Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
Policy Board Meeting
Thursday, December 3rd, 2015 – 6:00PM
Intergovernmental Center,
Minnesota River Room
10 Civic Center Plaza, Mankato, MN 56001

I. Call to Order

II. Review of Agenda

III. October 1, 2015 Meeting Minutes

IV. New Business

1. Resolution Adopting Long Range Transportation Plan

2. Resolution Amending 2015 Budget

3. FHWA Approved Functional Classification Map

V. TAC Comments
   (November 19, 2015 MAPO TAC Minutes Attached Informational)

VI. Policy Board Comments & Other Business

VII. Adjournment
A Regular meeting of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization Policy Board was held on October 1, 2015, at 6:00 p.m. in the Minnesota River Room of the Intergovernmental Center. Present Policy Board members, Dan Rotchadl, Chris Frederick, Bob Freyberg, Jack Kolars and Mark Piepho. Also present was MAPO Executive Director Paul Vogel, MAPO Transportation Planner Jake Huebsch, also in attendance were members from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) that included, Al Forsberg, Lisa Bigham.

**Call to Order**

Mr. Piepho called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**Motion to Approve Agenda**

Mr. Kolars motioned to approve the agenda, Mr. Rotchadl seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Motion to Approve July 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2015 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Freyberg moved to approve the July 2\textsuperscript{nd} Policy Board meeting minutes, Mr. Frederick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**New Business**

**Agenda 4.1 Resolution Amending the Existing Contract Date with SRF Consulting Group.**

Staff explained that the Long Range Transportation Planning contract with SRF Consultant Group currently has a contract end date of October 31, 2015. Staff wished to extend the completion date of the contract to December 31, 2015 instead of the previously agreed to contract date of October 31, 2015. Staff explained that the change had no financial impact to the MAPO and the LRTP adoption is anticipated for early December 2015. Mr. Kolars motioned to approve the Resolution amending the existing contract date with SRF Consulting Group, Mr. Frederick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Agenda 4.2 Long Range Transportation Plan Update**

Staff updated the Policy Board on the progress of the Long Range Transportation Plan. Staff explained the draft version of the Long Range Transportation Plan
has been completed and per the MAPO’s Public Participation Plan, the MAPO Policy Board must approve the release of the draft plan and provide a 30 day public comment period. The 30 day public comment period would be from October 2, 2015 to November 3, 2015. Staff explained that during the public comment period, MnDOT and FHWA will also be reviewing and commenting on the draft plan. It is anticipated that the final document will be finalized in the month of November with the final plan being presented to the Policy Board for considered adoption in December of 2015. In addition, the MAPO and area partners have scheduled a Public Open House on October 15, 2015 from 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. where the public will be able to learn and provide input about the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization’s (MAPO) draft 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan. Mr. Rotchadl moved to approve the release of the draft Long Range Transportation and to provide a 30 day public comment period ending November 3, 2015, Mr. Frederick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Agenda 4.3 Resolution Approving 2016 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget**

Staff presented the 2016 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget which provided a detailed description of all transportation related planning activities anticipated by the MAPO within the metropolitan planning area during 2016. In addition, the work program provides detailed list of work activities and budget information, including local, state and federal funding. The 2016 UPWP was been reviewed by the TAC and MnDOT. In addition to the highlighted work activities, the Policy Board wanted to add a work item that included working with MnDOT District 7 on drafting a scope of work for the Highway 22 corridor study and to begin work in 2016. Mr. Frederick moved to amend the 2016 UPWP to include this language, Mr. Freyberg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Staff will update the 2016 UPWP to include language pertaining to the Highway 22 Corridor study and coordination with MnDOT. Mr. Frederick moved to approve the Resolution approving the 2016 UPWP including discussed amendments and potential minor comments from Mn/DOT. Mr. Rotchadl seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Agenda 4.4 Resolution Approving Minnesota Department of Transportation Planning Contract #1001558**

Staff presented the Minnesota Department of Transportation State Planning Contract #1001558 which authorizes the execution of the 2016 State Planning Agreement and funds. The State funds are used to perform activities and planning efforts outlined and contained in the 2016 UPWP.

