Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization  
Technical Advisory Committee  
Thursday, October 20, 2016 – 1:30PM 
Intergovernmental Center,  
The Minnesota Valley Room, (Behind Elevators 1st Floor IGC)  
10 Civic Center Plaza, Mankato, MN 56001  

I. Call to Order  
II. Introductions  
III. Approval of Agenda  
IV. Approval of Minutes – July 21, 2016  
V. New Business  
  1. Proposed 2017 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment  
  2. Selection of Intersection Locations for Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Studies in 2017  
  3. Draft 2016 Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Reports  
  4. City of North Mankato Transportation Alternatives Project Solicitation & Requested Letter of Support  
  5. Proposed MAPO 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments  
VI. Other Business & Updates  
  1. City of Mankato Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Project & Requested Letter of Support  
  2. Regional Transit & Transit Development Plan  
  3. Riverfront Drive Corridor Study & Belgrade Avenue Corridor Study  
  4. Trunk Highway 22 Corridor Study  
  5. New MAPO website www.mnmapo.org  
VII. September 8, 2016 MAPO Policy Board Minutes (Informational)  
VIII. Adjournment
A meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Mankato Area Planning Organization was held on July 21, 2016, at 1:30 p.m. in the Minnesota Valley River Room of the Intergovernmental Center. Present 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, Ed Pankratz – Mankato Township, Sam Parker, Region Nine Development Commission, Ryan Thilges – Blue Earth County Engineer, Brad Potter – City of Eagle Lake, Seth Greenwood – Nicollet County Public Works Director, Mark Anderson – City of Mankato Transit and Mike Fischer – City of North Mankato, Dan Sarff – City of North Mankato. Others present were: Bobbi Retzlaff and Ronda Allis – Minnesota Department of Transportation, Angie Bersaw – Bolton & Menk and Scott Poska – SRF Consulting.

I. Call to Order

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

II. Introductions

Introductions were made.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Sarff moved and Mr. Pankratz seconded a motion to approve the agenda. With all voting in favor, the agenda was approved.

IV. Approval of Minutes, April 21, 2016

Mr. Johnson moved and Mr. Greenwood seconded a motion to approve the minutes. With all voting in favor, the minutes were approved.
V. New Business

1. **Draft 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
   Staff explained the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) reports how the various jurisdictions within the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) area have prioritized their use of limited federal highway and transit funding. The TIP process serves to implement projects identified in the Mankato/North Mankato area long range transportation plan (LRTP). The MAPO TIP document programs project funding for metropolitan area.

   Mr. Potter moved and Mr. Anderson seconded a motion to recommend the draft 2017-2020 TIP with the minor corrections as discussed be released for a 30-day public comment period to the MAPO Policy Board. With all voting in favor, the motion carried.

2. **2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) & Budget**
   Staff presented the draft 2017 UPWP & budget to the MAPO TAC. Staff explained the purpose of this work program is to provide a detailed description of all transportation related planning activities anticipated by the MAPO within the metropolitan planning area during 2017. In addition, the work program provides detailed work activities and budget information, including local, state and federal funding shares, to allow the state to document the requirements for planning grants distributed through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). It was noted, that the ADA transition plan identified in 2019 should be moved up to 2018 to meet Federal and State deadlines. Also, Ms. Retzlaff from MnDOT Central Office would provide written comments for staff to address before the final 2017 UPWP is adopted by the MAPO Policy Board.

   Mr. Johnson moved and Mr. Greenwood seconded a motion to recommend the draft 2017 UPWP with the minor corrections as discussed to the MAPO Policy Board. With all voting in favor, the motion carried.

3. **Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Studies Update**
   Scott Poska with SRF provided an update on three intersection control evaluation studies at Howard Drive/Lor Ray Drive, Pohl Road/ Stadium Road and Pohl Road/ Balcerzak Drive.

