the funds and return the approved form to the County Engineer provided that:
a) the amount requested is within the amount authorized by the County Board Resolution,
b) the amount requested is consistent with the other provisions of this guideline, and
c) the County intends to approve the contract within the next several weeks; or in the case of a construction project, a completed plan has been submitted for State Aid approval.

Upon receiving the approved Request to Reserve Advanced Funding, the County Engineer knows that funds have been reserved for the project.

## NEEDS ADJUSTMENTS

## Deficiency Adjustment - Oct. 1961 (Rev. June 1965)

That any money needs adjustment made to any county within the deficiency classification pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Chapter 162.07, Subdivision 4, shall be deemed to have such money needs adjustment confined to the rural needs only, and that such adjustment shall be made prior to computing the Municipal Account allocation.

## Minimum Apportionment - Oct. 1961 (Latest Rev. Dec. 1966)

That any county whose total apportionment percentage falls below .586782, which is the minimum percentage permitted for Red Lake, Mahnomen and Big Stone Counties, shall have its money needs adjusted so that its total apportionment factor shall at least equal the minimum percentage factor.

## Fund to Townships - April 1964 (Rev. June 1965)

That this Screening Board recommend to the Commissioner of Transportation, that he equalize the status of any county allocating County State Aid Highway Funds to the township by deducting the township's total annual allocation from the gross money needs of the county for a period of twenty-five years.

That a separate annual adjustment shall be made in total money needs of a county that has sold and issued bonds pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 162.181 for use on State Aid projects except bituminous overlay or concrete joint repair projects. That this adjustment, which covers the amortization period, which annually reflects the net unamortized bonded debt, shall be accomplished by adding said net unamortized bond amount to the computed money needs of the county. For the purpose of this adjustment, the net unamortized bonded debt shall be the total unamortized bonded indebtedness less the unencumbered bond amount as of December 31, of the preceding year.

## County State Aid Construction Fund Balances - May 1975 (Latest Rev. October 1996)

That, for the determination of County State Aid Highway needs, the amount of the unencumbered construction fund balance as December 31 of the current year; not including the current year's regular account construction apportionment and not including the last three years of municipal account construction apportionment or $\$ 100,000$, whichever is greater; shall be deducted from the 25-year construction needs of each individual county. Also, that for the computation of this deduction, the estimated cost of right-of-way acquisition which is being actively engaged in or Federally-funded projects that have been let but not awarded shall be considered as being encumbered and the construction balances shall be so adjusted.

## Needs Credit for Local Effort - Oct. 1989 (Latest Rev. October, 1997 )

That annually a needs adjustment for local effort for construction items which reduce State Aid needs shall be made to the CSAH 25 year construction needs.

The adjustment (credit for local effort) shall be the local (not State Aid or Federal Aid) dollars spent on State Aid Construction Projects for items eligible for State Aid participation. This adjustment shall be annually added to the 25 year County State Aid Highway construction needs of the county involved for a period of ten twenty years beginning with the first apportionment year after the documentation has been submitted.

It shall be the County Engineer's responsibility to submit this data to their District State Aid Engineer. His submittal and approval must be received in the Office of State Aid by July 1 to be included in the following years apportionment determination.

That, annually, a separate adjustment to the rural and the urban complete grading costs in each county be considered by the Screening Board. Such adjustments shall be made to the regular account and shall be based on the relationship of the actual cost of grading to the estimated cost of grading reported in the needs study. The method of determining and the extent of the adjustment shall be approved by the Screening Board. Any "Final" costs used in the comparison must be received by the Needs Section by July 1 of the Needs Study year involved.

## Restriction of 25-Year Construction Needs Increase - Oct. 1975 (Latest Rev. Oct. 1985)

The CSAH construction needs change in any one county from the previous year's restricted CSAH needs to the current year's basic 25-year CSAH construction needs shall be restricted to 20 percentage points greater than or lesser than the statewide average percent change from the previous year's restricted CSAH needs to the current year's basic 25-year CSAH construction needs. Any needs restriction determined by this Resolution shall be made to the regular account of the county involved.

## Trunk Highway Turnback - June 1965 (Latest Rev. June 1996)

That any Trunk Highway Turnback which reverts directly to the county and becomes part of the State Aid Highway System shall not have its construction needs considered in the money needs apportionment determination as long as the former Trunk Highway is fully eligible for 100 percent construction payment from the County Turnback Account. During this time of eligibility, financial aid for the additional maintenance obligation of the county imposed by the Turnback shall be computed on the basis of the current year's apportionment data and the existing traffic, and shall be accomplished in the following manner:

## Existing ADT Turnback Maintenance/Lane Mile/Lane

## 0-999 VPD Current lane mileage apportionment/lane

1,000-4,999 VPD $2 \times$ current lane mileage apportionment/lane
For every additional 5,000 VPD Add current lane mileage apportionment/lane

Initial Turnback Maintenance Adjustment - Fractional Year Reimbursement:
The initial Turnback adjustment, when for less than 12 full months, shall provide partial maintenance cost reimbursement by adding said initial adjustment to the money needs which will produce approximately 1/12 of the Turnback maintenance per lane mile in apportionment funds for each month, or part of a month, that the county had maintenance responsibility during the initial year.

Turnback Maintenance Adjustment - Full Year, Initial or Subsequent:
To provide an advance payment for the coming year's additional maintenance obligation, a needs adjustment per lane mile shall be added to the annual money needs. This needs adjustment per lane mile shall produce sufficient needs apportionment funds so that when added to the lane mileage apportionment per lane mile, the Turnback maintenance per lane mile prescribed shall be earned for each lane mile of Trunk Highway Turnback on the County State Aid Highwe y System. Turnback adjustments shall terminate at the end of the calenda var during which a construction contract has been awarded that fulfills. County Turnback Account payment provisions, or at the end of the viandar year during which the period of eligibility for 100 percent construction payment from the County Turnback Account expires. The needs for these roadways shall be included in the needs study for the next apportionment.

That Trunk Highway Turnback maintenance adjustments shall be made prior to the computation of the minimum apportionment county adjustment.

Those Turnbacks not fully eligible for 100 percent reimbursement for reconstruction with County Turnback Account funds are not eligible for maintenance adjustments and shall be included in the needs study in the same manner as normal County State Aid Highways.

## MILEAGE

## Mileage Limitation - Oct. 1961 (Latest Rev. Oct. 1997)

Mileage made available by an internal revision after July 1, 1990, will be held in abeyance (banked) for future designation.

That any request, after July 1, 1990, by any county for County State Aid Highway designation, other than Trunk Highway Turnbacks, or minor increases due to construction proposed on new alignment, that results in a net increase greater than the total of the county's approved apportionment mileage for the preceding year plus any "banked" mileage shall be submitted to the Screening Board for consideration. Such
request should be accompanied by supporting data and be concurred on by the District State Aid Engineer.

Any requested CSAH mileage increase must be reduced by the amount of CSAH mileage being held in abeyance from previous internal revisions (banked mileage).

All mileage requests submitted to the County State Aid Highway Screening Board will be considered as proposed, and no revisions to such mileage requests will be considered by the Screening Board without being resubmitted prior to publication of the Screening Board Report by the Office of State Aid. The Screening Board shall review such requests and make its recommendation to the Commissioner of Transportation. If approved, the needs on mileage additions shall be sisbmitted to the Office of State Aid for inc/usion in the subsequent year's study of needs.

Revisions in the County State Aid Highway System not resulting in an increase in mileage do not require Screening Board review.

Mileage made available by reason of shortening a route by construction shall not be considered as designatable mileage e/sewhere.

That any additions to a county's State Aid System, required by State Highway construction, shall not be approved unless all mileage made available by revocation of State Aid roads which results from the aforesaid construction has been used in reducing the requested additions.

That in the event a County State Aid Highway designation is revoked because of the proposed designation of a Trunk Highway over the County State Aid Highway alignment, the mileage revoked shall not be considered as eligible for a new County State Aid Highway designation.

That, whereas, Trunk Highway Turnback mileage is allowed in excess of the normal County State Aid Highway mileage limitations, revocation of said Turnbacks designated after July 1, 1965, shall not create eligible mileage for State Aid designation on other roads in the county, unless approved by the Screening Board.

That, whereas, former Municipal State Aid street mileage located in municipalities which fell below 5,000 population under the 1980 and 1990 Federal census, is allowed in excess of the normal County State Aid Highway mileage limitations, revocation of said former M.S.A.S. 's shall not create eligible mileage for State Aid Designation on other roads in the county, but may be considered for State Aid designation within that municipality.

That, whereas, the county engineers are sending in many requests for additional mileage to the C.S.A.H. system up to the date of the Screening Board meetings, and whereas this creates a burden on the State Aid Staff to prepare the proper data for the Screening Board, be it resolved that the requests for the spring meeting must be in the State Aid Office by April 1 of each year, and the requests for the fall meeting must be in the State Aid Office by August 1 of each year. Requests received after these dates shall carry over to the next meeting.

## Non-existing County State Aid Highway Designations - Oct. 1990 - (Latest Rev.

 Oct. 1992)That all counties which have non-existing CSAH designations, that have drawn needs for 10 years or more, have until December 1, 1992 to either remove them from their CSAH system or to let a contract for the construction of the roadway, or incorporate the route in a transportation plan adopted by the County and approved by the District State Aid Engineer. After that date, any non-existing CSAH designation not a part of a transportation plan adopted by the County and approved by the District State Aid Engineer will have the "Needs" removed from the 25 year CSAH Needs Study after 10 years. Approved non-existing CSAH designations shall draw "Needs" up to a maximum of 25 years or until constructed.