Mr. Kolars moved to approve the Resolution authorizing the Minnesota Department of Transportation Planning Contract #1001558, Mr. Rotchadl seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
TAC Comments
The September 17\textsuperscript{th}, 2015 MAPO TAC Minutes were attached as informational.

Policy Board Comments & Other Business
Mr. Vogel presented on a potential project involving MnDOT, Blue Earth County, The City of Mankato, and the DNR that would reuse and relocate the Kern Bridge from its current location to a new location which would ultimately connect the Minneopa Trail with Minneopa State Park via a grade separation using the relocated bridge. The Board will be presented with more information as discussions continue with the MnDNR, MnDOT, and Blue Earth county.

Adjournment
With no further business, Mr. Rotchadl moved to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Frederick seconded the motion. With all voting in favor the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Chair, Mr. Piepho
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Resolution Adopting Long Range Transportation Plan Item: 4.1

Agenda Item: Resolution Adopting Long Range Transportation Plan

Recommendation Action(s): Approval of the Attached Resolution

Summary: The MAPO held its third public open house for the Long Range Transportation Plan on October 15, 2015. Approximately 40 people attended the open house and provided feedback and comments on the presented material. The verbal and written comments were added to the entire list of public that were received throughout the public comment period which ran from 10/2/2015 through 11/3/2015. During the public comment period, MnDOT and FHWA staff also received and provided comments on the plan. In total approximately 130 comments were received with the majority of those being minor or grammatical errors. Staff summarized and provided the received comments to the MAPO TAC on November 19, 2015. The MAPO TAC recommended approval of the Long Range Transportation to the MAPO Policy Board.

Attachments:
1) Resolution Adopting Long Range Transportation Plan
2) Summary of Comments Received
RESOLUTION OF THE MANKATO /NORTH MANKATO AREA PLANNING ADOPTING THE 2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

WHEREAS, the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) was created as the MPO for the Mankato/North Mankato urbanized area through a joint powers Agreement between all local units of government located within the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, MAPO is the metropolitan planning body responsible for performing transportation planning in conformance with State and Federal regulation for Metropolitan Planning Organizations; and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Transportation requires the development of a Long Range Transportation Plan by a metropolitan planning organization for each urbanized area and area expected to have growth over a twenty year period; and

WHEREAS, the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan is the first Long Range Transportation plan for the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization as in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134 and 23 CPR 450.322, and complies with the requirements from Federal Transportation Bill MAP-21; and

WHEREAS, the Long Range Transportation Plan, in accordance with 23 CPR 450.322, is multi-modal in scope and accounts for all travel modes; and

WHEREAS, the Long Range Transportation Plan, in accordance with 23 CPR 450.322, is financially constrained to demonstrate that proposed projects have existing and/or reasonably projected sources of funds; and

WHEREAS, the MAPO followed its adopted Public Participation Plan to proactively involve the public early and often in the transportation planning process and held a public hearing at the appropriate time for each action regarding the Long Range Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the MAPO has worked with the Minnesota Department of Transportation, which is a coordinating agency for metropolitan planning activities, to ensure compliance with MAP-21; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED; that the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization Policy Board approves the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan.

CERTIFICATION

State of Minnesota

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a true and correct copy of the resolution presented to and adopted by the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization at a duly authorized meeting thereof, held on the __________day of__________, as shown by the minutes of said meeting in my possession.

Chair Date

Executive Director Date
Public Comments Received:

District 7 comments:

1. **TH 66 Turn back**, Page 3 – 22 discusses status of TH 66 as being in the process of changing jurisdiction from state to county. The miles shown in Table 3-11 and Figure 3-11 do not reflect the transfer. We assume that the State Road Pavement Condition Figure 3-19 also includes the 3 miles of TH 66, and are designated as having poor pavement quality, and should be noted.

The TH 66 turn back agreement upgrade is a regionally significant project and federal regulations require MPO LRTP’s to identify projects that are considered regionally significant. In order to be consistent with the way projects are being listed in the document, the TH 66 turn back agreement upgrade planned for 2016 should be identified in Chapter 9.

