Richfield - General

West 76th Street & Newton Avenue Intersection

Regional Solicitation - Unique Projects

ID: R-2026-05210

Matt Hardegger

Requested: $1,720,000

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.*

Proactive Safety

General Information

Organization Name: Richfield - General

▼ Organization Information

Organization Name	Richfield - General
Legal Name	Richfield - General
Street Address	6700 Portland Ave S
Street Address 2	
City	Richfield
County	Hennepin
State	Minnesota
Country	United States of America
ZIP Code	55423

▼ Contact Information

Contact	Full Name	Email	Phone
Primary Grant Contact	Matt Hardegger	mhardegger@richfieldmn.gov	
Authorized User	Joe Powers	jpowers@richfieldmn.gov	
Grant Administration	Kristin Asher	kasher@richfieldmn.gov	
Developer 1			
Developer 2			

▼ Project Information

Project Name* West 76th Street & Newton Avenue Intersection

Select Primary county where project is located* Hennepin

Cities or Townships where the Project is located* Richfield

Jurisdictional Agency (if different than applicant):

Brief project description. Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc. Limit of 400 words*

Project would reconstruct the signalized intersection at West 76th Street (minor reliever) and Newton Avenue (local MSAS road) with a multi-lane roundabout, including ADA ramp reconstruction and sidewalk reconstruction.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Description*

MSAS 361 from Oliver Avenue to Morgan Avenue (Richfield), 0.1 miles, Reconstruct, ADA, Sidewalks, Roundabout

Provide the project length to the nearest one-tenth of a mile* 0.1

Lead Agency* City of Richfield

ZIP Code where majority of work is being performed* 55423

Functional Class of Road* Minor Reliever

Road System* MSAS

Road/Route No.* 361

Name of Road* West 76th Street

Approximate begin construction date (mo/yr)* 6/1/2030

Approximate end construction date (mo/yr)* 11/30/2030

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 corrdior)

Roadway Name*	West 76th Street
From Cross-Street*	Oliver Avenue
To Cross-Street*	Morgan Avenue
Length of multimodal facilities included in project (nearest 0.1 miles, include all that apply using the best available information)*	0.2
Multiuse trail*	0
Separated bicycle facility*	0
On-street bicycle facility*	0
Sidewalk*	0.2
Miles of facility on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles)*	0
Miles of new RBTN facilities*	0
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:	0
Miles along Tier 1 facilities:	0
Miles along Tier 2 facilities:	0
Miles along Tier 3 facilities:	0
Number of Improved ADA Ramps*	10
Number of Intersection Improvements*	1

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

Grade, Agg base, Bit Surf, Conc Surf, Sidewalk, Lighting, Ped Ramps, Ped Signals, Storm Sewer, Lighting

Bridge/culvert projects (if applicable)

Old Bridge/Culvert No.	
New Bridge/Culvert No.	
Structure is over/under (Bridge or Culvert Name):	
Does the project constructs new left-turn lanes?	No
Does the project synchronizes traffic signals to reduce delay time*	No

Project Funding

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

No

Grant Request Amount, US$* $1,720,000.00

Project Total: $* $2,150,000.00

Match Amount: $ (Minimum of 20% of the project total for federally funded projects; no match for Active Transportation regional sales tax-funded projects)

Match Amount: $430,000.00

Match Percentage (Minimum of 20% for federally funded projects, no match required for Active Transportation Sales Tax-funded projects)

Match percentage: 20%

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* Local Funds

Please check the years that are feasible for your program.* 2030 (Federal projects), 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* $1,865,000.00

Bicycle/Pedestrian Costs* $285,000.00

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.

Storm Sewer

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 and entered the required information. Yes

▼ 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, roadway geometry, 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 Proactive and Reactive Safety projects only: The applicant should attach the listing of crashes. For Reactive Safety projects only, attach the B/C worksheet(s) and the crash modification factors used. These documents must be attached within the web-based application form.

