SAINT CLOUD | AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION

## AGENDA

## APO POLICY BOARD MEETING

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2021 - 4:30 P.M.
RIVERSIDE TERRACE EVENT CENTER 195 RIVER AVENUE SOUTH, SAUK RAPIDS, MN

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Introductions
3. Approval of Agenda

4. Public Comment Period
5. Consideration of Consent Agenda Items (Attachments A-H)
a. Approve Minutes of September 9, 2021 Policy Board Meeting (Attachment A)
b. Approve Bills Lists (Attachments B1 \& B2)
c. Approve Contract Extension for Mississippi River Bridge Planning Study (Attachment C)
d. Approve Thank You Letter to Senator Putnam (Attachment D)
e. Approve Administrative Modification to the 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (Attachment E)
f. Receive $3^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter Financial Report (Attachment F)
g. Receive Notice of Contract Change for Southwest Beltline Corridor Study (Attachment G)
h. Receive Staff Report of September 30, 2021 Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (Attachment H)
6. Consider Rankings of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Projects (Attachments I1 - I4) Vicki Johnson, Senior Planner
a. Suggested Action: Approve
7. Consider Amendment to 2022-2023 Unified Planning Work Program (Attachment
J) Brian Gibson, Executive Director
a. Suggested Action: Approve
8. Consider Stakeholder Engagement Plan Annual Review (Attachment K) Brian Gibson, Executive Director
a. Suggested Action: Approve
9. Other Business \& Announcements
10.Adjournment

## English

The Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization (APO) fully complies with the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Executive Order 12898, Executive Order 13116 and related statutes and regulations. The APO is accessible to all persons of all abilities. A person who requires a modification or accommodation, auxiliary aids, translation services, interpreter services, etc., in order to participate in a public meeting, including receiving this agenda and/or attachments in an alternative format, or language please contact the APO at 320-252-7568 or at admin@stcloudapo.org at least seven (7) days in advance of the meeting.

## Somali

Ururka Qorsheynta Deegaanka ee Cloud Cloud (APO) wuxuu si buuxda u waafaqsanahay Cinwaanka VI ee Xuquuqda Xuquuqda Rayidka ee 1964, Cinwaanka II ee Sharciga Naafada Mareykanka ee 1990, Amarka Fulinta 12898, Amarka Fulinta 13116 iyo qawaaniinta iyo qawaaniinta la xiriira. APO waa u furan tahay dhamman dadka awooda oo dhan. Qofka u baahan dib-u-habeyn ama dejin, caawimaad gargaar ah, adeegyo turjumaad, adeegyo turjubaan, iwm, si uu uga qeyb galo kulan dadweyne, oo ay ku jiraan helitaanka ajendahaan iyo / ama ku lifaaqan qaab kale, ama luqadda fadlan la xiriir APO. 320-2527568 ama at admin@stcloudapo.org ugu yaraan toddobo (7) maalmood kahor kulanka.

## Spanish

La Organización de Planificación del Área de Saint Cloud (APO en inglés) cumple plenamente con el Título VI de la Ley de Derechos Civiles de 1964, con el Título II de la Ley sobre los Estadounidenses con Discapacidad de 1990), de la Orden Ejecutiva 12898, de la Orden Ejecutiva 13116 y los estatutos y reglamentos relacionados. La APO es accesible para todas las personas de todas las capacidades. Una persona que requiere una modificación o acomodación, ayudas auxiliares, servicios de traducción, servicios de interpretación, etc., para poder participar en una reunión pública, incluyendo recibir esta agenda y/o archivos adjuntos en un formato o idioma alternativo, por favor, contacta a la APO al número de teléfono 320-252-7568 o al admin@stcloudapo.org al menos siete (7) días antes de la reunión.

## SAINT CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY BOARD Thursday, September 9, 2021 - 4:30 p.m.

A regular meeting of the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Policy Board was held on Thursday, September 12 at 4:30 p.m. APO Chair Joe Perske presided with the following members:

Joe Perske
Frank Theisen
Raeanne Danielowski
Dottie Seamans
Carol Lewis
Rick Schultz
Jeff Westerlund
Dave Kleis
Jeff Goerger
Jared Gapinski
Ryan Daniel
Tim Elness
Also in attendance were:
Brian Gibson
Amber Blattner
Vicki Johnson
Alex McKenzie
Fred Sandal

Stearns County
City of Waite Park
Sherburne County
City of Sauk Rapids
City of Saint Cloud
City of Saint Joseph
LeSauk Township
City of Saint Cloud
City if Saint Cloud
Benton County
Metro Bus
City of Sartell

Saint Cloud APO
Saint Cloud APO
Saint Cloud APO
Saint Cloud APO
Saint Cloud APO

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
Mr. Goerger motioned to approve the agenda, and Mr. Theisen seconded the motion. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: No members of the public were in attendance.

## CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

a. Approve Minutes of August 12, 2021 Policy Board Meeting
b. Approve Bills Lists
c. Consider 2022 Regional Safety Targets
d. Receive Staff Report of August 26, 2021 Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee

Mr. Gapinski motioned to approve the consent agenda, and Ms. Seamans seconded the motion. Motion carried.

## Consider 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Plan

Ms. Johnson summarized the status of the APO Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). At the June 10, 2021, APO Policy Board meeting, Policy Board members voted to release the draft FY 2022-2025 TIP out for a 30-day public comment period that concluded on August 13, 2021. APO staff received 27 responses to the 11 online surveys. The number of responses is down from last year. The APO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on August 26, 2021 to recommend Policy Board approval of the final draft of the TIP. With approval by the Board, APO staff will submit the final version of the TIP to MnDOT to be incorporated into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). From there, the STIP will need to be approved by Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administrations.

Mr. Goerger motioned to approve the TIP. Mr. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried.

## Consider Process to Rank Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Projects in 2021

Ms. Johnson summarized the change to the solicitation process for HSIP projects. MnDOT's Office of Traffic Engineering (OTE) has altered the solicitation process to further involve Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in the project selection process. On August 20, 2021 APO staff reached out to the three county engineers to ask if they were planning on submitting any HSIP projects within the APO's planning area. Two of the three indicated their intent to do so. With this information, APO staff - working closely with MnDOT's MPO coordinator, Anna Pierce came up with three possible solutions to address the need to prioritize HSIP projects: 1. APO staff would internally rank and prioritize all HSIP projects that fall within the planning boundaries. 2. APO staff could decide to provide all submitted projects with the same ranking/prioritization. 3. APO staff could call another meeting of the TAC and Policy Board to review the submitted projects and finalize a ranking/prioritization.

At the August 26, 2021 TAC meeting, TAC representatives recommended a meeting of the TAC in September (Sept. 30) and Policy Board (Oct. 14) to provide each respective entity the opportunity to review, prioritize, and rank proposed HSIP applications that will have an impact on the APO's planning area. Mr. Gibson clarified that the TAC would rank the projects and their decision would be brought to the Policy Board. Mr. Perske asked about details on the funding. Ms. Johnson clarified that each project is capped at $\$ 500,000$. Mr. Perske would like to see the funding maximized, prioritizing a project that costs the most. Mr. Kleis clarified that the projects need to be approved on the federal level and it is best the TAC make recommendations before it reaches the Policy Board for approval.

Mr. Kleis motioned to approve the third choice - another meeting of the TAC and Board to review and finalize project rankings - for the HSIP selection process. Mr. Goerger seconded the motion. Motion carried.

## Discuss Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP) City and Regional Profiles

Mr. Gibson clarified when the MTP was being put together the Policy Board reviewed the list of priorities and decided that the list was not accurate. To avoid a situation
like this Mr. Sandal will present on where the APO is at with the ATP for you to be able to provide comments through the end of the year.
Mr. Sandal provided a summary of where the APO staff is at with the ATP draft. APO staff wanted to provide the attached draft information as a check-in with Policy Board members before they begin to develop the draft document for public release.
City profiles provide analysis of focus areas within Sauk Rapids, Sartell, Saint Joseph, Waite Park, and Saint Cloud along with recommendations to address areas of need. The first phase is assessing the needs within the individual cities. The plan is not addressing all active transportation needs, but the intent is to address the areas that have the most needs within the MPA. Between September and December, the APO staff will complete the ATP draft. In February 2022 the TAC will review the draft, in March 2022 the Policy Board will review, and then it will go out for public comment.
Mr. Goerger commented that the material was extensive and is wondering where all the data came from. Mr. Sandal received estimates from the 2018 census to get the information for this plan. Ms. Seamans asked if the municipalities have reviewed the profiles and if they believe the information to be accurate. Mr. Sandal said there were meetings with the city planners and engineers to review this information. Mr. Gibson added that when a potential project touched county right-of-way the information was also sent to the county engineers for their review. Mr. Perske asked if a certain amount of sales-tax dollars were allocated for trails regionally. Mr. Schultz thought each jurisdiction set their own. Mr. Kleis clarified that the regional project got the most and then the local projects got funded. Mr. Perske noted that the Beaver Island Trail is in the running for a grant to complete the trail to Warner Lake. Mr. Kleis added Heatherwood road is a part of the trail and St. Cloud is doing a bonding request to complete that project. Mr. Gibson encouraged board members to review the draft and let APO know if they have any edits.

## Present Results of Executive Director Performance Evaluation

Mr. Perske summarized Mr. Gibson's annual performance review. Mr. Gibson received high scores from the APO staff and APO Policy Board members.
After an executive session it was approved to move Mr. Gibson to step 9 on the pay scale.

## OTHER BUSINESS \& ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Mr. Daniel asked for clarification on when the trip to DC will take place. Mr. Gibson clarified that the trip has been delayed and would take place Monday to Thursday (Oct. 18-21).
Mr. Westerlund commented on the large turnout by Board members and Mr. Perske agrees it is nice to see every jurisdiction have representation at the meeting.

## ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

## ST. CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION <br> Transaction List by Vendor

## September 2021

| Date | Transaction Type | Vendor | Accounting Description | Amount |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Adobe Creative Cloud |  |  |
| $09 / 13 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) |  | $6609 \cdot$ IT Support \& Software | 57.03 |
| $09 / 13 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) | $6609 \cdot$ IT Support \& Software | 57.03 |  |
| $09 / 20 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) | $6609 \cdot$ IT Support \& Software | 16.13 |  |
| $09 / 20 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) |  | $6609 \cdot$ IT Support \& Software | 16.13 |

AFLAC
09/16/2021 Bill Payment (Check)
09/15/2021 Bill Payment (Credit Card)

09/20/2021 Bill Payment (Check)
09/14/2021 Bill Payment (Check)

09/14/2021 Bill Payment (Check)

## David Turch \& Associates

Bill Payment (Check)

Bill Payment (Check)

Bill Payment (Check)
Emerald Companies Inc

| $09 / 10 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $09 / 15 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) |
| $09 / 22 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) |
| $09 / 30 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) |

Google Inc.
解

## ST. CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION <br> Transaction List by Vendor

## September 2021

| Date | Transaction Type | Vendor | Accounting Description | Amount |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $09 / 14 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Check) | Pest control - lawn \& building | 350.00 |  |

Liberty Savings Bank

## Loffler Companies

09/08/2021

09/02/2021

09/01/2021

09/22/2021

09/14/2021

09/14/2021

09/01/2021
09/14/2021
09/15/2021

Bill Payment (Check)

Bill Payment (Check)
Bill Payment (Check)
(Cll


## Liberty Savings Bank

09/02/202

09/14/2021

## Mailchimp.com

## Net V Pro

## Newegg.com

Bill Payment (Credit Card)

Bill Payment (Check)

Bill Payment (Check)

Bill Payment (Check)

Bill Payment (Check)

Credit card account payment
899.61

Copier useage
267.82

Stantec Consulting Services Inc

| SW Beltline Corridor Study | $20,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| SW Beltline Corridor Study | $13,149.50$ |

Stearns Electric Association
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
Office Supplies
$6600.5 \cdot$ Health/Dental/Life Insurance
361.28

RSG

Spectrum Business (Charter)
-

CPG Passthrough Mississippi River Bridge Plan20

2,530.01

## ST. CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION <br> Transaction List by Vendor

## September 2021

| Date | Transaction Type | Vendor | Accounting Description | Amount |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Superior Vent \& Air Duct Cleaning |  |  |
| 0 |  | building maintenance | 800.00 |  |


| $09 / 24 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Check) | Dues \& Subscriptions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $09 / 24 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Check) |  |  |
|  |  | Traut Companies |  |
| $09 / 28 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Credit Card) | Uline |  |
| $09 / 01 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Check) | Weisman Cleaning Inc | Office safety supplies |

West Central Sanitation, Inc
09/14/2021 Bill Payment (Check)
6606.1 • Utilities

Xcel Energy

| 09/02/2021 | Bill Payment (Check) |  | $6606.1 \cdot$ Utilities |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| $09 / 01 / 2021$ | Bill Payment (Check) | Your CFO Inc |  |
|  |  |  |  |

LIBERTY BANK DEPOSITS
Deposit Date Amount

9/30/2021
6.75
6.75

| To Whom Paid |
| :---: |
| Net Payroll (including insurance reimbursement) |

Direct Dep.
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Direct Dep.
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Direct Dep.
Electronic
Electroni
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electroni
Direct Dep
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Direct Dep.
Electronic
Electronic
Electroni
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic
Electronic

Credit Car
Credit Car
Check
Check
Credit Card
Electroni
Electron

Check
Check
Check
ity of St Cloud - Water/Sewer - October 2021
City of St Cloud - Water/Sewer - November 2021
Check Cloudnet - October 2021
Expense Reimbursemt - Employee mileage Social Security, Medicare \& Federal Tax PAID MN Department of Revenue-Withholding PAID PERA
Great West Annuity
Minnesota State Retirement System
Select Account (H.S.A.)
Net Payroll (including insurance reimbursement) Expense Reimbursemt - Employee mileage Social Security, Medicare \& Federal Tax PAID MN Department of Revenue-Withholding PAID PERA
Great West Annuity
Minnesota State Retirement System
Select Account (H.S.A.)
Net Payroll (including insurance reimbursement)
Expense Reimbursemt - Employee mileage
Social Security, Medicare \& Federal Tax PAID MN Department of Revenue-Withholding PAID PERA
Great West Annuity
Minnesota State Retirement System
Select Account (H.S.A.)
Net Payroll (including insurance reimbursement)
Expense Reimbursemt - TRB conference
Social Security, Medicare \& Federal Tax PAID
MN Department of Revenue-Withholding PAID PERA
Great West Annuity
Minnesota State Retirement System
Select Account (H.S.A.)
Net Payroll (including insurance reimbursement)
Expense Reimbursemt - TRB conference
Social Security, Medicare \& Federal Tax PAID
MN Department of Revenue-Withholding PAID PERA
Great West Annuity
Minnesota State Retirement System Select Account (H.S.A.)