## TRAFFIC

## Traffic Projection Factors - Oct. 1961 - (Latest Rev. Oct. 1992)

Tha* new Traffic Projection Factors for the needs study be established for each coct .y using a "least squares" projection of the vehicle miles from the last four tralic counts and in the case of the seven county metro area from the number of latest traffic counts which fall in a minimum of a twelve year period. This normal factor can never fall below 1.0. Also, new traffic factors will be computed whenever an approved traffic count is made. These normal factors may, however, be changed by the county engineer for any specific segments where conditions warrant, with the approval of the District State Aid Engineer.

Because of the limited number of CSAH's counted in the metro area under a "System 70" procedure used in the mid-1970's, those "System 70" count years shall not be used in the least squares traffic projection. Count years which show representative traffic figures for the majority of their CSAH system will be used until the "System 70" count years drop off the twelve year minimum period mentioned previously.

Also, due to the major mileage swap between Hennepin County and Mn/DOT which occurred in 1988, the traffic projection factor for Hennepin County shall be based on the current highway system, using the traffic volumes of that system for the entire formula period.

Also, the adjustment to traffic projection factors shall be limited to a 0.3 point decrease per traffic count interval.

## Minimum Requirements - Oct. 1963 (Rev. June 1985)

That the minimum requirements for 4-12 foot traffic lanes be established as 5,000 projected vehicles per day for rural design and 7,000 for urban design. Traffic projections of over 20,000 vehicles per day for urban design will be the minimum requirements for 6-12 foot lanes. The use of these multiple-lane designs in the needs study, however, must be requested by the county engineer and approved by the District State Aid Engineer.

## ROAD NEEDS

## Method of Study - Oct. 1961 (Rev. Nov. 1965)

That, except as otherwise specifically provided, the Manual of Instruction for Completion of Data Sheets shall provide the format for estimating needs on the County State Aid Highway System.

## Soil - Oct. 1961 (Latest Rev. June 1985)

Soil classifications established using a U.S. Soil Conservation Service Soil Map must have supporting verification using standard testing procedures; such as soil borings or other approved testing methods. A minimum of ten percent of the mileage requested to be changed must be tested at the rate of ten tests per mile. The mileage to be tested and the method to be used shall be approved by the District State Aid Engineer. Soil classifications established by using standard testing procedures, such as soil borings or other approved testing methods, shall have one hundred percent of the mileage requested to be changed tested at the rate of ten tests per mile.

All soil classification determinations must be approved by the District State Aid Engineer.

## Unit Costs - Oct. 1961 (Rev. Nov. 1965)

That the unit costs for base, surface and shouldering quantities obtained from the 5-Year Average Construction Cost Study and approved by the Screening Board shall be used for estimating needs.

## Design - Oct. 1961 (Latest Rev. June 1982)

That all roads be divided into proper segments and the highest estimated ADT, consistent with adjoining segments, be used in determining the design geometrics for needs study purposes.

Also, that for all roads which qualify for needs in excess of additional surfacing, the proposed needs shall be based solely on projected traffic, regardless of existing surface types or geometrics.

And, that for all roads which are considered adequate in the needs study, additional surfacing and shouldering needs shall be based on existing geometrics but not greater than the widths allowed by the State Aid Design Standards currently in force.

## Grading - Oct. 1961 (Rev. June, 1988)

That all grading costs shall be determined by the county engineer's estimated cost per mile.

## Rural Design Grade Widening - June 1980

That rural design grade widening needs be limited to the following widths and costs:

## Feet of Widening Needs Cost/Mile

4-8Feet $50 \%$ of Average Complete Grading Cost/Mile
9-12 Feet $75 \%$ of Average Complete Grading Cost/Mile
Any segments which are less than 4 feet deficient in width shall be considered adequate. Any segments which are more than 12 feet deficient in width shall have needs for complete grading.

## Storm Sewer - Oct. 1961 (Rev. Nov. 1965)

That storm sewer mains may be located off the County State Aid Highway if, in so doing, it will satisfactorily accommodate the drainage problem of the County State Aid Highway.

## Base and Surface - June 1965 (Rev. June 1985)

That base and surface quantities shall be determined by reference to traffic volumes, soil factors, and State Aid standards. Rigid base is not to be used as the basis for estimating needs on County State Aid Highways. Replacement mats shall be 3" bituminous surface over existing concrete or 2" bituminous surface over existing bituminous. To be eligible for concrete pavement in the needs study, 2,500 VPD or more per lane projected traffic is necessary.

## Construction Accomplishments - June 1965 (Latest Rev. Oct. 1983)

That any complete grading accomplishments be considered as complete grading construction of the affected roadway and grading needs shall be excluded for a period of 25 years from the project letting date or date of force account agreement. At the end of the 25-year period, needs for complete reconstruction of the roadway will be reinstated in the needs study at the initiative of the County Engineer with costs established and justified by the County Engineer and approved by the State Aid Engineer.
Needs for resurfacing shall be allowed on all county state aid highways at all times.

That any bridge construction project shall cause the needs on the affected bridge to be removed for a period of 35 years from the project letting date or date of force account agreement. At the end of the 35 -year period, needs for complete reconstruction of the bridge will be reinstated in the needs study at the initiative of the County Engineer and with approval of the State Aid Engineer.

The restrictions above will apply regardless of the source of funding for the road or bridge project. Needs may be granted as an exception to this resolution upon request by the County Engineer, and justification to the satisfaction of the State

Aid Engineer (e.g., a deficiency due to changing standards, projected traffic, or other verifiable causes).

## Special Resurfacing Projects - Mav 1967 (Latest Rev. June 1990 )

That any county using non-local construction funds for special bituminous or concrete resurfacing or concrete joint repair projects shall have the non-local cost of such special resurfacing projects annually deducted from its 25-year County State Aid Highway construction needs for a period of ten (10) years.

For needs purposes, a special resurfacing project shall be defined as a bituminous or concrete resurfacing or concrete joint repair project which has been funded at least partially with money from the CSAH Construction Account and is considered deficient (i.e. segments drawing needs for more than additional surfacing) in the CSAH Needs Study in the year after the resurfacing project is let.

## Items Not Eligible For Apportionment Needs - Oct. 1961 (Latest Rev. June 1985)

That Adjustment of Utilities, Miscellaneous Construction, or Maintenance Costs shall not be considered a part of the Study of Apportionment Needs of the County State Aid Highway System.

## Right of Way - Oct. 1979

That for the determination of total needs, proposed right-of-way widths shall be standardized in the following manner:


Also, that the total needs cost for any additional right of way shall be based on the estimated market value of the land involved, as determined by each county's assessor.

## Loops and Ramps - May 1966

That any county may include the cost of loops and ramps in the needs study with the approval of the District State Aid Engineer.

## BRIDGE NEEDS

## Bridge Widening - April 1964 (Latest Rev. June 1985)

That the minimum bridge widening be 4 feet.

## Bridge Cost Limitations - July 1976 (Rev. Oct. 1986 )

That the total needs of the Minnesota River bridge between Scott and Hennepin Counties be limited to the estimated cost of a single 2-lane structure of approved length until the contract amount is determined. Alst, that the total needs of the Mississippi River bridge between Dakota and Washrgton Counties be limited to the estimated cost of a 2-lane structure of approved length until the contract amount is determined. In the event the allowable apportionment needs portion ldetermined by

Minnesota Chapter 162.07, Subdivision 2) of the contract amount from normal funds (FAU, FAS, State Aid, Local) exceeds the "apportionment needs moct", the difference shall be added to the 25-year needs of the respective count/es for a period of 15 years.

## AFTER THE FACT NEEDS

## Bridge Deck Rehabilitation - Dec. 1982 (Latest Rev. Oct. 1992)

That needs for bridge deck rehabilitation shall be earned for a period of 15 years after the construction has been completed and the documentation has been submitted and shall consist of only those construction costs actually incurred by the county. It shall be the County Engineer's responsibility to justify any costs incurred and to report said costs to the District State Aid Engineer. His approval must be received in the Office of State Aid by July 1 to be included in the following years apportionment determination.

Right of Wav - June 1984 (Latest Rev. June 1994)
That needs for Right-of-Way on County State Aid Highway's shall be earned for a period of 25 years after the purchase has been made and the documentation has been submitted and shall be comprised of actual monies paid to property owners with local or State Aid funds. Only those Right of Way costs actually incurred will be eligible. It shall be the County Engineer's responsibility to submit justification to the District State Aid Engineer. His approval must be received in the Office of State Aid by July 1 to be included in the following years apportionment determination.

# Traffic Signals, Lighting, Retaining Walls, Sidewalk, and Wetland Mitigation - June 

 1984 (Latest Rev. Oct. 1992)That needs for Traffic Signals, Lighting, Retaining Walls, Sidewalk, and Wetland Mitigation (as eligible for State Aid participation) on County State Aid Highways shall be earned for a period of 25 years after the construction has been completed and the documentation has been submitted and shall consist of only those construction costs actually incurred by the county. It shall be the County Engineer's responsibility to justify any costs incurred and to report said costs to the District State Aid Engineer. His approval must be received in the Office of State Aid by July 1 to be included in the following years apportionment determination.