4. **Riverfront Drive Corridor Study & Belgrade Avenue Corridor Study Update**
   Angie Bersaw with Bolton & Menk provided an update to the MAPO TAC on the Riverfront Drive and Belgrade Avenue corridor studies. Ms. Bersaw provided a schedule and timeline of the studies as well as the main comments for each study.
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5. **MnDOT District 7, 10-Year Capital Highway Investment Plan (CHIP)**

   Ronda Allis with MnDOT District 7 presented on the District’s 10-year CHIP. The 10-Year Capital Highway Investment Plan (CHIP) details MnDOT’s capital highway investments for the next ten years on the state highway network. The primary purpose of the document is to communicate programmed and planned capital highway projects over the next 10 years. The first four years represents state highway projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) representing MnDOT’s committed construction program.

   **VI. Other Business**

   MAPO staff provided an update on the improved GIS software that now includes the entire MAPO Planning Area.

   Ms. Bigham provided a status update on the draft Trunk Highway 22 Request for Proposal and asked TAC members to review and provide comment on the scope of work.

   **VII. Adjournment**

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

   ________________________________
   Chair, Mr. Fischer
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Proposed 2017 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment
No: 5.1

Agenda Item: Proposed 2017 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment

Recommendation Action(s): Motion to recommend to the MAPO Policy Board amending the 2017 Unified Planning Work Program to include the ADA transaction plan and moving the Pavement Management Plan to 2018.

Summary: The purpose of this work program is to provide a detailed description of all transportation related planning activities anticipated by the MAPO within the metropolitan planning area during 2017. In addition, the work program provides detailed work activities and budget information, including local, state and federal funding shares, to allow the state to document the requirements for planning grants distributed through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

MAPO staff would like to propose moving the ADA Transition Plan from 2018 to 2017 and moving the Pavement Management Plan from 2017 to 2018 with no change in the budget for 2017.

The purpose of ADA transition plan is to incorporate all necessary elements required to ensure the local jurisdictions with the MAPO area are in compliance with current ADA regulations. The ADA transition plan provides an inventory of all existing facilities so that the local jurisdiction can identify existing obstacles and barriers to develop a long term plan for necessary upgrades.

Attachments: None
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Selection of Intersection Locations for Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Studies in 2017
No: 5.2


Recommendation Action(s): Motion to recommend to the MAPO Policy Board three intersections to have Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Studies performed in 2017.

Summary: Intersection Control Evaluation studies will select the optimal control for intersections based on an objective analysis. These guidelines provide direction and recommendations to facilitate and implement community transportation goals and to improve transportation facilities and services by:

- Improving the multi-modal transportation circulation of people and goods, using both motorized and non-motorized transportation modes and facilities.

- Providing a safe, efficient, accessible, cost-effective and aesthetically pleasing transportation system.

- Providing a balanced approach to the consideration and selection of access strategies and concepts during planning, project identification and initiation processes that contemplate the addition, expansion or full control of intersections.

In 2016 MAPO contracted with SRF Consulting Group to perform ICE Studies at:
- Ray Drive / Howard Drive
- Stadium Road / Pohl Road
- Balcerzak Drive / Pohl Road

MAPO staff reached out to area partners and identified twelve potential candidates. Attached is a map of the twelve intersections for review.

Attachments:
1. Map of Identified/Potential Intersections
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Draft 2016 Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Reports
No: 5.3

Agenda Item: Draft 2016 Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Reports

Recommendation Action(s): Informational/Discussion

Summary: In April of 2016 the MAPO contracted with SRF Consulting Group, Inc. to perform three intersection control evaluation studies at Howard Drive/Lor Ray Drive, Pohl Road/ Stadium Road and Pohl Road and Pohl Road/ Balcerzak Drive. Scott Poska with SRF will be providing an update on the draft ICE reports as well as discussing the decision matrices for the ICE studies.

The draft ICE reports were emailed out to local partners, MAPO TAC, and the Policy Board on October 13th for review and comment. Comments are due to Scott Poska at: sposka@srfconsulting.com by October 21st.