2. **DNR Trail**, Page 6-44, Figure 6-22. The DNR has been working with landowners on a feasible route between Mankato and St. Peter and a concept for the trail segment exists. The corridor could be shown on Figure 6-22.

3. **System Preservation**, Page 7-1. Because MnDOT is listing roadway and bridge preservation projects in the category of Major Rehab/Reconstruction in Table 9-9 and Major Rehab in Table 9-1, the statement, “Major rehabilitation and reconstruction projects are needed when roads and bridges have exceeded their functional lifespan” is not accurate. Our Major Rehab projects are definitely meant to extend functional lifespan.

4. Page 7-3. Perhaps the word “preservation” should be used instead of “operation and maintenance” on this page, twice. That way, Figure 7-1, which includes overlay, mill and overlay and reclaim and overlay is not inconsistent with the categories.

5. **Page 9-1**. Operations and Maintenance Projects – last sentence should be re-written to include pavement preservation needs. The jurisdictions had agreed to include a wide range of activities, from mowing and snow and ice removal to pavement chip seals and overlays in this category. Major Rehab/ Reconstruction Projects – again, the statement that these are needed when roads and bridges have exceeded their functional lifespan would not be true for our major rehab projects.

6. **Table 9-9**. For MnDOT 2015 CHIP projects, please replace reference points with “within MAPO boundaries” and change descriptions to “Resurface Pavement” to minimize the need for LRP amendments if these projects change.
7. **Table 9-10.** Remove “Expansion to six lanes (may include river bridge)” from the Project Description of US 14; the MATAPS 2035 reference is overstated and not needed. The high growth scenario and capacity analysis in MATAPS 2035 showed a LOS D for that segment and the recommendation was to “Monitor traffic volumes along US 14, between US 169 and MN 22, to adequately plan for the possibility of capacity improvements (including interchange ramps”). MATAPS 2035 and MAPO 2045 have similar existing volumes, as well as similar Medium Growth MATAPS 2035 to MAPO 2045 forecasts for this segment. An acceptable LOS D is given in MATAPS 2045 for year 2045.

8. **Figure 10-1.** TH 169 from US 14 to northerly planning boundary is shown purple as Principal Arterial Freeway Expressway for proposed 2045 roadway network. This is not consistent with MnDOT’s plans and should be shown as red, Principal Arterial Other. MnDOT’s 2002 IRC study recommended US 169 from TH 68 to US 14 through Mankato to be Freeway, but have since backed off from that goal. Also, please update TH 22 to Minor Arterial between Madison Ave and US 14 to reflect FHWA’s recent decision on the Principal Arterial classification for Madison Ave and Riverfront Drive.

9. **Table 9-12.** Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects – Remove MNDOT from Blue Earth River Bridge across the River #16

10. 6-35 See Figure 5-1 multimodal 5th paragraph should include “promotes an incremental approach which included enhancing bus transit”

11. 6-30 Rail section, as noted on page 3-50, serving passenger rail between Mankato and the twin cities is part of MnDOT Plan Statewide Rail Plan.

12. 6-21 Low=Cost/ High Benefit Solutions “Through this process project programming was considered” reword: there was no vetting so just say “the goal is” to preserve.

13. 6-22 Trunk Highway 22 second sentence, interchange change to intersection.

14. 9-9 Fiscally constrained Program of Projects, first sentence, “program of fiscally constrained projects was prepared for planning purposes. “All projects subject to change or minor change”.

15. 7-7 Major Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, third paragraph first sentence “must be” change to should be. Third sentence change word significant to needed.

16. 3rd Ave RR crossing Description in STIP is “upgrade existing signal system”, so depending on the actual work that is agreed to, we may need to change the description in the STIP.
17. 3-24 MnDOT is considering doing away w/IRC designation

18. 3-39 Figure 3-19 Why is title Bold

19. 3-39 in graph, Unknown (which roadways fall into this category? TWP? Almost ½ and it is an unclear category)

20. 3-46 fourth paragraph, Highway 22 or HWY 99? Last sentence is this the project that recently completed in 2015?

21. 6-1 Demographic Data – 2012, should it be 2014 demographer data?

22. 6-35 what about need for Mankato Transit Service to expand evenings and on weekends now that are an MPO is that addressed anywhere?