Adobe Creative Cloud - October 2021
Adobe Creative Cloud - November 2021
AFLAC - October 2021
AFLAC - November 2021
American Planning Association
BCBS of MN - October 2021

Cloudnet - November 2021
David Turch \& Associates - estimate - October 2021
David Turch \& Associates - estimate - November 2021

What Check is for
10/01/2021 Payroll Paid 10/01/2021 Payroll Paid 10/01/2021 Payroll Paid 10/01/2021 Payroll Paid 10/01/2021 Payroll Paid 10/01/2021 Payroll Paid 10/01/2021 Payroll Paid 10/01/2021 Payroll Paid 10/15/2021 Payroll Paid 10/15/2021 Payroll Paid 10/15/2021 Payroll Paid 10/15/2021 Payroll Paid 10/15/2021 Payroll Paid 10/15/2021 Payroll Paid 10/15/2021 Payroll Paid 10/15/2021 Payroll Paid 10/29/2021 Payroll Paid 10/29/2021 Payroll Paid 10/29/2021 Payroll Paid 10/29/2021 Payroll Paid 10/29/2021 Payroll Paid 10/29/2021 Payroll Paid 10/29/2021 Payroll Paid 10/29/2021 Payroll Paid 11/12/2021 Payroll Paid 11/12/2021 Payroll Paid 11/12/2021 Payroll Paid 11/12/2021 Payroll Paid 11/12/2021 Payroll Paid 11/12/2021 Payroll Paid 11/12/2021 Payroll Paid 11/12/2021 Payroll Paid 11/26/2021 Payroll Paid 11/26/2021 Payroll Paid 11/26/2021 Payroll Paid 11/26/2021 Payroll Paid 11/26/2021 Payroll Paid 11/26/2021 Payroll Paid 11/26/2021 Payroll Paid 11/26/2021 Payroll Paid

Subscription service to PDF software Subscription service to PDF software
Enployee AddtI Insurance
Enployee AddtI Insurance
Dues - Alex McKenzie
Employee Health Insurance
Employee Health Insurance
Utilities - water / sewer
Utilities - water / sewer
Internet Service
Internet Service
Lobbyist Services
Lobbyist Services

10,625.29
4,344.29 982.00

2,427.71

Payment
Check
heck
Check
Credit Card
Credit Card
Credit Card
Credit Card
Credit Card
Credit Card
Credit Card
Check
Check
Check
Credit Card
Credit Card
Credit Card
Check

## Check

Credit Card
Check

Credit Card Quill.com
Check

Check
Electronic
Electronic
Check
Check
Check
Credit Card
Check
Credit Card
Check
Check

Check Your CFO Inc
Check Your CFO Inc

Premium Water Inc - estimate - October 2021
Premium Water Inc - estimate - November 2021
Check Principal Financial - October 2021
Check Principal Financial - November 2021
G - White River Junction VT - Oct/Nov Estimate
Check Spectrum Business (Charter) - estimate - October 2021
Check Spectrum Business (Charter) - estimate - November 2021

West Central Sanitation Inc - estimate - November 2021
Electronic Xcel Energy - estimate - October 2021
Electronic Xcel Energy - estimate - November 2021
To Whom Paid
Delta Dental - estimate - October 2021
Delta Dental - estimate - November 2021
Emerald Companies Inc - October 2021
Express Services Inc
Express Services Inc
Express Services Inc
Express Services Inc

## Facebook

Google Inc - October 2021
Google Inc - November 2021
Granite Pest Control LLC
offler Companies - estimate - October 2021
Loffler Companies - estimate - November 2021
Mailchimp.com
Neopost USA, Inc
Neopost USA, Inc.
Net V Pro - October 2021
Net V Pro - November 2021
Newegg.com SRF Consulting - Oct/Nov Estimates
Stearns Electric Association - estimate - October 2021
Stearns Electric Association - estimate - November 2021 Superior Vent \& Air Duct Cleaning
SC Times - estimate - estimate - October 2021
C Times - estimate - estimate - November 2021
The MN Transportation Alliance Inc
Traut Companies
Uline
Weisman Cleaning Inc - estimate - October 2021

West Central Sanitation Inc - estimate - October 2021

TOTAL

| What Check is for | Account | Payroll |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Employee dental insurance | Pamount |  |


| Employee dental insurance | Payroll | $\$$ | 275.70 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Employee dental insurance | Payroll | $\$$ | 275.70 |

Employee dental insurance
monthly lawn service
Contract Labor - receptionist
Contract Labor - receptionist
Contract Labor - receptionist
Contract Labor - receptionist Advertising
G Suite Basic - Commitment
G Suite Basic - Commitment
lawn and building maintenance
Copier Supplies
Copier Supplies
Monthly IT Support
Postage Meter
Postage Meter
Monthly IT Support
Monthly IT Support
laptop
office drinking water
office drinking water
Emloyee disability insurance
Emloyee disability insurance
Office supplies
St Cld Household Travel Survey 2021 - estimates Internet Service
Internet Service
SW Beltline Corridor Study - estimate
Utilities - electric
Utilities - electric
Building maintenance
Public Postings
Public Postings
Dues
Lawn sprinkler clean out
office safety supplies
Office Cleaning Services
Office Cleaning Services
Utility - garbage
Utility - garbage
Utilities - gas
Utilities - gas
2021 accounting services - October
2021 accounting services - November

Payrol
Maintenance
Payroll
Payroll
Payroll
Payroll
Printing \& Publishing
Utilities
Utilities
Maintenance
Copy Machine
Copy Machine
IT Support \& Software
Meter Lease
Postage
IT Support \& Software
IT Support \& Software Miscellaneous

Utilities
Utilities
Payroll
Payroll
Office Supplies
St Cld Household Travel Survey 2021
Utilities
Utilities
SW Beltline Corridor Study

## Utilities

Utilities
Maintenance
Printing/Publishing
Printing/Publishing
Dues and Subscriptions
Maintenance
Office Supplies
Maintenance
Maintenance
Utilities
Utilities
Utilities
Utilities
Accounting Services
Accounting Services
275.70
346.71
379.95
506.60
506.60
395.91
100.00
48.00
350.00
267.82
250.00
14.99
59.25
200.00
321.00
321.00

1,311.95
30.00
30.00
300.00
300.00
22.98

30,000.00
414.94

| TO: | Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Policy Board |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Brian Gibson, Executive Director |
| RE: | Contract Extension for Mississippi River Bridge Study |
| DATE: | Sept 29, 2021 |

In October of 2020, the APO contracted with the consulting firm Stantec to update the planning for a Mississippi River Bridge at $33^{\text {rd }}$ Street South in Saint Cloud and the associated corridor connecting to US 10 in Sherburne County.

As part of that process, the Project Management Team felt it was important to engage the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to hear and mitigate any concerns they may have. The DNR has welcomed the engagement but reports that the documents and materials produced for the study will require review by 22 individuals in their offices. In order to accommodate that review time, Stantec is requesting a time extension for their contract.

Our contract currently stipulates that the project be completed by December 31, 2021. APO staff is recommending an extension to June 30, 2022.

This extension is for additional time only and does not impact the project budget.

## Suggested Action: Approve

| TO: | Senator Aric Putnam and Representative Dan Wolgamott |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Joseph Perske, Policy Board Chair |
| RE: | Funding for US-10 Safety Study and Project |
| DATE: | October 14, 2021 |

As you know, safe and efficient transportation networks are critical to economic development and quality of life for our residents.
The Policy Board of the APO asked me to convey their gratitude and thanks to both of you for the $\$ 1$ million in State funding you were able to direct toward conducting a safety study for US-10 in the APO planning area and for implementing one or more recommendations from that study.
US-10 is a critical mobility corridor that connects the entire Saint Cloud urban area to the Twin Cities and the rest of Minnesota. It is important for freight movement, commuters, students, and recreational travelers. Your commitment to ensuring its safe and efficient operation will help the region maintain its competitiveness as an economic hub and its attractiveness as a home for our almost 140,000 residents.
We look forward to continuing a productive relationship with both of you as the region continues to grow and we all work to provide the services and infrastructure our residents need.

Respectfully,

Joe Perske<br>Saint Cloud APO Policy Board Chair

| TO: | Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Vicki Johnson, Senior Transportation Planner |
| RE: | FY 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program Administrative |
|  | Modification |
| DATE: | Sept. 30, 2021 |

One of the responsibilities of the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization (APO), as outlined by the Federal Government, is to develop and maintain a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is the document that programs federal funds for transportation improvements in the APO's Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA). Decisions about transportation investments require collaboration and cooperation between different levels of government and neighboring agencies and jurisdictions. As a document, the TIP reports how the various agencies and jurisdictions within the MPA have prioritized their use of limited Federal highway and transit funding.

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) is requesting a change be made to the fiscal years 2021-2024 TIP. The US 10 box culvert project (0502-115) was originally programmed for construction in FY 2022 with an estimated project cost of $\$ 1,401,000$. Per MnDOT District 3's Planning Director, the estimated project cost has increased to $\$ 2,000,000$. Fiscal constraint has been maintained.
Due to the timing of this project's letting date (Jan. 28, 2022) and the transition from the outgoing FY 2021-2024 TIP to the incoming FY 2022-2025 TIP, this administrative modification request will need to be addressed in both the outgoing and incoming TIP.
MnDOT is requesting to modify the FY 2021-2024 TIP to allow the letting procedure to continue.

However, per the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), modifications to the FY 20222025 TIP cannot occur until the STIP has been approved by both FHWA and FTA. Because of this, the APO Policy Board CANNOT take action on the FY 2022-2025 modification request until a later date.

At the Sept. 30 TAC meeting, TAC representatives made two motions to accommodate this request. The first motion was to recommended Policy Board approval of the FY 2021-2024 TIP modification at the next regularly scheduled meeting. The second motion was to recommend Policy Board approval of the FY 2022-2025 TIP modification as soon as the STIP was approved by FHWA/FTA. A future meeting of the Policy Board will be required to take action on this motion.

In accordance with the APO's Stakeholder Engagement Plan, the proposed changes are an administrative modification and therefore do not require the 30 -day public input process.

Suggested Action: Approval of the FY 2021-2024 Administrative Modification.

## ST. CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION

 Budget vs. Actuals: Budget Year 2021 - FY21 P\&LJanuary - September, 2021

|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Actual |  | Annual Budget |  | over Budget |  | \% of Budget |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6560A Wages and Benefits |  |  |  | 468,000.00 |  | -468,000.00 |  |
| 6560 Payroll Expenses |  | 237,059.28 |  |  |  | 237,059.28 |  |
| 6565 Payroll Tax Expense |  | 29,238.08 |  |  |  | 29,238.08 |  |
| 6600 Employee Benefits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6600.1 PERA |  | 17,879.55 |  |  |  | 17,879.55 |  |
| 6600.10 Employment Services |  | 1,789.06 |  |  |  | 1,789.06 |  |
| 6600.2 Social Security |  | 3,732.56 |  |  |  | 3,732.56 |  |
| 6600.3 Medicare |  | 872.93 |  |  |  | 872.93 |  |
| 6600.5 Health/Dental/Life Insurance |  | 51,518.10 |  |  |  | 51,518.10 |  |
| 6600.6 HSA Account |  | 1,546.15 |  |  |  | 1,546.15 |  |
| Total 6600 Employee Benefits | \$ | 77,338.35 | \$ | 0.00 | \$ | 77,338.35 |  |
| Total 6560A Wages and Benefits | \$ | 343,635.71 | \$ | 468,000.00 | -\$ | 124,364.29 | 73.43\% |
| 6601 Office Supplies |  | 880.38 |  | 3,000.00 |  | -2,119.62 | 29.35\% |
| 6602 Accounting Services |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| 6602.2 Accounting Services |  | 13,761.00 |  | 18,410.00 |  | -4,649.00 | 74.75\% |
| Total 6602 Accounting Services | \$ | 13,761.00 | \$ | 18,410.00 | -\$ | 4,649.00 | 74.75\% |
| 6603 Communications |  |  |  | 4,500.00 |  | -4,500.00 |  |
| 6603.1 Telephone |  | 1,875.64 |  |  |  | 1,875.64 |  |
| 6603.2 Postage |  | 346.88 |  |  |  | 346.88 |  |
| 6603.3 Internet |  | 2,039.82 |  |  |  | 2,039.82 |  |
| 6603.4 Translation Services |  | 130.00 |  |  |  | 130.00 |  |
| Total 6603 Communications | \$ | 4,392.34 | \$ | 4,500.00 | -\$ | 107.66 | 97.61\% |
| 6604 Travel |  |  |  | 4,500.00 |  | -4,500.00 | 0.00\% |
| 6605 Printing \& Publishing |  | 590.55 |  | 2,500.00 |  | -1,909.45 | 23.62\% |
| 6606 Utilities and Maintenance |  |  |  | 12,000.00 |  | -12,000.00 |  |
| 6606.1 Utilities |  | 3,010.27 |  |  |  | 3,010.27 |  |
| 6606.2 Maintenance |  | 8,671.42 |  |  |  | 8,671.42 |  |


| Total 6606 Utilities and Maintenance | \$ | 11,681.69 | \$ | 12,000.00 | -\$ | 318.31 | 97.35\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6607 Legal Services |  | 360.00 |  | 1,500.00 |  | -1,140.00 | 24.00\% |
| 6608 Multifunction Copier |  | 1,242.41 |  | 3,000.00 |  | -1,757.59 | 41.41\% |
| 6609 IT Support \& Software |  | 15,071.25 |  | 18,700.00 |  | -3,628.75 | 80.59\% |
| 6609.1 Equipment \& Hardware |  | 8,795.07 |  | 7,500.00 |  | 1,295.07 | 117.27\% |
| 6610 Dues \& Subscriptions |  | 3,651.99 |  | 5,000.00 |  | -1,348.01 | 73.04\% |
| 6611 Miscellaneous Expenses |  | 1,311.95 |  | 5,000.00 |  | -3,688.05 | 26.24\% |
| 6615 Insurance - Office |  | 3,673.30 |  | 5,750.00 |  | -2,076.70 | 63.88\% |
| 6615.01 Workers Compensation |  | 645.68 |  |  |  | 645.68 |  |
| Total 6615 Insurance - Office | \$ | 4,318.98 | \$ | 5,750.00 | -\$ | 1,431.02 | 75.11\% |
| 6616 Bank Service Charges |  | 140.00 |  |  |  | 140.00 |  |
| 6618 Professional Development |  |  |  | 5,000.00 |  | -5,000.00 | 0.00\% |
| Sub-Total Non-Passthrough Expenses |  | 409,833.32 |  | 564,360.00 | -\$ | 154,526.68 | 72.62\% |


| 6622 CPG Passthrough Expense |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6622.21 TH15 Operational Improvemt |  | 5,827.78 |  |  |  | 5,827.78 |  |
| 6622.25 Mississippi River Bridge Plan20 |  | 43,482.26 |  | 116,941.98 |  | -73,459.72 | 37.18\% |
| 6622.26 Household Travel Survey 2021 |  | 33,441.68 |  | 300,000.00 |  | -266,558.32 | 11.15\% |
| 6622.27 SW Beltline Corridor Study |  | 90,406.92 |  | 145,000.00 |  | -54,593.08 | 62.35\% |
| Total 6622 CPG Passthrough Expense | \$ | 173,158.64 | \$ | 561,941.98 | -\$ | 388,783.34 | 30.81\% |
| Grand Total Expenses | \$ | 582,991.96 | \$ | 1,126,301.98 | -\$ | 543,310.02 | 51.76\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5001 Washington Lobbyist Assessment |  | 48,030.00 |  | 48,000.00 |  | 30.00 | 100.06\% |
| Total Other Income | \$ | 48,030.00 | \$ | 48,000.00 | \$ | 30.00 | 100.06\% |
| Other Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 902 Ineligible Fed Reimbursemt |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| 902.1 Travel - Air Meals Etc |  | 837.60 |  | 5,000.00 |  | -4,162.40 | 16.75\% |
| 902.10 Washington Lobbyist |  | 36,000.00 |  | 48,000.00 |  | -12,000.00 | 75.00\% |
| Total 902 Ineligible Fed Reimbursemt | \$ | 36,837.60 | \$ | 53,000.00 | -\$ | 16,162.40 | 69.50\% |
| 903 Audit Fees |  | 8,610.00 |  | 8,250.00 |  | 360.00 | 104.36\% |
| Total Other Expenses | \$ | 45,447.60 | \$ | 61,250.00 | -\$ | 15,802.40 | 74.20\% |

TO: Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Policy Board<br>FROM: Brian Gibson, Executive Director<br>RE: $\quad$ Contract Modification for Southwest Beltline Study<br>DATE: Sept 29, 2021

Earlier this year, the APO contracted with SRF Consulting Group to complete the Southwest Beltline Corridor Study. Last month, two of the senior SRF staff members working on the study decided to leave SRF and form their own consulting firm. They then contracted back to SRF to complete our Southwest Beltline Study.