Attachments:
1. Decision Matrices for the ICE Studies.
## Alternatives Decision Matrix: Lor Ray Drive at Howard Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All-Way Stop Control</th>
<th>Traffic Signal Control</th>
<th>Roundabout Control</th>
<th>Recommended Alternative(s) Based on Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warrants Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• Not met</td>
<td>• Not met</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>• Met</td>
<td>• Met</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• Lowest p.m. peak delay</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unacceptable a.m. peak LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>• Unacceptable a.m. peak LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Signal indications show vehicle right-of-way</td>
<td>• Least number of crashes expected</td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Slightly more crashes expected than roundabout</td>
<td>• Drivers select acceptable gaps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower capital costs ($300,000) than roundabout control</td>
<td>• Lower operation/maintenance costs than traffic signal control</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher operation/maintenance costs than roundabout control</td>
<td>• Higher capital costs ($1,490,000) than traffic signal control</td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right-of-Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No ROW impacts</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>• Requires additional ROW in all four quadrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation System Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides control continuity along Lor Ray Drive</td>
<td>• Matches control of roundabouts at nearby T.H. 14 interchanges</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian and Bicycle Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian pushbuttons and signal phasing</td>
<td>• Pedestrian refuge islands</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian signal phasing can lead to a false sense of security</td>
<td>• Longer pedestrian route</td>
<td>Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Acceptance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Familiar to drivers</td>
<td>• Familiar to drivers</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Alternatives Decision Matrix: Balcerzak Drive at Pohl Road

**Balcerzak Drive Four-Lane Roadway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All-Way Stop Control</th>
<th>Traffic Signal Control</th>
<th>Roundabout Control</th>
<th>Recommended Alternative(s) Based on Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warrants Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• AWSC warrant met</td>
<td>• Existing Year 2016 volumes do not meet traffic signal control warrants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>• AWSC warrant met</td>
<td>• Forecasted Year 2036 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS with four-lane Balcerzak Drive</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s):</td>
<td>• Least number of crashes expected</td>
<td>• Signal indications show vehicle right-of-way</td>
<td>• Least number of crashes expected</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s):</td>
<td>• Drivers decide right-of-way</td>
<td>• Slightly more crashes expected than all-way stop or roundabout</td>
<td>• Drivers select acceptable gaps</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s):</td>
<td>• No cost</td>
<td>• Lower capital costs ($300,000) than roundabout control</td>
<td>• Lower operation/maintenance costs than traffic signal control</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s):</td>
<td>• Low operation/maintenance costs</td>
<td>• Higher capital costs than all-way stop</td>
<td>• Higher capital costs ($1,390,000) than all-way stop or traffic signal control</td>
<td>Requires substantial roadway reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right-of-Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s):</td>
<td>N/A (existing control)</td>
<td>• No ROW impacts</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>• Requires additional ROW in all four quadrants</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation System Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides control continuity along Balcerzak Drive</td>
<td>• Traffic calming through residential area</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s):</td>
<td>N/A (existing control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian and Bicycle Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian pushbuttons and signal phasing</td>
<td>• Pedestrian Refuge islands</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s):</td>
<td>• All vehicular movements stop</td>
<td>• Pedestrian signal phasing can lead to a false sense of security</td>
<td>• Longer pedestrian route</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s):</td>
<td>• Expecting vehicles to yield to pedestrians can lead to a false sense of security</td>
<td>• No pedestrian phase</td>
<td>• No pedestrian phase</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Acceptance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro(s):</td>
<td>N/A (existing control)</td>
<td>• Familiar to drivers</td>
<td>• Familiar to drivers</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control Traffic Signal Control Roundabout Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balcerzak Drive Three-Lane Roadway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Analysis</th>
<th>Balcerzak Drive at Pohl Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• Acceptable LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>• Unacceptable p.m. peak LOS with Balcerzak three-lane variation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety Analysis**

| Pro(s): | • Vehicular safety benefits with only one opposing thru lane | Vehicular safety benefits with only one opposing thru lane | Vehicular safety benefits with no thru lane drop before roundabout |
| Con(s): | • None | • None | • None |
### Alternatives Decision Matrix: Stadium Road at Pohl Road

**Factor** | **All-Way Stop Control** | **Traffic Signal Control** | **Roundabout Control** | **Recommended Alternative(s) Based on Factor**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Warrants Analysis**
2016 | • AWSC warrant met | • Existing Year 2016 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants | N/A | All-Way Stop Control
2036 | • AWSC warrant met | • Forecasted Year 2036 volumes meet traffic signal control warrants | N/A | All-Way Stop Control