23. Implementation Plan, Project Categories nine is circled, are these the same as the 8 categories described on page 7-1? If so, why are there 9 here but 8 on page 7-1? If now, how are they different?

24. Implementation Plan, under operations and maintenance projects first paragraph: on 7-1 define operations and maintenance projects differently.

Open House Comments Received Written:

25. While there is some maintenance going on I the current main parts of town, are we looking for or to the east side of town too much for development? – Rebecca Novak

26. Have the transit options expanded or contracted in the last 25 years? How well do we market transit options for those with families? - Rebecca Novak

27. Realizing that we also want safe passage for children, how do we teach them to ride the bus responsibility? – Rebecca Novak

28. I like the Road maintenance plans. I think there should be a western bypass from the JCT 169 & 60 to Nicollet County road 41. – Tony Ulmen

29. Bicycle routes are much appreciated. – Tony Ulmen

30. CSAH 12 Stage 5 (completion stage) could be considered as illustrative short term safety project, as it is expected to relieve congestion on TH22 – Doug Haeder
Verbal Comments Received via Email:

31. Complete Hwy 12/169 interchange
32. Complete Hwy 14 four lane to New Ulm
33. River crossing (Minneopa area to Rockford Road)
34. More Off road vs. on Road bike trails needed
35. Need Rural Transit.
36. Route 7 should operate all day (this service originates at Cherry Street, travels to MSU via Val Imm Dr. then proceeds out to MRCL. This route follows the same alignment back to Cherry St.
37. Buses should begin earlier in the morning; 5:30 a.m. was the most popular start time cited.
38. City-wide buses should operate later in the evening, the range of suggestions was from 8:00 p.m. through 10:30 p.m.
39. Buses should operate on Sunday (currently no service with the exception of the Late Night Express which operates Midnight – 3:00 a.m. during the MSU academic school year).
40. Bus service needs to be improved between North Mankato and Mankato; North Mankato was an issue with a number of people as it operates on a fractured schedule and only six hours per day, thus limiting its functionality.
41. Buses should have more bike racks.
42. We should get rid of the small buses. (this issue has come up a number of times, as most people find the larger city coach style buss much more accessible and comfortable)
43. I've reviewed the Mankato Area Planning Org 2045 transportation plan and the articles in the Free Press. First of all, I want to support what the bicyclists say about adding more bike improvements, but my observations (along with everyone – everyone – I talk to) is that when the city puts in very expensive bike paths, trails and sidewalks for bikes, bicyclists don't use them at all. Only young children use them and walkers. Joggers don't use them consistently either. The only improvement that bicyclists seem to use is adding a stripe along the side of the streets. I've read that lately the city prefers narrower streets to calm traffic, but I strongly believe that the streets need to be wider to accommodate parked cars, and bicyclists since they won't use sidewalks or trails. So the wider streets would be for safety of the motorists and bicyclists.
44. As for the transportation plan, I truly think that the plan is very very good and I'm supportive of it. The highest priorities should be extension of Adams Street, working with the county to complete highway 12 and Hoffman Road. These projects should start as soon as spring 2016 for safety of the area around the new middle school and to accommodate growth to the east and also to improve traffic flow on the Adams Street area and around River Hills Mall/Highway 22.

45. I also think that 200th street south of Mankato should be paved and expansion allowed south of Mankato within 5-10 years. This street could be a major artery paralleling Stadium Road and possibly offering more affordable land for housing development and possibly opening business expansion along county road 90.
46. For safety improvements on highway 169 north of Mankato, I think that MNDOT should build the leaf of the clover on the north-east corner of the interchange. Considering that MnDonald's is in the way on the southeast leaf, building the northeast leaf now would cut 1/2 of the traffic that has to cross 169 while waiting to complete the cloverleaf.

47. For safety improvements on Highway 14 east of Mankato towards Eagle Lake, MNDOT should not bother with the J-turns, but should construct a full interchange near Eagle Lake while the land is available, construction is cheaper and before they wait to see how many people are killed in the next 5-10 years. For an intersection as busy as it is near Eagle Lake, how busy Highway 14 is along that stretch, and how Eagle Lake is growing, a full interchange is needed there – much more than was needed west of North Mankato. This was very evident with the construction on old 14 over the past two years when they had the cones near Casey's. This intersection was dangerous.

