

**SAINT CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING
Thursday, Sept. 26 @ 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, Sept. 26, 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
David Roedel	Sherburne County
Jon Noerenberg	City of Waite Park
Todd Schultz	City of Sauk Rapids
Randy Sabart	City of Saint Joseph
April Ryan	City of Sartell [Alternate for Kari Haakonson]
Steve Voss	MnDOT District 3

Non-Member Attendees:

Vicki Johnson	APO, Senior Planner
Alex McKenzie	APO, Associate Planner
James Stapfer	APO, Planning Technician
Trina Ness	APO, Administrative Specialist
Bryan McCoy	MnDOT

Online Attendees:

Brian Gibson	APO, Executive Director
Erika Shepard	MnDOT

Introductions were made.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No members of the public were present.

CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Approve minutes of the Aug. 29, 2024, TAC meeting.
- b. Receive staff report of Sept. 12, 2024, Policy Board meeting.

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

CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL DRAFT LOOKING AHEAD 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

Ms. Johnson explained that by federal regulation, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) must be updated at least every five years. The last MTP was approved on Oct. 30, 2019. APO staff are finalizing the development of the 2050 MTP – Looking Ahead 2050.

As the region’s long-range, multimodal, surface transportation plan, the MTP establishes a vision for transportation in the region, along with establishing goals, objectives, and performance measures. The MTP also documents the significant transportation projects which are eligible for future federal funding assistance by virtue of being included in the MTP.

Ms. Johnson reviewed the public engagement process taken as well as the steps that have gone into developing the MTP.

Mr. Norenberg motioned to recommend Policy Board approval of the final draft Looking Ahead 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Mr. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF PM1: TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; PM2: INFRASTRUCTURE; AND PM3: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE FEDERAL PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Mr. Stapfer presented the history and process behind performance measures (PMs) as a result of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act and the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. State DOTs and MPOs are required to establish targets for each performance measure developed by both the FHWA and FTA. Additionally, the FAST Act included requirements for state DOTs and MPOs to establish targets for various performance measures. These targets set measurable benchmarks for FTA, FHWA, state DOTs and MPOs to easily track their progress on safety, pavement condition, and system reliability goals. This performance-based approach is meant to improve accountability of Federal transportation investments, assess risks related to different performance levels, and increase transparency.

Mr. Stapfer reviewed the performance measures from 2023 for each category along with the proposed targets for MnDOT and the APO for 2025. Overall, the targets established by MnDOT have been determined to be of limited value to the APO, especially when compared with the existing conditions and priorities of the APO. Therefore, APO staff have developed the following targets for consideration by the TAC and approval by the Policy Board.

PM1: Transportation Safety

Performance Measure	Proposed 2025 Target
Fatalities	7.8
Fatality Rate (per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (100 MVMT))	0.607
Serious Injuries	23.0

Performance Measure	Proposed 2025 Target
Serious Injury Rate (per 100 MVMT)	1.946
Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	6.2

PM2: Infrastructure

Performance Measure	Proposed 2023 Target	Proposed 2025 Target
Interstate Pavement in Good Condition	90%	90%
Interstate Pavement in Poor Condition	1%	1%
Non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) Pavement in Good Condition	65%	65%
Non-Interstate NHS Pavement in Poor Condition	1%	1%
NHS Bridges in Good Condition	60%	60%
NHS Bridges in Poor Condition	1%	1%

PM3: System Performance

Performance Measure	Proposed 2023 Target	Proposed 2025 Target
Interstate Travel Time Reliability	100%	100%
Non-Interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability	91%	91%
Interstate Truck Travel Time Reliability	1.22	1.22

Mr. Byrd recommended Policy Board approval/adoption of the recommended performance measures. Mr. Glaesman seconded the motion. Motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF THE SAINT CLOUD APO-MANAGED CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM (CRP) REGIONAL PRIORITIES AND SOLICITATION GUIDANCE

Mr. McKenzie provided a brief recap of the Aug. 29 TAC meeting discussion regarding CRP, and the items the TAC charged APO staff with regarding reviewing the scoring rubric to better reflect the APO’s priorities.

The APO has used MnDOT’s scoring criteria for the past two CRP solicitations but has the flexibility to adjust the scoring rubric. The guidelines state the maximum split is 90/10 (cost-effectiveness/co-benefit), and the minimum is 50/50. He reminded everyone that the state had updated the CRP scoring tool to more effectively factor in the co-benefits category – equity, safety, access, and health – into the total project score.

Mr. McKenzie proceeded to review potential options for weighing the overall project scores – altering the cost-effectiveness/co-benefit ratio. One option would be to adjust the weight at the onset. The second option would have the weighting being completed at the end of the application scoring process.

