

Washington County - General

TH 36 and TH 120 Interchange

Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including
Multimodal Elements

ID: R-2026-04909

Lyssa Leitner

Requested: \$20,000,000

Status

Initial Review

▼ Table of Contents

General Information
Project Information
Project Funding
Document Requirements
Documents
Qualifying Requirements
Prioritizing Criteria and Measures
Evaluative Criteria
Funds & Payments - Internal
Grant Requirements - Internal
ArcGIS - Internal
Review & Feedback - Internal
Dates & Financials - Internal Only
Communications & Relationships - Internal
Notes & History - Internal

What application category are you applying for.*

New Interchanges

General Information

Organization Name: Washington County - General

▼ Organization Information

Organization Name	Washington County - General
Legal Name	Washington County - General
Street Address	11660 Myeron RD
Street Address 2	
City	Stillwater
County	Washington
State	Minnesota
Country	United States of America
ZIP Code	55082

▼ Contact Information

Contact	Full Name	Email	Phone
Primary Grant Contact	Lyssa Leitner	lyssa.leitner@washingtoncountymn.gov	
Authorized User			
Grant Administration			
Developer 1			
Developer 2			

▼ Project Information

Project Name* TH 36 and TH 120 Interchange

Select Primary county where project is located* Washington

Cities or Townships where the Project is located* North St. Paul, Oakdale

Jurisdictional Agency (if different than applicant): MnDOT

Brief project description*

TH 36 and TH 120 (Century Avenue) is an existing signalized intersection on the border of Oakdale and North St. Paul and Ramsey and Washington Counties. This project will construct an interchange in place of the signal. TH 36 is a principal arterial and TH 120 is a minor reliever. The project will also include a new multiuse trail along TH 120 which is a Tier 1 Regional Bike Trail Network (RBTN) corridor and a direct connection to the Gateway State Trail which is a Tier 2 corridor on the RBTN. This project will improve safety, operations, and reliability for all users and will replace the only remaining signal on TH 36 inside the I-694/494 loop.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Description*

TH 36 and TH 120 Interchange Area

Provide the project length to the nearest one-tenth of a mile* 0.7

Lead Agency* MnDOT

ZIP Code where majority of work is being performed* 55109

Functional Class of Road* Principal Arterial

Road System* TH

Road/Route No. (i.e., 53 for CSAH 53)* 36

Name of Road (Example: 1st st., Main Ave)* TH 36

Approximate begin construction date (mo/yr)* 7/1/2030

Approximate end construction date (mo/yr)* 7/1/2032

Name or description of trail/ped facility (i.e., Cedar Lake Trail, University Avenue Sidewalk)

Termini (Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work) (Do not include legal description; include name of roadway if majority of facility runs adjacent to a single corridor)

Roadway Name* TH 36/TH 120

From Cross-Street* Charles Street

To Cross-Street* Glennbrook Ave N

Length of multimodal facilities included in project (nearest 0.1 miles, include all that apply using the best available information)* 0.7

Multituse trail* 0.7

Separated bicycle facility* 0

On-street bicycle facility* 0

Sidewalk* 0

Miles of facility on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles)* 0

Miles of new RBTN facilities* 0.7

Miles of improved existing RBTN facilities* 0

Miles of facility on the regional trail network (nearest 0.1 miles)* 0

Miles of new Regional Trail facilities* 0

Miles of improved existing Regional Trail facilities* 0

Miles of Facility along Updated Regional Truck Corridors:

Miles along Tier 1 facilities:

Miles along Tier 2 facilities: 0.7

Miles along Tier 3 facilities: 0.2

Number of improved ADA ramps* 28

Number of intersection improvements* 7

Primary types of work (Examples: Grade, AGG Base, BIT Base, BIT Surf, Sidewalk, Signals, Lighting, Guardrail, Bike path, Ped Ramps, Bridge, Park and ride, etc.)*

GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, BRIDGE

Bridge/culvert projects (if applicable)

Current Bridge/Culvert No.

New Bridge/Culvert No.

Structure is over/under (Bridge or Culvert Name):

TH 36

Number of peak hours*	2
Intersection vehicles per hour (Intersection improvements only)*	5625
Peak hour delay per vehicle under No-Build conditions*	48
Peak hour delay per vehicle under Build conditions*	2
Average corridor speed under No-Build conditions*	39
Average corridor speed under Build conditions*	68

Project Funding

Are you applying for competitive funds from another source(s) to implement this project?*

No

Grant Request Amount, US\$* \$20,000,000.00

Project Total: \$* \$43,800,000.00

Match Amount: \$ (Minimum of 20% of the project total for federally funded projects)

Match Amount: \$23,800,000.00

Match Percentage (Minimum of 20% for federally funded projects)

Match percentage: 54%

Source of Match Funds (For federally funded projects, a minimum of 20% of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the 20% minimum can come from other federal sources)

Source of Match Funds* state and local for at least 20% of match and additional federal

Please check the years that are feasible for your program.* 2031 (Federal projects)

To provide the required budget information, complete the Total Project Cost Worksheet and then upload into the Documents section. Refer to the Total Project Cost Instructions for instructions on what to submit in Fluxx.

Roadway Costs* \$36,310,000.00

Bicycle/Pedestrian Costs* \$7,500,000.00

Transit/TDM Capital Costs* \$0.00

Transit/TDM Operating Costs* \$0.00

One of the federal funding sources is Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT). Please describe which specific elements of your project and associated costs out of the Total TAB-Eligible Costs are eligible to receive PROTECT funds.

PROTECT eligible costs associated with the TH 36 and TH 120 interchange project include those associated with natural and structural stormwater controls, new/improved drainage structures, stabilization of slopes, erosion control including vegetation establishment. From the developed project cost estimate, these items account for \$4,000,000 in the provided estimate.

As part of this application process, you must enter your project location(s) information into our Geographic Information System (GIS) via the link below.

The GIS link is not generated until a project name has been added to the question "Project Name" above and the application has been saved. For multiple locations, you will refresh the window to add additional locations. If you make a mistake, please refresh and add the correct location and add a comment describing the error and correction. The project location(s) are used to determine some of the outcomes below. Please note that it may take several minutes for the GIS data to be populated in the application below.

Please click the following link which opens in a new window: Draw Project Location

**I acknowledge that I clicked the GIS link Yes
and entered the required information.**

▼ Document Requirements

Instructions

Upload a PDF for the applicable project elements listed below. Multiple files can be uploaded with the attachment link below. Each individual attachment must be saved as an 8.5"X11"pdf and cannot be more than 15 pages in length to be considered. Only pdf files that meet the size and length limits will be accepted. Please do not submit entire plans or studies.

