



*Saint Cloud*  
**Area Planning Organization**

---

1040 County Road 4, St. Cloud, MN 56303-0643

(320) 252-7568 • (320) 252-6557 (FAX) • E-mail: [admin@stcloudapo.org](mailto:admin@stcloudapo.org) • [www.stcloudapo.org](http://www.stcloudapo.org)

**AGENDA**

Technical Advisory Committee

Thursday, February 1, 2018 – 10 AM

Stearns County Highway Department  
455 28th Ave. South, Waite Park

1. Consider Minutes of January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2017
  - a. Suggested Motion: Recommend Approval
2. Public Comment Period
3. Prioritize TIP STPBG funding list
  - a. Suggested Motion: Recommend Approval
4. Other Business / Open Floor
5. Adjournment

*St. Cloud APO meeting facilities will be accessible to mobility impaired individuals. If translation or interpretative services are required, the St. Cloud APO will make a good faith effort to accommodate these requests if time and resources permit. Please contact Dorothy Sweet at the St. Cloud APO 320-252-7568 at least three days in advance of the meeting if these special accommodations are required.*

**Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES  
January 4, 2018**

A regular meeting of the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization's (APO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held on Thursday, January 4, 2018 at Stearns County Public Works. Joseph Mueller, APO's Senior Planner, presided with the following members present:

Jodi Teich	Stearns County
Jon Halter	Sartell/SEH
Todd Schultz	Sauk Rapids
Matt Glaesman	Saint Cloud
Steve Foss	Saint Cloud
Kurt Franke	State Non-Motorized Transportation Committee
Steve Voss	MnDOT Dist #3
Chris Byrd	Benton County
Jim Perez	Metro Bus
Nancy Lahr	Metro Bus
Joseph Mueller	Saint Cloud APO

Additionally, the following people were also in attendance:

Brian Gibson	Saint Cloud APO
Doug Diedrichsen	Saint Cloud APO
Vicki Ikeogu	Saint Cloud APO
Dorothy Sweet	Saint Cloud APO

Mr. Mueller announced one modification to the Agenda. Number 6 on the agenda is for Information Only and does not need approval.

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2017:**

Mr. Mueller noted a change in the December minutes regarding the TIP conversation. The corrected minutes pertaining to that subject were included in everyone's packet.

***Mr. Voss motioned to approve the corrected December 7, 2017 TAC meeting minutes, and Ms. Teich seconded the motion. Motion carried.***

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:**

No public comments were received.

**UPWP AMENDMENT:**

Mr. Gibson briefly reviewed the UPWP, which is the annual work plan and budget. When the 2018 budget was developed, it was assumed that unspent Federal funds from previous years would be available, and the unspent funds were incorporated into the budget. However, the APO has since been informed that those unspent funds will not be available in FY 2018, which requires us to amend the UPWP. The changes affect 2018 consultative services as follows:

- Delaying the APO website until 2019
- Reducing the Federal match and total budget for the Travel Demand Model Support

- Removing the Federal funds from the Saint Cloud CSAH 7 Corridor Study Refresh and instead using \$20,000 from the City of Saint Cloud and \$80,000 in APO local funds to complete the project.
- Removing Federal funds from the Benton County ADA Transition Plan and instead using \$36,000 from Benton County and \$24,000 in APO local funds to complete the project.

The changes will reduce Federal funding from \$612,137 to \$441,010 and Total Funding from \$877,250 to \$810,434. Grants will now be administered using FHWA guidelines instead of FTA. **Mr. Glaesman motioned to approve the UPWP Amendment, and Ms. Teich seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

#### **HIGHWAY 23 COALITION – LETTER OF SUPPORT:**

The Minnesota Highway 23 Coalition is soliciting letters of support for Corridors of Commerce grant applications to widen MN-23 from two lanes to four lanes between Paynesville and Richmond. Although the project area lies outside the APO's planning area, MN-23 is an important corridor to the Saint Cloud metropolitan area. Any improvements along the corridor will likely impact our economy. A draft letter of support and resolution was presented to the TAC members for their recommendation of support to the Board. **Ms. Teich motioned to approve the letter of support, the resolution and to make a recommendation to the Board to support this endeavor. Mr. Byrd seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

