

## AGENDA

### APO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING

THURSDAY, JULY 31, 2025 – 10 A.M.  
STEARNS COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT  
455-28<sup>TH</sup> AVE. S, WAITE PARK

**MS TEAMS OPTION AVAILABLE BY REQUEST**

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment Period
3. Consideration of Consent Agenda Items
  - a. Approve minutes of June 26, 2025, TAC meeting (**Attachment A**)
4. Consideration of the draft 2026-2027 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (**Attachment B**) *Brian Gibson, Executive Director*
  - a. **Suggested Action:** Recommend Policy Board approval.
5. Consideration of revisions to the APO's ATP-Managed Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) Scoring Criteria (**Attachments C1-C2**), *Vicki Johnson, Senior Transportation Planner*
  - a. **Suggested Action:** Recommend Policy Board approval.
6. Other Business & Announcements
7. Adjournment

## **English**

The Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization (APO) fully complies with the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and related statutes and regulations. The APO is accessible to all persons of all abilities. A person who requires a modification or accommodation, auxiliary aids, translation services, interpreter services, etc., in order to participate in a public meeting, including receiving this agenda and/or attachments in an alternative format, or language please contact the APO at 320-252-7568 or at [admin@stcloudapo.org](mailto:admin@stcloudapo.org) at least seven (7) days in advance of the meeting.

## **Somali**

Ururka Qorsheynta Deegaanka ee Cloud Cloud (APO) wuxuu si buuxda u waafaqsanahay Cinwaanka VI ee Xuquuqda Xuquuqda Rayidka ee 1964, Cinwaanka II ee Sharciga Naafada Mareykanka ee 1990, iyo qawaaniinta iyo qawaaniinta la xiriira. APO waa u furan tahay dhammaan dadka awooda oo dhan. Qofka u baahan dib-u-habeyn ama dejin, caawimaad gargaar ah, adeegyo turjumaad, adeegyo turjubaan, iwm, si uu uga qeyb galo kulan dadweyne, oo ay ku jiraan helitaanka ajendahaan iyo / ama ku lifaaqan qaab kale, ama luqadda fadlan la xiriir APO. 320-252- 7568 ama at [admin@stcloudapo.org](mailto:admin@stcloudapo.org) ugu yaraan toddobo (7) maalmood kahor kulanka.

## **Spanish**

La Organización de Planificación del Área de Saint Cloud (APO en inglés) cumple plenamente con el Título VI de la Ley de Derechos Civiles de 1964, con el Título II de la Ley sobre los Estadounidenses con Discapacidad de 1990), y los estatutos y reglamentos relacionados. La APO es accesible para todas las personas de todas las capacidades. Una persona que requiere una modificación o acomodación, ayudas auxiliares, servicios de traducción, servicios de interpretación, etc., para poder participar en una reunión pública, incluyendo recibir esta agenda y/o archivos adjuntos en un formato o idioma alternativo, por favor, contacta a la APO al número de teléfono 320-252-7568 o al [admin@stcloudapo.org](mailto:admin@stcloudapo.org) al menos siete (7) días antes de la reunión.

**SAINT CLOUD AREA PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING  
Thursday, June 26, 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, June 26, 2025. Senior Transportation Planner Vicki Johnson presided with the following people in attendance:

Voting Members:

Zac Borgerding	City of Saint Cloud
Matt Glaesman	City of Saint Cloud
Jon Norenberg	City of Waite Park
Nate Keller	City of Saint Joseph
Chris Byrd	Benton County
Jodi Teich	Stearns County
David Roedel	Sherburne County
Steve Voss	MnDOT District 3

Non-Member Attendees:

Vicki Johnson	APO, Senior Planner
Alex McKenzie	APO, Associate Planner
Trina Ness	APO, Administrative Specialist
Angie Stenson	Bolton & Menk
Robin Kaufman	Bolton & Menk

Online Attendees:

April Ryan	City of Sartell (Alternate for Kari Haakonson)
Kevin Mackey	Bolton & Menk
Raveena Bandaru	Bolton & Menk
Jason Gottfried	MnDOT MPO Coordinator
James Stapfer	APO, Planning Technician

**1. Introductions were made.**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

No members of the public were present.

**3. CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

- a. Approve minutes of the May 29, 2025, TAC meeting
- b. Receive staff report of June 12, 2025, Policy Board meeting
- c. Receive staff report of June 12, 2025, Central Minnesota Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-3)

*Ms. Teich made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Keller seconded*

*the motion. Motion carried.*

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

Bolton & Menk's Senior Transportation Planner Angie Stenson provided TAC representatives with an update on the work completed as part of the Safe Streets and Roads for All Comprehensive Safety Action Plan Study.

Ms. Stenson discussed the work the consultant team completed regarding the Safety Countermeasure Strategy Matrix and Toolbox Guide. This information lists various safety infrastructure improvements that can be implemented along with the desired focus area for those improvements, cost range, and overall crash reduction. The toolbox provides the same information, but in a more public facing/easy to understand way.

Ms. Stenson then moved to discuss the draft concepts and provide cost estimates for corridors and/or spot locations for safety improvements by jurisdiction. Several TAC representatives commented on some of the proposed corridor improvements. Mr. Glaseman also recommended to have the Bolton & Menk team complete a cost estimate/concept drawing for the Cooper Avenue corridor between Division Street and University.

Ms. Stenson also had TAC representatives review a draft of the Regional Safety Policy Commitment. This included the APO's Vision Zero Policy Commitment: ***"The APO is determined to eliminate traffic deaths and severe injuries on roadways within the APO completely by 2050. This goal is intended to reduce these crashes on average by 4% per year, reaching a 50% reduction in deaths by 2037 and a 100% reduction by 2050."***

Lastly, Bolton & Menk's Community Planning/Planning Project Manager, Robin Kaufman, outlined the proposed public engagement timeline for the plan. It is anticipated that the TAC will receive the final version of the report by the Sept. 25 TAC meeting.

