

**SAINT CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING  
Thursday, August 29 @ 10 a.m.**

A meeting of the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization's (APO's) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held at 10a.m. Thursday, Aug. 29, 2024. 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
Michael Kedrowski	Saint Cloud Metro Bus
Jodi Teich	Stearns County
Chris Byrd	Benton County
Jon Noerenberg	City of Waite Park
Todd Schultz	City of Sauk Rapids
Nate Keller	City of Saint Joseph [Alternate for Randy Sabart]
Kari Haakonson	City of Sartell
Steve Voss	MnDOT District 3

Non-Member Attendees:

Brian Gibson	APO, Executive Director
Vicki Johnson	APO, Senior Planner
Alex McKenzie	APO, Associate Planner
James Stapfer	APO, Planning Technician
Trina Ness	APO, Administrative Specialist
Angie Stenson	Bolton & Menk
Robin Cauffman	Bolton & Menk
Ian Jacobson	Bolton & Menk
Dylan Edwards	Bolton & Menk

Online Attendees:

Bryan McCoy	MnDOT [Alternate for Erika Shepard]
Jeff Lenz	MnDOT District 3
Anna Pierce	MnDOT CRP Coordinator
William Lohr	FHWA
Phil Forst	FHWA
Dena Ryan	FHWA
Andrew Babb	Bolton & Menk
Kevin Kroll	Toole Design
Matt Pacyna	TC^2
David Roedel	Sherburne County

Introductions were made.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

No members of the public were present.

## **CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. Approve minutes of the July 25, 2024, TAC meeting.
- b. Receive staff report of the August 12, 2024, Central Minnesota Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-3) Meeting.
- c. Receive staff report of August 8, 2024, Policy Board meeting.

Ms. Teich requested two changes be made to the July 25 minutes. The first change was to clarify to the motion regarding the Regional Transportation Priorities List in which she stated support of the motion with the caveat that supporting the local priority projects in the Congressional Briefing Booklet would not commit APO jurisdictions/agencies to participate in the local share/match required if projects identified in the briefing booklet received federal funding. The second change Ms. Teich listed was to change what was listed under Other Business and Announcements regarding the County Engineers Conference date. She clarified the conference is the week of Martin Luther King, Jr. Day.

*Ms. Teich made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda items with the requested changes to the minutes. Mr. Keller seconded the motion. Motion carried.*

## **FUTURE REGIONAL ARTERIALS AND COLLECTORS PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT) COORDINATION DISCUSSION.**

Ms. Stenson and Mr. Babb highlighted today's topics, which were to review segments for further analysis; review and obtain feedback to confirm test future functional class for the travel demand model (TDM) run; review analysis and evaluation framework; and the schedule.

Ms. Stenson reviewed the test functional classification process and the previously identified segments which included the existing network, proposed alignments within the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and the added roadways from local plans.

Mr. Babb outlined the parameters to be used during the test model run on the future functional classification network. This included using the screening method previously used to assess the existing network on the new additions in order to assign potential functional classification for these new roadways. Mr. Babb called attention to specific corridors that Bolton & Menk staff were requesting to deviate from the screening factors to reclassify roadways ahead of the test model run. This was recommended to ensure network consistency.

TAC representatives posed a number of questions and concerns about the proposed future functional classification network and asked for additional time to review segments and provide comments prior to the test model run.

Mr. Babb stated the test model results will be analyzed, and segments will be flagged for further analysis if they:

- Fall outside the parallel spacing guidance.
- Fall outside the AADT recommendations for their future functional classification.
- Operate poorly during the test model run.
- Are located within the 2050 projected growth area.
- Impact several environmental factors such as steep slope areas, wetlands, DNR managed areas, etc.

Ms. Stenson reviewed the schedule and requested TAC representatives provide any segment-specific feedback by Sept. 6 to ensure a model run can be completed and analyzed by the Sept. 26 TAC meeting.

### **SAFE STREETS AND ROADS FOR ALL (SS4A)**

Ms. Stenson reviewed today's topics, which are the Engagement Update, Safety Plan and Policy Matrix, Equity Review Approach, Overview of Descriptive Safety Analysis, and Schedule Update.

Mr. Edwards discussed the Public Engagement Pop-Up Events in Waite Park, St. Cloud, Sartell, Sauk Rapids, and St. Joseph, as well as survey results as of Aug. 19, 2024. Mr. Edwards discussed what they've learned so far through the public engagement process which concludes on Sept. 1, 2024.

The top three objectives the public would like to see are:

- A Reduction in distracted driving.
- Safety improvements for people crossing the street.
- Increasing physical separation between people driving and people walking, rolling, or biking.

TAC representatives asked if the consultants had reached out to the local school districts given the school year was about to start. The Bolton & Menk team agreed to extend the public engagement period through Sept. 8 to allow for additional comments.