## Mn/DOT Bridges - June, 1997

That, Needs for bridge improvements to trunk highway bridges carrying CSAH routes shall be earned for a period of 35 years after the bridge construction has been completed and the documentation has been submitted and shall be comprised of actual monies paid with local or State Aid funds. Only those bridge improvement costs actually incurred will be eligible. It shall be the County Engineer's responsibility to submit justification to the District State Aid Engineer. His approval must be received in the Office of State Aid by July 1 to be included in the following years apportionment determination.

## VARIANCES

## Variance Subcommittee - June 1984

That a Variance Subcommittee be appointed to develop guidelines for use in making needs adjustments for variances granted on County State Aid Highways.

Guidelines for Needs Adjustments on Variances Granted - June 1985 (Latest Rev. June 1989)

That the following guidelines be used to determine needs adjustments due to variances granted on County State Aid Highways:

1) There will be no needs adjustments applied in instances where variances have been granted, but because of revised rules, a variance would not be necessary at the present time.
2) No needs deduction shall be made for those variances which allow a width less than standard but greater than the width on which apportionment needs are presently being computed.

Examples: a) Segments whose needs are limited to the center 24 feet.
b) Segments which allow wider dimensions to accommodate diagonal parking but the needs study only relates to parallel parking (44 feet).
3) Those variances granted for acceptance of design speeds less than standards for grading or resurfacing projects shall have a 10 year needs adjustment applied cumulatively in a one year deduction.
a) The needs deduction shall be for the complete grading cost if the segment has been drawing needs for complete grading.
b) The needs deduction shall be for the grade widening cost if the segment has been drawing needs for grade widening.
c) In the event a variance is granted for resurfacing an existing roadway involving substandard width, horizontal and vertical curves, etc., but the only needs being earned are for resurfacing, and the roadway is within 5 years of probable reinstatement of full regrading needs based on the 25-year time period from original grading; the previously outlined guidelines shall be applied for needs reductions using the county's average complete grading cost per mile to determine the adjustment. If the roadway is not within 5 years of probable reinstatement of grading needs, no needs deduction shall be made.
4) Those variances requesting acceptance of widths less than standard for a grading and/or base and bituminous construction project shall have a needs reduction equivalent to the needs difference between the standard width and constructed width for an accumulative period of 10 years applied as a single one year deduction.
5) On grading and grade widening projects, the needs deduction for bridge width variances shall be the difference between the actual bridge needs and a theoretical needs calculated using the width of the bridge left in place. This difference shall be computed to cover a 10 year period and will be applied cumulatively in a one year deduction.

Exception: If the county, by resolution, indicates that the structure will be constructed within 5 years, no deduction will be made.
6) On resurfacing projects, the needs deduction for bridge width variances shall be the difference between theoretical needs based on the width of the bridge which could be left in place and the width of the bridge actually left in place. This difference shall be computed to cover a ten year period and will be applied cumulatively in a one year deduction.

Exception: If the county, by resolution, indicates that the structure will be constructed within 5 years, no deduction will be made.
7) There shall be a needs reduction for variances which result in bridge construction less than standard, which is equivalent to the needs difference between what has been shown in the needs study and the structure which was actually built, for an accumulative period of 10 years applied as a single one year deduction.
8) No needs adjustments will be applied where variances have been granted for a recovery area or inslopes less than standard.
9) Those variances requesting acceptance of pavement strength less than standard for a grading and/or base and bituminous construction project shall have a needs reduction equivalent to the needs difference between the standard
pavement strength and constructed pavement strength for an accumulative period of 10 years applied as a single one year deduction.

HE $356, M 6542$
Minnesota. County Screening Board.
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## BLUE EARTH COUNTY

# STATE AID MILEAGE MODIFICATION REQUEST 

Submitted To:<br>The Minnesota Department of Transportation Office of State Aid

March 31, 1998


March 31, 1998

Mr. Douglas Haeder<br>District State Aid Engineer<br>Minnesota Department of Transportation<br>P.O. Box 4039<br>Mankato, Minnesota 56001<br>Re: ' Request for State Aid Mileage Changes<br>Dear Mr. Haeder:

Blue Earth County has recently completed a comprehensive transportation study. One of the key elements of the study was the review of the transportation system elements including: functional classification, jurisdiction, and designation. Based on analysis of these system elements, the study is recommending changes to the County State Aid system. These changes require review and approval by the Minnesota Department of Transportation Office of State Aid and the State Aid Screening Board. The purpose of this letter is to provide background information on the proposed system changes and to formally request that these changes be approved by Mn/DOT and the Screening Board.

The Blue Earth County Transportation Plan was developed with significant participation by transportation users including:

- Small-group meetings with local government agencies and transportation interests.
- Public open-house meetings.
- Survey of 1,000 residents on transportation issues and services.
- Coordination with adjacent counties, Mn/DOT and Region Nine Development Commission.
- Informal work sessions with County staff and elected officials.

As a result of these public participation efforts, the final plan has received a wide level of support including:

- Adoption by Blue Earth County Board of Commissioners.
- Functional classification approval by Region-Nine Development Commission.

The changes to the functional classification system are in the process of being submitted to $\mathrm{Mn} / \mathrm{DOT}$ by Region-Nine. It is anticipated that the functional classification changes will be approved by $\mathrm{Mn} / \mathrm{DOT}$ prior to the Screening Board meeting in June. The specifics of our request are outlined in Section 2.2 of the Blue Earth County Transportation Plan. We have enclosed this section to assist you in studying our request. In addition, we have enclosed an additional table (Table A), that specifically assesses each roadway designation change and compares it to some of the key designation criteria as outlined in Chapter 8820.07 of the State Aid Rules "Selection Criteria."

If you have any questions or comments on this request, please contact us.
Sincerely,

## Blue Earth County



Alan Forsberg, P.E.
Blue Earth County Engineer

### 2.2 SYSTEM PLAN DEVELOPMENT

The development of a system plan for Blue Earth County consisted of four key elements:

- Reviewing the existing functional classification system and defining the County's future functional classification system.
- Reviewing the existing roadway jurisdiction and identifying potential jurisdictional transfer candidates.
- Reviewing the existing County State Aid Highway Designations and defining potential County State Aid Highway designation changes.
- Developing surfacing guidelines to guide structural and surfacing projects and priorities throughout the County.


### 2.2.1 Functional Classification

A major component of the system plan involved a review of the existing functional classification system (Figure 4). The designated function of a road is defined by the role it plays in serving the flow of trips through the overall network or system. A formal process for determining urban and rural functional classification is outlined in FHWA's manual, Highway Functional Classification - Concepts, Criteria and Practices, March 1989. The concepts and guidelines in this manual were used in developing an updated functional classification plan for Blue Earth County. Changes to the functional classification system that were identified by the MATAPS'96 study were incorporated into the recommendations for the overall Blue Earth County Plan.

The existing functional classification system was reviewed using the following functional classification process:

- The trip length characteristics of the route as indicated by length of route, type and size of traffic generators served, and route continuity;
- The ability of the route to serve regional population centers, regional activity centers and major traffic generators;
- The spacing of routes to serve different functions (need to provide access and mobility functions for entire area);
- The ability of the route to provide continuity through individual travelsheds or between travelsheds;
- The role of the route in providing mobility or land access (number of accesses, access spacing, speed, parking, traffic control); and
- The relationship of the route to adjacent land uses (location of growth areas, industrial areas, neighborhoods).

Municipalities that have a population greater than 5,000 (City of Mankato) are considered "urban areas" by the U.S. Census Bureau. Areas that meet this definition have the ability to define an urban roadway system and obtain additional funds to maintain and construct the system. The established urban limits do not have any real impact on a route's function, but they trigger a change in functional classification terminology. It is common practice that major collector and minor arterial routes be "bumped" upward one classification when entering an urban area. This practice is evident in the City of Mankato, where TH 22 is bumped up from a minor arterial classification to a principal urban arterial classification.

The future functional classification system was developed using the above guidelines and Blue Earth County's GIS system. The GIS system was used to display and analyze route spacing, route continuity, proximity of major trip generators such as cities, large agricultural and trucking operations (Figure 5). In addition, it was used to check the mileage impacts of the proposed system changes. The changes to the functional classification system in the rural area should substantially conform to the FHWA's mileage guidelines because the rural transportation system in the County will not experience substantial growth or changes like urbanizing area around Mankato. In the urbanizing Mankato area, the FHWA mileage guidelines may be exceeded somewhat due to the regional center, radial roadway network and topographical complications.