Ms. Stenson stated that Bolton & Menk will be preparing to head out for public engagement the week of July 21, 2025. In order for them to present to the public the most finalized/complete draft, the Bolton & Menk team will need all technical comments on the draft materials presented to the TAC by no later than July 10, 2025.

Mr. Glaseman stated he would appreciate having some of these SS4A materials available during the comprehensive plan update engagement meetings the City of Saint Cloud is preparing to host in July/August.

#### **5. CONSIDERATION OF REVISIONS TO THE APO'S ATP-MANAGED SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM (STBGP) SCORING CRITERIA**

Ms. Johnson reviewed what the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) is, that it is managed by the Central MN Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-3), and that it is primarily used as the region's road and bridge formula

program.

The current process for evaluating the APO's STBGP Projects was formally adopted in September of 2019. She stated that as of October 2024 the APO has a new Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Staff would like to revisit the current scoring criteria to address current political changes at the national level as well as better align the STBGP funding with the goals of the 2050 MTP.

Ms. Johnson reviewed the proposed changes to the application, received input and stated she would make the changes that were suggested and email the amended draft application to the TAC members for review and comment. She stated she would be presenting an updated version of the scoring criteria at the July TAC meeting.

## **6. CONSIDERATION OF SARTELL-ST. STEPHEN SCHOOL DISTRICT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SRTS) PLAN**

Mr. McKenzie reviewed that Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is an effort to improve walking, biking, and rolling to school so that it is safe, comfortable, and fun for all students. Mr. McKenzie stated the Sartell-St. Stephen SRTS plan focused on Pine Meadow Primary, Riverview Intermediate, and Sartell Middle School and revolves around the six E's:

- Equity – understand neighborhood where students face greater transportation barriers to ensure all students can safely walk, bike, or roll to school.
- Evaluation – uses surveys, observations, and data to identify the most critical safety issues around each school.
- Education – recommends safety programs to teach students traffic rules and safe Walking and biking skills.
- Encouragement – promotes fun and inclusive events to build a culture of active transportation.
- Engagement – listening to children, families, school staff, and community partners to build creative, equitable, and meaningful engagement opportunities into the program structure.
- Engineering – identifying and prioritizing infrastructure projects to make school routes safer and more accessible.

Mr. McKenzie collaborated with school principals, city and county staff, public health, law enforcement, and other community partners. APO staff and local partners conducted site visits during arrival/dismissal times, reviewed crash data, traffic volumes, and existing infrastructure. APO staff also conducted a walking audit for ½ mile around the schools. Public engagement on the planning effort included participation of 388 families via a survey and interactive mapping tool.

Key issues identified during this planning process were unsafe crossings; high traffic volumes and speeding; gaps in the sidewalk and shared use path network; a need for better signage and crosswalk visibility; and inconsistent driver behavior and lack of enforcement in school zones.

The project recommendations were:

- Categorized into High, Medium, and Low priority
- Evaluated based on needs, feasibility, and impact.
- Inclusive of existing projects programmed in CIPs.

Mr. McKenzie reviewed examples of planned projects; high, medium, and low priority projects; and proposed school projects. He went on to review programmatic recommendations which consist of:

- Education and encouragement campaigns.
  - National Bike to School Day.
  - Safety Town.
- Walk! Bike! Fun! Curriculum.
- Crossing guard support and training.
- Enhanced police enforcement.

Mr. McKenzie stated that grants and CIP projects are potential outcomes of the SRTS plan.

## **7. OTHER BUSINESS & ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Ms. Johnson will make proposed changes to STBGP application and send it to TAC members for additional input.
- Ms. Johnson will send reminders to TAC members for feedback regarding the SS4A plan to be sent to Bolton & Menk by July 10, 2025.
- Mr. Voss stated the Draft STIP 2026-2029 is out for review until July 7, 2025.
- Mr. Voss stated the MN Highway Freight Program grant launched on June 25.
- Mr. Voss stated the PROTECT grant solicitation will be out throughout the summer.
- Ms. Johnson stated the ATP-3 did not take up discussion on formula funding at the last meeting.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

**TO:** Saint Cloud APO Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Brian Gibson, Executive Director  
**RE:** Draft 2026-2027 Unified Planning Work Program  
**DATE:** July 15, 2024

The Unified Planning Work Program (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. I need to provide the approved UPWP to MnDOT by September 1<sup>st</sup> each year to ensure our funding is properly obligated prior to January 1<sup>st</sup> of the following year.

For 2026, we are expecting \$692,988 from our USDOT planning grant, also called our Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG). These are formula funds and require a 20% local match.

Our consultant-lead projects proposed for 2026 include:

- Continuing our Community Liaisons program to better reach and include people who have been traditionally underserved in the planning process. (\$5,000)
- Regional Traffic Management Study (\$105,000), which will gather information on existing conditions, operational performance, and technological capabilities for managing traffic flow on existing arterial and collector roadways. Then, it will develop a set of prioritized recommendations for short-term (0-5 years) and long-term (5-20 years) improvements, including but not limited to operational strategies, ITS deployment, signal system enhancements, data management, interagency coordination, and staffing and training needs.