Summary

1. Applicants are required to submit a one-page project summary to be used by the scoring committees and TAB members. This one-pager may include the project name, applicant, route, a map, township/city/county where project is located, requested award amount, total project cost, before photo, project description, list of project benefits, or other pertinent information.
2. A photograph from within the past year showing the existing conditions within the project area. If awarded funds, this photograph will be utilized in the Metropolitan Council's online mapping tool to show a before-and-after comparison of the improvement. By submitting the application, the applicant agrees to allow the Council to use this photograph. Applicants should not use copyrighted images from other sources.

Maps

1. All infrastructure projects must include a map or concept drawing of the proposed improvements that clearly labels the beginning and end of the project, all roadways in the project area, and any bicycle, pedestrian, and transit components anticipated upon completion of the project.

Coordination

1. The applicant must include a letter of support from the agency that owns/operates the facility, will operate the transit service, or will be expected to maintain the project (if different than the applicant) indicating that it is aware of and understands the project being submitted, and that it commits to operate and maintain the facility for its design life.
2. Transit applicants that propose a project that begins or ends within another agency's service area must include a letter of support from the other transit agency.
3. If the applicant expects any other agency or competitive grant program to provide part of the local match, the applicant must include a staff-level letter from the other agency agreeing to financially participate/documentation of the competitive award.

Other

1. For Congestion Management Strategies and New Interchange projects only: The Synchro/Highway Capacity Manual emission reduction reports including the Timing Page Report that displays input and output information for both the no build and build scenarios. This report must be attached within the web-based application form. Upload additional attachments for multiple intersection reports.

To add a document, select the green plus sign on the far right of the screen in the row below. A new screen will appear. Upload files by selecting Add files on the bottom left of the screen. After all files have been added, select Start Upload. (Note: if you need to add more files to the same group of attachments, use the green + button in the "Documents" section at the bottom.)

▼ Documents

To add other documents, click the green + sign, then click "Add Files." Then select the document category from the dropdown and click "Start Upload"

APPLICATION DOCUMENTS

Filter by Type



2026-064 Regional Solicitation HSIP Active
Transportation.pdf



Resolution of Support

Added by Lyssa Leitner at 7:21 AM on June 24, 2026



MnDOT LOS TH 36_120.pdf



Year-Round Maintenance Commitment

Added by Lyssa Leitner at 7:19 AM on June 24, 2026



Ramsey LOS TH 36
_120.pdf



Year-Round Maintenance Commitment

Added by Lyssa Leitner at 7:19 AM on June 24, 2026



Oakdale LOS TH 36_120.pdf



Year-Round Maintenance Commitment

Added by Lyssa Leitner at 7:19 AM on June 24, 2026



NSP LOS TH 36_120.pdf



Year-Round Maintenance Commitment

Added by Lyssa Leitner at 7:19 AM on June 24, 2026

1 - 5 of 13 Records

[1](#) [2](#) [3](#)

Jump to Page

▼ **Qualifying Requirements**

The applicant must show that the project meets all the qualifying requirements to be eligible to be scored and ranked against other projects. All qualifying requirements must be met before completing an application.

By selecting each checkbox, the applicant confirms compliance with the following project requirements:

The project will follow all applicable federal and state design standards, including state statutes such as **State Aid Rule 8820** as required.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project is consistent with the **goals, objectives, policies, and actions of the 2050 Transportation Policy Plan**
Briefly list the applicable 2050 TPP objectives and policies.

Briefly list the applicable 2050 TPP objectives and policies*

- Briefly list the applicable 2050 TPP objectives and policies:
- People do not die or face life-changing injuries when using any form of transportation.
- People feel safer, more comfortable, and more welcome when using any form of transportation.
- People can increase physical activity with more opportunities to walk, roll, or bike.
- People have better travel options beyond driving alone to meet their daily needs, with a focus on improving travel times, reliability, directness, and affordability.
- People have more predictable travel times when traveling on highways, with a focus on reducing excessive delays.
- People and businesses can rely on predictable and cost-effective movement of freight and goods.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project or the specific transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document completed within the last 10 years. Reference the name of the comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study, Safe Routes to School Plan, Bicycle System Plan, or other approved/adopted plan or program of the applicant agency. The Active Transportation Planning application category (whose projects will be creating the plan itself) is exempt from this requirement.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

List the applicable document(s) and pages*

MnDOT CHIP – page 40

The project complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project year-round for the useful life of the improvement. This includes assurance of year-round use of bicycle and pedestrian facilities per FHWA direction established 9/27/2008 and updated 4/15/2019. Project sponsors of standalone bicycle and pedestrian projects or bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are part of a roadway project must include information on how the requirement to maintain facilities for year-round use will be met. This information may include:

- A local ordinance or policy that requires abutting property owners to maintain pedestrian or bicycle facilities, or that directs agency staff to maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

- A letter or resolution that confirms the proposed local facility will be maintained by agency staff or abutting private property owners.
- A cross-jurisdictional agreement with another agency to maintain the proposed local pedestrian or bicycle facility.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term “independent utility” means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any other construction elements to be delivered for the proposed project to be achieved.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The infrastructure project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project applicant has sent written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected units of government prior to submitting the application. Staff-level letters of support are required if another agency owns the roadway, will deliver the transit service, will contribute financially to the project, will be expected to sponsor the project, or will be expected to maintain the project. Transit projects proposing a project that crosses into another agency’s service area must include a letter of support from all relevant transit agencies.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The Metropolitan Council and the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) get the first opportunity to utilize a share of the greenhouse gas and vehicle miles traveled offsets of any awarded federal or active transportation regional sales tax projects proportionate to the share of the total project cost funded by TAB to fulfill state requirements for the Greenhouse Gas Impact Assessment (MN Statute 161.178) enacted in 2023. Each offset can only be used one time. If the projects are not needed by the Metropolitan Council and TAB as offsets to other awarded Regional Solicitation highway projects, ownership of them will revert, in whole or in part, to the original project sponsor. Based on inputs provided in the application, Met Council staff will calculate the magnitude of the offsets.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The applicant agrees to provide Metropolitan Council staff with post-construction data, as requested, in order to perform before-and-after analyses.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

Federally funded projects must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way acquisition costs are only eligible as part of transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project that is otherwise eligible.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

Applicant is a public entity (e.g., county, city, tribal government, transit provider, etc.), or non-profit organization in the TDM category only. Applicants for federal funds that are not State Aid cities in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required. Applicants for the three application categories funded with Active Transportation Regional Sales Tax funds do not need to be a State Aid city or a county to apply.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The public agency sponsor must either have a current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) self-evaluation or transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation, as required under Title II of the ADA. The transition plan must be completed by the local agency before the Regional Solicitation application deadline.