## Rural Functional Classification Changes

The future functional classification system for Blue Earth County's non-urban area is presented in Figure 6. The changes to the functional classification system are as follows:

- CSAH 32 from the south County line to TH 30 is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area and because it will provide better continuity with CSAH 32, a collector route north of TH 30.
- CSAH 25 from the west County line to CSAH 20 is recommended to be changed from a major collector to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other major collectors and the arterial routes, and the continuity of CSAH 25 as compared to CSAH 10.
- County Road 114 from TH 60 to CSAH 11 is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area, an adjacent industrial park, and continuity with CSAH 42 and Minnesota River Crossing.
- CSAH 35 and County Road 126 from CSAH 9 in Rapidan south to Good Thunder are recommended to be changed from major collector highways to local roads. This change is recommended due to spacing with TH 66 , a north-south major collector route located 1 mile to the east.
- County Road 126 from CSAH 35 to CSAH 34 is recommended to be changed from a local road to a major collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other east-west collector routes in the area and continuity with one of the few river crossings of the Maple River/LeSueur River system (CSAH 35) south of Mankato.
- CSAH 35 from TH 66 to CSAH 16 is recommended to be changed from a minor collector to a major collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area and limited river crossings between TH 66 and CSAH 16 south of Mankato.
- CSAH 16 from CSAH 90 to TH 22 is recommended to be changed from a minor collector to a major collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area, physical separation of travelsheds by the river system, and increased development along river bluff areas.
- CSAH 29 from TH 30 to TH 22 is recommended to be changed from a major collector to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to close spacing with TH 30.
- County Road 163 from TH 22 to CSAH 39 is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area.
- CSAH 21 from TH 22 to CSAH 14 is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other major collector and arterial routes in the area.
- County Road 161 from CSAH 53 to the south County line is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area.
- CSAH 49 from CSAH 15 to CSAH 23 is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area.
- County Road 185 from CSAH 23 to TH 14 is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area.
- CSAH 48 from TH 14 to CSAH 17 is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended due to spacing with other collector routes in the area, and the continuity of other north south collector routes.
- CSAH 26 from the right angle bend north of TH 60; extend route to east to connect with existing north/south segment of CSAH 26. This change is recommended due to spacing with CSAH 44 and future development in area.
- CSAH 69 located north of TH 60 near Mankato is recommended to be changed from a local road to a minor collector. This change is recommended because CSAH 69 is anticipated to function as a collector frontage road to the TH 60/169 corridor in this area.


## MATAPS'96 Area Functional Classification Changes

A future functional classification plan was developed for the urban area of Mankato/North Mankato area as part of the MATAPS'96 study. The future functional classification system assumes that additional development would occur in the fringe area surrounding Mankato/North Mankato. The following functional classification changes involving transportation links in Blue Earth County were recommended as part of the MATAPS' 96 study. The functional classification changes that affect the County system are listed first and are shown with an asterisk (*). A map of these changes can be found in the MATAPS'96 report.

- The arterial designation on CSAH 8 is recommended to continue north of Stadium Road on Monks Avenue to Glenwood Avenue. This change would provide better route continuity.
- An arterial connection is recommended between Madison Avenue and CSAH 3 (Thompson Ravine Road). This arterial should be an extension of Victory Drive to satisfy north-south traffic flow needs. This connection would provide better access to Emanuel St. Joseph's Hospital and other businesses in the Madison East area, provide a continuous north-south arterial between Riverfront Drive and TH 22, and would remove many short trips on TH $22 / \mathrm{TH} 14$ destined to the River Hills Mall area.
- CSAH 3 (Thompson Ravine Road) between the TH 14 interchange and County Road 193 is recommended to be upgraded to a minor arterial classification assuming a connection is achieved between CSAH 3 and Madison Avenue. This route provides continuity within the future growth area of Mankato.
- County Road 193 (future TH 22) from TH 14 to existing TH 22 is recommended to be upgraded to a principal arterial classification. This route would function as a major north-south route on the eastern side of Mankato.
- Old TH 14 from TH 22 to Eagle Lake is recommended to be downgraded to a major collector (new TH 14 would take over the principal arterial function).
- Main Street in Mankato is recommended to be changed from a minor arterial to a collector. This change is recommended due to the close spacing with other arterial streets in the area, the number of local accesses, trip length, and the length of the route.
- Balcerzak Drive is recommended to be changed from a minor arterial to a collector. This change is recommended due to the construction of Stadium Road. Stadium Road provides better access to Mankato State University (MSU), it is a longer eastwest route (connecting two other major north-south routes: Victory Drive and CSAH 16), and provides better arterial route spacing with Madison Avenue and Glenwood Avenue.
- Doc Jones Road is recommended to be upgraded from a collector to a minor arterial. This route would provide east-west continuity with Stadium Road
- A multi-collector connection using three routes has been adopted by the City of Mankato for the Mayan Way area. (Due to the map scale, these routes are shown as a single line.)
- Additional collectors are recommended for Marsh Street, Division Street (Main Street to Marsh Street), Bruels Street (Glenwood to Main Street). These designations are recommended due to spacing considerations and the anticipated growth of the hospital, clinic and Bethany College.
- Future frontage roads and numerous additional collector streets are recommended to protect access on major arterial routes in the system (TH 22, Stadium Road, TH 14, South Route) and to serve new development.

Based on analysis of the future functional classification system, the current and proposed mileage changes for the rural area of the County are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MILEAGE IMPACTS

| Functional <br> Classification | Existing <br> System <br> (miles) | Proposed <br> System <br> (miles) | Mileage <br> Change | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Principal | 00.00 | 1.4 | +1.40 | (a) |
| Arterial | 17.31 | 23.38 | +6.07 | (b) |
| Minor Arterial | 237.84 | 221.15 | -16.69 | (c) |
| Major Collector | 145.50 | 289.9 | +45.80 | (c) |
| Minor Collector | 326.39 | 727.13 | .-- |  |
| Local | 727.04 |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |

(a) The 1.4 miles of principal arterial miles is not new mileage, but a same classification transfer from the City of Mankato. Therefore, this change will not affect the percentage of principle arterial routes in the region.
(b) The 6.07 miles are new minor arterial mileage (weren't previously classified in the arterial category). This change would result in 10.7 percent of highway mileage designated as arterial in the County, or an increase of 0.4 percent.
(c) The net 29.11 additional collector miles (sum of major and minor collector categories) are new miles (weren't previously classified in the collector category); This change would increase the percentage of collectors in the County by 1.9 percent to a total of 27.5 percent.

The slightly higher collector percentages in the County can be justified by the numerous physical constraints (rivers and bluff areas in the County) and the radial orientation of routes focusing on Mankato as regional center. The rivers and bluff areas restrict normal connections and in some situations require parallel collector routes to service the area's transportation needs.

### 2.2.2 Route Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of roads is an important element in the Transportation Plan because it affects a number of critical organizational functions and obligations (regulatory, maintenance, construction, and financial). The primary goal in reviewing jurisdiction is to match the function of the roadway with the organizational level that is best suited to handle the route's function.

The jurisdictional process used in MATAPS'96 identified a number of jurisdictional transfer candidates (Figure 7). The rationale for changing jurisdiction of these routes is documented in Appendix E. In addition, MATAPS96 suggested that the County consider facilitating the temporary transfer and construction of Township Road T167 (Schonstag Road) and Township Road T196 (Doc Jones Road). The transfer and construction of these routes is considered an interim measure prior to their being annexed by the City of Mankato and added to their MSAS system. Routes outside of the MATAPS'96 area were also reviewed and the information was discussed with the Blue Earth County Commissioners. The County historically has played a significant role in maintaining and assisting with some of the roads functionally classified as local roads and this policy or direction has worked well. Therefore, no additional transfer candidates are being recommended as part of this study beyond the MATAPS changes.

### 2.2.3 System Designation

The County highway system is divided into two categories, County State Aid Highways (CSAH) and County Roads. The primary difference in the designation relates to the route's function and funding. The CSAH system originated in the mid 1950 s to provide an integrated network of secondary roads to service the state's rural transportation needs. Routes qualifying or designated as a CSAH route are eligible to receive state funding for maintenance and construction activities, while County roads are funded through local property tax dollars. Administration of the CSAH system is based on a detailed set of rules administered by the Minnesota Department of Transportation Office of State Aid. These rules outline requirements and responsibilities including designation, maintenance, and reconstruction.

The primary purpose of reviewing the system designation is to make sure that demographic and transportation changes that have occurred in the County since the late 1950s have been adequately addressed through system designation changes. Route designation as outlined in Chapter 8820.07 of the State Aid Rules "Selection Criteria" closely parallel the functional classification criteria for designating collector and arterial routes. These criteria are summarized as follows:

- State Aid routes carry a relatively heavier traffic volume or are functionally classified as a collector or arterial route on the County's functional classification system.
- State aid routes connect towns, communities, shipping points, and markets with a county or in adjacent counties; provide access to churches, schools, community meeting halls, industrial areas, state institutions, and recreational areas; or serve as a principal rural mail route and school bus route.
- State aid routes provide an integrated and coordinated highway system consistent with projected traffic demands.

The State Aid route designation criteria described above identifies the most important secondary highways as does the functional classification of arterial and collector routes. As a result, there should be significant overlap between these two systems. A comparison was made between the functional classification system and the current state aid system to identify potential inconsistencies between routes functionally classified as arterial and collector roads and improperly designated routes. A summary of current system designation inconsistencies is shown in Figure 8 with a mileage summary shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
SYSTEM DESIGNATION INCONSISTENCIES CURRENT FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

| Functional <br> Classification | STATE AID <br> (miles) | COUNTY <br> ROAD <br> (miles) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Minor Arterial | 17.31 | 0.00 | 17.31 |
| Major Collector | 224.79 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0 6}$ | 237.85 |
| Minor Collector | 140.55 | $\mathbf{4 . 9 5}$ | 145.50 |
| Local | $\mathbf{3 4 . 3 3}$ | 292.06 | 326.39 |
| All | $416.97(57 \%)$ | 310.07 | 727.04 |
| Classifications |  | $(43 \%)$ |  |

Table 2 shows that 34.33 miles of local routes are currently designated on the CSAH system, while 13.06 miles of major collector routes and 4.95 miles of minor collector routes are designated on the County Road system. These inconsistencies add up to approximately 52 miles of Blue Earth County highway that may be improperly designated based on current functional classification (miles of collector routes that are on the local system or miles of local routes designated on the state aid system).