**Operational Analysis**
2016 | • Acceptable LOS | • Acceptable LOS | • Acceptable LOS | Traffic Signal Control
2036 | • Unacceptable p.m. peak LOS with Forecasted Year 2036 volumes | • Acceptable LOS | • Near capacity during the p.m. peak under forecasted conditions | Roundabout Control

**Safety Analysis**
Pro(s): N/A | • Signal indications show vehicle right-of-way | • Least number of crashes expected | Roundabout Control
Con(s): N/A | • Slightly more crashes expected than roundabout | • Drivers select acceptable gaps

**Cost Analysis**
Pro(s): N/A | • Lower capital costs ($300,000) than roundabout control | • Lower operation/maintenance costs than traffic signal control | Traffic Signal Control
Con(s): N/A | • Higher operation/maintenance costs than roundabout control | • Higher capital costs ($1,130,000) than traffic signal control | Roundabout Control

**Right-of-Way**
Pro(s): N/A | • No ROW impacts | none | Traffic Signal Control
Con(s): N/A | none | • Requires additional ROW in all four quadrants

**Transportation System Considerations**
Pro(s): N/A | • Provides control continuity along Stadium Road to the west | • Provides control continuity along Stadium Road to the east | Traffic Signal Control
Con(s): N/A | • Would likely not operate in coordination with other signals | none | Roundabout Control

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Considerations**
Pro(s): N/A | • Pedestrian pushbuttons and signal phasing | • Pedestrian Refuge islands | Traffic Signal Control
Con(s): N/A | • Pedestrian signal phasing can lead to a false sense of security | • Longer route | Roundabout Control

**Local Acceptance**
Pro(s): N/A | • Familiar to drivers | • Familiar to drivers | Traffic Signal Control
Con(s): N/A | none | none | Roundabout Control
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: City of North Mankato Transportation Alternatives Project Solicitation
No: 5.4

Agenda Item: City of North Mankato Transportation Alternatives Project (TAP) Solicitation

Recommendation Action(s): Informational/Discussion, motion to have MAPO staff write letter of support for TAP applications.

Summary: The Transportation Alternatives Program 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.

MAPO staff has been notified of 2 TAP projects within the MAPO area that are being submitted for the 2021 solicitation.

Lookout Drive Trail:

- Construction/completion of an off-road multi-use trail along Lookout Drive from Lee Boulevard/Judson Bottom Road to North Ridge Drive
- Between the top of the hill to North Ridge Drive, there are existing segments of trail and/or sidewalk that would be maintained, enhanced and/or reconstructed as required to meet current standards
- Between Lee Boulevard/Judson Bottom Road and the top of the hill, a new trail would be constructed. It is anticipated that this would be accomplished by narrowing the existing travel lane widths and utilizing the existing shoulder, enhancing or replacing the existing guard rail system, and the construction of several bridges in areas where widening does not provide sufficient space for the trail
- This trail segment is identified in MAPO LRTP, the City of North Mankato’s Comprehensive Plan, and the City of North Mankato’ Capital Improvement Program
- North Mankato is currently in the process of preparing a Letter of Interest, during which we will evaluate the feasibility of the various alternatives and refine costs.
- The preliminary estimate of the project cost is approximately $1.25 Million
Monroe/Garfield Safe Routes to School Project (re-application from last year):

- Construction of curb extensions/bump outs in intersection areas to shorten crossing distance and provide traffic calming. Improvements to visibility of crosswalks in the intersections will also be provided by using block striping in crosswalks.
- Construction of curb extensions/bump-outs are proposed in the following intersections: Monroe Avenue/Cross Street, Monroe Avenue/Center Street, Monroe Avenue/Range Street, Garfield Avenue/Center Street, Garfield Avenue/Range Street
- Construction of parent drop-off/pick-up area. Areas that will be considered for this improvement include:
  - Off of Center Street between Garfield Avenue and Monroe Avenue
  - Utilizing a portion of the Garfield Elementary parking lot on the north side of the school
- Construction of a sidewalk link on the south side of Garfield Avenue between Center Street and Range Street
- Construction of a paved trail across Wheeler Park to connect Page Avenue and Garfield Avenue, including trail lighting
- Total Estimated Cost: $386,538