Choose one* The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and has a completed ADA transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation.

Date plan completed by governing body* 9/30/2015

Link to plan* <https://www.washingtoncountymn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/8045/Washington-County-Transition-Plan-Draft-20150616?bidId=>

All projects that are located within right-of-way occupied by an active railroad must confirm that the railroad has been engaged in project planning.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The roadway project is identified as a principal arterial (non-freeway facilities only) or minor arterial as shown on the latest **functional classification map**. Bridge Connections, Proactive Safety and Reactive Safety projects have broader eligibility and can be located on a minor collector and above functionally classified roadway in the urban areas or a major collector and above in the rural areas.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

The project must be designed to meet 10-ton load limit standards.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

This project involves the construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps.* Yes

Roadway projects that involve the construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps must have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to the application deadline. Please contact David Elvin at MnDOT (David.Elvin@state.mn.us or 651-234-7795) to determine whether your project needs to go through this process as described in the 2050 Transportation Policy Plan.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets the requirement above.* Yes

▼ Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

2050 TPP Goal: Our Region is Dynamic and Resilient

Category Definition: The New Interchanges application category is intended to fund projects that increase reliability and minimize excessive delay for people and freight and reduce severe and fatal crashes by grade separating opposing travel movements.

This application contributes to these 2050 TPP Objectives or Policies:

- People do not die or face life-changing injuries when using any form of transportation.
- People have more predictable travel times when traveling on highways, with a focus on reducing excessive delays.
- People and businesses can rely on predictable and cost-effective movement of freight and goods.
- The region's transportation system protects, restores, and enhances natural systems (air, water, vegetation, and habitat quality).

New State Law: Projects located on the Minnesota trunk highway system that have a total cost (including design and engineering and right-of-way costs) greater than \$15 million and are either new interchange projects or add 2,500 feet of lane miles or more are required to perform a transportation greenhouse gas emissions impact assessment per MN Statutes 161.178 . This law requires a greenhouse gas impact assessment of the project and development of an offset plan before inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The assessment and offset plan will need to be reviewed by the Metropolitan Council and Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Assessment Technical Advisory Committee. The Minnesota Commissioner of Transportation will approve the project to be included in the TIP.

Prior to Regional Solicitation application submittal, project proposers will need to determine project emissions impacts and identify vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and emissions offsets. Then, the TAB will add in offsets generated from other selected Regional Solicitation and Active Transportation projects. The combined local and regional offsets will form the basis of the total offset plan to be reviewed by the Metropolitan Council and certified by MnDOT and its Technical Advisory Committee at least 90 days prior to the project entering the draft TIP. Project sponsors are encouraged to contact Met Council and MnDOT staff several months before the Regional Solicitation application deadline.

Congestion Management Process (CMP): Roadway lane expansion projects of greater than one mile are required to follow the CMP Handbook process for identifying potential congestion solutions and submit materials to Metropolitan Council staff prior to the application deadline. For the 2026 Regional Solicitation, the Metropolitan Council has an on-call consultant who can assist applicants with going through the CMP

Handbook.

Please note that this list is not exhaustive and is intended only to provide examples. For questions regarding project eligibility, see the qualifying requirements for this application category and contact the Metropolitan Council.

- New interchanges (typically converting an at-grade intersection to a grade-separated one)
- New hybrid interchanges where only some movements are grade separated

▼ Evaluative Criteria

1. Anticipated Delay Reduction

Anticipated Delay Reduction: This criterion measures how the project reduces delay and prioritizes low-cost solutions by measuring the cost effectiveness of the delay reduced. It also aligns with the federally required Congestion Management Process, which considers low cost and low impact solutions before more costly and impactful solutions to improve congestion.

Measure A – Cost effectiveness of delay reduced

Consistent with the 2050 TPP measure of excessive delay, use a Synchro analysis to document the two hours with the highest anticipated delay reduction (shown with Synchro analysis in seconds). The two hours do not have to be consecutive. Use the total delay reduction (in seconds) of those two hours and divide by the total project cost. (100 words or less and provide Synchro analysis documentation)*

The 2 hours with the highest delay reduction are the PM peak hour and the hour before the PM peak. Delay reduction is estimated to be 46 s/veh in the PM peak hour (4625 vehicles) and 38 s/veh in the hour before the PM peak hour (4375 vehicles). Multiplying these gives a total 2-hour delay of 379,000 seconds. The estimated construction cost is \$43.81M. $379,000 / 43,810,000 = 0.00865$

Scoring Guidance

The project with a Synchro analysis that reduces the most delay for the two highest hours per dollar requested will receive the most points, with the remaining projects receiving a proportionate share of the points (25 points).

Projects that do not reduce delay or increase delay and/or do not include supporting a Synchro analysis should receive zero points in this measure.

2. Regional Priorities for Reliability & Excessive Delay

This criterion assesses the excessive delay (as defined in the region's CMP) and reliability of potential projects based on the 2050 TPP maps for Reliability or Excessive Delay (with updated data).

Measure A - 2050 TPP Map for Excessive Delay

Excessive Highway Delay map (if more than one applies in the project area, select the highest delay)*

Less than 2 hours

Measure A Scoring Guidance

- Less than 2 hours: 0 points
- 2-3 hours: 4 points
- 4-6 hours: 7 points

Measure B - 2050 TPP Map for Reliability

Highway Reliability map (if more than one applies in the project area, select the highest buffer index)*

Buffer time index between 0.75 and 1.00

Measure B Scoring Guidance

Less than 0.5: 0 points

Between 0.5 and 0.75: 4 points

3. Safety

This criterion measures the project's ability to promote safety for all users, including how the project responds to existing risks and makes use of proven safety countermeasures.

Measure A - Connection to Existing Safety Planning Efforts

Project Location (or part of the location) is listed in the Regional Safety Action Plan on any of the following lists (note an online map is being developed and a link will be provided in final application)

Crash Risk Index >15

Project location is not listed in a regional or local safety plan but provides a parallel or alternative route that will improve safety for people walking or biking.* No

Location is listed in another safety plan that prioritizes reducing fatal and serious injury crashes. Yes

Please describe and provide reference or link to the plan*

Intersection Mobility and Safety Study –included in “High” tier Executive Summary Report
Congestion Management Safety Plan 4 – included in top tier
Intersection Mobility and Safety Study - Metropolitan Council

Measure A Scoring Guidance

The project will be scored based on the scorer's discretion, using the following guidance:

- High: Project is identified in the regional safety action plan on either the regional top 25 or county top 10 lists or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- Medium-High
- Medium: Project location is identified in a regional safety action plan on High Injury Streets or Crash Risk Index, or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- Medium-Low
- Low: Project location is identified in a local (e.g. county or city) safety action plan, local or district Safe Routes to School plan, or project has a completed targeted study (e.g., NEPA document, corridor study, intersection study, ICE report, etc.) that identifies the specific safety measures needed to improve safety and those safety measures have been incorporated into the proposed project or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that are not identified in the Regional Safety Action Plan or any local safety plan. This could also include projects that also have not completed a targeted study that defines an existing safety issue (e.g., NEPA document, corridor study, intersection study, ICE report, etc.)

