

**SAINT CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING**
Thursday, Feb. 27, 2025 @ 10 a.m.

A meeting of the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization's (APO's) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held at 10 a.m. Thursday, Feb. 27, 2025. Senior Transportation Planner Vicki Johnson presided with the following people in attendance:

Voting Members:

Matt Glaesman	City of Saint Cloud
Zac Borgerding	City of Saint Cloud
Randy Sabart	City of Saint Joseph
Kari Haakonson	City of Sartell
Mike Decker	Stearns County
Chris Byrd	Benton County
David Roedel	Sherburne County
Michael Kedrowski	Saint Cloud Metro Bus
Steve Voss	MnDOT District 3

Non-Member Attendees:

Brian Gibson	APO, Executive Director
Vicki Johnson	APO, Senior Planner
Alex McKenzie	APO, Associate Planner
Trina Ness	APO, Administrative Specialist
Angie Stenson	Bolton & Menk

Online Attendees:

Nene Israel	Saint Cloud Metro Bus
Bryan McCoy	MnDOT MPO Program Coord. Central Office
Kevin Kroll	Toole Design
Dean Chamberlain	Toole Design
Kevin Mackey	Bolton & Menk
Matt Pacyna	TC^2

1. Introductions were made.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No members of the public were present.

3. CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Approve minutes of the Feb. 6, 2025, TAC meeting
- b. Receive staff report of Jan. 27, 2025, Central Minnesota Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-3) meeting
- c. Receive staff report of Feb. 13, 2025, Policy Board meeting

Mr. Glaesman made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda items. Mr. Byrd seconded the motion. Motion carried.

4. CONSIDERATION OF FY 2025-2028 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS

Ms. Johnson stated that the APO has received a request from MnDOT's Office of Freight and Commercial Vehicle Operations to remove the FY 2026 BNSF signal replacement project at 4½ Street NE in St. Cloud. The project will be completed without federal funding. This will require an administrative modification to the TIP. No public comment period is warranted to remove this project from the APO's TIP.

Mr. Voss made a motion to recommend Policy Board approval to remove the FY 2026 BNSF signal replacement project at 4 ½ Street NE in St. Cloud. Mr. Byrd seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Ms. Johnson went on to state after the last TAC meeting the APO received notification that the cost of the CR 61 project needed to be changed. Funding consists of legislative funding with Chapter 5 Bonds and requires construction to be complete by June 30, 2025, or risk losing the \$1 million dollars in state funding. APO staff worked with MnDOT and took the reduction in costs to the Policy Board. The project went from \$1.3 million to just under \$1 million dollars. The Policy Board approved the amended cost of the project.

Ms. Johnson stated the directive from FHWA has been to suspend all projects related to NEVI. At the last TAC meeting TAC reps recommended Policy Board approval to install a NEVI charging station along the I-94 corridor. Since then, APO staff have been instructed to suspend all work on that project. Should FHWA decide to go forth with the project in the future it only needs Policy Board approval.

Mr. Voss stated there was a change in how amendments get processed at both the state and federal level. In addition to being reviewed and approved at the local division level in St. Paul, all amendments must go to Washington, D.C. for review and approval. This may result in taking extra time to have amendments approved. Ms. Johnson stated that if TAC reps have any changes to their 2025 projects to please let her know as soon as possible as the APO staff doesn't know how long the review process will take.

5. SAFE STREETS AND ROADS FOR ALL (SS4A) PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING

Ms. Stenson reviewed the topics for today's meeting:

- Project Update
- Equity Spatial Analysis
- High Injury Network (HIN) Corridor Technical Rankings:
 - Corridors by City
 - Multimodal and Equity Considerations
 - Systemic Safety Needs

- Safety Policy Discussion
- Next Steps

Ms. Stenson presented the tasks that have been completed thus far and went on to present Equity Spatial Analysis along with Mr. Pacyna. This is a required component for the SS4A Safety Action Plan and has been historically one of the five components for consideration of grant applications. She stated that the goal is to identify HIN locations within equity areas to help compare and prioritize locations within each community. The Equity Area Definitions are:

- Median Age (greater than 65 years of age)
- Median Household Income (less than 80% of the median)
- Limited English-Speaking Households (greater than 5%)
- Households with one or more people with a disability (greater than 35%)
- People of Color (greater than 45%)

The final equity spatial analysis area was developed for multiple categories, including all-modes, vehicle, motorcycle, bicycle, and pedestrian. Ms. Stenson reviewed several maps and explained the analysis by city/category.

Regarding the equity analysis, Mr. Gibson reiterated that the official guidance is we should continue doing our job as normal until/unless we receive directions from FHWA or MnDOT otherwise.