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: All document types (10)

SRTS Letter of Support 062526.pdf

(Optional) Attach Project Detail Map(s)
Added by Matt Hardegger at 9:06 AM on June 25, 2026

Resolution 2026-12435 RegSol 76thNewton.pdf

Resolution of Support
Added by Matt Hardegger at 6:08 AM on June 25, 2026

RRS_76thNewton_Figure_20260625.pdf

Map or Concept Drawing
Added by Matt Hardegger at 6:07 AM on June 25, 2026

Multilane Roundabout CMF.pdf

Crash Modification Factors
Added by Matt Hardegger at 10:39 AM on June 24, 2026

76th Newton Crash Listing CMAT.pdf

Crash Listing
Added by Matt Hardegger at 10:01 AM on June 24, 2026

1 - 5 of 10 Records

1 2

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*

Objectives: An equitable and inclusive region, Healthy and safe communities, A dynamic and resilient region, Leading on climate

Policies: Policy 2: Funding, Policy 3: Asset management, Policy 4: Shared decision-making, Policy 5: Needs of people with disabilities, Policy 7: Equitable Benefits and Burdens, Policy 9: Quality transportation facilities, Policy 10: Eliminate traffic deaths and serious injuries, Policy 11: Bicycle and pedestrian safety, Policy 13: Reduce negative health impacts, Policy 14: Placemaking and placekeeping, Policy 17: Pedestrian network, Policy 21: Travel demand management, Policy 22: Multimodal connections, Policy 23: Complete Streets approach, Policy 27: Mitigate climate impacts, Policy 30: Reduce greenhouse gases, Policy 31: Reduce vehicle miles traveled

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*

Richfield 2027-2030 Capital Improvement Plan, page 32:
https://www.richfieldmn.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/113

Signal has reached the end of its useful life and is identified for replacement as early as 2029.

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*	2/25/2014
Link to plan*	https://www.richfieldmn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1634/ADATransitionPlan?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

▼ Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

2050 TPP Goal: Our communities are healthy and safe.
The Proactive Safety application category seeks to fund projects that reduce fatalities and serious injuries, as well as increase safety and comfort of people outside of vehicles by focusing on locations with a high severe crash risk that may not have a documented severe crash history.

This application contributes to these 2050 TPP Objectives or Policies:

- Work to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries from traffic crashes and incidents on the transportation system by 2050 using the Safe System Approach.
- Emphasize and prioritize the safety of people outside of vehicles in the transportation right-of-way.

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 intersection controls (e.g., roundabouts, reduced conflict intersections (RCIs), J-turns, refer to FHWA's Proven Safety Countermeasures for additional information)
- Intersection modifications (e.g., pavement messages, stop bars, lighting)
- Separated bicycle or pedestrian facilities (e.g., trails, shared use paths, walkways)
- Pedestrian crossing treatments (e.g., curb extensions, bump-outs, pedestrian countdown timers, pedestrian refuge islands and medians, raised crossings, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs))
- Roadway reconstruction or reconfiguration that focuses on safety improvements (e.g., adding turn lanes, adding medians, adding bypass lanes or bypass lane conversions, changing intersection control, etc.)
- Road diets, lane modifications or turn lanes (e.g., 3 to 2-lane conversions, lane narrowing, bypass lane conversion, turn lane modifications, etc.)
- Segment safety improvements (e.g., rumble strips, wider striping (6"), embedded wet reflective striping, cable median barrier, delineation for sharp curves (chevrons), new guardrail (not replacement), shoulder widening, safety edge, friction treatments, lighting)
- Sight distance improvements (e.g. lighting, turn lane modification, intersection modification, etc.)
- Access management changes (e.g. frontage roads or access removals)

▼ Evaluative Criteria

1. Connection to Existing Plan

This criterion measures how the project connects to the Regional Safety Action Plan, existing safety plan, road safety audit, and/or other safety studies focused on reducing fatal and serious injury crashes.

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. Please select all of the following that apply.

Crash Risk Index > 15 (for pedestrians, use the bicyclists' layers)

Is the location listed in another safety plan that prioritizes reducing fatal and serious injury crashes?*

No

Measure A Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below.

- High: Projects identified in the Regional Safety Action Plan on either the regional top 25 or county top 10 lists will score the highest followed by projects identified on the Crash Risk Index over 15 or on the Regional High Injury Streets maps.
- Medium-High
- Medium: Projects identified as a priority location for safety investment in a local (e.g. county or city) safety action plan based on a recent injury crash analysis.
- Medium-Low
- Low: Projects only identified in a 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.
- 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.).

---

2. Expected Reduction in Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes

This criterion awards points based on the Crash Reduction Factors (CMFRs).