**EXHIBIT 2 – 2026 WORK ACTIVITY BY REVENUE SOURCE**

<b>Work Activity Category</b>	<b>Federal Funding (CPG 1)</b>	<b>Federal Funding (CPG 2)</b>	<b>State Funding</b>	<b>Local Match - State Grant</b>	<b>Other Local Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
100 Administration & Overhead	\$275,148	\$0	\$27,104	\$6,772	\$41,676	<b>\$350,700</b>
200 Budget & UPWP	\$11,376	\$0	\$1,121	\$280	\$1,723	<b>\$14,500</b>
300 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	\$34,911	\$0	\$3,440	\$861	\$5,288	<b>\$44,500</b>
400 Transportation System Performance Monitoring (TSPM)	\$35,108	\$0	\$3,458	\$865	\$5,319	<b>\$44,750</b>
500 Planning Project Development	\$25,890	\$0	\$2,549	\$638	\$3,923	<b>\$33,000</b>
600 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	\$45,896	\$0	\$4,521	\$1,130	\$6,953	<b>\$58,500</b>
610 MTP – Active Transportation Planning	\$45,715	\$12,537	\$5,738	\$1,435	\$8,825	<b>\$74,250</b>
620 MTP - Transit Planning	\$5,687	\$0	\$561	\$141	\$861	<b>\$7,250</b>
630 MTP - Freight, Economic Vitality & Tourism	\$2,943	\$0	\$290	\$72	\$445	<b>\$3,750</b>
640 MTP - Safety, Security & Environmental Planning	\$14,514	\$0	\$1,430	\$358	\$2,198	<b>\$18,500</b>
700 Transportation Planning Coordination & Public Outreach	\$80,612	\$0	\$7,940	\$1,987	\$12,211	<b>\$102,750</b>
800 Transportation Modeling, Mapping & Technical Support	\$17,850	\$0	\$1,758	\$439	\$2,703	<b>\$22,750</b>
900 Locally Funded Activities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,250	<b>\$26,250</b>
<b>Sub-Total for APO Staff and Operations</b>	<b>\$595,650</b>	<b>\$12,537</b>	<b>\$59,910</b>	<b>\$14,978</b>	<b>\$118,375</b>	<b>\$801,450</b>
Contract Services: David Turch & Associates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$48,000	<b>\$48,000</b>
Contract Services: Community Liaisons for Hard-to-Reach Populations	\$4,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	<b>\$5,000</b>
Contract Services: Regional Traffic Management Study	\$80,801	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,199	<b>\$105,000</b>
<b>Grand Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$680,451</b>	<b>\$12,573</b>	<b>\$59,910</b>	<b>\$14,978</b>	<b>\$191,574</b>	<b>\$959,450</b>

## APO BUDGET HISTORY 2021 – 2026

Line Item	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Staff Salaries and Benefits	\$463,750	\$470,500	\$512,000	\$552,004	\$596,750	\$614,500
Overhead	\$96,360	\$92,000	\$119,750	\$150,746	\$151,500	\$160,700
Consultant Studies	\$445,000	\$325,000	\$263,500	\$303,000	\$117,000	\$110,000
<b>Sub-Total for CPG Eligible Expenses</b>	<b>\$1,005,110</b>	<b>\$887,500</b>	<b>\$895,250</b>	<b>\$1,005,750</b>	<b>\$871,750</b>	<b>\$885,200</b>
Turch & Associates	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000
Staff Time for Legislative Communications	\$4,250	\$4,500	\$6,000	\$6,500	\$6,500	\$5,750
Audit	\$8,250	\$8,500	\$14,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Legislative Comm. Travel	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
MN Transportation Alliance*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500
<b>Sub-Total for Other</b>	<b>\$65,500</b>	<b>\$66,000</b>	<b>\$73,000</b>	<b>\$74,500</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>	<b>\$74,250</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$1,070,610</b>	<b>\$953,500</b>	<b>\$968,250</b>	<b>\$1,080,250</b>	<b>\$940,250</b>	<b>\$959,450</b>

\*Prior to 2025, dues for the Minnesota Transportation Alliance were part of "Overhead"

## JURISDICTIONAL ASSESSMENTS HISTORY 2021 – 2026

Jurisdiction	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
St. Cloud	\$62,037	\$107,149	\$67,687	\$102,405	\$77,977	\$95,386
St. Joseph	\$6,361	\$7,149	\$7,011	\$10,468	\$7,588	\$9,342
Sartell	\$16,922	\$18,974	\$19,446	\$29,332	\$21,672	\$26,598
Sauk Rapids	\$12,581	\$13,883	\$13,485	\$20,480	\$14,815	\$18,591
Waite Park	\$7,582	\$8,166	\$8,720	\$12,775	\$9,538	\$11,514
LeSauk Township	\$1,237	\$1,385	\$1,133	\$1,851	\$1,268	\$1,611
Benton County	\$6,792	\$27,348	\$7,237	\$10,321	\$7,729	\$9,644
Sherburne County	\$2,251	\$2,414	\$2,936	\$4,385	\$3,320	\$3,870
Stearns County	\$20,752	\$21,552	\$71,726	\$29,426	\$26,692	\$26,862
Metro Bus	\$8,300	\$8,300	\$8,300	\$4,211	\$2,789	\$3,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$144,815</b>	<b>\$216,320</b>	<b>\$207,681</b>	<b>\$225,653</b>	<b>\$173,388</b>	<b>\$206,919</b>
% Change Year Over Year		+49.38%	-3.99%	+8.65%	-23.16%	+19.34%

Overall local assessments would be about 19% higher than in 2025. But recall that in 2025 you were given credit for the Safe Streets & Roads for All match that you provided in 2024, but for which we then found another grant to pay. Note that despite the increase

from 2025 to 2026, the 2025 request is still lower than the 2024 request.

If you need more details, the entire draft UPWP can be reviewed here:

<https://stcloudapo.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/2026-27-UPWP-DRAFT.pdf>.

***Suggested Action:*** *Recommend approval of the 2026-2027 UPWP to the APO Policy Board.*



1040 County Road 4, Saint Cloud, MN 56303-0643

*T. 320.252.7568 F. 320.252.6557*

**TO:** Saint Cloud APO Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Brian Gibson, Executive Director  
**RE:** Draft 2026-2027 Unified Planning Work Program  
**DATE:** July 15, 2024

The Unified Planning Work Program (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. I need to provide the approved UPWP to MnDOT by September 1<sup>st</sup> each year to ensure our funding is properly obligated prior to January 1<sup>st</sup> of the following year.

For 2026, we are expecting \$692,988 from our USDOT planning grant, also called our Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG). These are formula funds and require a 20% local match.

