

# 2020 Regional Solicitation Public Comment Report

Technical Advisory Committee  
December 4, 2019



# Comments Received

- 12 Commenters including 5 cities, 4 counties, 2 transit providers, one advocacy group
- 33 distinct comments
- Comments grouped by Regional Solicitation change topic
- Comments often on both sides of a topic, i.e. in support and opposition

# Process Moving Forward

- Nov/Dec: TAC Funding & Programming Committee and TAC review bridge sufficiency rating measure and any other topics and recommend changes to the Regional Solicitation application
- Dec: TAB reviews the TAC recommendations; votes to amend any additional changes into the draft Solicitation; and adopts the final Regional Solicitation as amended

# Cottage Grove Comments

- Not included in handout because they were sent to an older Council Address.
- Six comments, two of which are unique and will be added to the TAC version of the public comment report:
  - Support limiting BRT funding to ensure other transit projects can still be funded.
  - Support the required completion of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition plans.

# Comments on Modal Funding Ranges and Unique Project Funding

Comment	Comment Summary
1	Increase roadway modal category by \$4 million and the bicycle/pedestrian modal category by \$1 million, bringing them back to their traditional proportions.
2	Support the proposed additional regional funding to transit, whether through an increase to the modal funding range of transit projects or by over-programming across all modes.
3	Eliminate the proposed 2.5% set-aside for the Unique Projects category.
4	Supports the creation of the Unique Projects category.
5	Redirect the \$5 million proposed for Unique projects to restore roadway and bike/pedestrian amounts; then backfill Unique projects as additional funds become available.
6	Recommend that highways receive a minimum of 60% of available funding, consistent with historical levels.

- TAB Request: Any input on modal funding ranges or unique projects set-aside?
  - F&P: No input.

# Comments on Minimum and Maximum Awards

Comment	Comment Summary
7	The proposed adjustments to the minimum and maximum project awards will have a positive impact.
8	The increase to the \$10 M for Roadway Expansion is inconsistent with the other categories – all categories are experiencing inflation.
9	One or more projects should be eligible for a \$5.5 million max in the multiuse trail application category.
10	Support a \$10 M million maximum for bridge projects.

- TAB Request: Is there an interest in raising other maximum award amounts in other project categories? What is the impact to the number of awarded projects?
- TAB Request: Could an option with one large multiuse trail project at \$5.5M be possible from a technical perspective, while keeping the maximum for other projects \$4M?
  - F&P: This is feasible, but creates confusion for applicants regarding how to size a project.

# Comments on Bridge Category Funding Minimum

Comment	Comment Summary
11	Support keeping the \$10 million minimum set-aside for the Bridge application category

- F&P Comment: TAB could set a “general target” as opposed to a rigid rule.

# Comments on Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Program and Transit New Market Guarantee

Comment	Comment Summary
12	The creation of a new category specifically for Arterial Bus Rapid Transit precludes other agencies to compete for these funds. Support a broader interpretation of Bus Rapid Transit, which would allow multiple agencies to compete in this new category.
13	Supports the proposed Arterial BRT category.
14	The proposed \$25 million maximum for Arterial BRT projects and up to \$7 million for an additional BRT project selected through Transit Expansion of Transit Modernization categories leaves little funding for fixed route services.
15	The addition of the Arterial BRT category will reduce funding in other modal categories and limit the ability to improve the A-minor arterial roadway system, which is the primary system used by buses.
16	Support creation of a Transit New Market guarantee.
17	If broader BRT is not feasible, award at least one project in Transit Exp and at least one project in Transit Mod to a STA provider.
CG	Support limiting BRT funding to ensure other transit projects can still be funded.

- **TAB Request:** Should the proposed ABRT program be broadened to include all BRT projects? Could a new scoring system be easily developed, or should it be worked on and then implemented for the 2022 cycle?
  - **F&P:** Recommended establishing a scoring process in 2022 so all BRT project types can compete.