Measure B - Safety Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles

Please provide a written response that explains how the project will mitigate existing risk factors noted above and any other steps taken to ensure the project promotes safety for all users. Please cite any specific proven safety countermeasures that will be part of the project's design or methods the project will use to promote safety for people outside of vehicles (600 words or less).*

Consider the following when developing your response. Note that not all considerations are applicable to all projects, but please respond to those that are applicable.

- Will crossing distances or times between protected crossings for people outside of vehicles be increasing or decreasing? If so, how many locations will be affected? If increasing, what measures will be considered to recognize the increase in distance between crossing opportunities?
- Describe what measures are being used to reduce exposure and delay for people outside of vehicles.
- If grade separated pedestrian crossings are being added and increasing crossing times, describe any features that are included that will reduce the detour required of pedestrians and make the separated crossing a more appealing option.

- If mid-block crossings are restricted or blocked, explain why this is necessary and how pedestrian crossing needs and safety are supported in other ways.
- Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, in both through-traffic and turning movements. Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower or protect pedestrians and bicyclists if motorist speeds will increase.
- Consider these resources for safety improvements: Regional Safety Action Plan's Programmatic Recommendations, FHWA's Safe System Roadway Design Hierarchy, and MnDOT's Traffic Engineering Countermeasures

The at-grade intersection of TH 36 and TH 120 is currently a high-speed, high-conflict location that exceeds the critical crash rate. For vulnerable road users, crossing TH 36 at-grade introduces exposure to 50+ mph traffic. TH 36 is also one of the regional Bicycle Barriers, acting as a severe structural barrier between residential neighborhoods, North St. Paul High School, multiple elementary schools, downtown North St. Paul, local businesses, and the Gateway State Trail. The area also has multiple crossing locations that are identified as higher risk on the region's Bicycle Crash Risk Index.

The project design uses FHWA's Safe System Roadway Design Hierarchy to prioritize vulnerable users. The project will add a trail along TH 120 which is a Regional Bike Trail Network tier 2 corridor and prioritize trail connections to the Gateway State Trail. Today, a biker or walker needs to cross multiple at-grade intersections to access the State Trail in this area. After the project, there will be grade separated connections. Replacing the traffic signal with a grade-separated interchange eliminates vulnerable user exposure to TH 36 through-traffic. Multimodal delay will drop because users will no longer have to wait for long signal cycles. The multi-use trail runs directly along the TH 120 alignment, matching natural pedestrian desire lines to minimize detours and eliminate wide, unprotected crossing distances. Multiple side street intersections will have new or replaced ADA ramps to ensure safety and comfort for people of all ages and abilities.

To manage motorist speeds where turning movements interact with the multi-use trail, the design eliminates the existing free-right movements. Ramp terminals will utilize turning radii to force turning motorists to significantly reduce their speeds. Additionally, motorists on TH 120 will no longer be able to speed across TH 36 but will need to navigate two roundabouts that will significantly slow their travel speeds. At all ramp conflict points and side street intersections, high-visibility crosswalk markings and dedicated pedestrian-scale lighting will be used to maximize visibility.

The project design, specifically grade-separated crossings and dedicated multi-use trails have crash modification factors of .5 and .75 respectively. This project eliminates the highest-severity conflict points, directly fulfilling the Regional Safety Action Plan's goals to deliver a safe, low-stress multimodal network.

Measure B Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this criterion will serve the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists with the greatest safety and least pedestrian and bicyclist delay, detour, or discomfort. Score projects higher if selected countermeasures are designed to be comfortably used by people of all ages and abilities. The highest scoring projects will provide frequent, safe, at-grade crossing opportunities to prioritize directness and convenience with safety. Score projects higher if design elements are included to help motorists drive slower. The response will include quantitative or qualitative metrics showing a high level of improvement using an established methodology.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may make a strong case as to how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for people outside of vehicles but without quantitative data or using a less established methodology. These projects may require lengthy detours or elevation changes or have less frequent at-grade crossings that do not align well with destinations. Similarly, mid-range projects may have quantitative or qualitative data and an established methodology but only offer a small improvement to the multimodal experience.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Projects that make minimal improvement to the travel experience, safety and security for people outside of vehicles should receive low points in this measure. These projects may include motor vehicle design elements that raise concerns for pedestrian and bicyclist safety, such as increased vehicle speeds or increased crossing distances that would not be fully mitigated by any safety countermeasures for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not improve the travel experience and safety for people outside of vehicles should receive zero points for this measure.

Measure C - Safe System Approach

Please describe how the project aligns with the Safe System Approach where the transportation system is designed to minimize the consequences of human errors by implementing multiple layers of protection (400 words or less).*

Consider the following when developing your response. Note that not all considerations need to be addressed, but please respond to those that are applicable.

- Are safety improvements focused on reducing fatal and serious injury crashes?
- Does the project utilize proven safety countermeasures?
- Consider these resources for safety improvements: Regional Safety Action Plan's Programmatic Recommendations or MnDOT's Traffic Engineering Countermeasures

The project directly aligns with the Safe System Approach by shifting from a reactive design to one that proactively plans for human error to eliminate fatal and serious injury crashes. Currently, the TH 36 and TH 120 intersection exceeds the critical crash rate and contains multiple higher risk segments on the region's Bicycle Crash Risk Index.

The primary layer of protection applies the FHWA Safe System Roadway Design Hierarchy through "Separating Users in Space." By replacing the at-grade signal with a grade-separated interchange and building a multi-use trail along the TH 120, the design reduces vulnerable users from high-speed through-traffic. There will also be grade separated connections to the Gateway State Trail that do not exist today. This design reduces the risk that motorist error or a pedestrian misjudgment will result in a high-speed crash.

A secondary layer of protection manages "Safe Speeds" where the multi-use trail interacts with interchange ramps. Incorporating MnDOT Traffic Engineering Countermeasures, the design removes free-rights and uses tighter turning radii to physically force turning vehicles to slow down. Additionally, motorists on TH 120 will no longer be able to speed across TH 36 but will need to navigate two roundabouts that will significantly slow their travel speeds. At all ramp conflict points and side street intersections, high-visibility crosswalk markings and dedicated pedestrian-scale lighting will be used to maximize visibility.