To correct this inconsistency, Blue Earth County is proposing that all rural collector and urban arterial routes be placed on the CSAH system; urban routes would be limited to arterial routes that maintain mobility, continuity, and provide linkages to rural areas or high traffic generators, and local roads would be removed from the CSAH system. This would make the CSAH system consistent with the functional classification and would insure a well spaced and balanced State Aid system throughout the County. Designating CSAH routes in accordance with this criteria will result in approximately 20 miles of additional CSAH highways being designated in the County. These proposed changes are shown in Figure 9 and are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3
COUNTY STATE AID DESIGNATION CHANGES
FUTURE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

|  | Existing <br> CSAH | Proposed <br> CSAH | Change <br> Gain/Loss |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional | System <br> (miles) | System <br> (miles) | (miles) |
| Classification | 0.00 | 1.40 | +1.40 |
| Principal Arterial | 22.28 | 23.38 | +1.10 |
| Minor Arterial | 218.95 | 221.15 | +2.20 |
| Major Collector | 170.35 | 190.16 | +19.81 |
| Minor Collector | 5.39 | 0.00 | $(5.39)$ |
| Local | 416.97 | 436.09 | +19.12 |
| All Classifications |  |  |  |

In addition to the State Aid designation changes proposed by making the system more consistent with route function, there are a number of jurisdictional changes that also could impact the CSAH designation if the jurisdictional transfer of these routes occurs over the next 20 years. These changes are summarized in Table 4 and are shown in Figure 10.

TABLE 4
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED COUNTY STATE AID MILEAGE CHANGES ${ }^{(1)}$ BLUE EARTH COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLAN

| Description of CSAH Change | Miles of CSAH Impacted |
| :--- | :---: |
| Change based on future functional class | +19.12 |
| Proposed Trunk Highway Turnbacks | +17.69 |
| Proposed CSAH Transfers to Mn/DOT | -7.40 |
| Proposed Transfers from MSAS | +4.15 |
| Proposed Transfers to MSAS | -4.01 |
| New CSAH Segment | +.75 |
| Total 20-year Change to State Aid System | +30.03 |

(1) The table summarizes the mileage changes for the Blue Earth County CSAH system based upon the functional classification changes and potential jurisdictional transfers identified in the study.

The changes shown in Table 4 translate to an increase in State Aid mileage, from 416.97 miles to 436.09 miles. Of the 30.3 additional miles proposed, approximately 10 miles are a result of trunk highway transfers. The proposed system designation changes are described in detail as follows:

## Proposed Designation Change from County Road or Township Road to County State Aid Highway

County Road 114 - County Road 114 extends north of TH 60 to CSAH 11. This route is used as one of the connecting routes between the CSAH 42 Minnesota River Bridge crossing and TH 60. It also serves an industrial park adjacent to TH 60.

County Road 116 • County Road 116 extends north of TH 60 to TH 68. This route will play an increasingly important role when CSAH 90 (South Route) opens. County Road 116 will serve as the eastbound connection to the CSAH 90 (South Route).

County Road 126-County Road 126 provides an east-west extension to CSAH 35. CSAH 35 is one of the only routes that cross the Maple/LeSueur River system within a 3-mile area south of CSAH 90.

County Road 161 - County Road 161 is a north-south minor collector route that is an extension of CSAH 53 to the north. The combination of these routes provides a connection between TH 83, TH 30 and CSAH 20 at the south County line.

County Road 163-County Road 163 is an east-west collector route (extension of CSAH 4) that connects TH 22 and CSAH 39.

County Road 174 - County Road 174 provides an east-west connection of CSAH 16 to CSAH 10. The connection of CSAH 16 to south would be changed to County Road.

County Road 185 - County Road 185 is a north-south minor collector that provides access from the St. Clair area to the Madison Lake area of Blue Earth County. This route works in conjunction with CSAH 49.

County Road 186 - County Road 186 is a north-south minor collector route extending from CSAH 12 to TH 83. It is located in one of the fastest growing areas of Mankato.

T351 and T652 - These township roads form an extension of CSAH 12 that connect the Mankato airport to TH $14 / \mathrm{TH} 60$, a principal arterial east-west route.

T-167 and T-196 - Schonstag Road and Doc Jones Road are both designated as future city streets. However, many portions of these routes are currently outside the city limits and they have higher traffic volumes. These routes were discussed as part of the MATAPS study, and the County may accept them on an interim basis to assist in their transition from township to city. (These routes were not included in mileage changes since their designation is anticipated to be temporary).

## Proposed Designation Changes from CSAH to County Roads

- CSAH 35 CSAH 35 extends north from Good Thunder and is only 1 mile from TH 66 (future jurisdictional transfer candidate). The growth potential and existing route spacing warrant only one collector route in this rural area.

CSAH 16 East of TH 22, CSAH 16 is primarily an east-west route. It was recommended that the CSAH designation extend to the east over CR 174 and connecting to CSAH 10 . This would provide more eastwest continuity.

## Designation of Proposed Truck Highway Transfers

Old TH $14 \quad$ TH 14 is being reconstructed on new alignment east of Mankato. The old alignment of TH 14 will be designated as a major collector and is proposed to be transferred to the County as CSAH 17.

TH 66
TH 66 is a major collector route extending south of Mankato to the City of Good Thunder. Rural major collector routes were determined to be a County responsibility. A portion of TH 66 located within the future urban area of Mankato is proposed to be transferred to the City of Mankato. When reconstruction occurs as a turnback, County Road 126/CSAH 35 alignment should be considered as an option.

## TABLE A -

SUMMARY OF STATE AID MILEAGE CHANGES

| ADDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTE | FROM | TO | LENGTH | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FUNCTIONAL } \\ \text { CLASS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CURRENT } \\ \text { ADT } \end{gathered}$ | PRINCIPAL MAIL ROUTE | $\begin{gathered} \substack{\text { SCHOOL BUS } \\ \text { ROUTE }} \end{gathered}$ | CONNECTS | SERVICE | TRANSFER SCHEDULE |
| FUNCTIONAL CLASS ALIGNMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CR 114 | TH 60 | CSAH 11 | 1.9 | minor collector | 140. | YES | YES | TH 60 WITH CSAH 42 RIVER CROSSING | SERVES INDUSTRIAL PARK | 1998 |
| CR 116 | TH 60 | TH 68 | 2.2 | major collector | 210 | YES | YES | TH 68 WITH TH 60 AND THE SOUTH ROUTE | SERVES GRAVEL QUARRIES | 1998 |
| CR 126 | CSAH 34 | CSAH 35 | 1.8 | minor collector | 85. | YES | YES | CSAH 34 WITH CSAH 35 | ONLY RIVER CROSSING FOR 3 MILES | 1998 |
| CR 138 | CSAH 32 | CSAH 20 | 2.5 | minor collector | 250 | YES | YES | CSAH 32 WITH CSAH 20 | SYSTEM CONTINUITY | 1998 |
| CR 161 | CSAH 53 | S CO LINE | 6 | minor collector | 215 | YES | YES | TH 30 AND TH 83 | SYSTEM CONTINUITY | 1998 |
| CR 163 | CSAH 39 | TH 22 | 2.5 | minor collector | 105 | YES | YES | TH 22 AND CSAH 39 | SYSTEM CONTINUITY | 1998 |
| CR 174 | CSAH 16 | CSAH 10 | 1.25 | minor collector | 65 | YES | YES | CSAH 16 AND CSAH 10 | SYSTEM CONTINUITY | 1998 |
| CR 185 | CSAH 23 | TH 14 | 1.8 | minor collector | 90 | YES | YES | ST. CLAIR WITH MADISON LAKE | SERVES LAKE RECREATION AREA | 1998 |
| CR 186 | CSAH 26 | TH 83 | 3.2 | minor collector | 320 | YES | YES | CSAH 12 WITH TH 83 | SERVES FAST GROWING AREA | 1998 |
| CR 190 | CSAH 82 | CSAH 8 | 1.36 | minor arterial | 1200 | YES | YES | TH 22 WITH CSAH 8 | SERVES MSU | 1998 |
| 24.51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JURISDICTIONAL TRANSFER FROM MANKATO MSAS TO BLUE EARTH CSAH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sladium Rd. | CSAH 8 | CSAH 16 | 0.75 | minor arterial | 5600 | YES | YES | CSAH 8 and CSAH 16 | SERVES MSU | 2000 |
| Madison Ave. | TH22 | Aiverfront Dr. | 2.4 | minor arterial | 17500 | YES | YES | Hilltop Mankato with Downtown | SERVES REGIONAL CENTER | 2003 |
| Victory Dr. | Balcerrak Dr. | Madison Av. |  | minor arterial | 14600 | YES | YES | MSU to Hilltop Area | SERVES REGIONAL CENTER | 2003 |
| 4.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| th turneacks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TH 14 | TH 22 | E. OF EAGLE LAKE | 4.69 | major collector | 12400 | YES | YES | Mankato and Eagle Lake | EAGLE LAKE RES. AND COMMERCIAL | 1998 |
| TH 66 | GOOD THUNDER | CSAH 90 |  | major collector | 1150 | YES | YES | Rural Good Thunder area and Mankato | SERVES CENTRAL BLUE EARTH CO. | 2005 |
| OLD TH 22 | NEW TH 22 | TH 14 | 3.5 | minor arterial | 8000 | YES | YES | NEW TH22 and TH 14 | SERVES RIVERFRONT DRIVE AREA | 2000 |
| 17.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW CONSTRUCTION (NON-EXISTING ROAD) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VICTORY EXT | Madison Ave. | TH 14 |  | minor arterial | 16000 | YES | YES | Madison Ave. and TH 14 | SERVES REGIONALCENTER | 1998 |

TOTAL ADDITIONS 47.35


[^2]surfacing guidelines.

