



## MINUTES

33<sup>rd</sup> Street South Corridor Project  
Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #3  
Stearns County Highway Department  
1:00 PM – 2:00 PM on April 19, 2007

### Attendees:

Jodi Teich – Stearns County  
Leigh Lenzmeier – Stearns County  
Matt Glaesman – City of St Cloud  
Steve Foss – City of St Cloud  
Scott Mareck – St Cloud APO  
Herman Bartz – City of Waite Park  
Claudia Dumont – Mn/DOT D3  
Dale Grove - Bonestroo  
Brian Johnson - Bonestroo

Minutes recorded by: Brian C. Johnson - Bonestroo

Note: Minutes are in *Italics*

Action Items and Special Notes are in ***Bold Type Italics***

The meeting was started at 1:05 pm.

1. Review Progress
  - a. Action items from last meeting
    - i. *Brian reviewed the meeting minutes from the last PAC meeting and noted that all action items had been completed. Jodi pointed out a type-o in the minutes. Note: After Brian fixes the type-o, the minutes will become officially adopted and redistributed.*
  - b. Environmental Data Collection Update
    - i. *Brian gave the PAC an update of the environmental review process and current activities. Brian noted that the Phase I Site Review, Noise Analysis and Wetland Delineation processes were all in motion.*
    - ii. *Brian was recently contacted by Craig Johnson of Mn/DOT's Cultural Resource Unit (CRU). The CRU's review of the area, as part of the cultural review process, noted a barn owned by*

*Margaret Hartneck on the west side of TH 15 that could have some historical significance. The CRU requested that Brian check with the owner to see if a site visit could be made. The property owner made it clear that she is opposed to anyone coming onto her property in this regard. Brian will continue to work with the CRU on this issue.*

- c. Updated Existing Right-of-Way Map
  - i. *Brian gave the group an update on the existing R/W information. Jodi gave Brian some additional information after the meeting, which Brian will incorporate into the layout.*
- d. Existing/Projected Traffic Data
  - i. *Brian noted that Bonestroo has been working on compiling existing and projected traffic data with APO staff. There is a lack of existing traffic data in this area, so some reasonable assumptions are being made at this time. Moreover, future turning movements may be much different than today once various connections to the regional transportation system are made. Brian suggested that a technical meeting be held soon to review the data and the assumptions made. It will be important to agree upon and document the traffic data used early on in the process, as it will be used to define lane geometry and intersection configurations moving forward.*
  - ii. *Scott asked if there was crash data available for the corridor and if any particular area stood out in this regard. Jodi noted most incidents occur on the east end where all the businesses are.*
  - iii. *Claudia asked if there were recent traffic counts on Cooper Ave since it was upgraded recently. **Action Item #1: Brian will check into available crash data and traffic counts.***

## 2. Alternative Evaluation Criteria

- a. Review proposed criteria and grouping of issues
  - i. *A “Key Issues” chart was distributed to the PAC that summarized the issues that were discussed at the last PAC meeting. The chart broke the issues into 4 primary categories; Transportation, Social, Economic and Environmental. Dale talked through each issue with the group to gather feedback on the content.*
  - ii. *Claudia noted that “Granite Outcroppings” could be lumped under “Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA’s)”. Impacts to the ESA’s per alternative need to be shown graphically and evaluated accordingly.*

- b. Discuss method of measuring impacts
  - i. *Scott noted that safety improvements should be evaluated as part of “Transportation” (i.e., divided roadway vs. undivided roadway on the east end, etc.). Scott also noted that roundabouts vs. standard intersections should be evaluated in terms of safety and mobility in the matrix. Brian mentioned that a roundabout feasibility memo was in the works.*
  - ii. *Dale proposed an idea on how to evaluate and assign weighting to modifying or closing private, public or commercial access points. The general idea is to multiply the number of trips generated by a particular land use type times the ADT of the roadway. The point is by eliminating access points you can potentially reduce the number of traffic conflict points along the corridor which in turn improves safety. The PAC was receptive to the idea. Scott noted that relocating private or public access points from public ones would help in the same manner. Scott further noted that the APO’s guidelines for access management should be followed.*
  - iii. *Scott mentioned that the matrix was a good evaluation tool, but we should keep in mind that the public may not embrace it the same way, given its technical nature. Matt noted that the matrix is mainly a tool to eliminate flawed alternatives.*
  - iv. *It was decided by the PAC to walk through the “Key Issues” list at the Open House to inform the public what items will be evaluated, and to see if we missed anything important to the stakeholders.*
  - v. *Dale proposed a method to set a threshold for the realm of potential impacts along the corridor by running the previously recommended typical sections through the project area. This will allow an “impact baseline” to be established. Dale also mentioned that the corridor has three distinct (mile long) segments that could be evaluated independently in an effort to find the preferred typical section per segment. The PAC was receptive to both these ideas.*

### 3. Public Meeting #1

- a. Set Date/Location/Invitees
  - i. *Brian noted that he was attempting to set the time/date/location of the first Open House. The group discussed the information and decided that May 10<sup>th</sup> from 5:00 PM to 8:00 PM would work best. **Action Item #2: Brian will see if the church is available on the date. Presentations will be given by Bonestroo at 5:30 PM and 6:30 PM. Bonestroo will also produce a 15-min Power Point presentation that will be distributed to the PAC for review prior***

*to the open house. It was decided that Bonestroo would handle the entire presentation.*

- b. Review Data Sheet
  - i. *Brian distributed an Open House Notice for review by the PAC. The group decided to show a bubble around the project area instead of a line on the attached map. The notice will need to be mailed 10 days prior to the Open House. **Action Item #3: PAC - Please return any comments on the Open House Notice to Brian before 4/24/07. Janice will send a press release to the SC Times regarding the Open House. Copies of the Open House Notice will be made available for the next City Council and County Board Meeting's.***
  - ii. *Scott noted that we should anticipate questions that may be asked by the public that are ahead of the process (i.e., construction dates, R/W acquisition process). **Action Item #4: PAC - Please forward your thoughts frequently asked public questions to Brian before 5/10/07.***
- c. Review Meeting Outline
  - i. *Brian walked the PAC through an outline for the Open House. **Note: the first open house is essentially an information sharing meeting between the agencies and the public. Brian will be the point of public and agency contact for the Open House.***
  - ii. *It was decided that bottled water, coffee and cookies will be supplied at the meeting.*

The meeting concluded at 2:10.