#### **CONGRESSIONAL LOBBYING PRIORITIES LIST:**

Mr. Gibson presented last year's priority list for the TAC members to review and update. The priorities list is typically used during the annual Washington trip and trips to St. Paul to meet with local legislators. Last year smaller projects were added to the list, and this was well received. Mr. Halter noted that the 50<sup>th</sup> Avenue project in Sartell was completed last year and can be removed from the list. Mr. Voss noted that there is an I-94 corridor study from Albertville to Saint Cloud currently underway. The TAC members discussed whether the funding inequity issue was a state or federal issue. A word substitution was recommended on one of the priorities (miles vs needs). Mr. Voss described that when MAP-21 was guiding the principles of distribution, our area had significant gains. However, the formula that is being used now has changed and we no longer benefit to the extent we did under the previous formula. The booklet used last year did not prioritize the projects. The TAC members declined to prioritize any of the projects, and felt that should be left up to the Executive or Policy Boards. Ms. Teich suggested rewording the description of Heatherwood Road project, and Mr. Glaesman felt the project should be recharacterized. **Mr. Gibson asked the members to send an email or call him with any changes or updates or bring suggestions to the February meeting.**

#### **STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN (SEP):**

Ms. Ikeogu reviewed and summarized the Stakeholder Engagement Plan which updates the APO's 2012 Public Participation Plan and has been combined with an updated version of the Title VI Compliance Plan. The draft has been reviewed by Ms. Retzlaff, from MnDOT, and Mr. Perez, Metro Bus. **Feedback from TAC members was requested by January 19.** MnDOT's Title 6 office will be contacting Ms. Ikeogu. After all changes are incorporated into the plan and approximately one week after January 19, a 45-day

public comment period will take place. A new Social Media Policy, which applies to APO staff only, has been added.

Mr. Franke raised the question of what part does public participation play when creating the priorities list? Mr. Gibson responded that in the past we have not considered public comment in the creation of the priorities list, but rather we assumed that the elected officials on the Executive and Policy boards have discussed this with and received feedback from their constituents.

Mr. Voss said last year MnDOT adopted their own public involvement policy. As a result of that process, MnDOT has created a new position for a Public Engagement Coordinator in each district.

#### **2045 POPULATION/DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS REPORT:**

Mr. Gibson noted that this agenda item will not be discussed at this meeting. He apologized for the fact that the final numbers received from the consultant were incorrect and this was not realized until after the agenda was sent out. The information is being reworked and the correct figures and information will be presented at a future meeting. A request was made for a larger font on the charts on the corrected report.

#### **TIP MODIFICATION: ST. CLOUD TA FUND TIMELINE CHANGE: 33<sup>RD</sup> ST S PROJECT:**

Mr. Mueller reviewed Saint Cloud's request for TIP Modification. The City is requesting funds be moved from 2021 to 2018 with payback to 2021 on a 33<sup>rd</sup> Street South project. This would allow the project to keep on schedule and avoid another federal review pending ATP approval. The scope of the project does not change, just the year the money is spent. District 3 MnDOT staff have confirmed that there is no MnDOT policy that would prevent this shift with approval from the ATP. ***Ms. Teich motioned to approve the TIP modification, and Mr. Halter seconded the motion. Motion carried.***

#### **TIP DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE:**

Mr. Diedrichsen, the APO's GIS/Multi-modal staff person, created a TIP Development Schedule with contains the various deadlines. The Schedule follows the ATP timeline fairly closely. Dates and deadlines are indicated on the schedule. ***Mr. Byrd motioned to approve the TIP Development Schedule as created by Mr. Diedrichsen, and Ms. Teich seconded the motion. Motion carried.***

#### **TIP SOLICITATIONS REMINDER:**

Mr. Diedrichsen noted that TIP solicitation deadline for FY 2019-2023 projects is due on January 5. One project for 2022-23 from Sauk Rapids has been received.

In response to Mr. Voss's question about TAP projects received, Mr. Mueller said that one TAP project request from Sartell has been received.

#### **BNSF RAIL CORRIDOR ABANDONMENT:**

Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF) is filing for abandonment of a portion of railroad on the east side of St. Cloud, adjacent to the border with Sauk Rapids in Benton County. In conversations with Freight & Rail at MnDOT, it was suggested to Mr. Mueller that a

local entity take ownership of this section because once abandoned, anyone can purchase it. MnDOT is not interested in adding the land to the rail bank. A Rails-to-Trails route was briefly considered, but a long term lease with BSNF would be required, and BSNF could choose to end the lease at any time in the future. Two suggestions are recommended for consideration:

- 1) Use the corridor as a start to multimodal trail corridor that would depart eastward towards Foley and the Milaca region.
- 2) Use a portion of the abandoned corridor (nearest the current St. Cloud Amtrak station) as a potential north-end maintenance garage and siding for a future NorthStar Rail Commuter Train expansion up to Saint Cloud. The remaining portion of the corridor to the east not necessary for NorthStar's needs would then be used for a multimodal trail.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting was adjourned at 10:58 a.m.