## SUMMARY OF STATE AID MILEAGE CHANGES

## REQUIRING SCREENING BOARD APPROVAL

## ADDITIONS

| ROUTE | FROM | TO | LENGTH | FUNCTIONAL CLASS | CURRENT ADT | PRINCIPAL MAIL ROUTE | SCHOOL BUS ROUTE | CONNECTS | SERVICE | TRANSFER <br> SCHEDULE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FUNCTIONAL CLASS ALIGNMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CR 114 | TH 60 | CSAH 11 | 1.9 | minor collector | 140 | YES | YES | TH 60 WITH CSAH 42 RIVER CROSSING | SERVES INDUSTRIAL PARK | 1998 |
| CR 116 | TH 60 | TH 68 | 2.2 | major collector | 210 | YES | YES | TH 68 WITH TH 60 AND THE SOUTH ROUTE | SERVES GRAVEL QUARRIES | 1998 |
| CR 126 | CSAH 34 | CSAH 35 | 1.8 | minor collector | 85 | YES | YES | CSAH 34 WITH CSAH 35 | ONLY RIVER CROSSING FOR 3 MILES | 1998 |
| CR 138 | CSAH 32 | CSAH 20 | 2.5 | minor collector | 250 | YES | YES | CSAH 32 WITH CSAH 20 | SYSTEM CONTINUITY | 1998 |
| CR 161 | CSAH 53 | S CO LINE | 6 | minor collector | 215 | YES | YES | TH 30 AND TH 83 | SYSTEM CONTINUITY . | 1998 |
| CR 163 | CSAH 39 | TH 22 | 2.5 | minor collector | 105 | YES | YES | TH 22 AND CSAH 39 | SYSTEM CONTINUITY | 1998 |
| CR 174 | CSAH 16 | CSAH 10 | 1.25 | minor collector | 65 | YES | YES | CSAH 16 AND CSAH 10 | SYSTEM CONTINUITY | 1998 |
| CR 185 | CSAH 23 | TH 14 | 1.8 | minor collector | 90 | YES | YES | ST. CLAIR WITH MADISON LAKE | SERVES LAKE RECREATION AREA | 1998 |
| CR 186 | CSAH 26 | TH 83 | 3.2 | minor collector | 320 | YES | YES | CSAH 12 WITH TH 83 | SERVES FAST GROWING AREA | 1998 |
| CR 190 | CSAH 82 | CSAH 8 | 1.36 | minor arterial | 1200 | YES | YES | TH 22 WITH CSAH 8 | SERVES MSU | 1998 |

JURISDICTIONAL TRANSFER FROM MANKATO MSAS TO BLUE EARTH CSAH

| Stadium Rd. | CSAH 8 | CSAH 16 | 0.75 | minor arterial | 5600 | YES | YES | CSAH 8 and CSAH 16 | SERVES MSU | 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Madison Ave. | TH 22 | Riverfront Dr. | 2.4 | minor arterial | 17500 | YES | YES | Hilltop Mankato with Downtown | SERVES REGIONAL CENTER | 2003 |
| Victory Dr. | Balcerzak Dr. | Madison Av. | 1 | minor arterial | 14600 | YES | YES | MSU to Hilltop Area | SERVES REGIONAL CENTER | 2003 |


| VICTORY EXT. Madison Ave. | TH 14 | 1]minor arterial | 16000/YES | TYES | Madison Ave. and TH 14 | SERVES REGIONAL CENTER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

TOTAL ADDITIONS 29.66

## SUBTRACTIONS

FUNCTIONAL CLASS ALIGNMENT

| CSAH 35 | CSAH 1 | CSAH 35 | 4.39 |  | 350 | YES | YES | GOOD THUNDER AREA AND MANKATO | SERVES CENTRAL BLUE EARTH CO. | 1998 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CSAH 16 | CR 174 | CSAH 10 |  | local |  | YES | YES | CSAH 10 AND CSAH 174 | SERVES CENTRAL BLUE EARTH CO. | 1998 |
| 5.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRANSFER TO MANKATO MSAS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSAH 8 | CR 190 | FIFTH ST | 1.24 | major | 14800 | YES | NO | STADIUM RD AND MANKATO CBD | SERVES MANKATO CBD | 2000 |
| CSAH 54 | TH 22 | VICTORY DR | 1.14 | mi art | 11300 | YES | YES | TH 22 AND VICTORY DR | MANKATO EAST HIGH SCHOOL | 2000 |
| CSAH 3 | TH 14 | FIFTH ST | 1.03 | mi art/major | 470 | YES | YES | RIVERFRONT AND HILLTOP | SERVES REGIONAL CENTER | 1998 |

3.41

| TOTAL SUBTRACTIONS | 8.8 |
| ---: | ---: |

## NET CHANGE <br> 20.86

+ CSAH 54 is not all currently inside
the city limits of Mankato. Annexation is anticipated


B E C
TRANSPORTATION PLAN

FIGURE 10
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED
DESIGNATION CHANGES

|  | CURRENT CSAH WITH LOCAL FUTURE FUNC. cLass Remove from csah system | -5.39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | current county road with minor collector or higher future func. class ADD TO CSAH SYSTEM | +24.51 |
|  | trunk highway transfer to csah | +17.69 |
| -0-000 | csah transfer to state | -7.4 |
|  | csah transfer to city | -4.01 |
| --*-e* | msas transfer to csah | +4.15 |
| - © - | future (Sah (non-Existing road) | +. 75 |
| -1960 | unaffected trunk highway |  |
| -(15) | unaffected county state aid h | highway |
| $\square$ | unaffected county road |  |
|  | border road Nor | ORTH |
|  | township road | $1 / 5 / 97$ |

## DAKOTA COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

 Proposed 1998 County State Aid Mileage Request

April 24, 1998

## Background Information

- Result of the total review of the Dakota County Transportation System
- This review is part of the development of the Dakota County Transportation Plan
- Process that began in 1995 and has involved a series of meetings and workshops with the Cities and Townships
- Areas of review that have influenced the additional segments requested are:
- Dramatic changes in County growth
- Functional Class
- Jurisdictional Issues
- System Improvements and Changes


## Dakota County Comprehensive Plan Update

- Needs to be completed by December 31, 1998 and submitted to the Metropolitan Council as part of State Legislation
- Includes a Transportation Plan element
- Last Transportation Plan was completed in 1982
- Plan documents the significant changes that have occurred in Dakota County in the past 48 years
- Dakota County population in 1950 was 49,019
- Dakota County population in 1998 is 334,000
- Dakota County projected population in 2020 is 460,200
- Changes in population and land use have led to an increase in the vehicle miles traveled in Dakota County
- There were 318.5 million vehicle miles traveled in 1980 on Dakota County Roads
- There were 775.5 million vehicle miles driven in 1996 on Dakota County Roads. An increase of $243 \%$.
- Comprehensive plan has identified three distinct types of development which have different transportation needs
- First Ring Suburbs
- Rapidly Developing Outer Ring Suburbs
- Rural Area


## TRANSPORTATION PLAN ELEMENTS

Functional Classification Issues

- A functional classification system for the Dakota County Highway system is a requirement of the Transportation Plan.
- This system is based on criteria established by the Metropolitan Council and criteria for designation include:
- Place connections
- Spacing
- System Connections
- Trip Making Service
- Mobility vs. Land Access
- Management
- Using these criteria, staff is proposing functional classification changes that allow Dakota County to group the highways by the character of service they provide for transportation planning purposes.
- Several of these changes have been partial indicators for changes to the County State Aid System:
- CR 62 collector to minor arterial
- CR 79 collector to minor arterial
- CR 81 collector to minor arterial
- CR 85 collector to minor arterial



## TRANSPORTATION PLAN ELEMENT

## Jurisdictional Issues

- Dakota County has had a turnback program in place since 1986
- This program involved a series of public hearings in each of the impacted cities and townships
- Dakota County to date has turned back approximately 48 miles of highway as a result of this program and other developments such as the CR 46 interchange construction
- There are approximately 40 miles of highway left which need to have turnback agreements worked out
- Dakota County is currently working with Mn/DOT to work out the timing for the turnbacks of TH 13 (1998) from new TH 13 to Mendota, TH 156 (Concord), TH 103 (Robert Street)
- Dakota County during 1994/1995 accepted the turnbacks of TH 56 from I-494 to TH 52 and TH 50 from I- 35 to TH 3


## Dakota County Revoked State Aid Mileage

- Dakota County currently has 9.62 miles of banked state aid mileage to apply. It was determined to bank this mileage rather then designate it prior to a comprehensive review of the system.
- These miles have resulted from several means:
- Turnbacks
- CSAH 2, CSAH 9, CSAH 64
- Changes in the County Aid System at the County Border
- CSAH 74A, CSAH 80
- Dakota County is also proposing to revoke two segments of existing County State Aid Highway
- CSAH 45 in coordination with Ramsey County
- CSAH 48 with the construction of CR 46


## County State Aid Qualifying Criteria

- These routes are projected to carry relatively heavier volumes of traffic. 10 of the segments are classified as minor arterials and 3 are classified as collectors
- These routes connect cities, such as CR 46 linking Burnsville, Lakeville, Apple Valley, Rosemount, Empire Township, and Coates. CSAH 38/CR 38 linking Burnsville, Apple Valley and Rosemount.
- These routes provide logical system continuity. They provide connectivity to the principal arterial system, interconnect communities, provide a local minor arterial system to provide alternatives to principal arterials such as TH 52 and CSAH 42, provides a state aid highway network consistent with projected traffic demands.