MnDOT notified us that this change required a modification to our contract identifying the new sub-contractor.

The change does not impact the budget for the study nor the project schedule or scope. It is simply an administrative modification identifying the new subcontractor. Unfortunately, MnDOT would not allow the two former SRF staff members to work on the project until the contract had been formally amended. As a reminder, all APO Federal funds expire at the end of each calendar year so our consultant-led studies cannot carry over from one calendar year to the next. I was concerned that too much of a delay in amending the contract would put the study behind schedule. It must be completed no later than December $31^{\text {st }}$.

The APO's legal counsel advised that such a change could be approved by the Board Chair without formal Policy Board action, but he did recommend notifying the Board of the change at the earliest possible time.
Chair Perske did sign the contract modification on behalf of the APO and it has now been fully executed and submitted to MnDOT. The study is continuing on schedule.

## Suggested Action: None, informational only

TO: $\quad$ Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Policy Board<br>FROM: Vicki Johnson, Senior Transportation Planner<br>RE: $\quad$ Staff Report on Sept. 30, 2021, Technical Advisory Committee meeting<br>DATE:<br>Oct. 1, 2021

The Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization's (APO's) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) held a meeting on Thursday, Sept. 30, 2021. At that meeting, the following topics were discussed:

- Consideration of FY 2023-2026 Highway Safety Improvement Program project prioritization/ranking
- APO Senior Transportation Planner Vicki Johnson discussed the changes to the HSIP solicitation program that would require MPO involvement in the ranking/prioritizing safety projects prior to their submittal to MnDOT's Office of Traffic Engineering. Ms. Johnson reviewed the three HSIP projects that were submitted to the APO (one from Stearns County and two from Sherburne County). TAC representatives discussed the projects and issues with ranking them due to the differences in types of safety work and funding years proposed. TAC representatives recommended the Policy Board rank/prioritize these projects equally.
- Consideration of the 2020-2021 Stakeholder Engagement Plan Annual Report
- APO Executive Director Brian Gibson discussed the SEP Annual Report including reviewing the public engagement done between July 1, 2020, and June 30, 2021. He presented on proposed APO staff recommendations to improve engagement over the next year. TAC representatives recommended Policy Board approval of the report.
- Consideration of an amendment to the FY 2022-2023 Unified Planning Work Program:
- APO Executive Director Brian Gibson discussed proposed changes to the UPWP. This included the removal of the City of Saint Joseph's Birch Street consultant led study, APO staffing changes (Associate Planner Fred Sandal had left the APO), and the addition of a City of Saint Cloud planning study for Opportunity Drive. No net changes have been proposed to jurisdictional assessments - with the exception of the City of Saint Cloud's local match for the Opportunity Drive study. TAC representatives recommend Policy Board approval of the amendment.
- Consideration of an administrative modification to the FY 2021-2024 TIP and FY 2022-2025 TIP:
- This item was added to the agenda by MnDOT District 3 Planning Director Steve Voss. Mr. Voss stated the MnDOT project 0502-115 for a box culvert installation on US 10 (programmed for FY 2022) had increased in project cost from $\$ 1,400,000$ to $\$ 2,000,000$. This $43 \%$ increase would qualify this project for an administrative modification. Mr. Voss was requesting to change the FY 2021-2024 TIP/STIP to allow for the scheduled Jan. 28, 2022 letting date to
occur. Per Bobbi Retzlaff (FHWA) and Anna Pierce (MnDOT MPO Coordinator) changes to the FY 2022-2025 TIP would not be permitted to occur until after Federal Highway and Federal Transit approved the 2022-2025 STIP. They did say TAC could take recommending action on these items, but any Policy Board meeting to change the FY 2022-2025 TIP would need to occur after the STIP was approved. TAC representatives recommended Policy Board approval of the administrative modification to the FY 2021-2024 TIP and the modification to the FY 2022-2025 TIP. The latter would only be presented to the Policy Board once FHWA/FTA officially approved the FY 2022-2025 STIP.

Suggested Action: None, informational only.

TO: $\quad$ Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee<br>FROM: Vicki Johnson, Senior Transportation Planner<br>RE: FY 2023-2026 Highway Safety Improvement Program prioritization<br>DATE: Sept. 30, 2021

As a comprehensive, intergovernmental transportation planning agency for the Saint Cloud Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA), the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization (APO) works with member agencies and jurisdictions to facilitate local, state, and Federal funds for programs and surface transportation improvement programs. In order to accomplish this, the APO is tasked with prioritizing projects that align with its long-range transportation vision for the region.

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is a long-range, multimodal, surface transportation plan that identifies a regional vision for transportation and the steps necessary to achieve that vision. Part of those steps includes the identification of various transportation improvement projects within the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA).

In order to carry out the vision of the MTP, the APO develops and maintains a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is a short-range (four year) programming document that reports on how the various agencies and jurisdictions within the Saint Cloud MPA have prioritized their use of limited Federal highway and transit funding. This document is updated on an annual basis.
Projects contained within the TIP must either be identified within the MTP or align closely with the goals and objectives of the MTP. In addition, these projects are funded in part by the Federal Government or are projects sponsored specifically by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT).
One of the sources of transportation funding the Federal Government uses is the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The goal of HSIP is to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads and roads on tribal lands. This funding source requires a $10 \%$ local match with a maximum cap for a project being \$500,000 per location.
This year, MnDOT's Office of Traffic Engineering (OTE) has altered the solicitation process to further involve Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in the project selection process. In previous years, applicants would directly submit their projects to OTE, indicating if any potential project would be located within an MPO. A representative from OTE would then contact the respective MPO and would ask if the proposed projects were acceptable to the MPO.
However, in order to more actively involve the MPOs at the front end of the process, OTE has made the following changes to the HSIP process as of Friday, Aug. 20:

1. Reach out ASAP to your MPOs to coordinate with them to determine their upcoming meeting dates and individual processes and deadlines.
2. Submit your full, finalized HSIP application to your applicable MPO within an agreed upon approved time table.
3. The MPO will review the application and prioritize. You will receive

## confirmation from the MPO that the application is supported and can be submitted to OTE. This will come in the form of a letter or resolution depending on the MPO.

4. Submit the final, approved application with letter of support from MPO to OTE by Nov. 24.

With these changes, especially under bullet point number 3, the APO's Policy Board working in conjunction with APO staff and the APO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) have recommended an interim solution for the FY 2023-2026 HSIP solicitation cycle. This solution will include APO TAC representatives reviewing and recommending a prioritization and ranking for HSIP projects within the APO's planning area. This recommendation would be provided for consideration by the APO's Policy Board.

APO staff have requested county jurisdictions to submit their applications for TAC and Policy Board consideration by Sept. 20. Those applications can be found as Attachments I2I4.

At the Sept. 30, 2021, TAC meeting, TAC representatives heard presentations on the three proposed projects. A discussion was had about the difficulty in ranking these projects due to one being a reactive project programmed for FY 2025 or 2026 and two being proactive projects set to be programmed for FY 2023. In the end, TAC representatives recommended the Policy Board state these projects would receive equal rankings of importance and provide that recommendation to MnDOT's Office of Traffic Engineering.

Suggested Action: Recommend a final ranking and prioritization of HSIP projects.

Due Nov. 24, 2021
Greater Minnesota, Local HSIP Solicitation

## Application for Federal Safety Funds

## 1. Contact Information Details

| Lead Agency | Contact Name |
| :--- | :--- |
| Stearns County | Jodi Teich |

## 2. Funding Details

| Federal Funds | + | Local Match | $=$ | Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 500,000$ | + | $\$ 600,000$ | $=$ | $\$ 1,100,000$ |

NOTE: maximum of $\$ 500,000$ in federal funds per agency per project.

## Preferred Funding Year(s)

2025 or 2026

## Funding Notes

Stearns County and the city of St. Joseph will share the local match.

## 3. Project Description

## Project Description

Stearns County and the city of St. Joseph are proposing to construct a roundabout at the intersection of CSAH 2 and Minnesota Street/Leaf Road on the west side of the city. The intersection currently has stop signs on the side streets with CSAH 2 being the through route.

| ATP | County or Counties | Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stearns County | St. Cloud APO |  |
| 3 |  |  |


| Estimated Output | Units |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0.0 | Miles |
| 1 | Intersections |
| 0 | Curves |

NOTE: estimate output for one of three metric: number of miles, number of intersections, or number of curves.

## 4. Selection Criteria

## Describe how project was identified.

The proposed project area was analyzed by the consultant during the County Road Safety Plan update, and discussed at length as part of the public workshop held in 2017. At that time the consultant stated a roundabout would be the long-term solution if right of way could be secured, especially as heavy commercial traffic throughout the area became more accustomed to roundabouts. Adjacent property owners would support any form of intersection control, and the rural/higher speed nature of the area, combined with the superelevation along this section of CSAH 2 , causes concerns with a traffic signal. Constructing a R-CUT or JTurn type intersection would be challenging with the proximity to the Interstate 94 interchange to the south.

## Is this project in partnership with another agency?

Yes. The city of St. Joseph will partner with Stearns County on this project and share in the local match. A letter of support from the city is attached.
5. Crash Data for Reactive Projects ONLY: Jan. 1, 2016 through Dec. 31, 2020

| Number of Crashes | K | A | B | C | PDO | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Crash Types | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 11 |

NOTE: set filters to 2016 through 2020 in MnCMAT if you submit an Intersection Report or Section Report.

| OPTIONAL: Crashes by Basic Type | K | A | B | C | PDO | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bicyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Single Vehicle Run-off-road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Single Vehicle Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sideswipe Same Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sideswipe Opposing Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rear End | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Left Turn | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Angle | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## OPTIONAL: Description of any unique characteristics.

As stated above, the rural/higher speed nature of the area, combined with the superelevation along this section of CSAH 2, causes concerns with a traffic signal. Constructing a R-CUT or J-Turn type intersection would be challenging with the proximity to the Interstate 94 interchange to the south. Further, because of the traffic volumes an all-way stop would likely cause significant queuing during the peak hours, which would have the potential to impact the interchange at Interstate 94 and/or cause heavy commercial traffic to reroute through downtown St. Joseph.

Reactive projects must have a benefit-cost ratio greater than 1.00; to simplify this analysis, OTE will conduct the calculation. An electronic copy of the analysis output will be available upon request.

## 6. OPTIONAL: Additional Notes

## Additional Notes for Selection Committee

CSAH 2 was rerouted to the outskirts of the limits of St. Joseph in 2012 to keep heavy commercial truck traffic out of downtown St. Joseph. The newly constructed intersection of CSAH 2/Minnesota Street immediately had crashes. The county then installed larger stop and stop ahead signs as well as left side stop signs. As the crashes continued rural intersection lighting was installed at the intersection in 2013. Crashes continued to occur so the county installed a rural intersection conflict warning system in 2014. County forces also removed the concrete island that delineated the northbound right turn lane, as it was thought that may be creating some confusion for drivers stopped along Minnesota Street. As traffic continued to increase the RICWS lost effectiveness. As part of the Stearns County Road Safety Plan update the intersection was analyzed by the consultant and discussed at length at the county's workshop. At that time the consultant stated that traffic volumes had grown to the point that a RICWS was no longer effective based on (at that time) recent studies. While both the county and city had hoped that crashes would be minimized over time there were 11 reported crashes over the last five years (2016-2020). In 2021 there have been 2 left turn/angle type crashes, one of which involved a minor injury and the other a possible injury. There are also reports of multiple near misses every month.

## 7. Submission Information

Submit this application via PDF to SafetyProject.DOT@state.mn.us by November 24, 2021.

Please include the following as necessary:

- Map of project location(s)
- County Road Safety Plan project sheet(s)
- Letters of support
a. Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) if within borders
b. MnDOT District Traffic Engineer if work performed in MnDOT right-of-way

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ & 00495309 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { 04-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEASURE } \\ & 18.585 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAMECSAH 2 |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { ROUTE ID } \\ 0400006595170002-I \end{array}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { 73-Stearns } \end{aligned}\right.$ | CITY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { VEH } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | \# KILL <br> 0 | DATE 08/20/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIME } \\ & \text { 16:57 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{DAY} \\ & \text { Sun } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.561966 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left.\right\|_{395711.5} ^{\text {UTM X }}$ | UTM Y $5046249.2$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE Left Turn |  | CRASH SEVERITY <br> B - Minor Injury |  |  | FIRST HARMFUL <br> Motor Vehicle In Transport |  |  |  |  | LIGHT CONDITION Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Pickup | Passenger Car |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Northbound | Eastbound |  |  |
| Manuever | Moving Forward | Making a U Turn |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 61 M | 33 F |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Has Been Drinking Alcohol | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action | Operated Motor Vehicle: Cart |  |  |



| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ 0079929 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { O4-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEASURE } \\ & 18.585 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAME CSAH 2 |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> 0400006595170002-I |  | COUNTY 73-Stearns | CITY <br> Saint Joseph |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { VEH } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { KILL } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DATE } \\ & 02 / 14 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TIME } \\ & 13: 50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { DAY } \\ \text { Fri } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.561984 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { UTM X } \\ & 395712.2 \end{aligned}$ | UTM Y | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Left Turn |  | CRASH SE <br> N - Prop | EVERIT <br> Damag | Only | FIRST Motor | HARMF <br> Vehicl | $\mathrm{n} \operatorname{Tr}$ | port |  | LIGHT CON <br> Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Van (Seats Installı | Other Bus |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| Manuever | Moving Forward | Turning Left |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 37 M | 51 M |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | Unknown | Failure to Yield Right-of-Way |  |  |


| OFFICER SKETCH | Not To Scale | NARRATIVE <br> VEHICLE 1 WAS DRIVEN BY MALE ID'D AS SCOTT, HE WAS TRAVELLING NORTHBOUND ON CSAH 2 NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF MN ST W TO GO STRAIGHT NORTH ON CSAH 2. VEHICLE 2(BUS) WAS DRIVEN BY MALE ID'D AS RICHARD, HE WAS TRAVELLING SOUTH ON CSAH 2 APPROACHING MN ST W IN AN ATTEMPT TO MAKE A LEFT HAND TURN ONTO MN ST W. SCOTT ADVISED ME THAT HE WAS DRIVING WHEN HE SAW THE BUS TURN IN FRONT OF HIM, HE ATTEMPTED TO SWERVE TO THE RIGHT TO MISS THE BUS, AND WAS UNABLE TO AVOID THE COLLISION STRIKING THE BUS IN THE PASSENGER SIDE WITH IS FRONT END, DISABLING HIS VEHICLE. I SPOKE TO RICHARD WHO STATED HE MADE A COMPLETE STOP IN THE INTERSECTION, WAITING TO TURN LEFT. RICHARD STATED THERE WAS TWO OTHER VEHICLES IN THE NORTHBOUND TURN LANE TO TURN RIGHT (EAST) ONTO MN ST W, (WHO HAVE A YIELD SIGN FOR OPPOSING TRAFFIC). HE STATED when he saw that the vehicles were going to let him go, he |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ 00386139 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { 04-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEASURE } \\ & 18.586 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NAME } \\ & \text { CSAH } 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> 0400006595170002-I |  | COUNTY <br> 73-Stearns | CITYSaint Joseph |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT MINNESOTA |  |  | \# VEH $2$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \# \text { KILL } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ | DATE 10/12/16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIME } \\ & \text { 05:50 } \end{aligned}$ | DAY Wed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.561982 \end{aligned}$ | -94.336240 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM X } \\ & 395718.6 \end{aligned}$ | 5046250.9 | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE Sideswipe O |  | CRASH SEVERITY <br> C - Possible Injury |  |  | FIRST HARMFUL <br> Motor Vehicle In Transport |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LIGHT COND } \\ & \text { Dark (Str Lie } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TION } \\ & \text { hts On) } \end{aligned}$ | WEATHER PRIMARY Cloudy |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Car | Passenger Car |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Westbound | Northbound |  |  |
| Manuever | Turning Left | Moving Forward |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 76 M | 72 F |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | Failure to Yield Right-of-Way | No Clear Contributing Action |  |  |