Our consultant-lead projects proposed for 2026 include:

- Continuing our Community Liaisons program to better reach and include people who have been traditionally underserved in the planning process. (\$5,000)
- Regional Traffic Management Study (\$105,000), which will gather information on existing conditions, operational performance, and technological capabilities for managing traffic flow on existing arterial and collector roadways. Then, it will develop a set of prioritized recommendations for short-term (0-5 years) and long-term (5-20 years) improvements, including but not limited to operational strategies, ITS deployment, signal system enhancements, data management, interagency coordination, and staffing and training needs.

**EXHIBIT 2 – 2026 WORK ACTIVITY BY REVENUE SOURCE**

Work Activity Category	Federal Funding (CPG 1)	Federal Funding (CPG 2)	State Funding	Local Match - State Grant	Other Local Funds	Total Funding
100 Administration & Overhead	\$275,148	\$0	\$27,104	\$6,772	\$41,676	<b>\$350,700</b>
200 Budget & UPWP	\$11,376	\$0	\$1,121	\$280	\$1,723	<b>\$14,500</b>
300 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	\$34,911	\$0	\$3,440	\$861	\$5,288	<b>\$44,500</b>
400 Transportation System Performance Monitoring (TSPM)	\$35,108	\$0	\$3,458	\$865	\$5,319	<b>\$44,750</b>
500 Planning Project Development	\$25,890	\$0	\$2,549	\$638	\$3,923	<b>\$33,000</b>
600 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	\$45,896	\$0	\$4,521	\$1,130	\$6,953	<b>\$58,500</b>
610 MTP – Active Transportation Planning	\$45,715	\$12,537	\$5,738	\$1,435	\$8,825	<b>\$74,250</b>
620 MTP - Transit Planning	\$5,687	\$0	\$561	\$141	\$861	<b>\$7,250</b>
630 MTP - Freight, Economic Vitality & Tourism	\$2,943	\$0	\$290	\$72	\$445	<b>\$3,750</b>
640 MTP - Safety, Security & Environmental Planning	\$14,514	\$0	\$1,430	\$358	\$2,198	<b>\$18,500</b>
700 Transportation Planning Coordination & Public Outreach	\$80,612	\$0	\$7,940	\$1,987	\$12,211	<b>\$102,750</b>
800 Transportation Modeling, Mapping & Technical Support	\$17,850	\$0	\$1,758	\$439	\$2,703	<b>\$22,750</b>
900 Locally Funded Activities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,250	<b>\$26,250</b>
<b>Sub-Total for APO Staff and Operations</b>	<b>\$595,650</b>	<b>\$12,537</b>	<b>\$59,910</b>	<b>\$14,978</b>	<b>\$118,375</b>	<b>\$801,450</b>
Contract Services: David Turch & Associates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$48,000	<b>\$48,000</b>
Contract Services: Community Liaisons for Hard-to-Reach Populations	\$4,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	<b>\$5,000</b>
Contract Services: Regional Traffic Management Study	\$80,801	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,199	<b>\$105,000</b>
<b>Grand Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$680,451</b>	<b>\$12,573</b>	<b>\$59,910</b>	<b>\$14,978</b>	<b>\$191,574</b>	<b>\$959,450</b>

### APO BUDGET HISTORY 2021 – 2026

Line Item	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Staff Salaries and Benefits	\$463,750	\$470,500	\$512,000	\$552,004	\$596,750	\$614,500
Overhead	\$96,360	\$92,000	\$119,750	\$150,746	\$151,500	\$160,700
Consultant Studies	\$445,000	\$325,000	\$263,500	\$303,000	\$117,000	\$110,000
<b>Sub-Total for CPG Eligible Expenses</b>	<b>\$1,005,110</b>	<b>\$887,500</b>	<b>\$895,250</b>	<b>\$1,005,750</b>	<b>\$871,750</b>	<b>\$885,200</b>
Turch & Associates	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000
Staff Time for Legislative Communications	\$4,250	\$4,500	\$6,000	\$6,500	\$6,500	\$5,750
Audit	\$8,250	\$8,500	\$14,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Legislative Comm. Travel	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
MN Transportation Alliance*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500
<b>Sub-Total for Other</b>	<b>\$65,500</b>	<b>\$66,000</b>	<b>\$73,000</b>	<b>\$74,500</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>	<b>\$74,250</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$1,070,610</b>	<b>\$953,500</b>	<b>\$968,250</b>	<b>\$1,080,250</b>	<b>\$940,250</b>	<b>\$959,450</b>

\*Prior to 2025, dues for the Minnesota Transportation Alliance were part of "Overhead"

### JURISDICTIONAL ASSESSMENTS HISTORY 2021 – 2026

Jurisdiction	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
St. Cloud	\$62,037	\$107,149	\$67,687	\$102,405	\$77,977	\$95,386
St. Joseph	\$6,361	\$7,149	\$7,011	\$10,468	\$7,588	\$9,342
Sartell	\$16,922	\$18,974	\$19,446	\$29,332	\$21,672	\$26,598
Sauk Rapids	\$12,581	\$13,883	\$13,485	\$20,480	\$14,815	\$18,591
Waite Park	\$7,582	\$8,166	\$8,720	\$12,775	\$9,538	\$11,514
LeSauk Township	\$1,237	\$1,385	\$1,133	\$1,851	\$1,268	\$1,611
Benton County	\$6,792	\$27,348	\$7,237	\$10,321	\$7,729	\$9,644
Sherburne County	\$2,251	\$2,414	\$2,936	\$4,385	\$3,320	\$3,870
Stearns County	\$20,752	\$21,552	\$71,726	\$29,426	\$26,692	\$26,862
Metro Bus	\$8,300	\$8,300	\$8,300	\$4,211	\$2,789	\$3,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$144,815</b>	<b>\$216,320</b>	<b>\$207,681</b>	<b>\$225,653</b>	<b>\$173,388</b>	<b>\$206,919</b>
% Change Year Over Year		+49.38%	-3.99%	+8.65%	-23.16%	+19.34%

Overall local assessments would be about 19% higher than in 2025. But recall that in 2025 you were given credit for the Safe Streets & Roads for All match that you provided in 2024, but for which we then found another grant to pay. Note that despite the increase from 2025 to 2026, the 2025 request is still lower than the 2024 request.