The FHWA Crash Modification Factor (CMF) Clearinghouse indicates that converting an at-grade signalized intersection to a grade-separated interchange reduces total crashes by 40 to 50 percent and cuts fatal and injury crashes by up to 57 percent. By removing the regional Bicycle Barrier and addressing key vulnerabilities on the Bicycle Crash Risk Index, this design advances the Regional Safety Action Plan's goals, delivering a safer network built for users of all ages and abilities.

Measure C Scoring Guidance

The project will be scored based on the scorer's discretion, using the following guidance: Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria. Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and score projects based on the benchmarks provided below.

- High: The highest scoring projects in this criterion will align with the Safe System Approach and significantly improve safety for all users and cites specific safety best practices or countermeasures that will be included in the project. Scorer is confident the project sponsor will design the project to prioritize safety for people outside of vehicles. The response will include quantitative metrics showing a high level of improvement using a sound methodology.
- Medium-High
- Medium: Mid-range projects in this criterion may align with the Safe System Approach and improve safety for all users but without quantitative data or using a less solid methodology. Similarly, mid-range projects may have quantitative data and a solid methodology but only offer a small improvement to the multimodal experience.
- Medium-Low
- Low: Low scoring projects may not provide quantitative data to assess the claim of adherence to the Safe Systems approach.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that do not align with the Safe System Approach or improve the travel experience, safety and security for people outside of vehicles should receive zero points in this criterion.

4. Multimodal/Complete Streets Connections

This criterion measures how the project improves travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation and addresses the safe integration of these modes. The Transportation Policy Plan requires that explicit consideration of all users of the transportation system be considered in the planning and scoping phase

of projects.

Measure A – New or improved multimodal connections (transit, bicycle, pedestrian, TDM elements)

Describe the new or improved multimodal connections (transit, bicycle, pedestrian, etc.) along, across or underneath the project and/or TDM elements (400 words or less).*

Consider the following when developing your response. Note that not all considerations are applicable to all projects, but please respond to those that are applicable.

- How does the project reduce the level of traffic stress (reference the Oregon Department of Transportation level of traffic stress analysis procedure or another similar methodology) for all users of multimodal facilities?
- How will the project improve the comfort and quality of the travel experience for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users of all ages and abilities?
- How will the project reduce delays for these users?
- How will the project improve access or expand connections for these users?
- How will the project use TDM to encourage the use of other modes?
- Does the project provide a high-quality connection based on the surrounding land use and/or community context?

This project removes a major barrier, TH 36 at-grade crossing, identified in the Regional Bicycle Barriers Study (RBBS), adds trail to the RBTN tier 1 network, and makes grade separated connections to the Gateway State Trail which is on the RBTN tier 2 network. Currently, the at-grade intersection of TH 36 and TH 120 functions as a barrier, forcing vulnerable road users to navigate 50+ mph traffic. The project area also has multiple side street crossings that are higher risk on the region's Bicycle Crash Risk Index. Utilizing the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) methodology, the existing crossing rates as a LTS 4 (on a 1-5 scale with 5 being the highest). This signifies an environment of extreme stress that is only tolerated by a fraction of highly experienced cyclists, which means students cannot bike or walk to the multiple elementary schools in the area or to North St. Paul High School.

By constructing a continuous, grade-separated multi-use trail along TH 120—a designated RBTN Tier 2 corridor—this project replaces a major barrier and the area now becomes a LTS 1. This designation represents the highest tier of multimodal comfort, meaning the route becomes safe, low-stress, and inviting for users of all ages and abilities. The design directly accommodates vulnerable demographics, including students walking or biking to North St. Paul High School and nearby elementary schools, as well as residents traveling to the surrounding neighborhoods.

The project also enhances the quality and efficiency of the multimodal travel experience by eliminating active transportation delays that occur and the existing signal. Bicyclists and pedestrians will no longer be subjected to long, multi-phase signal cycles at TH 36.

In terms of community context, this infrastructure provides an invaluable, high-quality connection tailored to the surrounding land use. It seamlessly weaves together residential neighborhoods, downtown businesses, educational centers, and vital regional recreational assets. Most notably, it eliminates the multiple hazardous at-grade connections currently required to access the Gateway State Trail, replacing them with grade-separated trail connections. Metro Transit also operates route 219 through this corridor. That route will now become easier, safer, and faster to use because delay will be reduced due to the signal being removed and there will be a multi-use trail where there are no pedestrian or bike facilities today.

Measure A Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria. The project rating will be based on the quality of the improvements, as opposed to being based solely on the number of modes addressed.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will significantly improve the travel experience, safety, and security for modes of transportation beyond vehicles and the safe integration of these modes in the project. The response will include quantitative or qualitative metrics showing a high level of improvement using an established methodology. Projects that are on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) AND provide new or improved bicycle facilities designed to cater to uses of all ages and abilities will receive a high score.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may significantly improve the travel experience, safety, and security for modes of transportation beyond vehicles and the safe integration of these modes in the project but without quantitative or qualitative data or using a less established methodology. Similarly, mid-range projects may have quantitative data and a solid methodology but only offer a small improvement to the multimodal experience.

- Medium-Low
 - Low: Low rated projects in this measure will not include quantitative or qualitative data and may not provide clear information to create confidence that the project will provide benefits.
 - Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that do not improve the multimodal travel experience, safety and security should receive zero points in this measure.
-

5. Freight

Tying regional policy in the 2050 Transportation Policy Plan to the Regional Solicitation, this criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy based on how it aligns with the Regional Truck Corridor Study.

Measure A – Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers

This measure relies on the results on the Truck Highway Corridor Study, which prioritized all principal and minor arterials based on truck volume, truck percentage of total traffic, proximity to freight industry clusters, and proximity to regional freight terminals. The truck corridors were grouped into tiers 1, 2, and 3, in order of priority. Use the 2021 Updated Regional Truck Corridors tiers to respond to this measure: 2021 Updated Regional Truck Corridors.

Select one for your project, based on the 2021 updated Regional Truck Corridors*

Along Tier 2

Measure A Scoring Guidance

Applicants will be awarded points as assigned in the above tiers: (for new alignments, use the tier of the existing alignment or parallel alignment that the new connection is replacing):

- 5 points: Projects along Tier 1
 - 4 points: Projects along Tier 2
 - 3 points: Projects along Tier 3
 - 2 points: Projects that provide a direct and immediate connection to a corridor
 - 0 points: None of the tiers
-

6. Natural Systems Protection and Restoration

This criterion measures the project's ability to protect and preserve the region's natural systems and build more resilient infrastructure.