| OFFICER SKETCH | NARRATIVE <br> UNIT 1 TRAVELING WB ON MINNESOTA ST W STOPPED AT STOP SIGN AND PULLED ON TO COUNTY ROAD 2. UNIT 1 HIT UNIT 2 ON PASSANGER SIDE WHILE TRAVELING NB ON COUNTY ROAD 2. UNIT 1 DIDNT YEILD TO RIGHT OF WAY OF UNIT 2. |
| :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ 00428986 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ \text { 04-CSAH } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 18.586 |  | ROUTE NAMECSAH 2 |  |  | ROUTE ID0400006595170002-I |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { 73-Stearns } \end{aligned}$ |  | CITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT WITH |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { \# VEH } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \# \text { KILL } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { DATE } \\ 03 / 12 / 17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TIME } \\ & \text { 15:00 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAY } \\ & \text { Sun } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.561992 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { LONG } \\ -94.336327 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { UTM X } \\ & 395711.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM Y } \\ & 5046252.1 \end{aligned}$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Head On |  | CRASH S <br> N - Prop | EVERIT Dama | e Only | FIRST Moto | HARMF Vehicle |  | sport |  | LIGHT COND <br> Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Snow |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Car | Sport Utility Vehicle |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Westbound | Eastbound |  |  |
| Manuever | Vehicle Stopped or Stalled in | Turning Right |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 49 M | 21 F |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action | Swerved or Avoided Due to V |  |  |


| OFFICER SKETCH | NARRATIVE <br> WHILE VEHICLE 1 WAS STOPPED AT THE STOP SIGN TO TURN LEFT <br> ONTO CO RD 2, VEHICLE 2 WAS TURNING RIGHT ONTO MN ST W <br> FROM CO RD 2 WHEN SHE SLID ON SNOW COVERED ROAD INTO <br> VEHICLE 1. |
| :--- | :--- |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ & 00449353 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { O4-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEASURE } \\ & 18.587 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NAME } \\ & \text { CSAH } 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> O400006595170002-I$\|$ |  |  | CITY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT W MINNESOTA |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { \# VEH } \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \# \text { \# KILL } \\ 0 \end{array}$ | DATE 05/02/17 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { TIME } \\ \text { 07:25 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAY } \\ & \text { Tue } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.561998 \end{aligned}$ | -94.336331 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { UTM X } \\ & 395711.6 \end{aligned}$ | 5046252.8 | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Angle |  | CRASH SEVERITY <br> N - Prop Damage Only |  |  | FIRST HARMFUL <br> Motor Vehicle In Transport |  |  |  |  | LIGHT CON <br> Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  |  |  | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Car | Passenger Car |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Southbound | Eastbound |  |  |
| Manuever | Moving Forward | Moving Forward |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 16 F | 38 F |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action | Failure to Yield Right-of-Way |  |  |



| INCIDENT ID 00626828 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { 04-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { MEASURE } \\ 18.587 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | ROUTE NAME CSAH 2 |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> 0400006595170002-I |  | COUNTY <br> 73-Stearns |  | CITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT W |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# VEH } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \# \text { KILL } \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DATE } \\ & 07 / 29 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIME } \\ & 15: 50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAY } \\ & \text { Sun } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { LAT } \\ 45.561999 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { LONG } \\ -94.336331 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { UTM X } \\ 395711.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM Y } \\ & 5046252.9 \end{aligned}$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Angle |  | CRASH SEVERITY <br> N - Prop Damage Only |  |  | FIRST HARMFUL <br> Motor Vehicle In Transport |  |  |  |  | LIGHT CONDITION Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Sport Utility Vehicle | Sport Utility Vehicle |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Northbound | Westbound |  |  |
| Manuever | Moving Forward | Moving Forward |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 55 M | 77 F |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action | Failure to Yield Right-of-Way |  |  |


| OFFICER SKETCH |  | NARRATIVE <br> V1 WAS TRQAVELING N/B ON CTY RD 2 PULLING A BUMPER PULL CAMPER. V2 WAS W/B ON MINNESOTA STREET WEST AT STOP SIGN. V2 PULLED OUT ONTO CTY RD 2 CAUSING V1 TO SWERVE INTO ONCOMING TRAFFIC LANE. V2 STRUCK THE REAR CORNER OF V1'S CAMPER. NO INJURIES. VEHICLES MOVED UPON MY ARRIVAL. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ & 00524536 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { 04-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEASURE } \\ & 18.588 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAMECSAH 2 |  |  | ROUTE ID0400006595170002-I |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { 73-Stearns } \end{aligned}\right.$ | CITY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { VEH } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | \# KILL <br> 0 | DATE 12/13/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIIME } \\ & \text { 09:48 } \end{aligned}$ | DAY Wed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.562016 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -94.336325 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { UTM X } \\ & 395712.1 \end{aligned}$ | 5046254.8 | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Rear End |  | CRASH SEVERITY <br> N - Prop Damage Only |  |  | FIRST HARMFUL <br> Motor Vehicle In Transport |  |  |  |  | LIGHT COND Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Cloudy |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Pickup | Unit 4 |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Southbound | Southbound |  |  |
| Manuever | Moving Forward | Moving Forward |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 41 M | 81 M |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action | Failure to Yield Right-of-Way |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| OFFICER SKETCH |  | NARRATIVE <br> UNIT 1 WAS TRAVELING SOUTHBOUND ON CO ROAD 2 IN ST. JOSEPH TWP. UNIT 2 TURNED ONTO CO ROAD 2 FROM MINNESOTA STREET. THE INTERSECTION IS A PARTIALLY CONTROLLED INTERSECTION. NORTHBOUND AND SOUTHBOUND TRAFFIC HAVE THE RIGHT OF WAY. UNIT 1 WAS TRAVELING APPROXIMATELY 50 MPH AND STRUCK THE REAR OF UNIT 2'S VEHICLE. DRIVER 1 STATED HE WAS UNABLE TO AVOID THE CRASH DUE TO ONCOMING TRAFFIC IN THE NORTHBOUND LANE AND DUE TO THE FACT HE WAS PULLING A TRAILER WITH A BOBCAT. DRIVER 1 STATED HE APPLIED THE BRAKES BUT THE TRAILER BEGAN TO BREAK AND THE TRUCK BEGAN TO SLIDE. UNIT 1 SUFFERED DAMAGE TO THE FRONT END OF THE VEHICLE. UNIT 2 SUFFERED DAMAGE TO THE REAR BUMPER. DRIVER 1 AND DRIVER 2 DENIED HAVING ANY INJURIES. NEITHER ONE OF THE VEHICLE'S AIRBAGS DEPLOYED. BOTH VEHICLES WERE ABLE TO BE DRIVEN FROM THE SCENE. DRIVER 2 WAS CITED FOR FAILURE TO YIELD. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ 00809349 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { 04-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEASURE } \\ & 18.588 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAMECSAH 2 |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> 0400006595170002-I$\|$ |  | COUNTY <br> 73-Stearns | CITY <br> Saint Joseph |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# VEH } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { KILL } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DATE } \\ & 05 / 06 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l} \text { TIME } \\ 17: 59 \end{array}\right. \end{aligned}$ | DAY <br> Wed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.562020 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LONG } \\ & -94.336324 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM X } \\ & 395712.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM Y } \\ & 5046255.2 \end{aligned}$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Angle |  | CRASH S <br> A - Seriou | EVERITY us Injury |  | FIRS Moto | HARMFU Vehicle |  |  |  | LIGHT COND Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Uehicle Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  | Unit 4 |
| Direction of Travel | Northbound | Passenger Car |  |  |
| Manuever | Moving Forward | Westbound |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 55 M | Turning Left |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | 21 M |  |  |
| Apparently Normal |  |  |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action | Failure to Yield Right-of-Way |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ & 00810444 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ \text { 04-CSAH } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEASURE } \\ & 18.588 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAMECSAH 2 |  |  | ROUTE ID0400006595170002-I |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { 73-Stearns } \end{aligned}\right.$ | CITY <br> Saint Joseph |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { VEH } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | \# KILL <br> 0 | DATE 05/16/20 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TIME } \\ & \text { 12:50 } \end{aligned}$ | DAY <br> Sat | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.562020 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { LONG } \\ & -94.336364 \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\right\|^{\text {UTM X }} \begin{aligned} & \text { U95709.0 } \end{aligned}$ | UTM Y $5046255.2$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE Angle |  | CRASH SE N - Prop | EVERIT Dama | Only | FIRST <br> Moto | HARMF Vehicl | $\mathrm{In} \mathrm{~T}_{1}$ | sport |  | LIGHT COND Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Cloudy |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Car | Motorcycle |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Westbound | Northbound |  |  |
| Manuever | Turning Left | Moving Forward |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 67 M | 32 M |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | Failure to Yield Right-of-Way | No Clear Contributing Action |  |  |




#### Abstract

NARRATIVE DRIVER OF VEHICLE ONE WAS FACING WEST ON MINNESOTA STREET WEST. HE STOPPED AT STOP SIGN THEN PULLED OUT WITHOUT SEEING VEHICLE TWO UNTIL IT WAS TOO LATE. DRIVER OF VEHICLE TWO TOOK EVASIVE ACTIONS BY DRIVING INTO THE SOUTHBOUND LANE AS IT WAS TRAVELING IN THE NORTHBOUND LANE. THE ACTION WAS PARTIALLY SUCCESSFUL AS VEHICLE TWO AVOIDED HITTING VEHICLE ONE IN THE SIDE, HOWEVER, THE RIGHT SIDE SADDLE BAG ON VEHICLE TWO STRUCK THE RIGHT FRONT BUMPER OF VEHICLE ONE. DRIVER OF VEHICLE TWO WAS ABLE TO KEEP THE BIKE UPRIGHT SO THERE WERE NO INJURIES.


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ & 00733100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { 05-MSAS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0116 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEASURE } \\ & 0.018 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAME MINNESOTA ST |  |  | ROUTE ID0500023964970116-I |  | COUNTY <br> 73-Stearns | CITY <br> Saint Joseph |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT |  |  | \# VEH $3$ | \# KILL <br> 0 | DATE 07/12/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TIME } \\ & \text { 16:48 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { DAY } \\ \text { Fri } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.561989 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LONG } \\ & -94.335946 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { UTM X } \\ 395741.6 \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { UTM Y } \\ & 5046251.3 \end{aligned}\right.$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Rear End |  | CRASH SEV N - Prop D | EVERIT Damag | Only | FIRST <br> Moto | HARMF Vehicl | $\text { In } \operatorname{Tr}$ | port |  | LIGHT COND <br> Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Car | Passenger Car | Passenger Car |  |
| Direction of Travel | Westbound | Westbound | Westbound |  |
| Manuever | Vehicle Stopped or Stalled in | Vehicle Stopped or Stalled in | Moving Forward |  |
| Age/Sex | 72 F | 55 F | 27 M |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action | No Clear Contributing Action | Operated Motor Vehicle: Care |  |


| OFFICER SKETCH |  | NARRATIVE <br> VEHICLES ONE AND TWO WERE STOPPED IN THE TRAFFIC LANE OF WEST BOUND MINNESOTA ST WEST:IN A LINE OF CARS AT THE STOP SIGN AT COUNTY ROAD 2. VEHICLE THREE CAME UP BEHIND VEHICLE TWO, STRIKING IT IN THE REAR WITH THE FRONT OF HIS VEHICLE pUSHING VEHICLE TWO INTO THE REAR OF VEHICLE ONE. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

Selection Filter:
WORK AREA: County('659517') - FILTER: Year('2016','2017','2018','2019','2020') - SPATIAL FILTER APPLIED

Analyst:
Notes:
Jodi Teich


DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
Due Nov. 24, 2021
Greater Minnesota, Local HSIP Solicitation

## Application for Federal Safety Funds

## 1. Contact Information Details

| Lead Agency |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sherburne County | David Roedel |

## 2. Funding Details

| Federal Funds | + | Local Match | $=$ | Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 162,000$ | + | $\$ 18,000$ | $=$ | $\$ 180,000$ |

NOTE: maximum of $\$ 500,000$ in federal funds per agency per project.

## Preferred Funding Year(s)

2023

## Funding Notes

County funds will be used for the local match

## 3. Project Description

## Project Description

Rural Intersection Safety Street Lighting.

| ATP | County or Counties | Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | Sherburne County | St. Cloud Area Planning Organization |


| Estimated Output | Units |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0.0 | Miles |
| 9 | Intersections |
| 0 | Curves |

NOTE: estimate output for one of three metric: number of miles, number of intersections, or number of curves.

## 3. Selection Criteria

## Describe how project was identified.

The county's 2010 Safety Plan identifies many of these intersections as priority projects. Additionally, the intersections identified as " $T$ " intersections rank as a high priority in our adopted "Rural Safety Street Light Policy". We feel with the proven reduction of intersection crashes with the installation of streetlights, the county is aggressively implementing this improvement to reduce crashes.

## Is this project in partnership with another agency?

No.
4. Crash Data for Reactive Projects ONLY: Jan. 1, 2016 through Dec. 31, 2020

| Number of Crashes | K | A | B | C | PDO | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Crash Types | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

NOTE: set filters to 2016 through 2020 in MnCMAT if you submit an Intersection Report or Section Report.

| OPTIONAL: Crashes by Basic Type | K | A | B | C | PDO | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bicyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Single Vehicle Run-off-road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Single Vehicle Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sideswipe Same Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sideswipe Opposing Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rear End | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Left Turn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Angle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## OPTIONAL: Description of any unique characteristics.

None.

Reactive projects must have a benefit-cost ratio greater than 1.00; to simplify this analysis, OTE will conduct the calculation. An electronic copy of the analysis output will be available upon request.

## 6. OPTIONAL: Additional Notes

## Additional Notes for Selection Committee

Sherburne County recognizes the need to improve the safety of rural county road intersections. Sherburne county is currently in the process of installing intersection lighting at other various intersections that are experiencing safety concerns. This is a continuation of the safety improvements as we propose to install streetlights at designated intersections as part of the 2023-2026 HSIP solicitation. These are high priority " T " intersections, with many having a 3-star rating or greater. There are a few that are rated less than 2-star in the 2010 County road safety plan that have since, are being viewed by the county as high priority per our "Rural Safety Street Light Policy".

The county added 3 additional intersections not listed in Sherburne County's 2010 Safety Plan. We have included these important intersections that have systemic characteristics and are in the vicinity of intersections listed in the County Road safety plan. The intersections that are experiencing similar safety concerns. They are at or closely adjacent to the USTH 10 corridor.

Rural intersection street lighting improvements are recognized in the MnDOT's Traffic Safety Fundamentals Handbook (2015) as a proven effective strategy for reducing crashes. They have an average B/C ratio of approx. 15:1.