**Attachments:**
1. Project Maps
Lookout Drive
Proposed Trail

Disclaimer:
This drawing is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information, and data located in various city, county, and state offices, and other sources affecting the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City of North Mankato is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.
Monroe & Garfield Elementary Schools Safe Routes to School Project
City of North Mankato

Proposed Improvements
January, 2016

CLIENT
LOGO

Legend

Wheeler Path Lighting
Mid-Block Curb Extension
Intersection Curb Extensions
Continental or Zebra Striping
Proposed Paths
Potential Parent Drop-Off and Pick Up Area (Loop)
School Property
Parks

Source: City of North Mankato, MnDOT, Nicollet County
AGENDA RECOMMENDATION

Agenda Heading: Proposed MAPO 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment No: 5.5

**Agenda Item**: Proposed MAPO 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment

**Recommendation Action(s)**: Motion to recommend to the MAPO Policy Board approval of the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment

**Summary**: The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) reports how the various jurisdictions within the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO) area have prioritized their use of limited federal highway and transit funding.

The TIP process serves to implement projects identified in the Mankato/North Mankato area long range transportation plan (LRTP). The MAPO TIP document programs project funding for metropolitan area.

Upon review by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of the 2017-2020 TIP, the following comments by FTA need to be addressed in the 2017-2020 TIP which requires a TIP amendment and MAPO Policy Board to approval.

Below are FTA’s comments on Mankato’s TIP:

- The FTA Section 5307 annual apportionment for Mankato Transit averaged more than $880,000 from 2014-2016. A reasonable assumption for the 2017-2020 program years is that a total of about $3.5 million in Section 5307 funds will be available. Additionally, about $2 million in 2014-2016 Section 5307 funding remains unobligated. Thus, a total of about $5.5 million in Section 5307 funding is available for the duration of the TIP. However, only about $2.2 million of this is programmed. Additional projects should be programmed to account for this discrepancy.

- Mankato Transit has about $1.5 million in FY2013/14 Section 5307 funds that are obligated but have not been used. The TIP should explain this apparent lack of project implementation and how it will be resolved.

- Transit projects in the tables should reflect the City of Mankato in the Agency column and not MnDOT.

- Bus purchases should reflect replacement or expansion.
Attachments:
   1. Summary of proposed 2017-2020 TIP amendments
CITY OF MANKATO
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Jake Huebsch
FROM: Mark Anderson
DATE: Friday, October 14, 2016
SUBJECT: TIP Amendment

Programming of remaining $3.3M:
- Operations: $460,000
- Expansion Bus 1: $452,000
- Expansion Bus 2: $452,000
- Expansion Farebox: $18,000
- Replacement Bus 1: $170,000
- Pulse Center: $1,500,000
- Electric Lift for Bus Garage: $15,000
- Floor Scrubber Sweeper for Garage: $85,000
- Update to radios: $65,000
- Scheduling Software: $65,000

Discussion re: delay of planned project implementation:
- As Mankato transitioned from a 5311 system to a 5307 system we were on the front end of an $8M construction project with 5 separate funding silos. There were two federal silos, STP and SGR, with the remaining three silos being: 2008 state bond, 2012 state bond and state GMT funds. Several months into the construction project, the director of public works, who was the project lead, left the City for other employment. In addition to being the project lead, the public works director was assisting with the transition to becoming a direct recipient of federal funds. The City promoted the deputy director to director, but she had no experience with transit and was not involved in the project or the transition. The mass transit superintendent assumed the lead position for the construction project. Another important component is that the administrative staffing structure has not changed from the time Mankato operated as a 5311 system to current. During this same time period, Mankato experienced a significant increase in the demand for public transit and has increased the hours of operations by 30% on their RR and 27% on DAR.

In addition to the construction project, FTA was in the process of changing their grant / reporting software system from TEAM to TrAMS, the State of MN was changing their grant / reporting software system from PTA to BlackCat, The City of Mankato was in the process of changing their financial software from AS 400 to Tyler Munis. During this change, MNDOT was restructuring the central office and
Mankato began working with a new project manager and the city reassigned grant duties from the finance department to the mass transit superintendent. Finally, within the past year, mass transit has been moved out of public works and into community development and we have another new project manager at MNDOT.

We had our first triennial review in July 2016 and are in the process of making the corrections to our deficiencies. Part of the review is to correct and submit the program of projects.

In closing, there was too much going on, with too few people involved, to accurately and effectively make the transition to a 5307 system. This structural change, at just about every level of our operations and administration, has affected our ability to provide timely delivery of projects involving federal funds. Although the projects may be delayed, we do intend on spending our federal money and will work to achieve that end.

**Resolution:**
The construction project has been closed out and we are operational out of our new facility. Additionally, we’re in the process of securing consulting services that will allow us to catch up on our backlog of work and give us hands on training for the federal grant writing and reporting responsibilities. In addition, in 2017, we’re bringing an additional position that will assist with the federal grant / reporting duties.
A Regular meeting of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization Policy Board was held on September 8th, 2016, at 6:00 p.m. in the Minnesota River Room of the Intergovernmental Center. Present Policy Board members Mark Piepho, Chris Frederick, Jack Kolars, and Ryan Short. Also present was MAPO Transportation Planner Jake Huebsch, also in attendance from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was Ryan Thilges. Tom Rieff owner of GreenCare located at 1717 3rd Avenue, Mankato MN 56001 was also in attendance.

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

Motion to Approve Agenda
Mr. Frederick motioned to approve the agenda. Mr. Short seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Motion to Approve August 4th, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Mr. Kolars moved to approve the August 4th Policy Board Meeting minutes. Mr. Frederick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

New Business
Resolution Approving the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Staff presented the 2017-2020 TIP and explained that the TIP was released for a 30 day public comment period on August 5th and ended on September 5th. Staff followed the process outlined in the MAPO's Public Participation Plan which included distribution methods of the draft TIP and hosting a public open house. The open house was held on August 18th from 4:00 – 5:00. No comments were received during the public open house.

Mr. Tom Rieff owner of GreenCare located at 1717 3rd Avenue, Mankato MN 56001 expressed concern on project 07-00125 in FY2017 upgrade of existing railroad crossing on 3rd Avenue in Mankato, also known as Blue Earth County CSAH 5. Mr. Rieff was concerned that a median would be constructed with the project which could limit access to his business. MAPO staff and Mr. Thilges explained they followed up with MnDOT Central Office and District 7 staff to confirm no median work was included in the scope of work by MnDOT for this project. MAPO staff received confirmation from Ronda Allis at the District that the project was an upgrade of the existing railroad crossing and no median work was included with MnDOT STIP project 07-00125. Mr. Thilges and MAPO staff further explained how MnDOT rail projects are selected by MnDOT’s Rail Office.

Mr. Kolars motioned to pass the presented resolution approving the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion also directed MAPO staff to write a formal letter to MnDOT’s Rail Office requesting that the process for selecting rail crossing projects be more transparent with MnDOT Districts and local agencies. Also to be included in the letter will be the MAPO Policy Board's approval of the rail crossing
project (STIP number 07-00125) assuming that no median work will be constructed with the rail crossing upgrade located near Mr. Rieff’s property on 3rd Avenue. Mr. Short seconded the motion. The motion to pass the resolution approving the 2017-2020 TIP and directing MAPO staff to write a letter outlining the comments as indicted in the above minutes carried unanimously.

**MAPO Staff Presentation**
MAPO staff provided an overview and update of the Mankato/North Mankato Area Planning Organization. The presentation included an overview of the MAPO organization & background, Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), current studies & activities and upcoming Initiatives.

**TAC Comments**
None

**Policy Board Comments & Other Business**
Staff provided a brief update on Riverfront Drive and Belgrade Avenue Corridor studies including the local outreach meetings with local businesses along the corridors.

**Adjournment**
With no further business, Mr. Frederick moved to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Short seconded the motion. With all voting in favor the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

________________________
Chair, Mr. Piepho