APO PROJECT ASSESSMENT EVALUATION WORKSHEET		OVERALL RANKING	
Agency Name: _____		Project (Work) Type: _____	
Route No.: _____ &/or Street Name: _____			
Beginning Termini: _____		Ending Termini: _____	
Project Qualification	Comments	Rank - (H)igh (M)edium (L)ow	
<p><b>Access and Mobility</b> - Explain how the project increases the accessibility and mobility options for people and freight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implements access management strategies/techniques</li> <li>Improves level of service (LOS) by enhancing facility capacity</li> <li>Reduces travel time</li> <li>Eliminates/reduces freight impediments/bottlenecks</li> </ul>	<p>&lt; 5,000 ADT = Low (L) 5,000-10,000 = Medium (M) &gt; 10,000 = High (H)</p> <p>Must demonstrate improvements. Additional bump for "Low" if improvement accommodates heavy truck, improves access spacing (i.e. access closures/consolidation), etc.</p>		
<p><b>System Connectivity</b> - Explain how the project enhances the integration and connectivity of the transportation system for people and freight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fulfills region's functional classification goals</li> <li>Promotes multi-jurisdictional/regional projects</li> <li>Supports system development (e.g., 10-ton route, etc.)</li> <li>Involves multiple partners</li> </ul>	<p>Improves urban/rural collector = Low (L) Improves urban/rural arterial = Medium (M) Improves urban/rural principal = High (H)</p> <p>One additional bump for "Low or Medium" if improvement (based on above) that connects/involves multiple jurisdictions, AND if improvement increases roadway to 10-ton capacity.</p>		
<p><b>Multimodal</b> - Explain how the project promotes walking, bicycling, transit, and other modes as an integral component of the transportation system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accommodates pedestrians (e.g., sidewalks)</li> <li>Accommodates bicycles (e.g., bike lanes, trails)</li> <li>Accommodates pedestrians, bicycles, and other modes (e.g., CS)</li> </ul>	<p>No multimodal accommodations = Low (L) One of the following: sidewalk, bikeway, wide shoulder, or transit accommodation (M)</p> <p>Two of the following: sidewalk, bikeway, wide shoulder, or transit accommodation (H)</p>		
<p><b>System Condition</b> - Explain the current system conditions and how this project will preserve or enhance the transportation infrastructure and/or operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improves pavement condition (e.g., ride quality index (RQI) or equivalent rating)</li> <li>Improves bridge condition (e.g., sufficiency rating)</li> <li>Improves drainage condition</li> <li>Achieves state-aid design requirements</li> </ul>	<p>&lt; 10 Year Old Pavement (YOP) = Low (L) 10-19 YOP = Medium (M) &gt; 20 YOP = High (H)</p> <p><b>AND/OR</b> RQI 3.1 – 5.0 = Low (L)      SR &gt;80 = Low (L) RQI 2.1 – 3.0 = Medium (M)      SR 50-80 = Medium (M) RQI 0.0 – 2.0 = High (H)      SR &lt;50 = High (H)</p>		
<p><b>Safety</b> - Explain how the project or elements of the project may improve safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implements local safety plan strategies</li> <li>Preserves safety infrastructure/appurtenances (turn lanes, signals, signs, etc.)</li> <li>Addresses public right of way accessibility guidelines (PROWAG)</li> <li>Implements traffic calming techniques/strategies</li> </ul>	<p>Little to no safety improvements = Low (L) Few safety improvements included as part of project (i.e. striping &amp; signing but no rumble) = Medium (M) Major multiple safety improvements (i.e. PROWAG/ADA, new/expanded shoulder, and new signing, striping, &amp; OR sig. (projected) reduction in crashes or improving facility with fatal/serious crashes = High (H)</p>		
<p><b>Economic Vitality</b> - Explain how the project supports the economic dev. &amp; job retention/creation goals in the community &amp; region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improves commercial/industrial access</li> <li>Promotes economic development plans and recruitment efforts</li> </ul>	<p>No direct link to improved economy (i.e. improvement to commercial/industrial = Low (L) Improves structural capacity or access = Medium (M) Improvement is referenced in jurisdiction economic dev. plan or improves structural capacity AND access = High (H)</p>		
<p><b>Cost Justification</b> – Explain why the project is a sound investment for the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers lower cost alternatives before selecting preferred alternative</li> <li>Considers benefit-cost in overall evaluation of project</li> </ul>	<p>Little or no documentation/Low B/C = Low (L) Documentation supports investment = Med (M)</p> <p>Detailed cost analysis/study with innovative results = High (H)</p>		