The county has been making safety improvements over the years by enhancing signing at all intersections. However, we have not seen a reduction in intersection crashes from 2016-2020 and we believe this safety improvement will help with reducing intersection crashes and lighting of these intersections is the next step in recognized safety measures. See attached crash summary.

The following intersections are located within the St. Cloud APO area:
Int. \# 3.01 - CSAH 3 and USTH 10
Int \# 3.03 - CSAH 3 and CR 78
Int \# 8.10 - CSAH 8 and CSAH 16
Int \# 8.11 - CSAH 8 and CR 65
Int \# 16.01 - CSAH 16 and USTH 10
CSAH 16 and $45^{\text {th }}$ Street -2 intersections
CR 61 and USTH 10
Int \# 62.01 - CR 62 and CR 78

Attached is the letter of Support from the St. Cloud APO.

## 7. Submission Information

Submit this application via PDF to SafetyProject.DOT@state.mn.us by November 24, 2021.

Please include the following as necessary:

- Map of project location(s)
- County Road Safety Plan project sheet(s)
- Letters of support
a. Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) if within borders
b. MnDOT District Traffic Engineer if work performed in MnDOT right-of-way


Sherburne County
Rural Intersection Prioritization

| Int \# | Sys | Num | Intersection Description | Skew | On/Near Curve | Development | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{RR} \\ \text { Xing } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ADT | Previous STOP (>5mi) | Total Crashes | Ratio (Min/Maj) | Crash Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.10 | CSAH | 1 | 231ST AVE NW LT CR-32 | No | Yes | No | No | 2,625 | Yes | 0 | 0.21 | \$0 |
| 1.11 | CSAH | 1 | 237TH AVE NW RT CSAH-25 | No | Yes | No | No | 2,070 | Yes | 3 | 0.51 | \$36,000 |
| 1.12 | CSAH | 1 | 247TH AVE NW RT CR-46 | No | Yes | No | No | 2,525 | Yes | 4 | 1.06 | \$172,000 |
| 1.13 | CSAH | 1 | FREMONT AVE NW CSAH-4 X-ING | No | Yes | Yes | No | 7,750 | Yes | 10 | 0.34 | \$526,000 |
| 1.15 | CSAH | 1 | 281ST AVE NW LT CR-42 | Yes | Yes | No | No | 1,600 | No | 4 | 0.67 | \$527,000 |
| 1.17 | CSAH | 1 | 309TH AVE NW CR-42 X-ING | No | Yes | No | No | 2,175 | No | 1 | 0.75 | \$12,000 |
| 1.18 | CSAH | 1 | 325TH AVE NW LT CSAH-3, MILLE LACS C | No | No | No | No | 1,890 | No | 0 | 1.43 | \$0 |
| 2.02 | CSAH | 2 | 124TH ST NW CSAH-2 SEG \#2 AHD, CSAF | No | Yes | No | No | 3,700 | No | 2 | 1.44 | \$227,000 |
| 2.03 | CSAH | 2 | 108TH ST NW RT CSAH-19 | No | No | No | No | 2,525 | No | 1 | 0.59 | \$12,000 |
| 2.04 | CSAH | 2 | USTH-169 X-ING, T-110 BHD, CSAH-2 SEI | No | Yes | No | No | 10,400 | No | 6 | 0.12 | \$1,008,000 |
| 3.01 | CSAH | 3 | USTH-10 WBL X-ING, 32ND ST SE T-5 BHI | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 28,777 | No | 17 | 0.03 | \$1,061,000 |
| 3.02 | CSAH | 3 | 45TH AVE SE X-ING CSAH-7 LT CR-65 RT | No | No | No | No | 1,843 | No | 4 | 0.23 | \$448,000 |
| 3.03 | CSAH | 3 | 65TH AVE SE LT CR-78, CSAH-3 CURVES | No | Yes | No | No | 1,563 | No | 0 | 0.08 | \$0 |
| 3.04 | CSAH | 3 | 75TH AVE SE CSAH-20 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 1,835 | No | 5 | 0.22 | \$466,000 |
| 3.05 | CSAH | 3 | 95TH AVE SE X-ING T-27 LT CR-61 RT | No | Yes | No | No | 1,595 | Yes | 2 | 0.06 | \$148,000 |
| 3.07 | CSAH | 3 | 120TH AVE SE MNTH-25 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 3,695 | No | 2 | 0.42 | \$182,000 |
| 3.09 | CSAH | 3 | 150TH AVE SE CSAH-23 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 1,570 | No | 3 | 0.91 | \$284,000 |
| 3.10 | CSAH | 3 | 19TH ST SE RT CR-90 | No | Yes | No | No | 840 | No | 0 | 0.24 | \$0 |
| 3.11 | CSAH | 3 | 165TH AVE SE CSAH-11 X-ING, 20TH ST | Yes | No | Yes | No | 2,080 | No | 0 | 0.34 | \$0 |
| 3.12 | CSAH | 3 | 165TH AVE SE CSAH-11 X-ING (NORTH) | No | No | No | No | 1,615 | No | 1 | 0.44 | \$12,000 |
| 3.13 | CSAH | 3 | 173RD AVE SE RT CR-64 | No | No | No | No | 735 | No | 0 | 0.53 | \$0 |
| 3.14 | CSAH | 3 | 175TH AVE SE LT CR-70 (WEST) AT 17TH | No | No | No | No | 653 | No | 1 | 0.25 | \$824,000 |
| 3.15 | CSAH | 3 | 180TH AVE SE RT CR-70 (EAST) AT 17TH | No | No | No | No | 590 | No | 0 | 0.03 | \$0 |
| 3.16 | CSAH | 3 | 195TH AVE NW LT CSAH-22, CSAH-3 CUF | No | No | No | No | 738 | No | 1 | 1.30 | \$136,000 |
| 3.17 | CSAH | 3 | 22ND ST NW RT CR-70 (SOUTH) AT $313 \leqslant$ | Yes | Yes | No | No | 590 | No | 2 | 0.03 | \$24,000 |
| 3.18 | CSAH | 3 | 184TH ST NW CSAH-5 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 1,715 | No | 3 | 0.49 | \$684,000 |
| 3.19 | CSAH | 3 | 319TH AVE NW LT CR-80 | No | Yes | No | No | 1,088 | No | 0 | 0.23 | \$0 |
| 4.01 | CSAH | 4 | SHERBURNE AVE SE CSAH-23 X-ING | No | Yes | No | No | 4,975 | No | 8 | 0.34 | \$457,000 |
| 4.02 | CSAH | 4 | 155TH AVE SE RT CR-67 | No | No | No | No | 1,620 | No | 1 | 0.23 | \$136,000 |
| 4.03 | CSAH | 4 | 165TH AVE SE CSAH-11 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 4,200 | No | 5 | 0.56 | \$511,000 |
| 4.04 | CSAH | 4 | 173RD AVE SE X-ING T-217 LT CR-51 RT | No | No | No | No | 1,852 | No | 0 | 0.19 | \$0 |
| 4.05 | CSAH | 4 | 185TH AVE SE X-ING CR-93 LT T-480 RT | No | No | No | No | 2,027 | No | 2 | 0.31 | \$227,000 |
| 4.06 | CSAH | 4 | 188TH ST NW RT CR-75 | No | No | No | No | 2,200 | No | 2 | 0.84 | \$24,000 |
| 4.07 | CSAH | 4 | 184TH ST NW CSAH-5 X-ING, 253RD AVE | No | No | No | No | 3,927 | No | 4 | 0.25 | \$172,000 |
| 4.08 | CSAH | 4 | 184TH ST NW CSAH-5 X-ING (NORTH) | No | No | Yes | No | 4,275 | No | 5 | 0.71 | \$60,000 |
| 4.09 | CSAH | 4 | 164TH ST NW RT CSAH-15 | No | No | No | No | 4,800 | No | 4 | 0.39 | \$251,000 |
| 4.13 | CSAH | 4 | 112TH ST NW X-ING CR-39 LT T-130 RT | No | No | No | No | 6,702 | No | 8 | 0.10 | \$981,000 |
| 4.14 | CSAH | 4 | 104TH ST NW CSAH-19 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 7,725 | No | 12 | 0.33 | \$753,000 |

Sherburne County
Rural Intersection Prioritization

| Int \# | Sys | Num | Intersection Description | Skew | On/Near Curve | Development | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{RR} \\ \text { Xing } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ADT | Previous STOP (>5mi) | Total Crashes | Ratio (Min/Maj) | Crash Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.15 | CSAH | 4 | ISANTI CR-50 LT, T-119 RT, CSAH-8 AHD | No | No | No | No | 4,792 | No | 1 | 0.03 | \$12,000 |
| 5.05 | CSAH | 5 | 190TH ST NW LT CR-75 | No | Yes | No | No | 5,375 | No | 0 | 0.28 | \$0 |
| 5.06 | CSAH | 5 | (237TH) 241ST AVE NW X-ING T-442 LT C: | Yes | Yes | No | No | 3,850 | Yes | 3 | 0.44 | \$36,000 |
| 5.07 | CSAH | 5 | 271ST AVE NW LT CSAH-16 | No | No | No | No | 2,490 | Yes | 1 | 0.32 | \$412,000 |
| 5.08 | CSAH | 5 | 289TH AVE NW RT CSAH-9 | No | No | No | No | 1,530 | Yes | 5 | 0.66 | \$139,000 |
| 5.09 | CSAH | 5 | 321ST AVE NW RT CR-80 | No | No | No | No | 1,263 | Yes | 1 | 0.20 | \$12,000 |
| 6.02 | CSAH | 6 | 93RD AVE SE RT CR-55 | No | Yes | No | No | 1,540 | No | 6 | 0.12 | \$630,000 |
| 6.03 | CSAH | 6 | 57TH ST SE CSAH-16 X-ING (WEST) | Yes | No | No | No | 2,675 | No | 2 | 0.74 | \$148,000 |
| 6.04 | CSAH | 6 | 57TH ST SE CSAH-16 X-ING (EAST) | No | No | No | No | 2,675 | No | 5 | 0.74 | \$184,000 |
| 6.05 | CSAH | 6 | 37TH ST SE RT CR-48 | No | No | No | No | 1,248 | No | 1 | 0.50 | \$12,000 |
| 6.06 | CSAH | 6 | 17TH ST SE LT CR-62 | Yes | Yes | No | No | 538 | No | 1 | 0.34 | \$12,000 |
| 8.02 | CSAH | 8 | 125TH AVE SE CR-52 X-ING, W CORP LIM | No | No | No | No | 2,067 | No | 4 | 0.09 | \$527,000 |
| 8.03 | CSAH | 8 | 115TH AVE SE CR-53 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 2,075 | No | 1 | 0.09 | \$12,000 |
| 8.04 | CSAH | 8 | (80TH) 82ND AVE SE LT T-1580 80TH AVE | Yes | Yes | No | No | 2,040 | Yes | 3 | 0.07 | \$194,000 |
| 8.06 | CSAH | 8 | 58TH AVE SE LT 90TH ST SE RT CR-57 X- | Yes | Yes | No | No | 2,025 | No | 0 | 0.07 | \$0 |
| 8.07 | CSAH | 8 | 44TH AVE SE RT CR-76 | No | Yes | No | No | 1,953 | No | 1 | 0.06 | \$12,000 |
| 8.08 | CSAH | 8 | 31ST AVE SE RT CR-91 (SOUTH) | No | Yes | No | No | 1,930 | Yes | 0 | 0.03 | \$0 |
| 8.09 | CSAH | 8 | 31ST AVE SE RT CR-91 (NORTH) | No | Yes | No | No | 1,930 | Yes | 0 | 0.03 | \$0 |
| 8.10 | CSAH | 8 | 57TH ST SE RT CSAH-16 | Yes | No | No | No | 2,415 | Yes | 4 | 0.27 | \$251,000 |
| 8.11 | CSAH | 8 | 42ND ST SE X-ING T-6 LT CR-65 RT | Yes | No | No | No | 2,947 | Yes | 0 | 0.08 | \$0 |
| 8.12 | CSAH | 8 | 9TH AVE SE AT 15TH AVE SE RT CSAH-8 | No | Yes | No | No | 4,400 | Yes | 1 | 1.26 | \$12,000 |
| 9.01 | CSAH | 9 | 152ND ST NW CR-42 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 1,150 | No | 0 | 0.17 | \$0 |
| 9.03 | CSAH | 9 | 116TH ST NW RT CR-39 | No | No | No | No | 1,275 | No | 1 | 0.55 | \$136,000 |
| 9.04 | CSAH | 9 | 108TH ST NW CSAH-19 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 2,300 | No | 5 | 0.56 | \$432,000 |
| 10.01 | CSAH | 10 | 164TH ST NW CSAH-15 X-ING | No | Yes | No | No | 3,675 | No | 5 | 0.47 | \$432,000 |
| 11.02 | CSAH | 11 | 187TH AVE SE LT T-1406 175TH AVE SE F | No | Yes | No | No | 13,015 | No | 6 | 0.10 | \$1,284,000 |
| 11.04 | CSAH | 11 | 127TH ST SE X-ING T-200 LT CR-73 RT | No | No | No | No | 4,302 | No | 6 | 0.15 | \$444,000 |
| 11.05 | CSAH | 11 | 117TH ST SE X-ING CSAH-24 LT CR-51 R7 | No | No | No | No | 5,200 | No | 2 | 0.37 | \$148,000 |
| 11.06 | CSAH | 11 | 57TH ST SE CSAH-16 X-ING | Yes | Yes | No | No | 2,365 | Yes | 4 | 0.53 | \$606,000 |
| 11.07 | CSAH | 11 | 47TH ST SE LT CR-85 | No | No | No | No | 1,570 | Yes | 1 | 0.03 | \$412,000 |
| 11.08 | CSAH | 11 | 37TH ST SE LT CR-48 | No | No | No | No | 1,778 | Yes | 1 | 0.29 | \$12,000 |
| 11.09 | CSAH | 11 | 27TH ST SE X-ING CR-86 LT NWR-102 RT | No | No | No | No | 1,775 | Yes | 0 | 0.15 | \$0 |
| 14.01 | CSAH | 14 | (182ND) 183RD ST NW X-ING CSAH-43 LT | No | Yes | No | No | 3,337 | No | 8 | 0.15 | \$823,000 |
| 14.02 | CSAH | 14 | 160TH ST NW RT CSAH-30 | Yes | Yes | No | No | 3,325 | Yes | 2 | 0.29 | \$148,000 |
| 15.01 | CSAH | 15 | 202ND AVE NW RT CR-35 | No | Yes | No | No | 4,750 | No | 10 | 0.26 | \$402,000 |
| 15.02 | CSAH | 15 | 214TH AVE NW LT CR-83 | No | No | No | No | 4,405 | No | 1 | 0.18 | \$12,000 |
| 15.03 | CSAH | 15 | 229TH AVE NW LT CR-43 | No | Yes | No | No | 6,325 | Yes | 1 | 0.88 | \$12,000 |
| 16.01 | CSAH | 16 | USTH-10 X-ING | Yes | No | No | Yes | 29,163 | No | 6 | 0.04 | \$512,000 |

Sherburne County
Rural Intersection Prioritization

| Int \# | Sys | Num | Intersection Description | Skew | On/Near Curve | Development | $\begin{gathered} \hline R R \\ \text { Xing } \end{gathered}$ | ADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Previous } \\ \text { STOP }(>5 \mathrm{mi}) \end{gathered}$ | Total Crashes | Ratio (Min/Maj) | Crash Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.02 | CSAH | 16 | CR-66 X-ING | Yes | No | No | No | 2,040 | No | 0 | 0.05 | \$0 |
| 16.03 | CSAH | 16 | 75TH AVE SE CSAH-20 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 2,338 | No | 0 | 0.20 | \$0 |
| 16.04 | CSAH | 16 | 115TH AVE SE X-ING T-44 LT CR-53 RT | No | Yes | No | No | 2,037 | No | 0 | 0.15 | \$0 |
| 16.05 | CSAH | 16 | 125TH AVE SE MNTH-25 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 4,525 | Yes | 3 | 0.43 | \$36,000 |
| 16.06 | CSAH | 16 | 140TH AVE SE RT CR-127 | No | No | No | No | 1,490 | No | 0 | 0.71 | \$0 |
| 16.07 | CSAH | 16 | 150TH AVE SE CSAH-23 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 1,900 | No | 1 | 0.75 | \$12,000 |
| 16.08 | CSAH | 16 | 47TH ST SE LT CR-85 | Yes | Yes | No | No | 1,120 | No | 0 | 0.04 | \$0 |
| 17.01 | CSAH | 17 | MNTH-25 X-ING | No | Yes | Yes | No | 15,662 | No | 13 | 0.16 | \$1,453,000 |
| 19.01 | CSAH | 19 | USTH-169 X-ING | No | Yes | No | No | 31,600 | No | 17 | 0.07 | \$1,749,000 |
| 19.02 | CSAH | 19 | 108TH ST NW RT CR-74 | No | No | No | No | 2,585 | No | 0 | 0.43 | \$0 |
| 19.03 | CSAH | 19 | 289TH AVE NW RT CSAH-28 | No | Yes | No | No | 2,300 | No | 3 | 0.56 | \$318,000 |
| 19.04 | CSAH | 19 | 305TH AVE NW CR-38 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 2,090 | Yes | 3 | 0.42 | \$560,000 |
| 20.02 | CSAH | 20 | 47TH ST SE CR-61 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 510 | No | 0 | 0.52 | \$0 |
| 20.03 | CSAH | 20 | 17TH ST SE CR-62 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 630 | No | 1 | 0.88 | \$136,000 |
| 23.03 | CSAH | 23 | 137TH AVE SE RT CR-127 | No | Yes | No | No | 3,165 | No | 1 | 0.28 | \$136,000 |
| 23.04 | CSAH | 23 | 37TH ST SE CR-48 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 1,303 | Yes | 4 | 0.59 | \$1,920,000 |
| 23.05 | CSAH | 23 | 27TH ST SE RT CR-86 | No | No | No | No | 890 | Yes | 0 | 0.17 | \$0 |
| 23.06 | CSAH | 23 | 12TH ST SE LT CR-59 | No | No | No | No | 865 | Yes | 0 | 0.11 | \$0 |
| 25.01 | CSAH | 25 | 128TH ST NW LT CR-45 | No | Yes | No | No | 2,545 | No | 6 | 1.58 | \$72,000 |
| 25.02 | CSAH | 25 | USTH-169 X-ING | No | No | Yes | No | 31,500 | No | 12 | 0.07 | \$629,000 |
| 37.01 | CNTY | 37 | MILLE LACS CSAH-1 X-ING | No | Yes | No | No | 923 | No | 0 | 0.17 | \$0 |
| 38.01 | CNTY | 38 | USTH-169 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 19,935 | No | 7 | 0.03 | \$445,000 |
| 42.01 | CNTY | 42 | 128TH ST NW CR-45 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 3,825 | No | 3 | 0.57 | \$36,000 |
| 43.04 | CNTY | 43 | 221ST AVE NW X-ING T-846 LT CR-83 RT | No | Yes | No | No | 4,542 | No | 2 | 0.18 | \$24,000 |
| 48.01 | CNTY | 48 | 120TH AVE SE MNTH-25 X-ING | Yes | No | No | No | 3,203 | No | 1 | 0.19 | \$824,000 |
| 50.01 | CNTY | 50 | USTH-10 X-ING | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 19,975 | No | 1 | 0.07 | \$824,000 |
| 53.01 | CNTY | 53 | USTH-10 X-ING | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 12,205 | No | 2 | 0.02 | \$24,000 |
| 53.02 | CNTY | 53 | 87TH ST SE X-ING CR-56 LT T-37 RT | No | No | No | No | 325 | No | 0 | 0.38 | \$0 |
| 53.03 | CNTY | 53 | 77TH ST SE X-ING CR-54 LT, CR-53 TURN | No | Yes | No | No | 465 | No | 0 | 0.68 | \$0 |
| 54.01 | CNTY | 54 | USTH-10 X-ING, 85TH AVE SE T-246 BHD | Yes | No | No | Yes | 14,040 | No | 4 | 0.01 | \$251,000 |
| 54.02 | CNTY | 54 | 95TH AVE SE CR-55 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 675 | No | 0 | 0.50 | \$0 |
| 54.03 | CNTY | 54 | 105TH AVE SE X-ING CR-56 RT | No | No | No | No | 288 | No | 0 | 0.56 | \$0 |
| 55.01 | CNTY | 55 | USTH-10 X-ING | No | Yes | No | Yes | 13,313 | No | 5 | 0.03 | \$342,000 |
| 56.01 | CNTY | 56 | USTH-10 X-ING, 100TH AVE SE T-58 BHD | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 12,090 | No | 5 | 0.01 | \$218,000 |
| 57.01 | CNTY | 57 | MNTH-24 X-ING, CLEAR LAKE CORP LIM | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 13,108 | No | 0 | 0.02 | \$0 |
| 61.01 | CNTY | 61 | USTH-10 \& 52 X-ING | Yes | No | No | No | 28,088 | No | 3 | 0.01 | \$36,000 |
| 62.01 | CNTY | 62 | 65TH AVE SE RT CR-78 | No | No | No | No | 498 | No | 1 | 0.29 | \$12,000 |
| 62.02 | CNTY | 62 | 90TH AVE SE LT CR-71 | No | No | No | No | 170 | No | 0 | 0.19 | \$0 |

Sherburne County
Rural Intersection Prioritization

| Int \# | Sys | Num | Intersection Description | Skew | On/Near Curve | Development | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{RR} \\ \text { Xing } \end{gathered}$ | ADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Previous } \\ \text { STOP }(>5 \mathrm{mi}) \end{gathered}$ | Total Crashes | Ratio (Min/Maj) | Crash Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65.01 | CNTY | 65 | USTH-10 X-ING | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 28,338 | No | 5 | 0.01 | \$263,000 |
| 66.01 | CNTY | 66 | USTH-10 X-ING (SOUTH) | Yes | Yes | No | No | 28,045 | No | 3 | 0.00 | \$115,000 |
| 66.02 | CNTY | 66 | USTH-10 X-ING, 52ND ST SE T-14 AHD (N | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 28,072 | No | 2 | 0.00 | \$24,000 |
| 73.03 | CNTY | 73 | 221ST AVE NW LT CR-81 (NORTH) | No | No | No | No | 1,480 | No | 4 | 0.19 | \$127,000 |
| 74.01 | CNTY | 74 | USTH-169 X-ING | Yes | No | No | No | 30,960 | No | 9 | 0.03 | \$435,000 |
| 84.01 | CNTY | 84 | USTH-169 X-ING, 273RD AVE NW T-123 AI | No | Yes | No | No | 19,820 | No | 7 | 0.01 | \$411,000 |
| 87.01 | CNTY | 87 | 128TH ST NW CR-45 X-ING | No | No | No | No | 2,348 | No | 1 | 0.09 | \$12,000 |
| 92.01 | CNTY | 92 | MNTH-25 X-ING, BENTON CO T-59 BHD ( | No | Yes | No | No | 2,503 | No | 0 | 0.00 | \$0 |
| 92.02 | CNTY | 92 | 120TH AVE SE MNTH-25 X-ING (NORTH) | No | Yes | No | No | 2,503 | No | 0 | 0.00 | \$0 |
| 16.09 | CSAH | 16 | 185TH AVE SE CR-93 AHD, CSAH-16 TUR | No | No | No | No | 1,055 | Yes | 2 | 0.95 | \$24,000 |
| 56.02 | CNTY | 56 | 105TH AVE SE LT CR-56 SEG \#2 | No | No | No | No | 188 | No | 0 | 1.00 | \$0 |
| 59.01 | CNTY | 59 | 12TH ST SE X-ING T-341 LT CR-59 RT | No | No | No | No | 162 | No | 1 | 0.80 | \$412,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Critical ADT Ratio |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Min | 0.4 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Max | 0.8 |  |

Sherburne County
Rural Intersection Prioritization

| Rank | Int \# | Sys | \# | Intersection Description | Skew | On/Near Curve | Development RR Xing | $\begin{gathered} \text { Previous } \\ \text { STOP }(>5 \mathrm{mi}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total Crashes | Ratio (Min/Maj) | Priority | Crash Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 11.06 | CSAH | 11 | 57TH ST SE CSAH-16 X-ING | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star \star \star$ | \$ 606,000 |
| 2 | 5.06 | CSAH | 5 | (237TH) 241ST AVE NW X-ING T. | * | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star \star \star$ | \$ 36,000 |
| 3 | 3.01 | CSAH | 3 | USTH-10 WBL X-ING, 32ND ST S | $\star$ |  | * $\quad$ * |  | * |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 1,061,000 |
| 4 | 50.01 | CNTY | 50 | USTH-10 X-ING | $\star$ |  | $\star$ ¢ |  | * |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 824,000 |
| 5 | 1.15 | CSAH | 1 | 281ST AVE NW LT CR-42 | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 527,000 |
| 6 | 1.13 | CSAH | 1 | FREMONT AVE NW CSAH-4 X-IN |  | * | $\star$ | $\star$ | * |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 526,000 |
| 7 | 65.01 | CNTY | 65 | USTH-10 X-ING | $\star$ |  | * $\quad$ * |  | * |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 263,000 |
| 8 | 56.01 | CNTY | 56 | USTH-10 X-ING, 100TH AVE SE ${ }^{-}$ | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 218,000 |
| 9 | 8.04 | CSAH | 8 | (80TH) 82ND AVE SE LT T-1580 | * | * |  | $\star$ | * |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 194,000 |
| 10 | 14.02 | CSAH | 14 | 160TH ST NW RT CSAH-30 | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | * | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 148,000 |
| 11 | 1.11 | CSAH | 1 | 237TH AVE NW RT CSAH-25 |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 36,000 |
| 12 | 53.01 | CNTY | 53 | USTH-10 X-ING | $\star$ |  | * $\quad$ * |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 24,000 |
| 13 | 66.02 | CNTY | 66 | USTH-10 X-ING, 52ND ST SE T-1 | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star \star$ | \$ 24,000 |
| 14 | 23.04 | CSAH | 23 | 37TH ST SE CR-48 X-ING |  |  |  | $\star$ | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 1,920,000 |
| 15 | 17.01 | CSAH | 17 | MNTH-25 X-ING |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 1,453,000 |
| 16 | 19.04 | CSAH | 19 | 305TH AVE NW CR-38 X-ING |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 560,000 |
| 17 | 16.01 | CSAH | 16 | USTH-10 X-ING | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 512,000 |
| 18 | 10.01 | CSAH | 10 | 164TH ST NW CSAH-15 X-ING |  | $\star$ |  |  | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 432,000 |
| 19 | 55.01 | CNTY | 55 | USTH-10 X-ING |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 342,000 |
| 20 | 19.03 | CSAH | 19 | 289TH AVE NW RT CSAH-28 |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 318,000 |
| 21 | 8.10 | CSAH | 8 | 57TH ST SE RT CSAH-16 | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 251,000 |
| 22 | 54.01 | CNTY | 54 | USTH-10 X-ING, 85TH AVE SE T. | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 251,000 |
| 23 | 1.12 | CSAH | 1 | 247TH AVE NW RT CR-46 |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 172,000 |
| 24 | 3.05 | CSAH | 3 | 95TH AVE SE X-ING T-27 LT CR- |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 148,000 |
| 25 | 6.03 | CSAH | 6 | 57TH ST SE CSAH-16 X-ING (WE | $\star$ |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 148,000 |
| 26 | 5.08 | CSAH | 5 | 289TH AVE NW RT CSAH-9 |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 139,000 |
| 27 | 66.01 | CNTY | 66 | USTH-10 X-ING (SOUTH) | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 115,000 |
| 28 | 4.08 | CSAH | 4 | 184TH ST NW CSAH-5 X-ING (NC |  |  | $\star$ |  | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 60,000 |
| 29 | 16.05 | CSAH | 16 | 125TH AVE SE MNTH-25 X-ING |  |  |  | $\star$ | * | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 36,000 |
| 30 | 3.17 | CSAH | 3 | 22ND ST NW RT CR-70 (SOUTH) | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  | * |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 24,000 |
| 31 | 8.12 | CSAH | 8 | 9TH AVE SE AT 15TH AVE SE R ${ }^{-}$ |  | * |  | * | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 12,000 |
| 32 | 6.06 | CSAH | 6 | 17TH ST SE LT CR-62 | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 12,000 |
| 33 | 15.03 | CSAH | 15 | 229TH AVE NW LT CR-43 |  | * |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 12,000 |
| 34 | 1.17 | CSAH | 1 | 309TH AVE NW CR-42 X-ING |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star \star$ | \$ 12,000 |
| 35 | 57.01 | CNTY | 57 | MNTH-24 X-ING, CLEAR LAKE C | $\star$ | $\star$ | * |  |  |  | $\star \star \star$ | \$ - |
| 36 | 19.01 | CSAH | 19 | USTH-169 X-ING |  | * |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ 1,749,000 |
| 37 | 11.02 | CSAH | 11 | 187TH AVE SE LT T-1406 175TH |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ 1,284,000 |
| 38 | 2.04 | CSAH | 2 | USTH-169 X-ING, T-110 BHD, C! |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ 1,008,000 |