Mr. Pacyna reviewed the safety plan and policy discussion, showing existing plan elements as well as goals. Mr. Pacyna continued by presenting the following questions to the TAC members:

- Should any custom/localized "Performance Metrics" be considered?
  - Examples: Crash types, ped / bike, alcohol / drug, motorcyclist, animal.
- What categories should the APO define in its equity priority areas?
  - Baseline Categories: Age, income, race, disability status, access to a vehicle
  - Alternative Categories: School route/proximity, type of roadway or characteristic (e.g., 4-lane undivided, high-speed), land use, environmental conditions

How should the APO prioritize the equity areas?

- Option 1: High Injury Network (HIN) within any equity area or category (equally weighted)?
- Option 2: Develop a tiered HIN equity area based on 2+ or more categories?
- Option 3: Prioritize based on the number of equity area categories or a

specific equity category / ranking or performance metric?

Mr. Pacyna asked for TAC representative feedback on the proposed questions by Sept. 6.

Mr. Kroll gave an overview of the Descriptive Safety Analysis (DSA), reviewing maps and crash data. Upcoming Crash Data Analysis will consist of:

- DSA Process
  - Weather and Road Conditions
  - Travel Mode
  - Time of Day and Roadway Lighting
  - Behavioral Factors
  - Roadway Characteristics
  - Manner of Collision
  - Demographics
- High Injury Network (HIN)
- Safety Countermeasures and Solutions

Ms. Stenson reviewed the updated schedule and next steps which are to:

- Continue technical analysis on equity analysis and existing safety conditions
- Wrap up Phase 1 Public Engagement
- September TAC Meeting
  - Phase 1 Engagement Summary
  - Equity Review and Analysis
  - Existing Safety analysis with a presentation on Descriptive Safety Analysis, High Injury Network, and StreetLight Analysis introduction.

## **URBAN BELTLINE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

Mr. Gibson explained the Policy Board requested recommendations from the TAC regarding which steps in the planning and implementation process should be regionalized, and how those steps should be funded. This does not impact the 33<sup>rd</sup> Street S/Mississippi River crossing corridor environmental process. The Board's goal is to have an agreement that lives on even if board members change granting stability, predictability, and the certainty of the beltline development continuing.

Mr. Gibson presented FHWA's responses to the questions asked during the June 2024 TAC meeting:

- What are FHWA rules regarding Congressionally Directed Spending funds?
- Does FHWA still have the policy that if you're pursuing funds for one step in the project development process, they must have funding for the next step in the process?
- If a jurisdiction federalizes the environmental review step, do they have a limited number of years to complete the project before the money needs to be paid back?
- How does FHWA define the "Environmental Review" step in the project development process? Where does it begin? Where does it end?
- If we regionalize the "Environmental Review" process, but the constructing jurisdiction fails to move forward with the project, will all jurisdictions be "on the hook" to repay the cost of the "Environmental Review?"

Mr. Forst with FHWA was online to provide additional clarification to the responses to the above questions as well as take questions from TAC representatives.

Mr. Gibson asked TAC representatives to recommend to the Policy Board where the line should be drawn when it comes to regionalizing the cost participation in the beltline corridor. Additionally, he had asked TAC representatives to consider how that cost share should be handled for those regionalized components.

*Ms. Teich motioned the cost of the planning phase of any beltline project should be cost-shared among the jurisdictions according to the normal APO cost distribution formula. In addition, the local-match costs should be shared among the jurisdictions with the road authority paying 50% of the local match, and the other 50% being distributed among the jurisdictions according to the normal APO cost distribution formula with the line being drawn after scoping. Mr. Byrd seconded the motion.*

A discussion surrounding the motion took place regarding the “Tier 1 EIS” and “scoping” and how those two relate to one another in order to refine the motion further.

*Ms. Teich amended the motion to state that the cost of the planning phase of any beltline project should be cost-shared among the jurisdictions according to the normal APO cost distribution formula. For the next stage of project development, in the event federal funding (or any other outside funding) is received to complete a Tier 1 EIS, local match costs will be shared among member jurisdictions with 50% of the local share being covered by the road authority and the remaining 50% of the local match being distributed among all member jurisdictions according to the normal APO cost distribution formula. Anything after a Tier 1 EIS will be the sole responsibility of the implementing road authority jurisdiction. Mr. Byrd seconded the motion.*

*Ms. Johnson conducted a roll-call vote.*

*Those in favor of the motion: **Kedrowski, Haakonson, Keller, Norenberg, Byrd, Schultz, and Teich.***

*Those opposed to the motion: **Borgerding and Glaseman.***

*Those who abstained: **Voss.***

*Motion carried.*

## **CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL 2025-2028 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) DRAFT**

Ms. Johnson gave an update of the 2025-2028 TIP stating that the public comment period ran from July 17 to Aug. 16, 2024. There was also an in-person open house which one person attended, and a Facebook Live open house with no responses.