**Equity** - What was the last year the jurisdiction received federal aid for a construction project? \_\_\_\_\_

--

--

**REGION XX 2022 LOCALLY-SPONSORED FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION CANDIDATE PROJECT RANKING**

PROJECT NUMBER	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	ROUTE NUMBER	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED COST & FUNDING SOURCE			FUNCTIONAL CLASS	WORK TYPE	MILES	STP POPULATION CATEGORY	Project Qualifications Factors							OVERALL RANKING	REGIONAL PRIORITY	COMMENTS	APO Staff Rank Recommendation
				FEDERAL \$	LOCAL \$	TOTAL \$					Access & Mobility	System Connectivity	Multimodal	System Condition	Safety	Economic Vitality	Equity				
	Stearns Co.	CSAH 75	Rehabilitate concrete pavement from 15th Ave in Waite Park to Park Ave. in St. Cloud along Division St.	\$880,000	\$220,000	\$1,100,000	Urban Principal Arterial		1.40		x	x	x	x	x	x				1	
	Stearns Co.	Co. Rd. 134	Resurfacing	\$480,000.00	\$120,000.00	\$600,000.00	Urban Minor Arterial & Collector		1.5		x	x	x	x	x	x				2	
	St. Cloud	Cooper Ave. S.	Conversion from rural type roadway to an urban roadway with 2 traffic lanes, bike lanes and sidewalks.	\$2,000,000	\$500,000	\$2,500,000	Urban Collector		0.60		x	x	x	x	x	x				3	
	St. Cloud	22nd St. S.	Conversion from rural type roadway to an urban roadway with 2 traffic lanes, bike lanes and sidewalks.	\$2,080,000	\$520,000	\$2,600,000	Urban Collector		0.76		x	x	x	x	x	x				5	
	Sauk Rapids	2nd Ave. S.	Reconstruction with utilities improvements	\$1,112,000	\$278,000	\$1,390,000	Urban Major Collector		0.37		x	x	x	x	x	x				6	
	Sartell	19th Ave. S.	Reconstruction with utilities improvements	\$2,925,000	\$1,905,000	\$4,830,000	Urban Major Collector		1.30		x	x	x	x	x	x				7	
	Benton Co.	CSAH 1	Resurfacing	\$840,000	\$210,000	\$1,050,000	Rural Minor Arterial		3.50		x	x	x	x	x	x				4	
				\$10,317,000	\$3,753,000	\$14,070,000															



*Saint Cloud*  
**Area Planning Organization**

---

1040 County Road 4, St. Cloud, MN 56303-0643

(320) 252-7568 • (320) 252-6557 (FAX) • E-mail: [admin@stcloudapo.org](mailto:admin@stcloudapo.org) • [www.stcloudapo.org](http://www.stcloudapo.org)

**TO:** Saint Cloud APO Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Douglas Diedrichsen, APO Transportation Planner II  
**RE:** APO Federal Funding Set-aside in FY 2021 of \$287,420  
**DATE:** Feb. 1, 2018

The St. Cloud APO has a federal funding set-aside in the current STIP/TIP in fiscal year 2021 with \$287,420. Project number 8803-APO-21. This set-aside was set up last year because the APO did not program fully to its target in its FY 2020/2021 solicitation.

It has been advised by MnDOT that the APO program the \$287,420 remaining in Fiscal Year 2021 in addition to your plans to program fiscal years 2022 and 2023 with the fiscal year regional sub targets of \$1,970,880.00.

Discussion item:

- How should the remaining \$287,420 for FY 2021 be programmed?

Options:

- Do any jurisdictions have a project that could be ready by 2021 and can be matched while maintaining fiscal constraint?
- Do any jurisdictions have projects in 2021 that they have over matched?
- Competitive process based on need?
- Should the money be used by the APO to hire consultants to research long range planning for metro wide projects? (I.e. Ring road siting potential, Metro Area Bypass)
- Other options proposed by TAC members