If you need more details, the entire draft UPWP can be reviewed here:

<https://stcloudapo.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/2026-27-UPWP-DRAFT.pdf>.

**Suggested Action:** *Recommend approval of the 2026-2027 UPWP to the APO Policy Board.*



1040 County Road 4, Saint Cloud, MN 56303-0643

T. 320.252.7568 F. 320.252.6557

**TO:** Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Vicki Johnson, Senior Transportation Planner  
**RE:** Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) Scoring Criteria Updates  
**DATE:** July 17, 2025

The Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) provides flexible funding that may be used by states and localities for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any federal-aid highway, bridge, and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals. States and localities are responsible for a minimum 20% share of eligible project costs funded through this program.

Within the APO, funding through this program has historically been allocated to roadway and bridge projects.

STBGP funding is received by the state from the federal government. With that pre-determined funding allocation, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) sub-targets approximately 56% of those federal dollars to the Twin Cities metro area based upon a formula that factors in population and system needs. The remaining funding target is then sub-targeted among the greater Minnesota Area Transportation Partnerships (ATPs).

The Central Minnesota ATP (ATP-3) further sub-targets its targeted STBGP funds among the four regions that comprise ATP-3—Region 5 Development Commission, East Central Regional Development Commission (7E), Region 7W Transportation Policy Board, and the Saint Cloud APO. Currently, ATP-3 is in the process of developing a working group to further evaluate the sub-target distribution to each of these regions.

## The Existing Process

Within the APO, APO staffers initiate the solicitation process for projects. Jurisdictions within the APO's Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) complete an application form for funding that is consistent across the ATP. APO staffers then review, score, and rank those submitted applications using a technical merit scoring rubric developed in conjunction with TAC representatives and approved by the APO's Policy Board in September 2019.

Once APO staff have completed their review, those results are presented to the TAC as a discussion starting point to guide TAC representatives into ultimately recommending a list of prioritized projects for funding that will be presented to the APO's Policy Board for approval.

As stated earlier, APO staff have been utilizing the same scoring rubric/criteria since September 2019. However, in the years since, the APO has adopted a new Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) – Looking Ahead 2050. One of the purposes of the MTP is to guide investment direction of limited federal funding in order to achieve the regional, community-based priorities for the surface transportation network.

In order to address the vision, goals, objectives, and strategies identified in the current MTP, APO staff have initiated a review of the existing STBGP scoring guidance/criteria in order to ensure alliance with the current MTP and address various shortcomings of the

existing review and scoring process.

Attachment C2 is the APO staff's working draft of proposed changes to the STBGP scoring guidance.

## Proposed Updates

APO staff are proposing to revamp all of the scoring criteria used to evaluate projects within the APO's planning area. The following provides a short summary of proposed changes by application section. Note, the application itself will not change – that will have to be initiated by ATP-3. Total points possible will remain constant at 200 points.

### Access and Mobility

*Explain how your project increases the accessibility and mobility options for people and freight.*

#### CURRENT SCORING

*Point Total: 25 points.*

*Criteria to Address*

- Project complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and meets Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) requirements.
- Project improves travel time reliability and/or level of service (LOS).

#### PROPOSED SCORING

*Point Total: 25 points.*

*Criteria to Address*

- Demonstrate how the proposed project will construct and/or maintain ADA compliant infrastructure.
- Describe how the proposed project would decrease average trip time or trip length for transit or active transportation modes.
- Document the proximity (in miles) of the proposed project to the following destinations:
  - Grocery, retail, medical facilities, schools, parks, community gathering spaces.
  - Businesses, commercial properties, industry/manufacturing facilities.
  - Residential dwelling units.
- Describe how the proposed project will facilitate access to those destinations listed above.
- Describe how the proposed project will decrease the average vehicle trip time or trip length to those destinations listed above.
- Demonstrate the improvements the proposed project will have to the following:
  - Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR) – applicable to Interstate and non-Interstate NHS.
  - Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) – applicable to Interstate.
  - Volume to Capacity (V/C) ratio – as demonstrated in the APO's Travel Demand Model (TDM).

### Reason for proposed updates

APO staff are proposing the above changes to evaluate this category due to changes at the federal level regarding environmental justice prioritization. Additionally, APO staff felt the

previous evaluation criteria did not lend itself to understanding the community context of projects in terms of improving accessibility to key destinations in the region, while preserving modal choice (providing options for individuals to travel how they choose). APO staff retained mention of the LOS to address system mobility.

## System Connectivity

*Explain how your project enhances the integration and connectivity of the transportation system for people and freight.*

### CURRENT SCORING

*Point Total: 25 points.*

*Criteria to Address:*

- Project preserves and/or enhances an important long-distance commuter corridor for workers who commute into the greater Saint Cloud metropolitan area.
- Project furthers or completes the connection of existing transportation infrastructure (roadways, transit, active transportation) within and between jurisdictions (fills a gap).

### PROPOSED SCORING

*Point Total: 25 points.*

*Criteria to Address*

- Document the proximity (in miles) of the proposed project to a long-distance multimodal corridor (local/interjurisdictional) and/or the NHS/Interstate System and its direct and/or indirect connection to those corridors. Document the existing and/or proposed access control/spacing guidance.
- Describe how the proposed project facilitates a connection between residential areas and key destinations (grocery, retail, medical facilities, schools, parks, community gathering spaces, businesses, commercial properties, industry/manufacturing facilities).
- Describe how the proposed project furthers or completes the connection of existing transportation infrastructure (roadways, transit, active transportation) within and between jurisdictions (fills a gap) – if applicable.

## Reason for proposed updates

While APO staff understand the importance of the preservation/enhancement of long-distance commuter corridors, staff also wanted to provide opportunities for applicants to explain the local connectivity the proposed project has within the planning area boundaries – connecting people to goods and services.