Measure A - Flood mitigation, stormwater treatment, other environmental benefits

Describe how the project protects and restores natural systems through flood mitigation, stormwater treatment, etc. (600 words or less)*

Consider the following when developing your response. Note that not all considerations need to be addressed, but please respond to those that are applicable.

- Does the project increase or decrease impervious surface area?
- Does the project use alternative construction methods (e.g., recycling pavement materials or using surfaces more friendly to freeze/thaw cycles)?
- Does the project use landscaping or streetscaping appropriate for the area/climate?
- Does the project preserve existing mature trees or plan new trees with associated establishment period?
- Does the project use soil amendments to improve environmental performance (e.g., biochar food-derived compost)?
- Is the project designed to industry standard flood events (e.g., 100-year flood events)?
- Does the project manage stormwater more efficiently or mitigate an existing stormwater runoff concern?
- Does the project add new infrastructure that is more resilient to wetter and warmer conditions?
- Does the project improve habitat connectivity?

The existing TH 36 and TH 120 corridor reflects legacy infrastructure constructed before current sustainability, climate adaptation, and water quality standards. The proposed interchange will replace outdated roadway, drainage, and stormwater systems with resilient infrastructure designed to meet current MnDOT and watershed requirements.

The project will improve flood resiliency by providing new drainage infrastructure sized to safely convey and manage 100-year storm events. This will reduce roadway flooding risk, improve emergency and regional

mobility during extreme weather, and adapt the corridor to increasingly frequent wet conditions. Because the groundwater table is close to the existing surface, the design will minimize deep excavation where practicable and incorporate pumping and drainage solutions to reduce risk to the highway and adjacent properties.

The selected tight diamond interchange configuration provides an environmental benefit by limiting the overall project footprint while still addressing safety and mobility needs. A smaller footprint reduces right-of-way impacts, limits grading disturbance, minimizes tree removal, and reduces new impervious surface compared with larger alternatives. Where pavement must be reconstructed or added, the project will evaluate recycled aggregate base, reclaimed pavement materials, and other MnDOT-approved recycled materials to reduce demand for virgin materials and construction waste.

Stormwater treatment will be improved over the existing condition through best management practices such as vegetated swales, filtration or infiltration areas where feasible, sediment pretreatment, and upgraded conveyance systems. These features will slow runoff, promote sediment settling, and improve water quality before discharge. The project will also evaluate separating clean runoff from areas requiring treatment to improve drainage efficiency.

Disturbed areas will be stabilized and revegetated with climate-appropriate seed mixes, including native or low-maintenance grasses and pollinator-supporting vegetation where feasible and compatible with highway safety requirements. Landscaping will be selected for Minnesota's climate, winter maintenance conditions, and freeze/thaw cycles. Existing mature trees will be preserved where practicable, and new trees or woody vegetation may be planted in appropriate locations with an establishment period to support long-term survival. Soil amendments, such as compost or organic material, may be used to improve soil health, vegetation establishment, and stormwater performance.

Overall, the project will replace an outdated corridor with a more compact, resilient, and environmentally responsive interchange. By improving flood management, stormwater treatment, limiting the project footprint, using appropriate revegetation, and considering recycled materials, the project will protect natural systems and improve environmental performance compared with the existing condition.

Measure A Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** Projects in this range will significantly improve, protect, and restore natural systems over the existing condition. The response will include quantitative or qualitative metrics showing a high level of improvement using an established methodology.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Projects in this range will somewhat improve, protect, and restore natural systems over the existing condition. The response will include qualitative or quantitative metrics showing a smaller level of improvement using an established methodology.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** These projects make a case as to how the project somewhat improves, protects, and restores natural systems without qualitative or quantitative data or using a less solid methodology. Projects in this range have smaller improvements to natural systems.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not improve, protect or restore natural systems or do not provide adequate information should receive zero points for this measure.

Community Considerations

The Regional Solicitation **Community Considerations** criterion draws on multiple Metropolitan Council and Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) policies, including:

Imagine 2050 and Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) Goal: Our region is equitable and inclusive. Racial inequities and injustices experienced by historically marginalized communities have been eliminated and all people feel welcome, included, and empowered.

Imagine 2050 Equity Statement: Equity means that historically excluded communities – especially communities of color – have measurably improved outcomes through an intentional and consistent practice of adapting policies, systems, services, and spending so that they contribute to the repair of both historic and ongoing injustice.

Imagine 2050 contains an Equity and Environmental Justice Framework, which is a people-centered approach that should guide regional processes and actions to work toward a more equitable region. A description of the framework is linked [here](#) Imagine 2050: Regional Vision, Values, Goals - Revised for Adoption. The three components of the framework include:

- A people-centered, data-driven decision-making approach
- Prioritized engagement with overburdened communities
- Provision of benefits to the communities that go beyond harm mitigation

TPP Policies or Objectives: TPP Policies and Objectives related to achieving the regional equitable and inclusive goal include:

- Conduct engagement activities and implement shared decision making with historically underrepresented communities throughout policy making, planning, and project development to ensure equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of transportation investments.
- Evaluate processes, policies, programs, and plans to ensure that community benefits and burdens from transportation investments are distributed equitably.
- Implement investments that repair harms and impacts to historically disadvantaged communities from past highway investments.
- Implement strategies against gentrification and displacement caused by transportation investments.

TAB Communities to Consider: Beginning with the Regional Solicitation redesign in 2014, the Transportation Advisory Board has identified “specific communities” that should be prioritized in transportation decision-making processes: people of color, Indigenous people, low-income, disabled, youth and older adult populations. These specific communities should be engaged and empowered in transportation decision-making processes, and projects should be developed to specifically address their transportation needs.

Metropolitan Council staff have provided an interactive map that can be used to understand the composition of the communities of consideration within your project area. This map can serve as a basis for your response to each measure but applicants are encouraged to provide additional detail and understanding of community.

Other Key Concepts

Community Definition: For the Community Considerations scoring criterion, “community” is defined as people and groups of people who are adjacent to and/or impacted by the proposed project. This includes those who live, work, attend school, or access essential destinations (such as healthcare, shopping, or services) within the project area. Prioritized consideration is given to communities of color, Indigenous communities, low-income, disabled, youth, and older adult populations. The term “community” does not include transportation system users who only travel through the area without connecting to destinations within it. Transit users and others outside personal vehicles may be considered part of the community if their trips begin, end, or include stops within the project area.

Scoring: Three qualitative measures are used for the Community Considerations criterion as described below. Applicants will receive a High, Medium/High, Medium, Medium/Low, or Low rating for each of the three measures: (1) Community Data and Context, (2) Community Needs and Future Engagement, and (3) Community Benefits.

Funding Priority: Projects receiving a high score on each of the three measures, if any, will be considered for funding priority. Up to one (1) project from each solicitation round that was not otherwise selected for funding will be recommended for full funding in either the Roadway, Bike/Ped, Transit, or Environment categories.

Applicant Training Opportunities: The Met Council will provide optional yearly trainings for local agency staff to build their understanding of the Community Considerations criterion and measures. This training will also be centered around best practices set forth by the Council’s Equity Evaluation of Regional Transportation Investment Processes study.

Community Considerations Scoring: Scorers for the Community Considerations criterion will be selected based upon their experience and knowledge in community work, will have completed the Community Considerations training, and will meet multiple times as a group of scorers to discuss and agree upon scoring expectations. Projects recognized as a funding priority will be reviewed and agreed upon by all Community Considerations scorers. 2-3 Community Considerations scorers will be assigned to each project application.

This criterion measures the project’s ability to ensure the needs of specific populations are considered and prioritized in transportation decisions.

A. Community Data and Context

Describe the project area’s community data and context* including locations of specific communities and important regional and local destinations those community members access regularly. Relate the community data to the project purpose. Supplement widely available demographic data with community-specific information via additional maps or descriptions. Include any transportation history impacting the communities and intentional or unintentional past and ongoing harms caused by the transportation system (600 words or less).*

*Examples of detailed community data: demographics (race, ethnicity, age, low income, disabled), affordable housing locations, essential services, employers/job centers, schools, cultural resources, places of worship and

social destinations.

The surrounding census tracts of the TH 36 and TH 120 intersection are highly diverse, with over 48% of the population identifying as BIPOC, well above the regional average of 27%. To further illustrate this diversity, nearby North St. Paul High School has a 76% minority enrollment compared to the state average of 39%. Additionally, one adjacent census tract reports that 35% of residents live with a disability, while other surrounding tracts range from 12% to 15%, exceeding the 11% regional average and amplifying the need for accessible infrastructure. The area is also flanked by multiple apartment and manufactured home complexes that provide vital naturally occurring affordable housing.

Residents must cross the busy TH 36 corridor daily to access work, education, and daily needs, increasing their exposure to this high-crash location. To the north sits Century College, a higher education and job center serving over 16,000 students. To the west lie North St. Paul High School, multiple elementary schools, and a primary commercial shopping district. To the south, residents access North St. Paul's historic downtown corridor and the critical regional connection of the Gateway State Trail.

The proposed grade-separated interchange and expanded active transportation networks directly reflect community feedback. During a recent MnDOT Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) study, the project team actively engaged local multicultural businesses and used targeted phone questionnaires to ensure continuous input from BIPOC residents, providing translated materials in Spanish and Hmong. Key themes emphasized pedestrian and bicycle safety and the prevention of fatal crashes. Similarly, outreach for Oakdale's Glenbrook Small Area Plan—the neighborhood northeast of the intersection—revealed that the Gateway State Trail was the most popular walking and biking destination. However, residents cited TH 120, TH 36, a lack of dedicated bike and walking facilities, and general traffic safety as the primary barriers preventing them from walking or biking. This interchange project directly addresses these community-identified barriers.

Current safety issues stem from a legacy of disconnected planning between state and local agencies. North St. Paul originally developed a local street grid independent of regional highway construction, creating multiple at-grade crossings. In 2007, MnDOT converted TH 36 into a controlled-access freeway to the west but stopped at TH 120. This created a dangerous transitional zone where high-speed traffic must suddenly stop. This partial conversion has driven a created an environment where the crash rate is 50% higher than the critical crash rate, including fatal pedestrian crashes. Replacing this signal with a grade-separated interchange will protect drivers, walkers, and cyclists while reducing idling to improve local air quality.

Applicants will receive a High, Medium/High, Medium, Medium/Low, or Low rating for each of the three measures. The expectations should be considered as cumulative, i.e., Medium builds on Low; High builds on Medium. Scoring via this rubric will be based exclusively on the application materials provided.

High: The project application:

- has granular, neighborhood-scale data and context on specific communities
- identifies cultural assets & significant sites validated by the communities (e.g., this community of low-income residents expressed a need to be able to walk to a health care destination)
- Describes any past and present transportation harms to community
- Has data on cultural history of communities

Medium: The project application:

- Has local maps and/or description beyond census data
- Has granular data or maps (e.g., knowledge of a concentration of a large youth population in this neighborhood or location)
- Identifies affordable housing locations and areas of low-income
- Links data to project purpose
- Identifies past system burdens.

Low: The project application:

- Include general census data on "specific communities," (e.g. "community has x% low-income population, versus the regional average of y%")
- Has a basic list of important destinations without demonstrating local knowledge
- Has a project area community description but lacks community insight or context

B. Community Needs and Future Engagement

Describe how the project was identified, and how it addresses a community need. Community needs may be identified through long-range or strategic planning, community surveys, formal or informal meetings and conversations with community members or neighborhood groups, outreach, and other means. Describe any discussion with specific communities, and how it contributed to identifying the project need. Describe how community engagement will occur throughout the project. Reference the engagement spectrum on page 55 of the Imagine 2050 Regional Vision, Values, and Goals chapter of

the Regional Development Guide. Describe and link (if possible) documented organizational structures that support future engagement on the project; these structures could include policies, procedures, financial or staff resources, or other documents (600 words or less).*

The proposed grade-separated interchange and expanded active transportation networks directly reflect community feedback. During a recent MnDOT Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) study, the project team actively engaged local multicultural businesses and used targeted phone questionnaires to ensure continuous input from BIPOC residents, providing translated materials in Spanish and Hmong. Key themes emphasized pedestrian and bicycle safety and the prevention of fatal accidents. Similarly, outreach for Oakdale's Glenbrook Small Area Plan—the neighborhood northeast of the intersection—revealed that the Gateway State Trail was the most popular walking and biking destination. However, residents cited TH 120, TH 36, a lack of dedicated bike and walking facilities, and general traffic safety as the primary barriers preventing them from walking or biking. This interchange project directly addresses these community-identified barriers.

A Century Avenue Coalition was also created by Ramsey and Washington Counties to ensure continued, collaborative efforts along the entire TH 120 corridor with an explicit focus on the TH 36 and TH 120 intersection. This Coalition has elected and appointed members from each city and county along the corridor. The coordination for the Coalition includes all the state senators and representatives, MnDOT, Met Council, and Metro Transit. Since this area is a boarder between two counties and cities and has multiple transportation services that are operated/owned by different entities, this Coalition brings all parties to the table to ensure a continued feedback loop between projects and the agency and city partners.

MnDOT recently began preliminary design and environmental documentation. This study has an engagement plan that includes a multi-phased approach. The project team will conduct multiple public open houses. The team will also be providing regular updates to the TH 120 elected officials coalition, city councils, and elected county officials. MnDOT is hosting a project website to provide project document and updates. The project team will work with MnDOT engagement staff to ensure comprehensive engagement. There is approximately \$150,000 amount in project funds dedicated to the engagement plan including dedicated staff resources from MnDOT and a consultant. Engagement efforts have shaped design and policy decisions on the project in a meaningful way.

Applicants will receive a High, Medium/High, Medium, Medium/Low, or Low rating for each of the three measures. The expectations should be considered as cumulative, i.e., Medium builds on Low; High builds on Medium. Scoring via this rubric will be based exclusively on the application materials provided.

High: The project application:

- References documented organizational structures that support future engagement on the project, e.g. Policy, procedure, and/or budget to compensate engagement participants; Formal, approved engagement plan; Anti-displacement policy, strategy, or funding; Reparative project goals shaped by community; Commitment to financial opportunity for local businesses and contractors; Advisory committee charter; Dedicated project engagement staff; Other governing board or council action demonstrating a commitment to community considerations.

Medium: The project application:

- Describes how the project need was identified through planning and information-gathering work with communities
- Describes how input from engagement with “specific communities” helped identify the project need and purpose
- References Imagine 2050 Engagement Spectrum (engagement and power sharing levels) and identifies future community engagement activities
- Describes how specific communities will be included and prioritized in future engagement efforts

Low: The project application:

- Does not link past planning and information-gathering work with communities to identify project need
- References planning work that is too broad to practically influence project need
- Does not include description of input and interactions with “specific communities” that helped identify the project need
- Does not include description or commitment to future engagement efforts with communities

C. Community Benefits

Provide a description of the anticipated project benefits and how these benefits address the needs of the identified communities. Describe any past or ongoing burdens the project will mitigate and how any potential new impacts or burdens will be addressed (600 words or less).*

The proposed grade-separated interchange at TH 36 and TH 120 directly responds to the safety needs the

community identified though many years of engagement by transforming a high-speed, high-conflict location into a lower-stress environment. Currently, this at-grade intersection exceeds the critical crash rate and exposes vulnerable road users to dangerous 50+ mph traffic. The project prioritizes pedestrians and cyclists by eliminating their exposure to TH 36 through-traffic. To manage motorist speeds where turning movements interact with active travelers, the design eliminates existing free-right movements and utilizes tight turning radii at ramp terminals to force drivers to significantly slow down. Furthermore, motorists on TH 120 will no longer be able to speed straight across the highway, as they will instead navigate two new roundabouts designed to slow traffic. To maximize visibility and protect users of all ages and abilities, the project incorporates high-visibility crosswalk markings, dedicated pedestrian-scale lighting at all ramp conflict points, and fully updated ADA-compliant ramps at adjacent side streets.

In addition to these critical safety upgrades, the project reduces a major barrier. Currently designated as a regional bicycle barrier, TH 36 physically isolates surrounding residential neighborhoods from local businesses, historic downtown North St. Paul, North St. Paul High School, and multiple elementary schools, while forcing users through segments flagged as higher risk on the region's Bicycle Crash Risk Index. The project also adds a new trail along TH 120, a Regional Bike Trail Network tier 1 corridor, and establishes grade-separated connections to the Gateway State Trail. By replacing the traffic signal with these separated pathways, walkers and bikers will no longer have to navigate hazardous at-grade crossings or endure long signal cycles, which reduce multimodal travel delays. Through these coordinated infrastructure improvements, the project replaces a high risk corridor with a continuous, protective, and accessible network tailored directly to the community's daily needs.

Applicants will receive a High, Medium/High, Medium, Medium/Low, or Low rating for each of the three measures. The expectations should be considered as cumulative, i.e., Medium builds on Low; High builds on Medium. Scoring via this rubric will be based exclusively on the application materials provided.

High: The project application:

- Describes how project repairs past burdens and barriers
- Describes how project improves safe access to priority destinations
- Describes how project adds context-sensitive features beyond transportation needs (e.g. art, greenspace, other community-influenced elements).

Medium: The project application:

- Describes benefits for specific communities
- Ties benefits directly to community-identified needs
- Describe how benefits were identified through engagement
- Includes early mitigation plans for project burdens.

Low: The project application:

- Does not describe project benefits for specific communities
- Describe benefits in general terms for all users
- Does not acknowledge potential project burdens, despite high potential for them to arise.

▼ Funds & Payments - Internal

Current Amount Recommended:

▼ Funding Sources

Funding Sources

No Funding Sources available

▼ Payments and Refunds

Payments and Refunds

Add Payment

No transactions available

▼ Grant Requirements - Internal

Progress Reports

No Progress Reports available

▼ ArcGIS - Internal

gis_taz_population:

gis_taz_jobs:

gis_regional_destinations:

gis_project_location_description:

▼ Review & Feedback - Internal

Program: Regional Solicitation

Sub Program: Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Assigned Council Program Contact:

Finance Unit Reviewer:

External Reviewers

Reviewers

▼ Internal Reviewers

Comments Returned to
Applicant:

Program
Feedback:

▼ Evaluative Criteria

**Measure A – Multimodal/Complete
Streets Connections:**

**Measure A – Connection to existing
safety planning efforts:**

**Measure B – Safety improvements for
people outside of vehicles:**

Measure C – Safe system approach:

**Measure A – Cost effectiveness of
delay reduced:**

**Measure A – 2050 TPP map for
Excessive Delay:**

**Measure B – 2050 TPP Map for
Reliability:**

**Measure A – Regional Truck Corridor
Study Tiers:**

Measure A – Flood mitigation, stormwater treatment, other environmental benefits:

Evaluative Criteria Total: 0
Save to update the total.

Dates & Financials - Internal Only

Start Date:

End Date:

Amount Requested: \$20,000,000.00

Total Project Budget:

▼ Communications & Relationships - Internal

Relationships

Interactions

► Signals (0 Signals)

► Internal Notifications (0 internal notifications)

OUTLOOK EMAIL COMPONENT

SYSTEM GENERATED EMAIL ALERTS

▼ Notes & History - Internal

Status

Initial Review

NOTES

Draft → Initial Review

Created by Lyssa Leitner at 7:36 AM on June 24, 2026

NOTES
HISTORY
Show History

Updated By: Lyssa Leitner

Created By: Lyssa Leitner

Updated At: 6/24/2026

Created At: 5/14/2026