Turning to the High Injury Network (HIN) Corridor Technical Rankings, Ms. Stenson stated the purpose and need for the rankings which consists of using the HIN and Descriptive Safety Analysis (DSA) to identify:

- Top corridor projects for each municipality
- Multi-jurisdictional corridor projects
- Top corridors by mode
- Regional systemic projects

Ms. Stenson reviewed the HIN Corridor Identification Process for each jurisdiction as well as Multijurisdictional Project Opportunities. She then reviewed the next steps which are:

- Narrow down these lists to 1 project per City and provide more analysis
- Identify Multijurisdictional or Regional/Systemic Project Opportunities

Mr. Pacyna went on to explain that the equity areas are based on the census block data. All of the different categories are based off of an apples-to-apples comparison based on an area. The graphics included are a high-level overview of potential areas for improvement.

Ms. Stenson stated to think about this information and how it is being incorporated into priority corridors. The data where crashes may be overrepresented in certain areas, and also gives examples of corridor profiles, and recommendations.

Mr. Kroll went into more detail. Toole is identifying a couple of different things based off the HIN and descriptive safety analysis that was proposed in last year's process. Toole Design identified a couple of projects in each municipality as well as a couple of potential projects that crossed city lines, primarily referring to the City of St. Cloud and the City of Waite Park. Top corridors were reviewed by mode scenarios,

separate HIN, all modes together, but also focused on all of the roads together, but appeared on the bicycle, pedestrian and motorcycle HIN. They also considered regional systemic projects.

The HIN is for all modes and for individual modes as well. They tried to concentrate on all of the modes combined, but if there is a certain situation where not enough of the corridors appeared within smaller communities, they tried to look at one of the other HIN in other areas to look at projects to keep in mind for the future. HIN is ranked based on a weighted score. Fatalities (5 points), serious injuries (2 points) and minor injuries (1 point). Possible injuries and property damage only crashes are not included in the analysis as the plan is based on the safe systems approach.

Toole Design would like to highlight for St. Cloud and Waite Park specifically, the corridors with the highest scores because there are so many in those areas (indicated by orange and red). For the other areas in the APO, Toole Design expanded from there.

Mr. Kroll stated that regarding the City of St. Cloud, Toole Design identified 13 corridors on the HIN. He proceeded to review each corridor, and the mode of transportation included in the HIN, as well as the multijurisdictional projects, top pedestrian and top bicyclist corridors in the region, as well as why it met the criteria for being in the top two HIN modes. He also reviewed example corridor profiles and recommendations.

One goal is to list tables by city and match off countermeasures from a high-level countermeasure toolbox which would consist of a toolbox (general), Profiles (10 locations – 1 per, one per city), top bike and ped locations, potentially some multijurisdictional corridors and/or systemic improvement areas. The hope is to identify at least 10 locations that they would take to work on and bring back to the TAC in April. From those 10 the TAC will determine the concepts that would be used for grant applications, determining corridor profiles where you get more information and then look at specific improvements as well as zero in on the five specific concept designs at the end of the project. They are looking for projects in the 5–10-year time frame.

Ms. Stenson asked if anything is missing or is there a part of the HIN that should be added to these top lists that move forward for the countermeasure toolbox analysis? The main piece they're looking for next steps to identify the 10 corridors that we will complete countermeasure profiles on.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that they realized that MnDOT recently did a project on Hwy 10 and wanted to bring attention to the fact that data may not show improvements made within the last 5-10 years. They asked that we identify corridors where construction is being planned or has been completed.

Mr. Glaesman stated he loves the data set but is concerned about public input. He stated that if this data is expressed as a technical recommendation of here's X many numbers of things you can do on the corridor to solve a problem, great. If this data is expressed as to determine "the corridor should look like this, lane configuration, turn lanes pedestrian crossings, tools to address the problem, he doesn't believe Bolton & Menk have the funds to do the planning the correct way in

terms of public service. He is concerned that this will become more of a planning document.

Ms. Stenson stated that the intention is to improve on the technical side. Bolton & Menk is scoped to do five concept designs and cost estimates and what do those look like.

Mr. Kroll stated that the sliding window analysis looks along the roadway in 1/10 of a mile segment and picks out segments along that roadway based on the weighting.

Ms. Stenson stated that as they develop the list of 10 areas which projects on the short list should move ahead. Members have until March 13, 2025, to update Ms. Stenson on projects that they should concentrate on.

Ms. Stenson reviewed the Safety Policy Discussion. She stated there is a need for the Policy Board to have a Vision Zero Statement as part of the SS4A Plan. The statement could then be adopted by an entity as well.

She went on to state that Bolton & Menk needs to assign a year and show how the region would make progress toward that project by 2050. Coordinating with safety performance measures then defining what that looks like from a technical standpoint.

Mr. Gibson asked if each individual jurisdiction needs to take an action on this, or can the APO adopt the plan for all jurisdictions.

Ms. Stenson responded that each jurisdiction would need to create some type of resolution to accept the study at a regional level and would have to show that they are on board. Ultimately guidance should be sought from FHWA.

Ms. Johnson stated two of our three counties are represented by Stearns-Benton TZD. She will provide the mission statement, purpose, goals to Ms. Stenson to assist with the Vision Statement. Mr. Voss stated that MnDOT's Strategic Highway Safety Plan implementation plan aligns with a lot of this, and Ms. Stenson stated that she would review that plan online.

Ms. Stenson presented the goals going forward. In March they will develop technical corridor profiles, as well as the countermeasure toolbox to identify support as well as other locations. They will return in April to identify the five locations that concept design and cost estimate should be conducted on. They will return in June to present the information on concept design and cost estimate. During July and August they will refine materials and have public engagement, agency engagement, and a public comment period. They will return in September for final plan presentation. They will be looking for feedback on the safety policy discussion.

Ms. Stenson then reviewed the Safety Policy Discussion Draft Policy Statements:

- Adopt a Vision Zero statement with a goal of zero fatalities or serious injury crashes on roadways within the APO by the year 2050
- Recognize the Safe System principles
 - Death or Serious Injury is unacceptable
 - Humans make mistakes
 - Humans are vulnerable

- Responsibility is shared, Safety is proactive
- Redundancy is Crucial

She then reviewed the support and focus on the following core elements of a Safe System:

- Safe Road Users
- Safe Speeds
- Safe Vehicles
- Safe Roads
- Post-Crash Care
- Use the High Injury Network (HIN) as a planning tool to prioritize investment and help meet the Vision
- Adopt complete streets policies to ensure safe access and mobility for all users and abilities
- Achieve equity in transportation by ensuring more vulnerable communities are a priority and have improved access to safe and efficient travel options
- Create a safer roadway culture by actively partnering with other agencies and organizations to collect and share information to implement strategies and projects that will most benefit roadway safety within the APO.

Mr. Gibson stated to utilize Bolton and Menk as this is each jurisdictions plan, and the APO wants to be sure that members are getting what they need out of this. Regarding the 10 priority locations, if each jurisdiction has something that they might need, inform them and use the resources at Bolton & Menk. He also asked if it would be helpful if the APO staff identified 3 -5 alternatives and sent them to all entities for feedback. Mr. Sabart is stating that each entity will have a different priority, which may not score as highly as St. Cloud projects. Ms. Stenson reiterated that they're looking for one project per entity as well as an alternate. They are also looking for feedback on multijurisdictional pieces.

6. CONSIDERATION OF THE 2025-2029 REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PLAN (RIIP)

Ms. Johnson reviewed the history and purpose of the Regional Infrastructure Investment Plan (RIIP). She explained that while the TIP focuses only on federal and/or state funded projects, the RIIP identifies proposed improvement projects from across the MPA regardless of funding source. The RIIP is composed of approved jurisdictional CIPs and MnDOT District 3's CHIP, where projects are located, the timeframe, and coordinate with other entities. The purpose of the document is to provide a one-stop-shop for all transportation infrastructure projects occurring within the planning area, and to facilitate better interjurisdictional coordination of project development and construction.

The 2025-2029 RIIP includes projects slated to be completed in the years 2025-2029 as well as a look back at projects completed and/or delayed during the 2024 construction season. This also includes the actual construction costs as well as the percentage of the respective projects that were over or under the estimated budget to complete.

Some entities identified maps or information that was incorrect in the current RIIP. Ms. Johnson stated that she will make the amendments before presenting to the Policy Board for publication approval.

Mr. Byrd motioned to recommend Policy Board approval of the publication of the Amended 2025-2029 Regional Infrastructure Investment Plan (RIIP). Mr. Voss seconded the motion. Motion carried.

7. OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- TIP Amendments due to Ms. Johnson by March 10, 2025, anticipating May Policy Board Approval.
- Financial information and Annual Listing of Obligated Projects Information needs to be back to Ms. Johnson by March 21, 2025.
- Mr. Gibson stated that next month the APO anticipates proposing functional class changes, looking at 12-13 changes based on immediate existing condition data.
- Mr. Voss stated that changes have been made to the Corridors of Commerce Program, which was originally a legislative way to fund principle arterial roadways and trunk highways. It consists of three tiers: areas inside the 694-494 beltway (Met Council), outside of the beltway impacting counties like Isanti, Sherburne, and Wrigh. Outside of that area, rural communities would be considered the Greater Minnesota Tier. This is a new way of looking at statewide distribution for planning, environmental review, predesign and level one design in transportation programing. Applications will be sent out in the next few weeks and will run through spring.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.