## C. Multimodal

*Explain how the project promotes walking, bicycling, transit, and other modes as an integral component of the transportation system.*

### CURRENT SCORING

*Point Total: 20 points.*

*Criterion to Address*

- Project furthers or establishes new connections of existing multi-use paths, bicycle lanes, and/or sidewalks within and between jurisdictions (fills a gap).

### PROPOSED SCORING

*Point Total: 15 points.*

*Criteria to Address*

- Detail how the proposed project will provide multimodal access based upon context

sensitive solutions. Prioritization will be given for projects that fill an existing gap (sidewalk network) and/or complete pieces of the regional active transportation network as documented in the APO's Regional Active Transportation Plan.

- Describe the coordination efforts with Saint Cloud Metro Bus to ensure the proposed project supports Metro Bus's long-range planning efforts (as applicable).

### Reason for proposed updates

APO staff understand that constructing shared use paths and/or sidewalks with every project is feasible (or warranted) due to a variety of factors, most notably, community context. However, APO staff would recommend TAC representatives strongly consider modal choice options and safety when proposing projects due to the alignment with the APO's 2050 MTP Vision Theme: Multimodal Connections. APO staff are also recommending reducing the point total in this category from 20 (current) to 15 (proposed) to accommodate the introduction of a new scoring category. See *I. Technological Advancements*.

### D. System Condition

*Explain the current system conditions and how this project will preserve or enhance the transportation infrastructure and/or operations.*

#### CURRENT SCORING

*Point Total: 50 points.*

*Criterion to Address*

- Project improves the pavement condition of an existing bridge, roadway, multi-use path, or bicycle lane. Prioritization will be taken for projects that improve bridges with a 'poor' condition rating or roadways with a 'poor' International Roughness Index (IRI) rating.

### PROPOSED CATEGORY CHANGE

#### D. System Condition OR Congestion Management

**For system preservation projects, complete the System Condition section. For capacity expansion projects, complete the Congestion Management section. DO NOT COMPLETE BOTH SECTIONS!**

##### D1. System Condition

*Explain the current system conditions and how this project will preserve or enhance the transportation infrastructure and/or operations.*

*Point Total: 50 points.*

*Criterion to Address*

- Describe how the proposed project will improve the pavement condition of an existing bridge, roadway, shared use path, or bicycle lane.

##### D2. Congestion Management

*Explain how the project seeks to mindfully plan, develop, and operate an innovative transportation network to minimize unnecessary travel delays.*

*Point Total: 50 points*

*Criteria to Address*

- Describe the existing level of service/congestion issues located within close (1/4-1/2 mile) proximity to the location of the proposed project.
- Demonstrate the need for the proposed project based upon the current V/C ratio of adjacent corridors as well as results from the APO's Travel Demand Model (TDM) and/or the APO's 2024 Future Functional Classification Study.

- Demonstrate the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Impact Assessment/mitigation strategy of the proposed project location (if applicable).

### Reason for proposed updates

APO staff felt the current application was tailored to system preservation projects (reconstructions, rehabilitations, mill and overlays, etc.) and did not lend itself well to addressing capacity expansion needs within the APO's planning area. Over the past few local solicitations, capacity expansion projects (or right-of-way acquisition projects) tended to score significantly lower than the reconstruction counterparts in this category. In order to address this discrepancy as well as account for the Congestion Management goal in the MTP, APO staff are proposing to split this category and have applicants complete one of two tracks. Evaluations will be separate based on the criteria needed to be addressed for each project, but the point totals provided will be the same (50 points). Additionally, APO staff have proposed including the state's requirements to include GHG emissions impact assessments on capacity expansion projects. While this is a requirement for the state trunk highway system, APO staff would ask TAC representatives to weigh in on including this under the Congestion Management portion of this section.

### E. Safety

*Explain how the project or elements of the project may improve safety.*

#### CURRENT SCORING

*Point Total: 50 points.*

*Criterion to Address*

- Project includes appropriate safety infrastructure to assist in preventing crashes (i.e. shoulder and centerline rumble and mumble strips and stripes; roundabouts; median barrier systems; crash cushions; guiderail end treatments; traffic calming measures; pedestrian crossing infrastructure; etc.). Prioritization will be taken for projects that are constructed at high crash locations.

#### PROPOSED SCORING

*Point Total: 50 points.*

*Criteria to Address*

- Document existing safety concerns on the existing corridor (system preservation) or in close proximity to the proposed corridor (capacity expansion). Prioritization will be provided to those projects located on the region's High Injury Network (HIN).
- Detail how the proposed project will incorporate safety infrastructure based upon context sensitive solutions.

### Reason for proposed updates

The APO is currently working with Bolton & Menk to develop a Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) plan for the region. In this plan, the consultant team identified a High Injury Network within the region and is working to identify several safety improvements that can be made corridor-wide or various spot locations. APO staff also realize that not all safety improvements will be an option based upon land use context.

### F. Economic Vitality

*Explain how the project supports the economic development and job growth retention/creation goals in the community and region.*

## CURRENT SCORING

*Point Total: 15 points.*

*Criteria to Address*

- Project improves the efficient movement of people and freight between the region and the rest of the state and/or nation.
- Project promotes improved operation of the existing freight network.

## PROPOSED SCORING

*Point Total: 15 points.*

*Criteria to Address*

- Document the proximity (in miles) of the proposed project to major freight routes, particularly the NHS system (US 10, I-94, MN 23, MN 15, and Stearns CSAH 75) and its direct and/or indirect connection to those major freight corridors. Detail how the proposed project will improve the flow of freight on those corridors as well as work to improve and/or address existing freight bottlenecks within the region.
- Detail the proposed project's proximity (in miles) to various businesses/industries and how the proposed project will impact access and mobility to the region's top five economic sectors as determined by the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (health care, education, manufacturing, retail, accommodation/food service industries).
- Describe the proposed project location's current AADT and detail future projections of AADT based upon the APO's TDM.

