

# State Aid Program Mission Study Report

## Phase I Mission Study

### [Mission Study Report](#)

## Phase II Study Work Plan County Issues

### [Issue #1 System Size and Jurisdictions](#)

### [Issue #2 Standards Issues](#)

### [Issue #3 Needs Reinstatement](#)

*[Needs Reinstatement Study Final Report\(pdf\)](#) by Don Wisniewski*

### [Issue #4 Credit for Local Effort](#)

### [Issue #5 After-the-Fact Needs](#)

## Phase II Study Work Plan County Reports

### [Issue #1 Final Jurisdiction Report](#)

# State Aid Program Mission Study Report

## Phase II Study Work Plan Revised Schedule

### Issue #1 Functional Classification/Roadway Jurisdiction/State Aid System

**Study Initiated** Mn/DOT Functional Class Update begins. Functional Class Update schedule is attached. County representatives on the Advisory Committee are Darrel Pettis, Dave Olsonowski, and Wayne Sandberg. Rick Kjonaas is co-chair of the committee. Mark Gieseke also is on the committee representing Metro District.

**Completed** BOD approves the Work Plan

**In Progress** Appoint a new Task Force to study roadway ownership and state-aid route designation issues that may result from the Functional Class Update. The Task Force should be appointed by the State Aid Engineer with the input of the MCEA President.

Membership on the Task Force should be one County Engineer per Screening Board District with 3 members from rural counties, 3 members from growing/non-urban counties, and 3 members from urban counties. Staff support will be provided by SALT

Mn/DOT, CEAM, and the Township Association should be invited to join the process after the Task Force defines the issues. The Task Force should consider these specific questions:

1. Should Mn/DOT own all Principal Arterials? Will Mn/DOT take over any Principal Arterials beyond the current TH system? How would these routes be taken over? This will require coordination with Mn/DOT top staff.
2. Will Counties release roads designated as “local” to cities or townships? Consult with the Township Association.
3. After consideration of jurisdictional transfers, what roadways should be on the state-aid system and how does that coincide with the updated functional class?

# State Aid Program Mission Study

4. If the state-aid system and the arterial/collector system do not coincide, what criteria should be used to justify a “local” road remaining on the state-aid system? Definition could form the basis for a tiered state-aid system.
5. What roads should be removed from the system? When? How?
6. How is the CSAH Municipal mileage affected by the recommendations? How do TH turnback miles affect the CSAH Municipal system? Are classified local roads needed to make an integrated network on the CSAH Municipal system?
7. Consult with CEAM. Will there be any impacts to the MSAS system as a result of these recommendations

The Task Force may recommend to the BOD that the study be terminated if there are no issues that can be acted upon.

March 2007	Completed Draft Functional Class Plan is made available for local review.
January – June	Opportunity for discussion at District meetings
June 2007	Functional Class update is completed.
August 2007	Meet with Mn/DOT OIM Staff to present results and coordinate future actions.
October 2007	Task Force presents draft report to BOD.
October-January	Opportunity for discussion of draft report at District meetings.
January 2008	Task Force presents final report to BOD for appropriate action by Screening Board, Rules Committee, or State Aid Division.
April 2008	Present final report to AMC.
April 2008	Make a formal recommendation to the Commissioner for further study of jurisdictional transfers, if any, and future use of the Special 5% Distribution.

# State Aid Program Mission Study

## Phase II Study Work Plan Revised Schedule

### Issue #2 Standards Issues

Completed	Convene the Standards Committee to review and make recommendations on these questions. The Standards Committee is an existing committee of MCEA with membership of one County Engineer per District. Staff support is provided by SALT.
Completed	BOD approves the Work Plan.
Completed	Opportunity for discussion of standards questions at District meetings.
Completed	Opportunity for discussion of standards questions at District meetings.
Completed	State Aid Engineer convenes the Rules Committee.
Completed	Rules Committee completes recommendations for rules changes on standards issues.
June 2007	Screening Board takes action or refers recommendations with Needs equity impacts to a Screening Board subcommittee.
June-September	Opportunity for discussion of Needs Study Subcommittee recommendations at District meetings.
October 2007	Screening Board takes final action on subcommittee recommendations.
September 2007	Rules changes take effect. <a href="#">Flexible Pavement Design Paper</a>  <a href="#">2006 Rules Revision Proposals</a>