Measure – Crash Modification Factor (CMF)

Applicants should select a Crash Modification Factor (CMF) from the supplied list of commonly used CMFs. For treatments where a CMF is not chosen from the list, the applicant will provide a reasonable CMF from the FHWA's CMF Clearinghouse (the applicant MUST include a printout of the CMF reference page). Additionally, the applicant is required to write a brief, logical explanation on why they chose a particular CMF. For projects with multiple intersections, different CMFs can be used for each intersection depending on the crash types occurring at each intersection but no more than two CMFs

can be used for each intersection or location along the project per crash. Refer to the HSIP guidance if using multiple CMFs.

Crash Modification Factors Used (100 words or less)*

Conversion of signalized intersection into single- or multi-lane roundabout - Conversion to 2-lane roundabout (ID 4194): CMF Value = 0.81, Star Rating = 4, Crash Type = All, Crash Severity = All

Rationale for Crash Modification Factor(s) Selected and how the CMF(s) connect to FHWA's Safe System Approach (300 words or less)*

CMF chosen due to applicability and quality, since there were no directly applicable CMFs on the provided list. There are few CMFs discussing signal conversion to multi-lane roundabout and this studied conversions in multiple urban and suburban settings across multiple states.

The CMF connects to the Safe System Approach by removing severe conflicts and reducing vehicle speeds, resulting in fewer crashes and less severe crashes.

Measure A Scoring Guidance

- High: Projects in this range will provide a high CMF that targets high severity crashes (fatal or serious injury). CMFs selected should be of high quality and should directly align with the safety improvements being proposed. The response will include qualitative and quantitative metrics showing a high level of potential reduction in crashes with the proposed improvements using a sound methodology.
- Medium-High
- Medium: Projects in this range may provide a high CMF but one that doesn't target high severity crashes (fatal and serious injury) specifically. CMFs selected should be of high quality and should directly align with the safety improvements being proposed. The response will include qualitative and quantitative metrics showing a medium level of potential reduction in crashes with the proposed improvements using an established methodology.
- Medium-Low
- Low: Projects in this range may provide a lower CMF that targets all crash types of vs high severity crash types (fatal and serious injury) specifically. These projects may also provide a lower CMF that does target high severity crashes, but the CMF is lower than the "high" or "medium" scoring projects. CMFs selected should be of high quality and should directly align with the safety improvements being proposed. The response will include qualitative and quantitative metrics showing a lower level of potential reduction in crashes with the proposed improvements using an established methodology.
- Non-responsive/Not relevant: Projects that do not improve safety or decrease safety should receive zero points in this measure.

---

3. Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History

This criterion measures the history of fatal and serious injury crashes from 2016 to 2025 that have occurred along the proposed project.

Measure A – a 10-year fatal and serious injury crash history

Total correctable fatal and serious injury crashes for 2016-2025 will be tallied with each fatal (type K) crash being worth two times the number of each serious injury (type A) crash.*

Note possible injury (type B) crashes can be included for pedestrian and bicycle crashes only. Crash data must be obtained for the project length for calendar years 2016 through 2025. Crashes within a 250 ft radius of an intersection or along a corridor should be included. Crash data should include all crash types and severities, including pedestrian and bicycle crashes. Only crashes contained within the Minnesota Department of Public Safety's database can be used. If the agency submitting the application has access to MnCMAT2, crash data from that system can be used as part of the submittal. MnCMAT2 data will be reviewed by MnDOT to ensure accuracy. Crash data can also be obtained from MnDOT if an agency does not have access to MnCMAT2. MnDOT Metro District Traffic Office (Kaare Festvog at kaare.festvog@state.mn.us) will provide a crash listing upon request. Applicants should request crash data from MnDOT at least three weeks before the application deadline.

If applicants wish to include crash data not available in MnCMAT2 they should reach out to MnDOT Metro District Traffic Office (Kaare Festvog at kaare.festvog@state.mn.us) to discuss further.

Total crashes = 2* “Fatal” crashes + “Serious Injury” crashes + “Minor Injury” crashes (pedestrian and bicycle only)

"Fatal Crashes" (Type K):	0
"Serious Injury" Crashes (Type A):	0
"Minor Injury" Crashes (Type B):	0
Total Crashes:	0

Measure A Scoring Guidance

Correctable crashes are those that the treatment being proposed is anticipated to mitigate. The applicant with the highest number of correctable fatal (type K), serious injury (type A), and minor injury (type B) (for pedestrians and bicycles only) crashes will receive the full points for the measure. The remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the points.

---

4. Improvement for People Outside of Vehicles

This criterion measures the project’s ability to promote safety for people outside of vehicles, including how the project responds to existing risks and makes use of proven safety countermeasures.

Measure A – Project-based pedestrian safety enhancements and risk elements

To receive maximum points in this category, pedestrian safety countermeasures selected for implementation in projects should be, to the greatest extent feasible, consistent with the countermeasure recommendations in the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and state and national best practices. Links to resources are provided on the Regional Solicitation Resources web page. Answer the following questions with as much detail as possible based on the known attributes of the proposed design. If any aspect referenced in this section is not yet determined, describe the range of options being considered to the greatest extent available. If there are project elements that may increase pedestrian risk, describe how these risks are being mitigated.

1. Describe how this project will address the safety needs of people crossing the street at signalized intersections, unsignalized intersections, mid-block locations, and roundabouts.*

Treatments and countermeasures should be well-matched to the roadway’s context (e.g., appropriate for the speed, volume, crossing distance, and other location attributes). Refer to the Regional Solicitation Resources web page for guidance links (400 words or less)

Currently the intersection is a four-leg intersection with no median refuges and crossing availability only on 3 of the 4 legs. This project would shorten pedestrian crossing distances and allow staged crossings by constructing pedestrian refuges in the four-lane legs of the roundabout. Additionally, the roundabout will slow vehicles to safer speeds, allowing drivers more time to stop for pedestrians crossing. Finally, the project will utilize rectangular rapid-flashing beacons on all approaches to increase visibility of pedestrians crossing the roundabout.

Consider the following when responding

Is the distance in between signalized intersections increasing (e.g., removing a signal)?*

Yes

Describe what measures are being used to recognize the increased distance between designated crossing opportunities for pedestrians*

(e.g., adding High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk beacons to help motorists yield and help pedestrians find a suitable gap for crossing, converting intersection control from signalized to roundabout to slow motorist speed, curb extensions, medians, lighting, etc.)

Existing signalized intersection currently only allows crossing on 3 of 4 legs. Project would allow crossing at all four legs of the intersection.

The existing signal would be converted to a roundabout to slow motorists down. Due to multi-lane roundabout configuration, rectangular rapid-flashing beacons would be constructed to increase motorist awareness of pedestrian crossings and increase yielding.

Will your design increase the crossing distance or crossing time across any leg of an intersection?*

(e.g., by adding turn or through lanes, widening lanes, using a multi-phase crossing, prohibiting crossing on any leg of an intersection, pedestrian bridge requiring length detour, etc.).

This does not include any increases to crossing distances solely due to the addition of bike lanes (i.e., no other through or turn lanes being added or widened).

No

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

(e.g., nearest protected or enhanced crossing opportunity).

2. Describe how separation will be provided for modes (vehicles and people outside of vehicles), including if there will be separation between bicyclists and pedestrians (400 words or less)*

The existing sidewalk on the north side of the roadway is wide, but unbuffered. The proposed project would construct a buffer to the north sidewalk between Oliver Avenue and Morgan Avenue, allowing for separation from traffic, additional green space, and landscaping. Median refuges at the roundabout legs will also increase pedestrian separation from vehicles by allowing a space to stop outside of a traffic lane during a multi-stage crossing.

3. Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, in both through-traffic and turning movements.*

Describe any project-related factors that may affect speed directly or indirectly, even if speed is not the intended outcome (e.g., wider lanes and turning radii to facilitate freight movements, adding turn lanes to alleviate peak hour congestion, etc). If known, what are the existing and proposed speed limits? Is this an increase or decrease from existing conditions? (400 words or less)

Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower (e.g., visual narrowing, narrow lanes, truck aprons to mitigate wide turning radii, etc.)
or protect pedestrians and bicyclists if motorist speed will increase (e.g., buffers or other separation from moving vehicles, crossing treatments appropriate for higher speed roadways, etc.).

If known, what are the existing and proposed speed limits? Is this an increase or decrease from existing conditions? (400 words or less):*

The main speed management device being proposed is the roundabout. This roundabout would help naturally reduce speeds closer to the existing speed limit by slowing traffic upstream, inside, and downstream of the intersection, since roundabouts and raised medians have both been found to reduce speed (with single lane roundabouts reducing speed up to 7 mph within 500 feet (LRRB Complete Streets Speed Impacts Study)).

The existing speed limit in the area is 30 miles per hour, with median speeds typically around 35 mph. The proposed speed limit is not planned to change as a result of this project.

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: 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 convenient or direct at-grade crossing opportunities to prioritize directness and convenience with safety. Score projects higher if design elements are included to help motorists drive slower or mitigate multiple crash types or threats. 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 convenient or direct 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.

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 stretch of 76th Street between Penn Avenue and I-35W is a unique segment of the city. There are approximately 485 units of affordable housing between the apartments on the 7500 blocks of Penn & Oliver Avenues, the Fountainhead Apartments, and the Colony Apartments. The Colony Apartments also houses the Minnesota Independence College and Community, a program that provides education, training, and community for neurodivergent and autistic adults. Richfield Middle School, which serves 72% students of color (MnDOT STEPP Tool 2024), is one block north of the project. The south leg of the intersection is the entrance to the headquarters of Best Buy Corporation, one of the largest employers and job centers in the city.

MnDOT's I-494 project has removed the previously accessible SB I-35W to WB I-494 to Penn Avenue movement, so the only access to Penn Avenue from SB I-35W is to use 76th Street. This project (in coordination with a previously awarded roundabout project at 76th and Knox Avenue) minimizes the effects of these through travelers by limiting vehicle speed in the corridor, reducing idling, and creating shorter crossings for pedestrians at the intersections.

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).*

This project was identified through a signal condition assessment study in 2023, and has been in the city's Capital Improvement Plan since then, with a projected construction date of 2029. The project had been originally identified as a signal replacement, but through conversations with Public Works and the School District, the benefits of a roundabout at this location were preferred.

Engagement with the residents of the area has not yet occurred. The area surrounding the project has around 485 units of affordable housing, a population of neurodivergent and autistic adults who live at and attend the Minnesota Independence College and Community, Richfield Middle School, and the Best Buy Corporate Headquarters. Richfield has a well-documented Public Engagement Policy for projects in the public right of way that requires activities that span consult, involve, and collaborate on the engagement spectrum (https://www.richfieldmn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/984/Public-Engagement-Process-PDF). Staff collaborate with the public to develop a project problem statement that guides the design direction of the project. Staff then consult and involve the public through the remainder of the open house process to gain feedback on various tools that can address the collaborative problem statement and explain how that feedback influenced the design. This process leads to a final design that achieves the community-developed goals and can be supported by the public, policymakers, and staff.

For this project, since the problems have been identified through other planning means, the process will begin by confirming the previously defined problems with the community as a whole, to ensure that nothing has been missed and that perspectives previously not included are able to collaborate on the project's development. The public will be involved in intersection and pedestrian crossing design, sidewalk location, and greenspace usage.

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 primary benefits to the community are lower vehicle speeds, reduced idling at the intersection with smoother and more consistent traffic flow, and shorter pedestrian crossing distances. This will create a more livable area for those in the affordable housing units, create a slower and safer roadway for our neurodivergent neighbors, and allow for more efficient dismissal operations for Richfield Middle School and for employees entering and leaving the Best Buy Headquarters.

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 - Unique Projects

Assigned Council Program Contact:

Finance Unit Reviewer:

External Reviewers

Reviewers

▼ Internal Reviewers

Comments Returned to Applicant:

Program Feedback:

▼ Evaluative Criteria

Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts:

Measure – Crash Modification Factor (CMF):

Measure A – 10-year crash history of fatal and serious injury crashes:

Measure A – Project-based pedestrian safety enhancements and risk elements:

Evaluative Criteria Total: 0

Dates & Financials - Internal Only

Start Date:

End Date:

Amount Requested: $1,720,000.00

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 Matt Hardegger at 9:07 AM on June 25, 2026

HISTORY

Show History

Updated By: Matt Hardegger

Created By: Matt Hardegger

Updated At:	6/25/2026
Created At:	6/8/2026