Comments Received via mail:

48. Your transportation plan seemed to be based on current levels of roadway accidents projected into the future. I don’t think the future is a linear extension of the present for agencies, but where are the intersections of the people in this plan?

Comments from MnDOT CO & FHWA:

49. **Project Lists.** At a minimum, federal regulations require MPO plans to specifically identify projects that will add capacity or projects that are considered regionally significant. The project lists MAPO developed as part of its planning process are very extensive and show the level of effort undertaken to understand system needs.

50. Federal regulations also require projects identified in the Transportation Improvement Program to be consistent with the plan (23 CFR 450.324(g)). Due to the extensive nature of MAPO’s project list, this TIP requirement may result in amendments to the plan to ensure the project is consistent with the plan and to ensure the plan remains fiscally constrained. We encourage MAPO to limit the projects identified in the plan to those that add capacity and/or are regionally significant. For all other projects, we encourage MAPO to identify specific policies/strategies that would ensure project consistency on a broader perspective.

51. **Operations & Maintenance.** 23 CFR 450.322(f)(10) requires MPO plans to include system-level estimates of costs and revenues available to operate and maintain federal-aid highways. Tables 7-2 through 7-4 clearly document pavement operation and maintenance needs. It is unclear whether the funding needs cited in Table 7-4 are addressed in Chapter 9. The examples of operations and maintenance projects identified in Chapter 9 include re-striping, turn lanes and traffic control modifications. The chapter notes that these items are independent of preservation projects (page 9-1). Page 9-3 notes that Figures 9-1 through 9-5 document the preservation setaside. While the figures identify O&M costs and major rehabilitation and reconstruction projects, it is unclear if the plan is accounting for other maintenance costs such
as chip seal, crack seal, etc. It is also unclear if the plan addresses operations costs such as snow/ice remove or signal systems.

52. **Transit.** Chapter 6 identifies transit needs and recommends continued implementation of the Greater Mankato Transit Redesign Study. The chapter notes that implementation includes “increase frequency and add service hours in areas where the greater ridership returns will be realized” (page 6-35). Based on the projects identified in Chapter 9, it does not appear as if any expansion of transit service is identified in the plan. It is understood that the Transit Development Plan is not yet complete. However, it seems that illustrative transit projects could be identified. Including illustrative transit projects would aid in addressing some of the challenges faced by Mankato Transit that were identified at the September 30, 2015, MPO Directors meeting. Once the Transit Development Plan is completed, the transportation plan should be amended to reflect the transit plan’s recommendations and ensure transit projects identified in the Transportation Improvement Program are consistent with the transportation plan.

53. **Year of Expenditure.** Chapter 9 notes that an annual inflation rate of 4.5 percent was used to develop year of expenditure costs. The plan should discuss how this inflation rate was determined, particularly since inflation has averaged around 3 percent.

54. **Environmental Justice.** The plan does not discuss how environmental justice/Title VI populations were included in the planning process. What public outreach efforts were undertaken to encourage traditionally underrepresented populations to participate in the process? What lessons were learned?

55. **Performance Measures & Targets.** Chapter 5 clearly identifies the plan’s goals and objectives. More clarity is needed with the performance measures. Performance measures are metrics used to assess progress toward meeting an objective. In accordance with 23 USC 134 (h)(2)(D), the MAPO should add targets to the five identified performance areas. Targets are specific levels of performance that are desired to be achieved within a certain timeframe. They can be used as a basis for comparing progress over time to a desired outcome or for making investment decisions.

56. **Modal Interconnectivity.** Chapter 3 provides an in-depth overview of the transportation modes, but it appears each mode was analyzed separately. The MAPO should explore how the modes interact with each other. How do the modes work together? What barriers may exist? Devoting time to intermodal connectivity addresses long-term planning on a more comprehensive scale.