A potential downside to adjusting the weight at the beginning is that we would not be weighing co-benefits equally across all projects. APO staff findings show that when projects have identical cost-effectiveness and co-benefit scores, those with a higher percentage allocated to cost-benefit tend to score lower overall, which means co-benefits are factoring into the final score more than in previous solicitations.

If TAC representatives chose this option, Mr. McKenzie indicated they would need to determine what ratios would be applied and if there would be different weights associated with different CRP categories of projects (electrification, travel options, and low carbon infrastructure and system management).

For Option 2, adjusting the weight of the total project scores would occur after scoring was completed. If this option is chosen, TAC representatives would need to determine two things:

1. What should the initial cost-effectiveness/co-benefit ratio be (this should be consistent across all project types)?
2. What should the final weighted score be for each project type?

Ms. Teich motioned to start with Option 1, leaving the scoring rubric for carbon effectiveness-to-co-benefit ratio at 50/50 for all projects. Ms. Ryan seconded the motion. Motion carried.

TAC representatives continued to discuss how the weight of a project would change the outcome in the carbon emissions tool.

Ms. Teich motioned to leave the weight of the projects as is. Mr. Sabart seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Mr. McKenzie stated that during the last TAC meeting there was a discussion on public fleet electrification projects and whether they should be weighed differently. There was feedback suggesting that these projects may need specific consideration. However, TAC representatives opted to forgo this discussion.

Mr. McKenzie proceeded to present the four co-benefit narrative revisions that APO staff drafted. Staff proposed aligning these co-benefit narratives with the goals and objectives of our Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Additionally, staff wanted to ensure that each narrative appropriately applied to all three project types: electrification, travel options, and low-carbon infrastructure and system management.

Ms. Teich motioned to accept the co-benefit narratives as written by APO staff. Mr. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Ms. Johnson stated the state is asking the APO to require a letter of intent process for this. The APO will have its own separate letter of intent from ATP-3, therefore those agencies/jurisdictions in the rural portions of the planning area (outside of the APO's urbanized boundaries) will go through the ATP for funding. Ms. Johnson

created a webpage regarding all available grants, letter of intent requirements, and guidebook information on the APO's website.

CONSIDERATION OF 2025 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

Ms. Johnson stated that the purpose of the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization's (APO's) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is to research, analyze, and report on all issues of a technical nature as well as to provide assistance and to make recommendations to the APO's Policy Board in carrying out the goals and objectives of the APO. The TAC will also provide guidance to APO staff and consultants in conducting the work specified in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Additional and specific responsibilities may be defined, as needed, by the APO Policy Board.

Ms. Johnson proceeded to present the meeting schedule for 2025.

Ms. Teich motioned to recommend approval of the 2025 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule as presented. Mr. Byrd seconded the motion. Motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Johnson provided the following updates regarding ongoing and/or upcoming solicitations:

- HSIP applications/solicitation are now open for counties and cities. There will be additional points for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, if you are looking at that type of project. Proactive project concepts are needed by Ms. Johnson by noon Oct. 21, 2024. These projects are not prioritized because they are promoting safety, and the APO gives a blanket statement stating we support them. Reactive project applications (as complete as possible) need to be to Ms. Johnson by noon Oct. 21, 2024. The TAC does review these and recommend a prioritization, and that goes to the Policy Board.
- Completed applications for all HSIP projects are due by noon on Nov. 4, 2024. The Policy Board can then look at the applications and review what the projects are and what they are approving. The approval from the Policy Board would be the approval to submit the application to the Office of Traffic Engineering. You will receive a letter of support from the APO. Ms. Johnson will send a letter of approval for projects approved by the Policy Board on Nov. 15, 2024. The application deadline is Nov. 27, 2024.
- SRTS Infrastructure Grants and Active Transportation Infrastructure Grants are now open, and letters of intent are due by Oct.18, 2024. These projects are 100% state funded for eligible construction costs. You can use this to match Transportation Alternatives funded projects. You can request anywhere from \$50,000 - \$1 million. The projects are competitive statewide.
- TA Workshops are **MANDATORY**. There will be an upcoming workshop held in Brainerd on Oct. 3, 2024, for TA, CRP, and PROTECT. An additional

workshop will be held on Tuesday Oct. 8, 2024, in St. Cloud. Contact Mr. Lenz if you are unable to attend.

- Mr. Voss stated that there is discussion from the state-aid engineer about having a separate federal aid project workshop, which would include the CRP, PROTECT, and STBGP applications to review what's required when you have a federally funded project.
- Mr. Voss also stated that they will recommend/propose needing a letter of support to accompany applications submitted to the ATP. Mr. Voss said for local agencies planning to use another agency's ROW you need to secure a letter of support for that project from the agency. Mr. Voss recommended that the initial contact is made at least six weeks prior to the application deadline which is Jan. 10, 2025. Action on the recommended change will be taken at the Oct. 3 ATP-3 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 a.m.