

**SAINT CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING**

***Thursday, July 27 @ 10:00 a.m.***

A meeting of the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization's (APO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held at 10:00 a.m. Thursday, July 27, 2023. Senior Transportation Planner Vicki Johnson presided with the following people in attendance:

Voting Members:

Luke Langer	City of Saint Cloud
Zac Borgerding	City of Saint Cloud
Matt Glaesman	City of Saint Cloud
Michael Kedrowski	Saint Cloud Metro Bus
Jon Noerenberg	City of Waite Park
Chris Byrd	Benton County
Andrew Witter	Sherburne County
Jodi Teich	Stearns County
Kari Theisen	City of Sartell
Steve Voss	MnDOT District 3
Randy Sabart	City of Saint Joseph
Scott Hedlund	City of Sauk Rapids

Non-Member Attendees:

Alex McKenzie	APO, Associate Planner
James Stapfer	APO, Planning Technician
Joe DeVore	KLJ Project Manager
Brian Gibson	APO, Executive Director
Vicki Johnson	APO, Senior Planner

Zoom Attendees

Sheri Wegner	ConnectAbility of MN, Executive Director
Jeff Lenz	MnDOT District 3
Haifeng Xiao	KLJ, TDM Modeler
Erika Shepard	MnDOT MPO Coordinator
Angie Tomovic	MnDOT DSA

Introductions were made.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

No members of the public were present.

**CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. Approve minutes of the May 25, 2023, TAC meeting.

- b. Receive staff report of June 8, 2023, Policy Board meeting.
- c. Receive staff report of June 15, 2023, Central Minnesota Area Transportation partnership (ATP-3) meeting.

***Mr. Byrd made a motion to approve Consent Agenda Items. Ms. Teich seconded the motion. Motion carried.***

### **Consideration of the 2050 MTP Cost and Initial 2050 Build Travel Demand Model Results.**

Mr. DeVore presented project costs and travel demand model results for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Mr. Byrd asked about collector roadways showing a 206% increase in delay in the no-build scenario and if that means the commuter's time will be tripled. Mr. DeVore responded that the 206% increase in delay isn't area wide delay. However, several roadways are experiencing large amounts of delay, going from 20 seconds to a minute and a half of delay, which are overrepresented. Mr. Voss asked if the Interstate is only I-94. Mr. DeVore confirmed that. Mr. Voss added that expressways would be roadways like MN 15 and US 10. Mr. Voss asked how the short, mid, and long-term time bands were established for cost estimates. Ms. Johnson responded that the APO looked at historical expenditures for each jurisdiction and assumed a three percent inflation yearly. The jurisdictions prioritized each project, and once cost estimates were developed, the APO tried to fit each project within a time band, with the highest-rated projects in the short time band. Mr. DeVore stated that KLJ included all projects within MnDOT's CHIP and grouped them into reconstruction. Mr. Voss stated there might be a disconnect between the CHIP and what is being shown, and also, in the list, there are a lot of MNDOT reconstruction projects, but they are not listed that way in the CHIP. Mr. Gibson stated that it's a wording choice in the MTP. The MTP only looks at expansion and reconstruction projects, so overlays would be considered reconstruction in the MTP. Mr. Voss and Mr. Lenz will work with the APO and KLJ on a solution. Mr. Byrd stated that Benton CSAH 29 is shown as overcapacity in the build scenario but is included as a three-lane expansion project; what else can be done to improve the situation? Mr. DeVore responded that intersection capacity improvements might be made to improve the corridor. Mr. Xiao told the group there aren't intersection capacity improvements in the model, but changing the functional classification or the project from a divided roadway would add more capacity. Mr. DeVore concludes that microsimulation isn't possible at this level, and maybe this corridor warrants a more in-depth study. Mr. Gibson added that projects must be in the MTP to be eligible for federal funding and that the UPWP is meant to help implement MTP projects, such as doing corridor studies. Ms. Theisen asked if the project costs are accounting for just construction costs. Mr. DeVore confirmed but added that the cost and a 15% contingency included right-of-way acquisition. Ms. Theisen added that she may have a couple of project changes and will send them to Ms. Johnson. Mr. Langer asked about receiving congressionally directed spending from the State for University Drive and how that relates to the TIP. Ms. Johnson will ask Ms. Shepard. Mr. Gibson added that KLJ will

also be modeling the build scenario with the beltline projects added. Mr. Byrd asked if intersection improvements need to be added to the MTP, and if those intersections intersect with a MnDOT corridor, would MnDOT also need to add that project? Mr. Gibson said MnDOT would need to be on board to show the project. Mr. Witter asked how the beltline scenario plays into the fiscal constraint of the plan. Mr. Gibson said the beltline isn't fiscally constrained but is modeled to show how it will impact the network and its need. Mr. Witter added that Sherburne County has leftover money that could be used to show some beltline projects. Mr. Gibson received verbal confirmation to show proposed projects.

***Discussion item only.***

### **Consideration of the draft Looking Ahead 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Transportation Visioning Themes**

Ms. Johnson presented the draft Metropolitan Transportation Visioning Themes. Through the course of approximately two years, APO staff researched, developed, and conducted a visioning process. During this time, APO staff documented nearly 2,000 responses through a variety of means, including both in-person and online engagement strategies. Each of these responses was recorded and categorized into six themes in which the public believes the region should be heading by planning horizon 2050. The second public engagement period, which ran from early December through January 2023, asked the public to weigh in if these six visioning themes should remain a priority for the region as APO staff moved into the latter half of the MTP development – including project identification. During this second public input period, staffers received nearly 160 survey responses. In addition, staffers hosted or participated in seven in-person meetings and held three focus groups with students from all three Boys and Girls Clubs of Central Minnesota locations. Overall, responses reaffirmed APO staff's proposed visioning themes. Ms. Teich asked if the priority ranking of themes had anything to do with outreach to certain focus groups. Ms. Johnson said possible, but most of the APO's outreach was after the themes were developed. Mr. Voss stated that the themes will help with strategies, goals, and objectives in the MTP and can also influence the scoring criteria of STGBP funding. Ms. Teich asked if the scoring criteria for the STGBP funding were altered, it would do so by the TAC and be sent to the Policy Board. Ms. Johnson confirmed and added that the goals in the MTP will be input into the STGBP scoring criteria. Ms. Teich asked if the MTP would show the priority order, and Ms. Johnson stated that it would be in the appendices. Ms. Johnson clarified that the priority rankings are how the public felt was most important to them, not necessarily what the TAC thinks is the most important.

***Mr. Noerenberg made a motion to recommend Policy Board approval of the draft Looking Ahead 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Visioning Themes. Mr. Borgerding seconded the motion. Motion carried.***

### **Consideration of the draft Saint Cloud APO Urbanized Area Boundary**

Mr. Stapfer presented the draft Saint Cloud APO Urbanized Boundary. The urban area boundaries must be adjusted to reflect population changes after each decennial census. Mr. Byrd asked about the difference between the urbanized area and the APO's planning boundary. Mr. Voss stated that there are different spacing guidelines for functionally classified roadways once an area is considered urban versus rural, which is one reason the urbanized boundary matters. Mr. Gibson added that there is a potential funding impact, such as transit funding. Any route not within the urbanized boundary has a different funding source. Another reason Mr. Gibson brought up was that when the urbanized area exceeds the APO's planning boundary, new townships or cities, such as Lyden Township, may be eligible for inclusion into the APO. Ms. Johnson brought up the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) and funding eligibility within and outside the urbanized area boundaries. Mr. Voss mentioned that STGBP funding allocation has population thresholds based on the urbanized population. Mr. Gibson stated that there are guidelines for what areas can be included in the urbanized area boundary. Ms. Johnson brought up Mr. Sabart's email about including future development areas in the boundary. Mr. Gibson stated that any area that may develop within the next 20 years could be added to the boundary. Mr. Witter added in future schools and if the airport should be included in the boundary. Mr. Gibson questioned if the airport was a significant traffic generator and if the distance would fit the guidance. Mr. Byrd asked if there is guidance or rules on how much we can expand the boundary. Mr. Stapfer responded with a half mile to one and a half miles from the proposed urbanized area boundary.

***Discussion item only.***

### **Consideration of the 2024-2025 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Gibson presented on the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The UPWP is both our budget and our work plan. It identifies funding sources, revenues, expenditures, and the tasks we expect to accomplish each calendar year. Mr. Gibson needs to provide an UPWP to MnDOT by Sept. 1 each year to ensure our funding is properly obligated before Jan. 1 of the following year. Ms. Teich asked if budget increases could be reviewed earlier in the year before the counties and cities pass their budgets. Mr. Gibson stated that he would try.

***Ms. Teich made a motion to approve the 2024-2025 Unified Planning Work Program. Ms. Theisen seconded the motion. Motion carried. Mr. Voss abstained from voting.***

### **Consideration of the 2023 Regional Transportation Priorities**

Mr. Gibson presented the 2023 regional transportation priorities. Each year the APO Board Chair and Executive Director travel to Washington DC to meet with members of Congress (or their senior staff) to present the APO's regional transportation

priorities. Mr. Voss stated that 10% of the Corridors of Commerce grant money is being held back for planning and design work. Mr. Gibson stated that he is looking for regional priorities that can't be funded merely in local dollars. Options could include the Mississippi River crossing or an environmental study of the beltline. Ms. Teich mentioned that the Mississippi River crossing has independent utility even if the rest of the beltline was never constructed. Mr. Byrd questioned whether the TAC was ready to commit to constructing the beltline before the bridge was built. Mr. Byrd stated that CSAH 29 has no funding for the corridor yet, and Ms. Teich agreed that corridor is regionally important. Ms. Teich also stated that it is too early to request the University Drive bridge expansion money. Mr. Witter asked where MnDOT is with the US 10 improvement between Saint Cloud and Clear Lake. Mr. Voss stated they received funding for phase 1 of the study, but specifics haven't been solidified. Ms. Teich asked if HWY 15 would be a priority since Corridors of Commerce money isn't guaranteed. Mr. Gibson feels like it's a top priority of the region, but since there is interest at the state level, the ask might not be needed, but he will add it. Mr. Gibson stated that the three priorities he has now are HWY 15, US 10, and CSAH 29

**Ms. Teich made a motion to approve the 2023 Regional Transportation Priorities. Mr. Byrd seconded the motion. Motion carried. Mr. Voss abstained from voting.**

#### **Other Business and Announcements**

Ms. Johnson stated that the TIP is out for public comment until August 11.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.