57. **Coordination.** Chapter 12 identifies ongoing and future work effort. Planning coordination should be identified as an ongoing effort. The plan should note coordination between MAPO and its partner agencies, both for project and system planning. For example, MnDOT is currently updating its Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan, Highway Investment Plan and Greater
Minnesota Transit Investment Plan. It is preparing its first Statewide Pedestrian System Plan and finalizing its Statewide Freight System Plan, State Bike System Plan and State Rail Plan.
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Resolution Adopting Long Range Transportation Plan Item: 4.2

**Agenda Item**: Resolution Amending 2015 Budget

**Recommendation Action(s)**: Approval of the Attached Resolution

**Summary**: The Federal Transit Administration has delayed the deployment of a new grant application system, TrAMS, and limited the Minnesota Department of Transportation’s access to additional federal metropolitan transportation planning funds prior to January 1, 2016. The Minnesota Department of Transportation is amending the 2015 consolidated planning grant contract to include activities identified in the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization 2016 Unified Planning Work Program to ensure the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization uninterrupted access to federal metropolitan planning funds in 2016.

In addition, the amount to be expended in 2015 is less than budget by $35,781 and because the reduction in the budget will exceed 5 percent of the total approved CPG budget for the MAPO. The MAPO’s 2015 budget is $329,687; the 2015 projected amount spent is anticipated to be $293,906.

**Attachments:**
1) Resolution Amending 2015 Budget
RESOLUTION OF THE MANKATO /NORTH MANKATO AREA PLANNING
AMENDING THE 2015 BUDGET

WHEREAS, the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) was created as the MPO for the Mankato/North Mankato urbanized area through a joint powers Agreement between all local units of government located within the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization has entered into an agreement with the State of Minnesota to perform work under the 2015 Unified Planning Work Program,

WHEREAS, the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization has adopted a 2016 Unified Planning Work Program,

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration has delayed the deployment of a new grant application system, TrAMS, and limited the Minnesota Department of Transportation’s access to additional federal metropolitan transportation planning funds prior to January 1, 2016,

WHEREAS, the Minnesota Department of Transportation is amending the 2015 consolidated planning grant contract to include activities identified in the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization 2016 Unified Planning Work Program to ensure the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization uninterrupted access to federal metropolitan planning funds in 2016,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Chairperson and Executive Director of the Mankato /North Mankato Area Planning Organization are hereby authorized to execute the necessary agreements and amendments.

CERTIFICATION

State of Minnesota

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a true and correct copy of the resolution presented to and adopted by the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization at a duly authorized meeting thereof, held on the __________day of________, as shown by the minutes of said meeting in my possession.

____________________________________
Chair Date

____________________________________
Executive Director Date
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: FHWA Approved Functional Classification Map Item: 4.3

Agenda Item: FHWA Approved Functional Classification Map

Recommendation Action(s): Informational

Summary: In 2012, the U.S. Census Bureau released urban area boundaries which were followed by the release of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) functional classification guidelines in 2013. The Minnesota Department of Transportation is currently performing a Statewide Functional Classification Review which was previously conducted in the mid 2000s.

Staff worked with area partners and jurisdictions to update the functional classification map in the MAPO planning area. Throughout the process, all roadways were agreed upon with an exception of Madison Avenue and Riverfront Drive. The City of Mankato appealed MnDOT’s decision to classify the roadways as Minor Arterials. The appeal was reviewed by a committee and their decision was to functionally classify the roadways as Minor Arterials. After the review committee’s decision, the City of Mankato provided additional information to FHWA to why the roadways should be classified as Principal Arterials. FHWA ultimately decided to have the roadways classified as Minor Arterials.

Attachments:
1) FHWA Approved Functional Classification Map
SUMMARY OF MEETING
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee Regular Meeting
Thursday, November 19, 2015 – 1:30 p.m.
Minnesota Valley River Room
Intergovernmental Center,
10 Civic Center Plaza,
Mankato, MN 56001

A meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Mankato Area Planning Organization was held on November 19, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. in the Minnesota Valley River Room of the Intergovernmental Center. Present were Michael Fischer – City of North Mankato Community Development, Landon Bode for Jeff Johnson – City of Mankato Public Works Director, Paul Vogel – MAPO Executive Director, Lisa Bigham – District 7 Minnesota Department of Transportation, Jake Huebsch – MAPO Transportation Planner, Jerry Kolander for Shari Allen – ISD 77, Al Forsberg – Blue Earth County Engineer, Mark Anderson – City of Mankato Transit, Seth Greenwood – Nicollet County Engineer, Brad Potter – City of Eagle Lake, Karl Friedrichs – Lime Township, Mandy Landkamer – Nicollet County, Ed Pankratz, Mankato Township. Others present were: Bobbi Retzlaff – Minnesota Department of Transportation & Kirby Becker – Minnesota Department of Transportation.