# State Aid Program Mission Study

## Phase II Study Work Plan Revised Schedule

### Issue #3 Needs Reinstatement

Completed	BOD approves the Work Plan.
Completed	Present concept to Screening Board for a consultant to perform a study of roadway/pavement life cycles for the purpose of recommending appropriate methods for determining the time for reinstatement of complete grading needs and additional surfacing needs for various types of roadways. The Mission Study Advisory Committee will serve as the Technical Advisory Panel for the consultants study.
Completed	<p>Publish a Request for Proposals for a consultant or execute a sole source agreement with a former/retired County Engineer.</p> <p>Don Wisniewski, retired County Engineer has been hired.</p>
In progress	<p>Consultant study begins. Guidance for the consultant contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recommendations should reflect best pavement design practices and realistic funding limitations.</li><li>• Summarize the actual practice for use and frequency of regrading, rehabilitation, renovation, recycling, and overlays. SALT can provide data. Consider MCEA's Life-Cycle Cost Study (the Greg Isakson Study).</li><li>• Address the perpetual pavement concept. How many state-aid routes are being maintained with perpetual mill and overlay?</li><li>• What is a typical overlay/concrete rehab schedule?</li><li>• Age is the only factor used now to determine if a route segment should draw needs. Make a recommendation for what factors should be used instead of or in addition to age, such as ESALS carried or capacity. Recommend a methodology for determining if a segment should be drawing needs using those factors.</li><li>• Review the Special Resurfacing Adjustment in light of the above recommendations, and recommend and changes.</li></ul>
February-June	Opportunity for discussion of needs reinstatement issues at District meetings

## State Aid Program Mission Study

June 2007	Consultant presents study results to the BOD for concurrence.
June 2007	Consultant to present study results to the Screening Board. Screening Board to refer to appropriate subcommittee for implementation of recommendations.
June-September	Opportunity for discussion of Screening Board Subcommittee recommendations at District meetings.
October 2007	Screening Board adopts recommendations.

# State Aid Program Mission Study

## Phase II Study Work Plan County Issues

### Issue #4 Credit for Local Effort

Issue #4 addresses topic M (see list of [topics and survey results](#)).

Issue #4 is completed.

Credit-for-Local-Effort was established in 1989 following the Metro-Rural Partnership study in 1988. The Advisory Committee recommended that open discussions on the use of credit-for-local-effort be held, and that the results of those discussions be used to create guidance for use by local agencies on the proper use of credit-for-local-effort.

SALT staff prepared draft guidance that documented the intent and purpose of credit-for-local-effort, evaluated its use since 1989, identified areas of concern such as under-reporting or improper use, and developed written guidance on the proper and consistent use of credit-for-local-effort. Some questions were:

1. What is credit-for-local-effort? How does it fit with the Mission? Refer to the Metro-Rural Partnership Study.
2. What types of expenses are eligible for credit-for-local-effort?
3. Are after-the-fact needs expenses eligible for credit-for-local-effort? Are maintenance facilities eligible?
4. What types of funds are considered local funds?
5. What documentation is required?
6. If some expenses reduce needs and some do not, how do we manage targeting local funds to needs reducing items in order to claim credit-for-local-effort? There is an expected 20% contribution built in by the mill levy deduction.

[After the Fact and Credit for Local Effort](#)

[Credit for Local Effort User Guide](#)

# State Aid Program Mission Study

## Phase II Study Work Plan County Issues

### Issue #5 After the Fact Needs Issues

Issue #5 addresses topic E (see list of [topics and survey results](#)).

Issue #5 is completed.

The Advisory Committee presented to the Screening Board the concept of including additional items for eligibility as after-the-fact needs. These were items that are typically not related to standards issues (lanes, shoulders, pavement type), and are not uniformly distributed across the state-aid system. The request was for the Screening Board to refer these issues to a subcommittee for investigation:

1. Determine types of costs that are not already included in the needs study (grading cost study) that are unique to construction in certain areas, and so are not evenly distributed across all county projects. Some examples might include:
  - Traffic control, traffic staging, and detours
  - Paved medians
  - Storm water ponds (in the grading cost study?)
  - Agricultural drain tile relocation/restoration
  - Overhead signs and sign bridges
  - Pedestrian bridges and tunnels
  - Guardrail
  - Rumble Strips
  - Striping – latex vs. epoxy vs. tape
  - Auxiliary lanes or turn lanes
2. Determine if there is an inequity and which costs are significant enough to report.
3. Develop recommendations and guidance on any additional after-the-fact needs items.

[After the Fact and Credit for Local Effort](#)

[General Subcommittee Minutes - April 12, 2006](#)

# State Aid Program Mission Study

## The State Aid Program Mission Study Draft survey results for consideration 1/18/05

During the course of the Mission Study, issues were encountered that were important to investigate and may require further studies, but were not within the scope of the Mission Study, and in fact required the completion of the Mission Study before they could be properly addressed. The following is a list of those issues, and is referred to as the Phase II studies list. It is not comprehensive and represents issues that were brought up during Phase I. Other issues may also arise requiring study. Survey: For each issue an answer of “priority 1-5” was given a value of 1, for “priority 6-10” it was a value of 2, and for “priority >10” it was a value of 3. Below are the sorted results from the 49 counties:

### Priority 1- 5

G. Review the current standards to verify that they reflect the most prudent practice and cost effective use of limited funds. Determine if thresholds for multi-lane designs are appropriate. Consider the outcome of the 10-ton route study.

(priority 1-5=35% priority 6-10=18% priority >10=47%)

B. The 62-29-9 formula assumes roads will be in the right jurisdiction. Perform a review of the functional class definitions and the jurisdiction of present roads in those classes and make recommendations on any necessary changes. Anticipated to happen following the new Federal Transportation Act.

(priority 1-5=33% priority 6-10=18% priority >10=49%)

A. Develop a recommendation for the CSAH fund distribution formula. Several other groups are currently addressing this issue.

(priority 1-5=31% priority 6-10=16% priority >10=53%)

E. Review the needs of the growth areas and very high volume roads. Investigate whether those needs are adequately represented in design and needs calculations. Determine the magnitude of those needs.

(priority 1-5=20% priority 6-10=27% priority >10=53% total score tied with F. and J.)

F. Review the AASHTO Low Volume Design Guide and determine if it is applicable to the state-aid system or if any aspects can or should be adapted to the state-aid system.

(priority 1-5=27% priority 6-10=14% priority >10=59% total score tied with E. and J.)

# State Aid Program Mission Study

J. Construction standards, AASHTO guidance, and economics all permit or encourage perpetual rehabilitation of roadways. Determine if the Needs formulas be revised to acknowledge perpetual pavement rehabilitation as a long-term fix, and if so, how.

(priority 1-5=24% priority 6-10=18% priority >10=57% total score tied with E. and F.)

## Priority 6-10

D. Consider a tiered system concept for funding and building state-aid roads. Consider tiers for the very high and very low volume categories. Consider the use of new funding mechanisms for growth area/mega-projects and how such mechanisms are integrated with traditional state aid funding. Tiering could happen on the allocation side or the eligibility side or both.

(priority 1-5=22% priority 6-10=20% priority >10=57%)

L. Investigate the use of the Special Resurfacing Adjustment, document its use and determine if its use is still appropriate or if it should be revised.

(priority 1-5=22% priority 6-10=14% priority >10=63% total score tied with M.)

M. Investigate the local ability to pay question, including the mill levy adjustment. Determine if the mill levy adjustment is still correct.

(priority 1-5=20% priority 6-10=18% priority >10=61% total score tied with L.)

N. Review the present adjustments for credit for local effort, bonding, and advancing. Determine if they are being treated correctly and consistently.

(priority 1-5=14% priority 6-10=22% priority >10=63%)

C. Review the route segments currently on the state-aid system, looking for roads or types of roads that should no longer be on the state-aid system. Are roads with a functional class of "local" appropriate on the state-aid system? Principal arterials?

(priority 1-5=18% priority 6-10=8% priority >10=73%)

## Priority >10

P. Review the original work done to determine the level for a minimum county and evaluate the data for an appropriate level today.

(priority 1-5=14% priority 6-10=14% priority >10=71% total score tied with Q.)

## State Aid Program Mission Study

Q. The Rules Committee proposed an interim rule of 3 years to complete a phased project, pending review by the Standards Committee. Recommend a rule for determining how long a phased project can be in progress.

(priority 1-5=12% priority 6-10=18% priority >10=69% total score tied with P.)

H. Determine if the construction standards chart or another chart is most appropriate for the Needs study design charts.

(priority 1-5=8% priority 6-10=22% priority >10=69% total score tied with O.)

O. Recommend a threshold for paving state-aid roads. Consider the needs implications and the impact on already paved roads if their ADT is below the paving threshold.

(priority 1-5=10% priority 6-10=18% priority >10=71% total score tied with H.)

K. Investigate alternatives to the automatic 20 or 25-year reinstatement of needs and recommend any changes so that the needs formula best represents actual needs.

(priority 1-5=4% priority 6-10=22% priority >10=73%)

I. Determine if off-system spending is being treated consistently in the MSAS needs formula and recommend whether incentives, disincentives, or no incentives are appropriate. Review county participation policies to see if needs adjustments are appropriate.

(priority 1-5=8% priority 6-10=8% priority >10=84%)