## Reason for proposed updates

APO staff previously had relied heavily on the regional freight network developed in 2017. However, APO staff understand this does not account for first- and last-mile trips to access the freight network – or more appropriately, the NHS. APO staff also wanted to capture the importance of the corridor location to the top industries located within the APO's planning area and how the proposed project will continue to foster economic prosperity in these sectors.

## G. Energy and Environmental Conservation (APO staff to replace this category)

*Explain how the project promotes energy conservation and improves public health and quality of life while sustaining and improving the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system.*

*Point Total: 5 points.*

*Criterion to Address*

- Project complies with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA), and appropriate mitigation options have been explored in order to minimize environmental impact.

## PROPOSED CATEGORY CHANGE

### G. Environmental Stewardship

*Explain how the proposed project will protect and preserve the region's existing environmental assets.*

*Point Total: 5 points.*

*Criteria to Address*

- Describe the environmental review process/path you plan to take for the construction of the proposed project.
- Detail any environmental concerns related to the construction of the proposed project. Note any environmental impacts avoided by the design or alignment of the

project. Describe any mitigation measures, if any, needed to complete the project.

- Demonstrate the GHG Emissions Impact Assessment/mitigation strategy of the proposed project (if applicable).

### Reason for proposed updates

APO staff are proposing to adjust the name and explanation of this category to align with the 2050 MTP visioning statement reflected in the System and Environmental Stewardship goal. Similar to the Congestion Management section above, APO staff have tentatively included the GHG Emissions Impact Assessment here for applicable projects.

### H. Public Engagement, Plan Identification, Project Readiness (APO staff to make adjustments to entire category)

*Identify where the project has been notated in one or more statewide, regional, or local plan, which has been adopted by federal, state, regional, or local agencies.*

#### CURRENT SCORING

*Point Total: 10 points*

*Criteria to Address*

- Proposers should identify the relationship of the project to any statewide, regional, or local plans/objectives that have gone through a public planning process. They should explain how the project is consistent with these plans and objectives, refer to specific sections of the plan, and describe the level of public involvement in which the project was developed, adopted and/or approved. Provide a link to the plan or cite plan document reference.
- Include any pertinent excerpts from completed feasibility documentation for the project (i.e., scoping study, preliminary engineering, etc.). Describe the public outreach that has taken place and include any controversial issues that may affect this project.

#### PROPOSED CATEGORY CHANGE

##### H. Plan Identification, Public Engagement, and Project Readiness

*Identify where the project has been notated in one or more local, regional, and/or statewide plans. These plans must be adopted by the appropriate governing body (local, regional, state).*

#### PROPOSED SCORING

*Point Total: 10 points*

*Criteria to Address*

- The proposed project has been incorporated into an approved local, regional, and/or state planning document. Prioritization will be given to those projects specifically identified in the APO's Looking Ahead 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
- Detail the importance of this proposed project to the Saint Cloud Metropolitan Planning Area.
- Provide detailed information regarding the level of public engagement that has occurred pertaining to the proposed project.
- Provide detailed information on the readiness/schedule of this proposed project. This can include, but is not limited to, feasibility documentation, right-of-way negotiations, scoping, preliminary engineering, etc.

### Reason for proposed updates

Projects eligible for federal funding must be identified within the APO's MTP. APO staff are recommending this explicitly be included as an application criterion. In addition, staff would like to learn more about why the proposed project is important not only to the implementing agency but to the regional transportation network.

## NEW CATEGORY

### I. Technological Advancements

*Explain how the project coincides with planning for future innovative transportation technologies and/or encourages their presence and incorporation into the region's existing transportation network.*

*Point Total: 5 points*

*Criterion to Address*

- Provide details on engineering/planning/design innovations associated with the proposed project. These innovations should work to support future technological advancements in the transportation system to benefit the Saint Cloud MPA.

#### Reason for proposed updates

Within the APO's Looking Ahead 2050 MTP, one of the visioning themes identified was Technological Advancements. In order to address this theme, APO staff have worked to come up with some prioritization factor to include in the STBGP scoring criteria.

#### Next Steps

APO staff initially presented a draft of the proposed revisions to the STBGP scoring process at the June 2025 TAC meeting. TAC representatives shared comments for APO staff to incorporate into the draft both at the meeting and through July 21.

APO staff have incorporated those comments into this revised scoring rubric as reflected in Attachment C. Staff are hoping to finalize the proposed changes/revisions to the scoring rubric and present this to the APO's Policy Board in August for approval to be used during the FY 2030 solicitation period kicking off Oct. 1, 2025.

**Suggested Action:** Recommend Policy Board approval.



1040 County Road 4, Saint Cloud, MN 56303-0643

T. 320.252.7568 F. 320.252.6557

# Surface Transportation Block Grant Program

Project Score Sheet Rubric

## About this Rubric

This rubric is designed to complement the Central Minnesota Area Transportation Partnership (ATP-3)'s Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) guidebook and application guidance. This rubric is designed to assist agencies and jurisdictions within the Saint Cloud Area Planning Organization's (APO's) planning area in completing the STBGP solicitation for ATP-3 STBGP dollars sub-targeted to the APO's planning area.

## Application Requirements

All agencies and jurisdictions within the APO's planning area applying for STBGP funding must comply with the requirements dictated by the ATP. In addition, the APO is requiring a resolution of support from the applicant's governing body **PRIOR** to the submittal of the application to the APO. This resolution, if the project is selected for funding, will serve as the required resolution for ATP-3. Any application submitted without a resolution will be ineligible for scoring.

## Project Qualifications

### A. Access and Mobility (25 points total)

*Explain how your project increases the accessibility and mobility options for people and freight.*

#### Criteria to Address

- Demonstrate how the proposed project will construct and/or maintain ADA compliant infrastructure.
- Describe how the proposed project would decrease average trip time or trip length for transit or active transportation modes.
- Document the proximity (in miles) of the proposed project to the following destinations:
  - Grocery, retail, medical facilities, schools, parks, community gathering spaces.
  - Businesses, commercial properties, industry/manufacturing facilities.
  - Residential dwelling units.
- Describe how the proposed project will facilitate access to those destinations listed above.