I. Call to Order

Vice Chair Greenwood called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Introductions

Introductions were made.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Potter moved and Mr. Anderson seconded a motion to approve the agenda. With all voting in favor, the agenda was approved.
IV. Approval of Minutes, September 17, 2015

Mr. Friedrichs moved and Mr. Fisher seconded a motion to approve the minutes. With all voting in favor, the minutes were approved.

V. New Business

1. Long Range Transportation Plan
MAPO staff provided an update on the Long Range Transportation Plan and discussed the public open house which took place on October 15, 2015 and had approximately 40 people in attendance. Staff described the public comment period and process relating to the verbal and written comments from the public, MnDOT, TAC and FHWA. The public comment period ran from 10/2/2015 through 11/3/2015. In total approximately 130 comments were received with the majority of those being minor, grammatical errors or clarification. Staff provided a summary of comments received to the MAPO TAC. One specific comment that was discussed during the meeting was the Highway 66 turn back project involving Blue Earth County and MnDOT. After discussions with the MnDOT District 7 Engineer, it was determined to identify the turn back project in the Range of Alternatives within the plan, but indicate the turn back agreement was done prior the Long Range Transportation Plan. Furthermore, the project was not identified in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), therefore it doesn’t need to be included in the MAPO’s Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).

Mr. Forsberg moved and Mr. Anderson seconded a motion recommending adoption of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization’s (MAPO) Long Range Transportation Plan to the MAPO Policy Board. With all voting in favor, the motion passed.

2. 2015 UPWP Budget Amendment
Staff explained that the MAPO’s 2015 budget is $329,687 and the 2015 projected amount spent is anticipated to be $293,906. The projected amount spent by the MAPO deviates 5 percent from the total approved agreement with MnDOT therefore, staff requested a formal motion approving the budget change.

Mr. Friedrichs moved and Mr. Potter seconded a motion recommending approval of the MAPO’s 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Budget Amendment. With all voting in favor, the agenda was approved.

3. FHWA Approved Functional Classification Map
Staff presented the FHWA approved functional classification showing the updated functional classification system in the MAPO planning area.
4. **Received Transportation Alternatives Projects**

Staff explained that the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a competitive grant opportunity for local communities and regional agencies to fund projects for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, historic preservation, Safe Routes to School and more. Mr. Bode from Mankato and Mr. Fischer from North Mankato provided an overview of their submitted projects.

5. **Presentation by MnDOT Central Office Staff on Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan & Minnesota 20-Year State Highway Investment Plan.**

Kirby Becker from the MnDOT presented on Minnesota 20-Year State Highway Investment Plan which is one of the state’s direction-setting plans. MnDOT staff provided an overview and background of the plan as well proved an opportunity for TAC members to give input to help shape the direction of the plan update.

**VI. Other Business**

None

**VII. Adjournment**

Mr. Anderson moved and Mr. Fischer seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. With all voting in favor, the motion carried unanimously.

__________________________
Chair, Mr. Johnson
Notice is hereby given that on the 3rd day of December at 6:00 p.m. the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) Policy Board will hold their regularly scheduled meeting.

The meeting will be held in the Minnesota River Room of the Intergovernmental Center, 10 Civic Center Plaza, Mankato, Minnesota.

Copies of the agenda and materials will be available upon request by November 24th at the Intergovernmental Center, 10 Civic Center Plaza, Mankato, Minnesota, during regular business hours. To receive electronic copies please visit http://www.mankatomin.gov/city-services-a-z/city-services-a-m/mankato-north-mankato-area-planning-organization-mapo or call (507) 387-8630 for additional information.

Paul Vogel  
Executive Director  
Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization