

Partnership Business Meeting

June 23, 2022 at 7:30 a.m.

- www.RegionalPlanningPartnership.org
- RegionalPlanningPartnership@gmail.com
- Partnership and Staff Roster
- In-person meeting will be held at Sherburne County Government Center County Board Room, 13880 Business Center Drive, Elk River 55330
- Join the meeting from a computer click Here; join by phone: +1-510-338-9438, meeting number (access code): 2551 655 2595, meeting password: s7jHQjcSM83 (77547527 from phones)

		TOPIC		ACTION	LEAD
Routine Business				Action	Lead
1. Welcome and call to order (Link: <u>Presentation</u>)					Chair
2. Introductions/roll call for both in-person and online (sign-in sheet as relevant)a. Members Present (in person or remotely):					
	Becker, City	Tracy Bertram (P) x Rick Hendrickson (A)	x Greg Lerud (Admin) x Jacob Sanders (LT)		
	Becker Township	Brian Kolbinger (P)	Brad Wilkening (A)		
	Big Lake, City	x Paul Seefeld (P) Kim Noding (A)	Clay Wilfahrt (Admin) Lucinda Meyers (LT)		
	Big Lake Township	X Dean Brenteson (P)	Larry Alfords (A)		
	Monticello, City	x Lloyd Hilgart (P) Charlotte Gabler (A)	x Rachel Leonard (Admin) Angela Schumann (LT)		
	Monticello Township	Bob Idziorek (P)	x Shannon Bye (A)		
	Sherburne County	Tim Dolan (P) x Raeanne Danielowski (A)	x Dan Weber (Admin) x Marc Schneider (LT)		
	Silver Creek Township	x Barry Heikkinen (P)	x Chris Newman		
	Wright County	x Darek Vetsch (P) Mark Daleiden (A)	Lee Kelly (Admin) Barry Rhineberger (LT)		
	■ Consulta Chad Hau	n person or remotely) nts, staff: Jessica Barthel, An Ismann, Hannah Klimmeck, I tt Leonard, Keisha Erickson (Bill Kemp, Tom Cruikshank, Phil		
3. Agenda: Revise/approve Notes: Motion by Hilgart, second by Hendrickson. Approved.				Changes, Approve	Chair
4. Previous meeting <u>notes</u> Notes: Motion by Heikkinen, seconded by Hilgart. Approved.				Changes, Approve	Chair
Treasurer's Report: Information not yet available; deferred to next meeting Notes:				Questions, Receive	Treasurer
Notes: Action Items: None				Action	Lead

Discus	sion or Information Items	Action	Lead
5.	MnDOT/FHWA presentation and Q&A (see Presentation)		Marc
	a. Introduction:		Schneider,
	■ High-level information about major transportation project		FHWA (Phil
	development previously presented		Forst),
	■ Partnership's need for detailed information from MnDOT and FHWA		MnDOT
	about this complex process, decision points, timing, costs, etc.,		(Tom Cruikshank)
	resulted in a flowchart		Cruiksnank
	Note that while this flowchart answers questions and is a valuable		
	resource, as you get into the formal environmental studies the		
	process is even more complex; FHWA and MnDOT are willing to		
	provide those additional details at a later date		
	b. Process information presented live via a flowchart (PDF)		
	c. Supporting materials:		
	(A) TH 25 Transportation Study Summary (SRF, Oct 2019)		
	(B) CMRP history and governance summary		
	(C) <u>Factbooks</u> from Framework 2030 (2020) link is to CMRP		
	website		
	■ (D) Framework 2030 Vision, Strategies, Actions (2021-present)		
	■ (E-1) MnDOT/FHWA Purpose and Need Requirements link to		
	MnDOT website		
	■ (E-2) MnDOT/FHWS Purpose and Need graphic		
	(F) MnDOT expectations for desired non-transportation outcomes		
	(link to "goals" per MnDOT transportation project development		
	process)		
lotes:			
•	Marc Schneider, Bill Kemp and Phil Frost summarized the timeline and highlighted		
	key components and future plans of the timeline. All presentation details are on file to look back on if needed.		
•	Discussion regarding the process of getting from the point of Tier 1 to Tier 2. Tier 1		
	involves a reasonable range of alternatives. NEPA is an informed decision making process.		
•	In these early stages, there cannot be only 1 alternative to look at; there need to be		
	multiple. If you only have one alternative that you like, you would not be able to		
	move into Tier 1.		
•	Discussion regarding how to determine the viability, or lack thereof, for expanding		
	Hwy 25. With NEPA there is not one parameter or one threshold when entering into		
	a Tier 1. To expand the existing Hwy 25, there are a variety of alternatives. Process		
	would look at performance and impacts that would be laid out for the joint leads to		
	make an informed decision.		
•	The cost for a corridor of our size is approximately \$300-900,000 for a PEL and \$2 -		
	\$3 million for a Tier 1.		
•	Discussion on how to seek out and retain funding sources. MnDOT noted the state		
	would likely support the planning effort; further discussion required about that		

involvement and what grant funds might be available. Depending on the circumstances, there could also be some economic development funds available. FHWA not aware of any Federal grant opportunities for planning process. • Pushing too early for a specific corridor has consequences on the resources and environmental clearances. There will need to be permits and those permits will have their own set of processes that go along with them. A good way to determine when an idea/alternative should fall off is to look at the age of the studies and the integrity of the process. Make sure to keep priorities the same to keep the integrity and apply the same decision making process to all of the alternatives. Note the decision point in the flowchart about whether the requirements have been met for a transportation solution. Immediate next steps include comparing the purpose and needs statement with what we've done, identifying missing elements, plugging holes, and confirming needs for additional studies. Documenting how and what you have done through the process is very important. Raeanne Danielowski left the meeting at 9:00am and Lloyd Hilgart took over as chair. Chair 6. Other business/future agenda items: a. Does the Partnership wish to schedule a special meeting on 6/30 to discuss Workplan refinements or another date? b. Community update: When to schedule Sherburne County? c. Other? Notes: Motion by Heikkinen, second by Hendrickson to set the Special Meeting to discuss Workplan refinements on 6/30. Approved. Sherburne County will present their community update at the regular scheduled meeting in July. 7. Adjourned: Meeting adjourned at 9:12 a.m.