Public outreach included 12 online surveys with 52 responses, WJON story, emails to interested persons/stakeholder list, Facebook/Instagram posts, The Oxcart newsletter article, and legal notice in the St. Cloud Times. The final changes to the draft included incorporating the public comments and staff disposition into Chapter 5 of the TIP as well as Appendix C of the document.

Ms. Johnson is in the process of finalizing the individual comment packets and she will send them to the TAC representatives as well as the Policy Board.

*Ms. Haakonson motioned to recommend Policy Board approval of the 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) draft as presented. Mr. Byrd seconded the motion. Motion carried.*

## **CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM (CRP) REGIONAL PRIORITIES DISCUSSION**

Mr. McKenzie updated TAC representatives on the answers received to the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) questions raised at the July 25 TAC meeting. Ms. Pierce was also online to help further clarify those responses.

1. Is it allowed to assign different weights for cost-benefit scores under each carbon reduction strategy? For instance, if the TAC wants to prioritize electrification, can projects under this category have a cost-benefit share of 80% and a co-benefits share of 20%, while travel options have a 70% cost-benefit share and a 30% co-benefits share?

Ms. Teich clarified that she was asking if we want to prioritize electrification. So other projects, like trails or sidewalks, because we don't want to eliminate them. If we could reduce their score to 70% of their total score. Not give a higher weight or a lower weight to the cost-share. Because the cost-share is going to win the money regardless. Ms. Teich was wondering if we could just say, let's hypothetically say the scores are out of 100, and two scores got 90, well the bike trail or the sidewalk connection would be 80% or 80-90% of their overall score. We're not eliminating project types. So regardless of what we're going to do with the cost-share, the cost-share is going to win.

Ms. Pierce stated that the score would already be adjusted. If you have a policy stating that in the event of a tie, the prioritization is going to electrification. That would be fine.

2. Instead of inputting the total project costs into the Carbon Emission Tool, can the applicant calculate their cost-effectiveness based on the amount of CRP funds they are requesting?

Ms. Johnson stated that based off of the ATP development committee's meeting with Ms. Pierce last week, she reiterated that this program is to focus on carbon reduction. So altering the project cost to the requested amount versus the actual project cost would be disingenuous.

3. Are there plans to adjust the process for the upcoming solicitation?

Ms. Pierce stated that they are looking at adjusting the scoring options.

Mr. McKenzie then reviewed the Scoring Rubric Options – Cost-Effectiveness.

However, based upon further discussions, TAC representatives requested to table this action and asked that APO staff return in September with a list of options for TAC representatives to take into consideration regarding CRP.

## **CENTRAL MINNESOTA AREA TRANSPORTATION PARTNERSHIP (ATP-3) MANAGED PROGRAM FORMULA DISTRIBUTION FORMULA**

Mr. Stapfer presented information on how the state of Minnesota distributes the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) funding targets to each of the ATPs based on the 2020 Census population (50%) and 2023 system needs for the County-State Aid Highways (CSAHs) and Municipal State Aid Streets (MSASs) (50%). This distribution applies to all ATPs with the exception of the Met Council area which receives STBGP funding targets solely based on population.

Mr. Stapfer proceeded with leading a discussion as to whether APO staff should seek to inquire about a distribution target formula change. APO staff proceeded to provide comparisons between the three regions (Region 5, Region 7E, and Region 7W/Saint Cloud APO) to review the changes in population growth and state aid system needs. If ATP-3's target distribution formula were to match the way the state distributes funds to the ATPs, this would result in the following:

- Region 5's new target would be 28.20%, down from the current 32.65%.
- Region 7E's new target would be 12.87%, down from the current 13.82%.
- Region 7W/Saint Cloud APO's new target would be 58.93%, up from the current 53.53%.

*Ms. Teich motioned to recommend Policy Board approval to proceed with inquiry to ATP-3 regarding funding formulas. Mr. Norenberg seconded the motion. Motion carried. Mr. Voss abstained.*

## **CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL 2025-2028 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) AMENDMENT SCHEDULE**

Ms. Johnson presented the proposed 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Schedule.

*Ms. Teich motioned to approve the 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Schedule. Mr. Noerenberg seconded the motion. Motion carried.*

## **CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL 2026-2029 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE**

Ms. Johnson presented the final 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program Development Schedule.

*Mr. Noerenberg motioned to approve the 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Development Schedule. Mr. Voss seconded the motion. Motion carried.*

Ms. Johnson will confirm/update dates and send them out via email.

## **OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1 p.m.