Sherburne County
Rural Intersection Prioritization

| Rank | Int \# | Sys | \# | Intersection Description | Skew | On/Near Curve | Development RR Xing | $\begin{gathered} \text { Previous } \\ \text { STOP }(>5 \mathrm{mi}) \end{gathered}$ | Total Crashes | Ratio (Min/Maj) | Priority | Crash Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39 | 48.01 | CNTY | 48 | 120TH AVE SE MNTH-25 X-ING | $\star$ |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 824,000 |
| 40 | 14.01 | CSAH | 14 | (182ND) 183RD ST NW X-ING C¢ |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 823,000 |
| 41 | 3.18 | CSAH | 3 | 184TH ST NW CSAH-5 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 684,000 |
| 42 | 6.02 | CSAH | 6 | 93RD AVE SE RT CR-55 |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 630,000 |
| 43 | 25.02 | CSAH | 25 | USTH-169 X-ING |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 629,000 |
| 44 | 4.03 | CSAH | 4 | 165TH AVE SE CSAH-11 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 511,000 |
| 45 | 4.01 | CSAH | 4 | SHERBURNE AVE SE CSAH-23 |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 457,000 |
| 46 | 74.01 | CNTY | 74 | USTH-169 X-ING | $\star$ |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 435,000 |
| 47 | 9.04 | CSAH | 9 | 108TH ST NW CSAH-19 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 432,000 |
| 48 | 11.07 | CSAH | 11 | 47TH ST SE LT CR-85 |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 412,000 |
| 49 | 5.07 | CSAH | 5 | 271ST AVE NW LT CSAH-16 |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 412,000 |
| 50 | 59.01 | CNTY | 59 | 12TH ST SE X-ING T-341 LT CR-: |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 412,000 |
| 51 | 84.01 | CNTY | 84 | USTH-169 X-ING, 273RD AVE NV |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 411,000 |
| 52 | 15.01 | CSAH | 15 | 202ND AVE NW RT CR-35 |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 402,000 |
| 53 | 2.02 | CSAH | 2 | 124TH ST NW CSAH-2 SEG \#2 A |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 227,000 |
| 54 | 6.04 | CSAH | 6 | 57TH ST SE CSAH-16 X-ING (EA |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 184,000 |
| 55 | 3.07 | CSAH | 3 | 120TH AVE SE MNTH-25 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 182,000 |
| 56 | 23.03 | CSAH | 23 | 137TH AVE SE RT CR-127 |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 136,000 |
| 57 | 9.03 | CSAH | 9 | 116TH ST NW RT CR-39 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | * | $\star \star$ | \$ | 136,000 |
| 58 | 25.01 | CSAH | 25 | 128TH ST NW LT CR-45 |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 72,000 |
| 59 | 61.01 | CNTY | 61 | USTH-10 \& 52 X-ING | * |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 36,000 |
| 60 | 42.01 | CNTY | 42 | 128TH ST NW CR-45 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 36,000 |
| 61 | 16.09 | CSAH | 16 | 185TH AVE SE CR-93 AHD, CSA |  |  |  | $\star$ | * |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 24,000 |
| 62 | 43.04 | CNTY | 43 | 221ST AVE NW X-ING T-846 LT ( |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 24,000 |
| 63 | 5.09 | CSAH | 5 | 321ST AVE NW RT CR-80 |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 64 | 8.07 | CSAH | 8 | 44TH AVE SE RT CR-76 |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 65 | 11.08 | CSAH | 11 | 37TH ST SE LT CR-48 |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 66 | 16.07 | CSAH | 16 | 150TH AVE SE CSAH-23 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 67 | 2.03 | CSAH | 2 | 108TH ST NW RT CSAH-19 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 68 | 3.12 | CSAH | 3 | 165TH AVE SE CSAH-11 X-ING ( |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 69 | 6.05 | CSAH | 6 | 37TH ST SE RT CR-48 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 70 | 3.11 | CSAH | 3 | 165TH AVE SE CSAH-11 X-ING, | * |  | * |  |  |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | - |
| 71 | 8.08 | CSAH | 8 | 31ST AVE SE RT CR-91 (SOUTH |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | - |
| 72 | 8.09 | CSAH | 8 | 31ST AVE SE RT CR-91 (NORTH |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | - |
| 73 | 16.08 | CSAH | 16 | 47TH ST SE LT CR-85 | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | - |
| 74 | 1.10 | CSAH | 1 | 231ST AVE NW LT CR-32 |  | $\star$ |  | * |  |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | - |
| 75 | 8.06 | CSAH | 8 | 58TH AVE SE LT 90TH ST SE RT | $\star$ | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | - |
| 76 | 8.11 | CSAH | 8 | 42ND ST SE X-ING T-6 LT CR-65 | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star \star$ | \$ | - |

Sherburne County
Rural Intersection Prioritization

| Rank | Int \# | Sys | \# | Intersection Description | Skew | On/Near Curve | Development RR Xing | $\begin{gathered} \text { Previous } \\ \text { STOP }(>5 \mathrm{mi}) \end{gathered}$ | Total Crashes | Ratio (Min/Maj) | Priority | Crash Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 77 | 53.03 | CNTY | 53 | 77TH ST SE X-ING CR-54 LT, CR |  | $\star$ |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star \star$ | \$ | - |
| 78 | 4.13 | CSAH | 4 | 112TH ST NW X-ING CR-39 LT T. |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 981,000 |
| 79 | 3.14 | CSAH | 3 | 175TH AVE SE LT CR-70 (WEST) |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 824,000 |
| 80 | 4.14 | CSAH | 4 | 104TH ST NW CSAH-19 X-ING |  |  |  |  | * |  | * | \$ | 753,000 |
| 81 | 8.02 | CSAH | 8 | 125TH AVE SE CR-52 X-ING, W ( |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 527,000 |
| 82 | 3.04 | CSAH | 3 | 75TH AVE SE CSAH-20 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 466,000 |
| 83 | 3.02 | CSAH | 3 | 45TH AVE SE X-ING CSAH-7 LT |  |  |  |  | * |  | $\star$ | \$ | 448,000 |
| 84 | 38.01 | CNTY | 38 | USTH-169 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 445,000 |
| 85 | 11.04 | CSAH | 11 | 127TH ST SE X-ING T-200 LT CR |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 444,000 |
| 86 | 3.09 | CSAH | 3 | 150TH AVE SE CSAH-23 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 284,000 |
| 87 | 4.09 | CSAH | 4 | 164TH ST NW RT CSAH-15 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 251,000 |
| 88 | 4.05 | CSAH | 4 | 185TH AVE SE X-ING CR-93 LT 1 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 227,000 |
| 89 | 4.07 | CSAH | 4 | 184TH ST NW CSAH-5 X-ING, 25 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 172,000 |
| 90 | 11.05 | CSAH | 11 | 117TH ST SE X-ING CSAH-24 LT |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 148,000 |
| 91 | 3.16 | CSAH | 3 | 195TH AVE NW LT CSAH-22, CS |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 136,000 |
| 92 | 4.02 | CSAH | 4 | 155TH AVE SE RT CR-67 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 136,000 |
| 93 | 20.03 | CSAH | 20 | 17TH ST SE CR-62 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 136,000 |
| 94 | 73.03 | CNTY | 73 | 221ST AVE NW LT CR-81 (NORT |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 127,000 |
| 95 | 4.06 | CSAH | 4 | 188TH ST NW RT CR-75 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 24,000 |
| 96 | 15.02 | CSAH | 15 | 214TH AVE NW LT CR-83 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 97 | 62.01 | CNTY | 62 | 65TH AVE SE RT CR-78 |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | * | \$ | 12,000 |
| 98 | 87.01 | CNTY | 87 | 128TH ST NW CR-45 X-ING |  |  |  |  | * |  | * | \$ | 12,000 |
| 99 | 4.15 | CSAH | 4 | ISANTI CR-50 LT, T-119 RT, CSA |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | * | \$ | 12,000 |
| 100 | 8.03 | CSAH | 8 | 115TH AVE SE CR-53 X-ING |  |  |  |  | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | \$ | 12,000 |
| 101 | 3.03 | CSAH | 3 | 65TH AVE SE LT CR-78, CSAH-3 |  | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 102 | 3.10 | CSAH | 3 | 19TH ST SE RT CR-90 |  | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 103 | 11.09 | CSAH | 11 | 27TH ST SE X-ING CR-86 LT NW |  |  |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 104 | 23.05 | CSAH | 23 | 27TH ST SE RT CR-86 |  |  |  | $\star$ |  |  | * | \$ | - |
| 105 | 23.06 | CSAH | 23 | 12TH ST SE LT CR-59 |  |  |  | $\star$ |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 106 | 92.01 | CNTY | 92 | MNTH-25 X-ING, BENTON CO T- |  | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 107 | 92.02 | CNTY | 92 | 120TH AVE SE MNTH-25 X-ING ( |  | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | * | \$ | - |
| 108 | 3.19 | CSAH | 3 | 319TH AVE NW LT CR-80 |  | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 109 | 5.05 | CSAH | 5 | 190TH ST NW LT CR-75 |  | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 110 | 16.02 | CSAH | 16 | CR-66 X-ING | $\star$ |  |  |  |  |  | * | \$ | - |
| 111 | 16.04 | CSAH | 16 | 115TH AVE SE X-ING T-44 LT CF |  | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 112 | 20.02 | CSAH | 20 | 47TH ST SE CR-61 X-ING |  |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 113 | 37.01 | CNTY | 37 | MILLE LACS CSAH-1 X-ING |  | $\star$ |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | \$ | - |
| 114 | 54.02 | CNTY | 54 | 95TH AVE SE CR-55 X-ING |  |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | \$ | - |

## Sherburne County Rural Intersection Prioritization

|  | Rank | Int \# | Sys | \# | Intersection Description | Skew | On/Near Curve | Development RR Xing | $\begin{gathered} \text { Previous } \\ \text { STOP }(>5 \mathrm{mi}) \end{gathered}$ | Total Crashes | Ratio (Min/Maj) | Priority |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 115 | 3.13 | CSAH | 3 | 173RD AVE SE RT CR-64 |  |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | \$ | - |
|  | 116 | 19.02 | CSAH | 19 | 108TH ST NW RT CR-74 |  |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | \$ | - |
|  | 117 | 54.03 | CNTY | 54 | 105TH AVE SE X-ING CR-56 RT |  |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | \$ | - |
|  | 118 | 16.06 | CSAH | 16 | 140TH AVE SE RT CR-127 |  |  |  |  |  | $\star$ | $\star$ | \$ | - |
|  | 119 | 3.15 | CSAH | 3 | 180TH AVE SE RT CR-70 (EAST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | 120 | 4.04 | CSAH | 4 | 173RD AVE SE X-ING T-217 LT C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | 121 | 16.03 | CSAH | 16 | 75TH AVE SE CSAH-20 X-ING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | 122 | 53.02 | CNTY | 53 | 87TH ST SE X-ING CR-56 LT T-3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | 123 | 62.02 | CNTY | 62 | 90TH AVE SE LT CR-71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
|  | 124 | 56.02 | CNTY | 56 | 105TH AVE SE LT CR-56 SEG \#2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | 125 | 1.18 | CSAH | 1 | 325TH AVE NW LT CSAH-3, MILL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
|  | 126 | 9.01 | CSAH | 9 | 152ND ST NW CR-42 X-ING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| Totals |  |  |  |  | Total Stars -- | 27 | 49 | $10 \quad 9$ | 27 | 91 | 32 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \% That Gets Star -- | 21\% | 39\% | 8\% 7\% | 21\% | 72\% | 25\% |  |  |  |
|  | \# | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\star \star \star \star \star \star \star$ | 0 | 0\% |  |  |  | Stars |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\star \star \star \star \star \star$ | 0 | 0\% |  |  | Skew - If intersection is skewed at an angle of 15 degrees or greater.On/Near Curve - If intersection is on or within 1,000 feet of curve. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\star \star \star \star \star$ | 2 | 2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\star \star \star \star$ | 11 | 9\% |  |  | Development - | If intersection aerial shows a commercial development with access near intersection. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\star \star \star$ | 22 | 17\% |  |  | RR Xing - | If intersection has a railroad crossing on any approach within 500 feet. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\star \star$ | 42 | 33\% | Previous STOP ( $>5 \mathrm{mi}$ ) - If |  |  | If minor leg of intersection's previous STOP sign is greater then 5 miles away. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\star$ | 41 | 33\% | Total Crashes - If |  |  | If intersection has at least 1 crash. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | 8 | 6\% | Ratio (Min/Maj) - If intersection has an ADT ratio in the range of 0.4 to 0.8 . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 126 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Crash Severity/Crash Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Crash Severity | Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ |
| K - Fatal | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |  |
| A - Serious Injury | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |
| B - Minor Injury | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 17 | 15 | 18 |  |
| C - Possible Injury | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 22 | 20 | 13 | 0 |
| N - Prop Dmg Only | 427 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 83 | 100 | 9 | 67 | 0 |
| U - Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 620 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 121 | 143 | 138 | 103 | 0 |


| Crash Severity/Number of Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity | Total | 0 | 1 | 2 | $3+$ |
| K - Fatal | 10 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 |
| A - Serious Injury | 20 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 1 |
| B - Minor Injury | 88 | 0 | 37 | 50 | 1 |
| C - Possible Injury | 75 | 0 | 15 | 52 | 8 |
| N - Prop Dmg Only | 427 | 0 | 162 | 255 | 10 |
| U - Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 620 | 0 | 227 | 373 | 20 |
| Basic Type Summary |  |  |  | Total | \% |
| Pedestrian |  |  |  | 12 | 1.9 |
| Bike |  |  |  | 5 | 0.8 |
| Single Vehicle Run Off Ro |  |  |  | 153 | 24.7 |
| Single Vehicle Other |  |  |  | 58 | 9.4 |
| Sideswipe Same Direction |  |  |  | 29 | 4.7 |
| Sideswipe Opposing |  |  |  | 19 | 3.1 |
| Rear End |  |  |  | 144 | 23.2 |
| Head On |  |  |  | 10 | 1.6 |
| Left Turn |  |  |  | 24 | 3.9 |
| Angle |  |  |  | 135 | 21.8 |
| Other |  |  |  | 31 | 5.0 |
| Total |  |  |  | 620 | 100.0 |
| First Harmful Event Summary |  |  |  | Total | \% |
| Pedestrian |  |  |  | 8 | 1.3 |
| Bicyclist |  |  |  | 5 | 0.8 |
| Motor Vehicle In Transport |  |  |  | 383 | 61.8 |
| Parked Motor Vehicle |  |  |  | 8 | 1.3 |
| Train |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Deer/Animal |  |  |  | 48 | 7.7 |
| Other - Non Fixed Object |  |  |  | 4 | 0.6 |
| Collision Fixed Object |  |  |  | 130 | 21.0 |
| Non-Collision Harmful Events |  |  |  | 34 | 5.5 |
| Non-Harmful Events |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other/Unknown |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total |  |  |  | 620 | 100.0 |


| Relationship to Intersection Summary | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not at Intersection/Interchange | 0 | 0.0 |
| Four-Way Intersection | 0 | 0.0 |
| T or Y Intersection | 620 | 100.0 |
| Five-Way Intersection or More | 0 | 0.0 |
| Roundabout | 0 | 0.0 |
| Intersection Related | 0 | 0.0 |
| Driveway Access Related | 0 | 0.0 |
| At School Crossing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Railway Grade Crossing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Shared Use Path or Trail | 0 | 0.0 |
| Interchange or Ramp | 0 | 0.0 |
| Crossover Related | 0 | 0.0 |
| Acceleration/Deceleration Lane | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other/Unknown | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 620 | 100.0 |
| Weather 1 Summary | Total | \% |
| Clear | 368 | 59.4 |
| Cloudy | 146 | 23.5 |
| Rain | 19 | 3.1 |
| Snow | 54 | 8.7 |
| Sleet, Hail (Freezing Rain/Drizzle) | 8 | 1.3 |
| Fog/Smog/Smoke | 8 | 1.3 |
| Blowing Sand/Soil/Dirt/Snow | 6 | 1.0 |
| Severe Crosswinds | 1 | 0.2 |
| Other/Unknown | 10 | 1.6 |
| Total | 620 | 100.0 |
| Light Condition Summary | Total | \% |
| Daylight | 391 | 63.1 |
| Sunrise | 23 | 3.7 |
| Sunset | 21 | 3.4 |
| Dark (Str Lights On) | 69 | 11.1 |
| Dark (Str Lights Off) | 5 | 0.8 |
| Dark (No Str Lights) | 98 | 15.8 |
| Dark (Unknown Light) | 12 | 1.9 |
| Other/Unknown | 1 | 0.2 |
| Total | 620 | 100.0 |


| Time of Day/Day of Week |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From To | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 00:00 } \\ & 01: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 02:00 } \\ & 03: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 04:00 } \\ & 05: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 06:00 } \\ & 07: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 08:00 } \\ 09: 59 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:00 } \\ & \text { 11:59 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 00 \\ & 13: 59 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 00 \\ & 15: 59 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:00 } \\ & \text { 17:59 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:00 } \\ & \text { 19:59 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 00 \\ & 21: 59 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:00 } \\ & \text { 23:59 } \end{aligned}$ | Total | \% |
| SUN | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 13 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 61 | 9.8 |
| MON | 2 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 17 | 17 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 80 | 12.9 |
| TUE | 0 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 82 | 13.2 |
| WED | 1 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 92 | 14.8 |
| THU | 4 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 16 | 21 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 100 | 16.1 |
| FRI | 0 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 21 | 19 | 13 | 8 | 10 | 122 | 19.7 |
| SAT | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 83 | 13.4 |
| Total | 18 | 11 | 31 | 71 | 56 | 54 | 47 | 91 | 114 | 56 | 42 | 29 | 620 | 100.0 |
| \% | 2.9 | 1.8 | 5.0 | 11.5 | 9.0 | 8.7 | 7.6 | 14.7 | 18.4 | 9.0 | 6.8 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