## Other Issues

- Dakota has already obtained support for the designation of CR 46 from the City Councils of Lakeville and Apple Valley, they have entered into agreements to remove their MSA designation and concur with the County State Aid designation.
- Dakota County will have to resolve with the City of Eagan the issue of removing MSA status off of CR 28 and CR 43. Due to the lack of connector and through streets they have designated County Roads as MSA routes.


# Dakota County State Aid Mileage Request 

Current State Aid System 283.78 Miles

Banked State Aid Mileage 9.62 Miles

Proposed Revocations 2.58 Miles

Proposed Additions
66.58 Miles

Total Mileage Increase 54.38 Miles

Proposed System Mileage 338.16 Miles


## County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information

| CSAH No.: | 46 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | CSAH 5 - TH 52/ CSAH 48 |
| Length: | 14.54 |
| Functional Class: | Minor Arterial |
| Location: | Lakeville, Burnsville, Apple Valley, Rosemount, Empire Township, Cootes, Vermillion Township |
| 1996 ADT: | 6,600-13,500 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 16,000-39,000 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Mileage Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1999 (Upon Federal Project Letting) |
| Construction | ISTEA Project Scheduled for 1999, CSAH 31 - CSAH 48 |
| Programmed: | Last graded 1992-1996 |
| Existing Section: | non-existent - $86^{\prime}$ |
| Proposed Section: | 24'-86' |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$67,334 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$36,042 |

Rationale: $\quad$ RR 46 ploys an important role in connecting Lakeville, Burnsville, Apple Valley, Rosemount, Empire Township, Coates, Vermillion Township and Hastings. The CSAH 42 Corridor Study has demonstrated that $C R 46$ as an A-Minor Arterial provides relief to CSAH 42 (Principal Arterial). The western section of road traverses the fastest developing sections of Dakota County. This road provides access to I-35, CSAH 23/TH T7, TH 3, and TH 52.

## DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 91 'PROPOSED CSAH ADDITION



# County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information 

| CSAH No.: | 91 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | CSAH $54-$ TH 316 |
| Length: | 3.07 |
| Functional Class: | Collector |
| Location: | Hastings, Marshan Township |
| 1996 ADT: | 510-840 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 1000 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Milecge Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5-year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1991 |
| Existing Section: | 24' Bituminous, 8' gravel shoulders |
| Proposed Section: | $36^{\prime}$ |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$8,774 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$2,163 |

Rationale: $\quad$ Provides state aid continuity between CSAH 54 and TH 316. The segments of $C R 91$ to the south are currently designated as state aid highway. This will provide state aid continuity between CSAH 54 and the south County limits.

## DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 62 



# County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information 

| CSAH No.: | 62 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | CSAH 47-TH316 |
| Length: | 6.74 |
| Functional Class: | Existing Collector (1998 Comp Plan recommends Minor Arterial) |
| Location: | Vermillion Township, Marshan Township, Ravenna Township |
| 1996 ADT: | 1,650-1,900 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 2,000-3,000 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Mileage Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5-year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1939-1966 |
| Existing Section: | 24' $38^{\prime}$ |
| Proposed Section: | 24'-38' |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$19,263 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$56,904 |

Rationale: $\quad$ CR 62 plays an important role in connecting Empire, Vermillion and the townships to TH 316 and TH 61. Providing access to Red Wing and Hastings. Based on Met Council spacing guidelines, CR 62 meets the qualifications for a minor arterial, and the 1998 comprehensive plan will reflect this change. CSAH 66 intersects with CSAH 62 and provides county state aid continuity between Farmington and TH 316.

## DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 85 -PROPOSED CSAH ADDITION

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2020 \text { ADT }
\end{aligned}
$$



## County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information

CSAH No.: ..... 85
Segment: ..... CSAH 47 - TH 50
Length: ..... 3.35
Functional Class: Existing Collector (1998 Comp Plan Update recommends MinorArterial)
Location: Hampton Township, Vermillion Township
1996 ADT: ..... 320-500
2020 Projected ADT: ..... 1000
CSAH Designation Mileage Requested
Source:
CSAH Designation ..... 1998
Year:
Construction
Not in the 5-year Capital Improvement Program
Programmed:
Last graded 1979, paved 1991
Existing Section: 24' Bituminous, 8' gravel shoulders
Proposed Section: ..... $36^{\prime}$
Estimated Mileage ..... \$9,574
Apportionment:
Estimated Needs ..... \$2,361
Apportionment:
Rationale:
Provides state aid continuity between TH 50 and CSAH 47. Thesegments of $C R 85$ to the north and south are currently designatedas state aid routes. This will provide state aid continuity betweenTH 55 and CSAH 86/TH 52. The 1998 Comprehensive Plan updaterecommends $\mathbb{R} / C S A H 85$ as a minor arterial.


## County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information

| CSAH No.: | 81 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | CSAH $66-$ TH 52 |
| Length: | 3.84 |
| Functional Class: | Existing Collector (1998 Comp Plan Update recommends Minor Arterial) |
| Location: | Coates, Empire Township |
| 1996 ADT: | 430-470 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 1000 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Milenge Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5 - year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1922 |
| Existing Section: | $30^{\circ}$ |
| Proposed Section: | $36^{\prime}$ |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$10,975 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$22,355 |
| Rationale: | Provides state aid continuity between TH 52 and CSAH 66. This route in conjunction with $C R 79$ provides a north-south state aid continuity between TH 52 and CSAH 86. This provides a local alternative to $T H 52 / 56$. The 198 Comprehensive plan update recommends $C R 81$ as a minor arterial. |

DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 79
PROPOSED CSAH ADDITION
Legend

(66)


# County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information 

| CSAHNo.: | 79 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | CSAH $86-$ CSAH 66 |
| Length: | 8.04 |
| Functional Class: | Existing Collector (1998 Comp Plan Update recommends Minor Arterial) |
| Location: | Costle Rock Township, Empire Township |
| 1996 ADT: | 180-400 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 400-1500 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Milege Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5-year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1926-1966 |
| Existing Section: | 24' $34^{\prime}$ |
| Proposed Section: | $36^{\prime}$ |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$22,978 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$48,245 |
| Rationale: | Provides state aid continuity between CSAH 47/86 to CSAH 66. The nearest CSAH north-south route is 7.5 miles to the west and 6 miles to the east. This provides a local alternative to TH 52/56. The 1998 Comprehensive plan update recommends $C R 79$ as a minor arterial. |



# County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information 

| CSAH No.: | 96 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | West County Limits - TH3 |
| Length: | 5.87 |
| Functional Class: | Collector |
| Location: | Greenvale Township, Waterford Township |
| 1996 ADT: | 110-280 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 500 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Milenge Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5-year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1947 |
| Existing Section: | 24' Bituminous |
| Proposed Section: | $36^{\prime}$ |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$16,776 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$28,903 |
| Rationale: | Provides state aid continuity between Dakota/Rice County Line and TH 3. This route provides east-west state aid connectivity to the interchange at TH 19 from Dakota County. There is a one mile segment of CSAH 23 that runs east west along the $C R 96$ alignment. Provides a connection to I-35 that bypasses Northfield from eastern Dakota County. |
| Additional Information: | Rice County has reviewed their County State Aid system and concurs that this makes a logical state aid connection between the counties. Rice County will be requesting the approximate 0.25 mile extension of CR 96 into Rice County be added to the Rice County state aid system. |



## County State Aid Highway New Segment Requert Requested Segment Detailed Information

| CSAH No.: | 11 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | CSAH $42-$ TH 13 |
| Length: | 3.40 |
| Functional Class: | Minor Arterial |
| Location: | Burnsville, Apple Vailey |
| 1996 ADT: | 7,700-17,500 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 9,000-33,000 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Milenge Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5-year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1981(N) \& 1985(S) |
| Existing Section: | $40^{\prime}-52^{\prime}$ |
| Proposed Section: | $52^{\prime}$ |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$15,290 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$48,228 (Draws widening and surfacing needs) |
| Rationale: | CR 11 plays an important role in connecting Burnsville and Apple Valley to I-35 E. Provides state aid continuity between Trunk Highway 13, CSAH 38 and CSAH 42 (Principal Arterial). |

## DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 38 PROPOSED CSAH ADDITION


$\frac{1996 \text { ADT }}{\text { PROJECTED }} \frac{10500}{16000}$
PROJECTED
2020 ADT

## County State Aid Highway New Segment Request

## Requested Segment Detailed Information

| CSAH No.: | 38 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | Johnny Cake Ridge Road - Th 3 |
| Length: | 3.3 |
| Functional Class: | Minor Arterial |
| Location: | Apple Valley, Rosemount |
| 1996 ADT: | 3,250-12,000 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 9,000-17,000 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Mileoge Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5-year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1986-1990 |
| Existing Section: | 44' $74^{\prime}$ |
| Proposed Section: | $52^{\prime}-74{ }^{\prime}$ |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$12,518 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$38,717 |
| Rationale: | CR 38 plays an important role in connecting Burnsville, Apple Valley and Rosemount. The CSAH 42 Corridor Study has demonstrated that $\mathbb{R} 38$ as an A-Minor Arterial provides relief to CSAH 42 (Principal Arterial). The section of $C R 38$ west of this segment, is already designated County State Aid Highway. This provides a missing link and state aid continuity between CSAH 5 and TH 3. |

# DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 43 PROPOSED CSAH ADDITION 

| LEGEND |
| :---: |
| $\frac{1996 \text { ADT }}{\substack{\text { PROJECTED } \\ 2020 \text { ADT }}} \frac{10500}{16000}$ |



## County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information

CSAH No.: ..... 43
Segment: ..... CSAH 32 - TH 55
Length: ..... 4.92
Functional Class: ..... Collector
Location: Eagan
1996 ADT: ..... $5,200-15,400$
2020 Projected ADT: ..... 8,000-27,000
CSAH Designation Mileage Requested
Source:
CSAH Designation ..... 1998
Year:
Construction
Segment from CR 28 - CSAH 26 (1974) is scheduled for 1999
Programmed:Existing Section: $\quad 34^{\prime}-$ 8 $^{\prime}$
Proposed Section: ..... $52^{\prime}-86^{\prime}$
Estimated Mileage ..... \$27,322
Apportionment:
Estimated Needs ..... \$37,141
( 0.75 miles of complete grading needs 4.17 miles of surfacing needs)
Rationale: CR 43 plays an important role in providing north - south connectivitybetween TH 55, CSAH 26, CR 28, CSAH 30 and CSAH 32. Thisroute provides links for the County Park System and to Eagan HighSchool.
Additional Information:designate this a CSAH, it is currently designated a MSA street.

# DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 28 PROPOSED CSAH ADDITION 

## Dakota County and Eagan will need to work out an agreement to

 designate this a CSAH, it is currently designated a MSA street.I.EGEND

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1996 \text { ADT }}{\text { MRONCTED }} 16500 \\
& 2020 \text { ABl }
\end{aligned}
$$



# County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requerted Segment Detailed Information 

CSAH No.:

| Segment: | THI |
| :--- | :--- |
| Length: | 6.48 |


| Functional Class: | Minor Arterial |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Engan, Inver Grove He:igits |
| 1996 ADT: | $2,500-27,000$ |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | $5,000-50,000$ |
| CSAH Designation | Milenge Requested |
| Source: | 1998 |
| CSAH Designation <br> Year: |  |

Not in the 5 - year Capital Improvement Program
Nast graded 1924-1996
Existing Section: $\quad 52^{\prime \prime}-120^{\circ}$

Proposed Section: 52' - 120'
Estimated Mileage
Apportionment.
Estimated Needs
Apportionment:
Rationale:

Additional Information:
$\$ 00,782 \quad$ (1.61 miles draws complete grading needs 4.87 miles draws surfacing needs)

QR 23 plays an important role in connecting Eagan and Inver: Grove He:eints to TH 13, I-35 E, TH 149, TH 55, TH 52 and CSAH 56. Provides state aid continuity between these Trunk Highwcys. Tris route is an important link for the trucking firms located in the Tr-: 149 and TH 55 area.

The segment from TH 149 to TH 3 is currently being studied by Mn/DOT. Esgan, Inver Grove Heights and Dakota County for the need and feasibility of constructing this seament. If it is determined feasible, Dakota County would anticipate requesting adding this segment to the state aid system after construction.

## DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 30 PROPOSED CSAH ADDITION

\author{
LEGEND

$\frac{1996 \text { ADT }}{\text { PROJECTED }}$| 10500 |
| :--- |
| 2020 ADT |

}


# County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information 

| CSAH No.: | 30 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | TH 13 - Nicols Rood |
| Length: | 0.49 |
| Functional Class: | Minor Arterial |
| Location: | Burnsville, Eagan |
| 1996 ADT: | 6,600-18,000 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 12,000-36,000 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Mileage Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5 - year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1965 |
| Existing Section: | 52 |
| Proposed Section: | 52'-68' |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$2,801 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | \$16,503 |
| Rationale: | CR 30 plays an important role in connecting Burnsville, Eagan and Inver Grove Heights to TH 13, TH 77, I-35E and TH 3. The remaining segments of CSAH 30 from Nicols Rd. (Eagan) to TH 3 (Eagan/Inver Grove Heights City Limits) are already County State Aid Highways. |

# DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 8 PROPOSED CSAH ADDITION 



# County State Aid Highway New Segment Request Requested Segment Detailed Information 

| CSAH No.: | 8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | TH 149-TH 52 |
| Length: | 2.54 |
| Functional Class: | Minor Arterial |
| Location: | Mendota Heights, West St. Paul, South St. Paul |
| 1996 ADT: | 3,300-10,400 |
| 2020 Projected ADT: | 4,000-14,000 |
| CSAH Designation Source: | Mileage Requested |
| CSAH Designation Year: | 1998 |
| Construction Programmed: | Not in the 5-year Capital Improvement Program Last graded 1946-1975 |
| Existing Section: | 32'-52' |
| Proposed Section: | $52^{\prime}$ |
| Estimated Mileage Apportionment: | \$11,089 |
| Estimated Needs Apportionment: | $\begin{array}{ll}\$ 40,795 \quad \text { ( } 1.86 \text { miles draws surfacing needs } \\ & 0.68 \text { miles draws complete grading needs) }\end{array}$ |
| Rationale: | CR 8 plays an important role in connecting Mendota Heights, W. St. Paul and S. St. Paul to TH 13, TH 149, TH 103 and TH 52. Provides state aid continuity between these Trunk Highways. This will provide a northerly east-west county state aid highway and replaces CSAH 2 (Annapolis) which Ramsey and Dakota Counties' turned back to St. Paul and West St. Paul in 1997. |

# DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 45 PRROPOSED CSAH DELETION 






# .DAKOTA COUNTY ROAD 48 PROPOSED CSAH DELETION 


－CONTROL SECTION

SEGMENT FOR DAKOTA
LOCATION：COATES TERHINI：FROM TH 52 TO 0.5 MILES EAST
－FAS CINC NON－URBAN MIMNOR SYSTEM：NONE $\qquad$ COST AREA ${ }^{1}$

## SIFICATION

 ？IPTIONFUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
－GRADED TO 48 FT IN 1967
GRADED TO 48 FT IN 1967 NO EXISTING STORM SEWER MNOR ARTERIAL INOR ARTERIAL STRUCTURAL CAPAC .50 MILES 2 LANES NOT DIVIDED 2 PARKIMG LAHES －NO SETS OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS RIIGIIT OF WAY WIDTH＝ 2 PGAMES SUBGRADE FACTOR＝ $100 \%$
$\stackrel{\text { TION }}{\text { IC }}$

## DEFICIENT IN STRUCTURE

ISED DATA
－ 1996 TRAFFIC 2,850 ADT PROJECTIONFACTOR 1．7 PROJECTED TRAFFIC 4,845 ADT
SED DATA
－ 9 TON URBAN DESIGN 44 FEET WIDE 2 LANES NOT DIVIDED 2 PARKING．LANES RIGHT OF WAY WIDTH $=66$ FEET

```
IAL MESSAGES - YEAR OF LATEST STATE-AID FUND EXPENDITURES - l967
    COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION WITH STATE-AID FUNDS
SURFACE CONSTRUCTED WITII LOCAL FUNDS

\section*{JMSTRUCTION ITEHS}
；FOR COMPLETE GRADING GRADING STORM SEWER CONSTRUCTION
；FOR COHPLETE BASE
GRAVEL SUBASE 非2211 CL 4 BITUMINOUS BASE 非2331

FOR INITIAL SURFACE BITUMINOUS SURFACE \＃2341
ELLANEOUS CONSTRUCTION CURB AND GUTTER

QUANTITY
UNIT PRICE


57,750
119,000 \(\begin{aligned} & 119,000 \\ & \$ 176,750\end{aligned}\)
\begin{tabular}{llll}
8.643 & TONS & 5.64 & 48,747 \\
5 & 58,747
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{lll}5,067 & \text { TONS } & 5.64 \\ 1,420 & \text { TONS } & 19.25\end{array}\)
48,747
28,578
28，747 27， 335
\(\$ 104,660\)
1,065 TONS SURFACE ITEHS TOTAL 20,354 22，354
\(\$ 22,354\)
2,640 LIN FEET 7.50 19，800 19，800
MISCELLANEOUS CONSTRUCTION ITEMS TOTAL \(\$ 19,800\) 19，800 \(\$ 19,800\)
\(\begin{array}{llll} & \text { ALL ROADNAY ITENS TOTAL } & \$ 323,564 & \$ 323,564 \\ A L L & \text { CONSTRUCFION ITEHS TOTAL } & \$ 323,564 & \$ 323,564\end{array}\)


```


[^0]:    * The Recommended Gravel Base Unit Price for each individual county is shown on the state map foldout (Fig. A).
    G.B. - The gravel base price as shown on the state map.

[^1]:    * Screening Board directed that at no time may Washington County's CSAH mileage exceed this total (due to revisions made by this Mileage Request)

[^2]:    - Low ADT gravel roads where traffic volumes are
    restrained by poor road conditions. ADT is projected
    to increase significantly with road reconstruction to
    surfacing guidelines.