E. [admin@stcloudapo.org](mailto:admin@stcloudapo.org) W. [stcloudapo.org](http://stcloudapo.org)

- Describe how the proposed project will decrease the average vehicle trip time or trip length to those destinations listed above.
- Demonstrate the improvements the proposed project will have to the following:
  - Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR) – applicable to Interstate and non-Interstate NHS.
  - Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) – applicable to Interstate.
  - Volume to Capacity (V/C) ratio – as demonstrated in the APO’s Travel Demand Model (TDM).

## B. System Connectivity (25 points total)

*Explain how your project enhances the integration and connectivity of the transportation system for people and freight.*

### Criteria to Address

- Document the proximity (in miles) of the proposed project to a long-distance multimodal corridor (local/interjurisdictional) and/or the NHS/Interstate System and its direct and/or indirect connection to those corridors. Document the existing and/or proposed access control/spacing guidance.
- Describe how the proposed project facilitates a connection between residential areas and key destinations (grocery, retail, medical facilities, schools, parks, community gathering spaces, businesses, commercial properties, industry/manufacturing facilities).
- Describe how the proposed project furthers or completes the connection of existing transportation infrastructure (roadways, transit, active transportation) within and between jurisdictions – fills a gap (if applicable).

## C. Multimodal (15 points total)

*Explain how the project promotes walking, bicycling, transit, and other modes as an integral component of the transportation system.*

### Criteria to Address

- Detail how the proposed project will provide multimodal access based upon context sensitive solutions. Prioritization will be given for projects that fill an existing gap (sidewalk network) and/or complete pieces of the regional active transportation network as documented in the APO’s Regional Active Transportation Plan.
- Describe the coordination efforts with Saint Cloud Metro Bus to ensure the proposed project supports Metro Bus’s long-range planning efforts (as applicable).

## D. System Condition OR Congestion Management (50 points total)

**For system preservation projects, complete the System Condition section. For capacity expansion projects, complete the Congestion Management section. DO NOT COMPLETE BOTH SECTIONS!**

### D1. System Condition

*Explain the current system conditions and how this project will preserve or enhance the transportation infrastructure and/or operations.*

### Criteria to Address (System Condition)

- Describe how the proposed project will improve the pavement condition of an existing bridge, roadway, shared use path, or bicycle lane.

### D2. Congestion Management

*Explain how the project seeks to mindfully plan, develop, and operate an innovative transportation network to minimize unnecessary travel delays.*

#### Criteria to Address (Congestion Management)

- Describe the existing level of service/congestion issues located within close (1/4 to 1/2-mile) proximity to the location of the proposed project.
- Demonstrate the need for the proposed project based upon the current V/C ratio of adjacent corridors as well as results from the APO's Travel Demand Model (TDM) and/or the APO's 2024 Future Functional Classification Study.
- Demonstrate the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Impact Assessment/mitigation strategy of the proposed project location (if applicable).

#### E. Safety (50 points total)

*Explain how the project or elements of the project may improve safety.*

##### Criteria to Address

- Document existing safety concerns on the existing corridor (system preservation) or in close proximity to the proposed corridor (capacity expansion). Prioritization will be provided to those projects located on the region's High Injury Network (HIN).
- Detail how the proposed project will incorporate safety infrastructure based upon context sensitive solutions.

#### F. Economic Vitality (15 points total)

*Explain how the project supports the economic development and job growth retention/creation goals in the community and region.*

##### Criteria to Address

- Document the proximity (in miles) of the proposed project to major freight routes, particularly the NHS system (US 10, I-94, MN 23, MN 15, and Stearns CSAH 75) and its direct and/or indirect connection to those major freight corridors. Detail how the proposed project will improve the flow of freight on those corridors as well as work to improve and/or address existing freight bottlenecks within the region.
- Detail the proposed project's proximity (in miles) to various businesses/industries and how the proposed project will impact access and mobility to the region's top five economic sectors as determined by the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (health care, education, manufacturing, retail, accommodation/food service industries).
- Describe the proposed project location's current AADT and detail future projections of AADT based upon the APO's TDM.

#### G. Environmental Stewardship (5 points total)

*Explain how the proposed project will protect and preserve the region's existing environmental assets.*

##### Criteria to Address

- Describe the environmental review process/path you plan to take for the construction of the proposed project.
- Detail any environmental concerns related to the construction of the proposed project. Note any environmental impacts avoided by the design or alignment of the project. Describe any mitigation measures, if any, needed to complete the project.
- Demonstrate the GHG Emissions Impact Assessment/mitigation strategy of the proposed project location (if applicable).

## H. Plan Identification, Public Engagement, and Project Readiness (10 points total)

*Identify where the project has been notated in one or more local, regional, and/or statewide plans. These plans must be adopted by the appropriate governing body (local, regional, state).*

### Criteria to Address

- The proposed project has been incorporated into an approved local, regional, and/or state planning document. Prioritization will be given to those projects specifically identified in the APO's Looking Ahead 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
- Detail the importance of this proposed project to the Saint Cloud Metropolitan Planning Area.
- Provide detailed information regarding the level of public engagement that has occurred pertaining to the proposed project.
- Provide detailed information on the readiness/schedule of this proposed project. This can include, but is not limited to feasibility documentation, right-of-way negotiations, scoping, preliminary engineering, etc.

## I. Technological Advancements (5 points total)

*Explain how the project coincides with planning for future innovative transportation technologies and/or encourages their presence and incorporation into the region's existing transportation network.*

### Criteria to Address

- Provide details on engineering/planning/design innovations associated with the proposed project. These innovations should work to support future technological advancements in the transportation system to benefit the Saint Cloud MPA.

**Total Score: 200 points possible**