| Driver \& Non-Motorist Age/Gender Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Age | $\mathbf{M}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | NR | No Value | Total | $\%$ |
| $\mathbf{< 1 4}$ | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 20 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 49 | 4.7 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 4.2 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 22 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 3.3 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 19 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 2.7 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 4}$ | 50 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 8.7 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ | 57 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 9.7 |
| $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ | 56 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 8.6 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | 48 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 8.4 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 4 4}$ | 60 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 94 | 8.9 |
| $\mathbf{4 5 - 4 9}$ | 50 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 7.5 |
| $\mathbf{5 0 - 5 4}$ | 48 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 8.5 |
| $\mathbf{5 5 - 5 9}$ | 40 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 66 | 6.3 |
| $\mathbf{6 0 - 6 4}$ | 27 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 4.6 |
| $\mathbf{6 5 - 6 9}$ | 20 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2.8 |
| $\mathbf{7 0 - 7 4}$ | 17 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 2.7 |
| $\mathbf{7 5 - 7 9}$ | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1.5 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 - 8 4}$ | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0.9 |
| $\mathbf{8 5 - 8 9}$ | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1.0 |
| $\mathbf{9 0 - 9 4}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.1 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 +}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 2.1 |
| Total | 597 | 430 | 2 | 23 | 1052 | 100.0 |
| \% | 56.7 | 40.9 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


| Month Summary | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| January | 67 | 10.8 |
| February | 67 | 10.8 |
| March | 40 | 6.5 |
| April | 36 | 5.8 |
| May | 42 | 6.8 |
| June | 44 | 7.1 |
| July | 43 | 6.9 |
| August | 52 | 8.4 |
| September | 50 | 8.1 |
| October | 58 | 9.4 |
| November | 50 | 8.1 |
| December | 71 | 11.5 |
| Total | 620 | 100.0 |
| Physical Condition Summary |  |  |
| Apparently Normal (Including No Drugs/Alcohol) | 941 | 91.4 |
| Physical Disability (Short Term or Long Term) | 1 | 0.1 |
| Medical Issue (III, Sick or Fainted) | 1 | 0.1 |
| Emotional (Depression, Angry, Disturbed, etc.) | 1 | 0.1 |
| Asleep or Fatigued | 13 | 1.3 |
| Has Been Drinking Alcohol | 44 | 4.3 |
| Has Been Taking Illicit Drugs | 1 | 0.1 |
| Has Been Taking Medications | 2 | 0.2 |
| Other/Unknown | 26 | 2.5 |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 1030 | 100.0 |

Selection Filter:
WORK AREA: County('659515') - FILTER: Year('2016','2017','2018','2019','2020'), Relationship to Intersection('4')

Analyst:
David Roedel
Notes:
$\square$

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
Due Nov. 24, 2021
Greater Minnesota, Local HSIP Solicitation

## Application for Federal Safety Funds

## 1. Contact Information Details

| Lead Agency |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sherburne County | David Roedel |

## 2. Funding Details

| Federal Funds | + | Local Match | $=$ | Total Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 17,100$ | + | $\$ 1,900$ | $=$ | $\$ 19,000$ |  |

NOTE: maximum of $\$ 500,000$ in federal funds per agency per project.

| Preferred Funding Year(s) |
| :--- |
| 2023 |

## Funding Notes

County funds will be used for the local match.

## 3. Project Description

## Project Description

Mumble Strip Installation

| ATP | County or Counties | Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | Sherburne County | St. Cloud Area Planning Organization |


| Estimated Output | Units |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2.3 | Miles |
| 0 | Intersections |
| 0 | Curves |

NOTE: estimate output for one of three metric: number of miles, number of intersections, or number of curves.

## 3. Selection Criteria

## Describe how project was identified.

The county's 2010 Safety Plan identifies road segments with similar systemic characteristics.

## Is this project in partnership with another agency?

No
4. Crash Data for Reactive Projects ONLY: Jan. 1, 2016 through Dec. 31, 2020

| Number of Crashes | K | A | B | C | PDO | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Crash Types | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

NOTE: set filters to 2016 through 2020 in MnCMAT if you submit an Intersection Report or Section Report.

| OPTIONAL: Crashes by Basic Type | K | A | B | C | PDO | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bicyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Single Vehicle Run-off-road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Single Vehicle Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sideswipe Same Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sideswipe Opposing Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rear End | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Left Turn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Angle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## OPTIONAL: Description of any unique characteristics.

None.

Reactive projects must have a benefit-cost ratio greater than 1.00; to simplify this analysis, OTE will conduct the calculation. An electronic copy of the analysis output will be available upon request.

## 6. OPTIONAL: Additional Notes

## Additional Notes for Selection Committee

Sherburne County recognizes the need to improve the safety of rural county roads. We are proposing to install mumble strips on a segment of CSAH 7. These systemic conditions and associated safety issues are identified in the 2010 County Road Safety Plan.

Run off the road crashes account for $32.6 \%$ of the total county wide K-Fatal and A-Serious injury crashes. We believe with the installation of the mumble strip will help reduce these types of crashes.

Attached is a crash summary of $K$ and $A$ crashes with run off the road crashes highlighted, for your reference.

The St. Cloud APO provided us letters of support for road segments within their area. Attached. CSAH 7 - TH 10 to east of $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue SE.

## 7. Submission Information

Submit this application via PDF to SafetyProject.DOT@state.mn.us by November 24, 2021.

Please include the following as necessary:

- Map of project location(s)
- County Road Safety Plan project sheet(s)
- Letters of support
a. Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) if within borders
b. MnDOT District Traffic Engineer if work performed in MnDOT right-of-way



| Time of Day/Day of Week |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From To | $\begin{aligned} & 00: 00 \\ & 01: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 02:00 } \\ & 03: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 04:00 } \\ & 05: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 06:00 } \\ & 07: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 08: 00 \\ & 09: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:00 } \\ & \text { 11:59 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 00 \\ & 13: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 00 \\ & 15: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 00 \\ & 17: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 00 \\ & 19: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 00 \\ & 21: 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 00 \\ & 23: 59 \end{aligned}$ | Total | \% |
| SUN | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 23 | 12.5 |
| MON | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 21 | 11.4 |
| TUE | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 11.4 |
| WED | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 25 | 13.6 |
| THU | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 23 | 12.5 |
| FRI | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 41 | 22.3 |
| SAT | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 30 | 16.3 |
| Total | 15 | 6 | 9 | 17 | 11 | 9 | 13 | 24 | 15 | 33 | 17 | 15 | 184 | 100.0 |
| \% | 8.2 | 3.3 | 4.9 | 9.2 | 6.0 | 4.9 | 7.1 | 13.0 | 8.2 | 17.9 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


| Driver \& Non-Motorist Age/Gender Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | M | F | NR | No Value | Total | \% |
| <14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.3 |
| 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 16 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2.3 |
| 17 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3.0 |
| 18 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2.6 |
| 19 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3.0 |
| 20 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1.0 |
| 21-24 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 10.5 |
| 25-29 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 10.2 |
| 30-34 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 9.2 |
| 35-39 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 7.5 |
| 40-44 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 6.9 |
| 45-49 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 8.2 |
| 50-54 | 21 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 10.5 |
| 55-59 | 23 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 9.5 |
| 60-64 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.2 |
| 65-69 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3.0 |
| 70-74 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1.6 |
| 75-79 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2.0 |
| 80-84 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 85-89 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.3 |
| 90-94 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 95+ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 1 | 0.3 |
| Total | 204 | 99 | 0 | 2 | 305 | 100.0 |
| \% | 66.9 | 32.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


| Month Summary | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| January | 9 | 4.9 |
| February | 17 | 9.2 |
| March | 9 | 4.9 |
| April | 10 | 5.4 |
| May | 19 | 10.3 |
| June | 25 | 13.6 |
| July | 17 | 9.2 |
| August | 11 | 6.0 |
| September | 11 | 6.0 |
| October | 20 | 10.9 |
| November | 21 | 11.4 |
| December | 15 | 8.2 |
| Total | 184 | 100.0 |
| Physical Condition Summary | Total | $\%$ |
| Apparently Normal (Including No Drugs/Alcohol) | 205 | 67.4 |
| Physical Disability (Short Term or Long Term) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Medical Issue (III, Sick or Fainted) | 5 | 1.6 |
| Emotional (Depression, Angry, Disturbed, etc.) | 1 | 0.3 |
| Asleep or Fatigued | 3 | 1.0 |
| Has Been Drinking Alcohol | 42 | 13.8 |
| Has Been Taking Illicit Drugs | 8 | 2.6 |
| Has Been Taking Medications | 1 | 0.3 |
| Other/Unknown | 39 | 12.8 |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 304 | 100.0 |

Selection Filter:
WORK AREA: County ('659515') - FILTER: Crash Severity(' ${ }^{\prime}$ ','2'), Year('2016','2017','2018','2019','2020')

Analyst:
Andrew Witter

| TO: | Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Policy Board |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Brian Gibson, Executive Director |
| RE: | Amendment to 2022-2023 Unified Planning Work Program |
| DATE: | Sept 29, 2021 |

The proposed amendment makes the following changes to the approved 2022 work plan:

1. Deletes the Saint Joseph Birch Street Redevelopment Study - This change is being made at the request of the City of Saint Joseph. The Federal funds $(\$ 20,000)$ would be redistributed to the Opportunity Drive Operations Review (see \#3 below).
2. Redistributes resources based on staff changes and post-Census tasks - Associate Planner Fred Sandal has left the APO for a non-profit organization. I have promoted Planning Technician Alex McKenzie into the Associate Planner position and we are currently searching for a new Planning Technician. These staff changes result in about \$22,000 less needed for staff. The Federal funds no longer needed for staff will also be redirected into the Opportunity Drive Operations Review (\#3 below). Additionally, the 2020 US Census will result in two additional tasks: 1) a re-evaluation of the APO's planning boundaries, and 2) MnDOT will be re-evaluating all roadway functional classifications. I have shifted some hours around in order to better accommodate those tasks.
3. Opportunity Drive Operations Review - Using the Federal funds from the Birch Street Redevelopment Study and the staffing changes, the APO would support an operational review of Opportunity Drive including the I-94 interchange. The study budget would include $\$ 40,000$ in Federal funds plus $\$ 40,000$ in local funds provided by the City of Saint Cloud, for a total budget of $\$ 80,000$. This project came to us from St. Cloud city staff based on a discussion by the City Council. Jurisdictional assessments would NOT be increased. Our request for Federal funds would not be reduced.
The Technical Advisory Committee considered this change on September 30 th and recommended approval.

## Suggested Action: Approve

EXHIBIT 2

## 2022 WORK ACTIVITY BY REVENUE SOURCE

| Work Activity Category | Federal Funding (CPG) | State Funding | Local Match State Grant | Other Local Funds | Total Funding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1) po Administration \& Overhead | \$174,122171,228 | \$21,389858 | \$5,347465 | \$2z,1420,949 | \$223,00019,500 |
| 200 Budget \& UPWP | \$8,97971 | \$1,10345 | \$27686 | \$1,142098 | \$11,500 |
| 300 Transportation Improvement P-ogram (TIP) | \$28,1097,303 | \$3,45385 | \$86371 | \$3,575341 | \$365,000 |
| 400 Transportation System Performance Monitoring (TSPM) | \$21,8633,012 | \$2,686938 | \$671734 | \$2,780816 | \$289,0500 |
| 500 Planning Project Development | \$27,3296,133 | \$3,35736 | \$8394 | \$3,475197 | \$353,0500 |
| 600 Metropolitan Transportation Plan $\text { ( } 1 / 1 \mathrm{TP} \text { ) }$ | \$40,60238,224 | \$4,988880 | \$1,24720 | \$5,1634,676 | \$5249,000 |
| 610 MTP - Active Transportation Planning | \$380,650813 | \$4,7483,934 | \$1,187983 | \$4,9153,770 | \$439,500 |
| 620 MTP - Transit Planning | \$4,6855,071 | \$575647 | \$14462 | \$596620 | \$6,0500 |
| 630 MTP - Freight Planning, Economic Vitality \& Tourism | \$2,3420 | \$28899 | \$72] | \$29886 | \$3,000 |
| 640 MTP - Safety, Security \& Environmental Planning | \$9,37061 | \$1,15195 | \$28899 | \$1,19145 | \$12,000 |
| 700 Transportation Planning Coordination \& Public Outreach | \$78,47272,938 | \$9,640311 | \$2,410328 | \$9,9788,923 | \$10093,500 |
| 800 Transportation Modeling, Mapping \& Technical Support | \$213,472403 | \$2,638987 | \$659747 | \$2,731863 | \$27,50030,000 |
| 900 Locally Funded Activities | \$0 | \$6,800 | \$1,700 | \$9,500 | \$18,000 |
| Sub-Total for APO Staff and Cperations | \$455,99538,797 | \$62,815 | \$15,704 | \$67,4863,184 | \$602,000580,500 |
| Contract Services: David Turch \& Associates | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$48,000 | \$48,000 |
| Contract Services: Travel Demand Model Calibration \& 2050 Population Forecasts | \$112,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$28,000 | \$140,000 |
| Contract Services: Community Liaisons for Hard-to-Reach Populations | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$5,000 |
| Contract Services: Mayhew Lake Road Corridor Access Study | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$100,000 |
| donsultant Services: Opportunity Drive operations Review | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,000 | \$80,000 |
| Grand Total Expenses | \$674,797 | \$62,815 | \$15,704 | \$200,184 | \$953,500 |
| Elontract Serviees: Birch Street Redevelopment | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$25,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| TO: | Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Policy Board |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Brian Gibson, Executive Director |
| RE: | Stakeholder Engagement Plan Annual Review |
| DATE: | Sept 29,2021 |

Federal regulations require Metropolitan Planning Organizations to periodically review the effectiveness of our public input procedures and strategies to ensure a full and open participation process. The APO annually reviews our public engagement activities to gain such insights.

The attached Stakeholder Engagement Plan Review analyzes our public engagement activities between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021. Based on that analysis, the report makes the following recommendations:

1. Hybrid public input meetings - Continue researching the potential for hybrid meetings (i.e., some people in the room while some people participate remotely). The bottom line is that technology is needed in order for everyone to see and hear everyone else.
2. Post meetings on YouTube - Record and post public input meetings on YouTube as we are able to do so. Again, technology is the limiting factor.
3. Target Outreach to Black, Indigenous, and People-of-Color (BIPOC) - In 2022, the APO will undertake a pilot project to test an "ambassador" program wherein we recruit and train a member of the BIPOC community to act as our liaison and (hopefully) better engage people from that community.
4. Soliciting email addresses from people already engaged - Continue this practice
5. Survey public input participants about our process immediately after the engagement process has concluded as opposed to waiting until the end of the year - Continue this practice
6. Social media - Continue monitoring the reach and impact of various social media platforms in search of the best mix of platforms given constraints of time and money.
7. Newsletter - Continue the newsletter, but explore ways to measure its impact
8. Explore innovative tools - Research tools such as Wikimaps, mentimeter, and story maps (among others) for potential inclusion in our process.
9. Public comments - Circle back to let people know how their comments were considered and how they made a difference
10.Demographic questions - Provide a standard set of demographic questions for all consultant-lead public input processes too
The Technical Advisory Committee considered this change on September $30^{\text {th }}$ and recommended approval.
Suggested Action: Approve