# Comment on Long-Term Transit Operations

Comment	Comment Summary
18	Reinstate the requirement that transit applicants must demonstrate financial capacity to operate projects beyond the life of awarded projects.

- TAB Request: Should any technical changes be made to this qualifying requirement? “The applicant must have the capital and operating funds necessary to implement the entire project ~~and commit to continuing the service or facility beyond the initial three-year funding period for operating costs.~~”
  - F&P Action: “The applicant must have the capital and operating funds necessary to implement the entire project **and certify that they will provide funding, if the service or facility project continues beyond the initial three-year funding period for transit operating funds.**”

# Comments on Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities Measures

Comment	Comment Summary
19	Revise the new bonus point scoring added to criterion 4A (Deficiencies and Safety). Remove Part 2 scoring and bonus point option.
20	Revise and redistribute the 50 additional points proposed for criterion 2A Potential Usage to other measures. This measure of population and employment within 1-mile does not accurately capture facility usage in rural or rural center communities or for bicycle and pedestrian facilities that serve as the primary connection between communities.
21	Develop a process to update the RBTN map.
22	Give multiuse trails that connect to an existing or future transitway station the full 200 points in the RBTN criteria.

- TAB Request: Should Washington County’s request to add a Tier 1 RBTN trail alignment along the Gold Line be considered? Note: RBTN map is being considered for use during this meeting cycle.
  - F&P: This question is better-suited for the RBTN discussion than it is for the Regional Solicitation discussion.

# Comments on Roadways and Spot Mobility Categories and Measures

Comment	Comment Summary
23	The Spot Mobility category will be beneficial in allocating funding to small improvement projects that will provide significant value at lower costs
24	Support new emphasis given to pedestrian safety. However, 41% of scoring is still related to existing congestion and mitigation, which may counteract potential safety improvements.
25	Safety scores based on travel speeds is counter-intuitive and has inverse relationship with crash severity and lacks context sensitivity with new state law allowing cities to set speed limits.
26	Consider the addition of negative points for projects that negatively impact non-motorized travel.
27	Scoring should be based upon new/improved pedestrian facilities, not for upgrading facilities to ADA standards.
28	Measures A and B in the roadway modernization/reconstruction category should both use daily person throughput
29	The measures have a continued focus on congestion, vehicle mobility, capacity expansion and highway investment which is counter to regional policy, climate change and greenhouse gas reduction.
30	There is a new roadway measure for pedestrian safety, however, most of the measures and points continue to emphasize travel time and congestion displacement.

# General Comments

Comment	Comment Summary
31	<p>Completed Council-led studies are used in the scoring criteria, but the results of these studies, in particular the maps, are often out-of-date. With no process to update these maps and rankings to reflect changing demographics, potential projects are unable to be considered for funding.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add an option to allocate points for projects that meet the intent of the study map or used in the scoring criteria, specifically:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Give the at-grade intersection with the highest traffic volumes on Highway 36 the full 80 points from the PAICS and</li> <li>b. Roadways with a heavy commercial vehicle volume of 1,000 should receive the full 80 points from the Truck Freight Corridor study map.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Develop a process to update maps and investment rankings prior to each future regional solicitation, specifically including the RBTN map, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study rankings, and Truck Freight Corridor Study map</li> </ol>
32	Support inclusion of the Bike Barriers Study results into the scoring
33	The 2020 Regional Solicitation process circumvented the role of technical committees.
CG	Support the required completion of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition plans.

- TAB Request: Examine whether anything should, or can, be done to address concerns about outdated information in studies or to address interest in giving full credit under certain circumstances.
  - F&P: No.

# Questions

Steve Peterson, Manager of Highway Planning and TAB/TAC Process

651-602-1819

[Steven.Peterson@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Steven.Peterson@metc.state.mn.us)

Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator

651-602-1717

[Elaine.Koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Elaine.Koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us)

Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner

651-602-1705

[joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us)