Minutes

TAB Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting Date: November 2, 2022   **Time**: 9:00 AM   **Location:** Virtual

Members Present:

- ☒ Jon Solberg, Chair, MnDOT
- ☒ Joe MacPherson, Anoka Co
- ☒ Lyndon Robjent, Carver Co
- ☒ Erin Laberee, Dakota Co
- ☒ Brian Isaacson, Vice Chair, Ramsey Co
- ☒ Chad Ellos, Hennepin Co
- ☒ Lisa Freese, Scott Co
- ☒ Lyssa Leitner, Washington Co
- ☒ Andrew Witter, 7W

- ☒ Karl Keel, Bloomington
- ☒ Charlie Howley, Chanhassen
- ☒ Robert Ellis, Eden Prairie
- ☒ Brandon Brodhag, Fridley
- ☐ Paul Oehme, Lakeville
- ☒ Ken Ashfeld, Maple Grove
- ☒ Ross Beckwith, West Saint Paul
- ☒ Michael Thompson, Plymouth
- ☒ Jenifer Hager, Minneapolis
- ☒ Jim Voll, Minneapolis
- ☒ Paul Kurtz, Saint Paul
- ☒ Bill Dermody, Saint Paul

- ☒ Steve Peterson, Council MTS
- ☒ Michael Larson, Council CD
- ☒ Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB
- ☒ Innocent Eyoh, MPCA
- ☒ Bridget Rief, MAC
- ☒ Matt Fyten, STA
- ☒ Adam Harrington, Metro Transit
- ☐ Praveena Pidaparthi, MnDOT
- ☐ Colleen Eddy, DEED
- ☐ Vacant, MN DNR
- ☒ Danny McCullough, Bicycle
- ☐ Vacant, Pedestrian
- ☐ Vacant, FHWA (ex-officio)

☒ = present

Call to Order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Solberg called the regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee to order at 9:02 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

The committee approved the agenda with no changes. Therefore, no vote was needed.

Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Keel and seconded by Freese to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2022, regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee. **Motion carried**.

Public Comment on Committee Business

None.

TAB Report

Koutsoukos reported on the October 19, 2022, Transportation Advisory Board meeting.

Business – Committee Reports

Executive Committee (Jon Solberg, Chair)

Chair Solberg reported that the TAC Executive Committee met prior to the TAC meeting and discussed the Regional Solicitation scenarios and nominations for the next Chair. He added that a

funding scenario created by the counties was discussed and that the scenario was not fiscally constrained.

Planning Committee/TPP Technical Working Group (Angie Stenson, Vice Chair)

TAC Planning Committee vice chair Angie Stenson reported that the TAC Planning Committee meeting was cancelled in October. She provided an update on the TPP Technical Working Group meeting that occurred in October.

Funding & Programming (Michael Thompson, Chair)

1. [2022-44: Program Year Extension Request: Maple Grove Rush Creek Boulevard/I-94/TH 610 Interchange](#)

Thompson said Maple Grove is requesting a program year extension from 2023 to 2024 for its four-lane divided A-minor arterial expander between CSAH 30 and the I-94 and MN 610 interchange. Barbeau added that the project scored eight on the program year extension assessment, which is better than the minimum score of seven required for a recommendation of approval.

It was moved by Freese and seconded by MacPherson to recommend that TAB approve Maple Grove's Rush Creek Boulevard/I-94/TH 610 Interchange Construction and MN 610 Extension (SP# 189-143-001) be extended from fiscal year 2023 to fiscal year 2024. **Motion carried** unanimously.

2. [2022-45: 2022 Regional Solicitation Funding Options](#)

Peterson introduced the item, which included three proposed funding scenarios: A) Midpoint Plus with Extra to Bicycle/Pedestrian, B1) Bicycle/Pedestrian-Heavy Option + Extra to Roadway, and B2) Bicycle/Pedestrian-Heavy + Extra to Bicycle/Pedestrian. These scenarios include $2.1M to $3.5M of yet-to-program funding available to bring the overprogramming up to 11%. In response to a question from Robjent, Peterson stated that MnDOT has enabled the Council to be more flexible in terms of project years for use of the Bridge funds, which will lead to funding more bridges in the next cycle. In response to a question from MacPherson, Peterson said that only the fifth-ranked bridge, funded with STPG Program funding, is included in the modal spits.

Keel asked whether not funding the yet-to-program funds would keep overprogramming to about 10%, to which Peterson replied in the affirmative. Solberg said that a larger number of projects will be funded, opening the possibility of overprogramming at a higher rate than possible.

Isaacson said that if TAC can show differences among the scenarios from a regional perspective, that could help prevent TAB from discussing the merits of individual projects.

Solberg suggested that TAC conduct a straw poll on which alternative(s) is preferred.

Leitner proposed narrowing to two scenarios by removing scenario B2 and using overprogramming to fund Scott County's multiuse trail application in scenario B1.

Laberee asked that regional balance be taken into consideration when looking into where to place extra funds. She added that Dakota County is consistently underfunded versus its population and jobs.

Hager expressed support for Leitner's suggestion of eliminating one of the B scenarios. She then asked why safety is only monetized for roadway projects and why scenario A funds an extra transit project. Peterson replied that scenario A does not spread funding to bike/ped, enabling funding of the final transit expansion project. Hager replied that TAB had wanted to move funding to bicycle/pedestrian, to which Koutsoukos replied that TAB did not suggest that for the midpoint scenario. Peterson said that safety is only monetized for the roadway applications because those are the only applications that have scoring measures that are conducive to that. He added that there are safety measures in bicycle/pedestrian and there could be some math that could be done. He added that other measures are monetized and could be added. Hager added that if

emissions could be shown that might be valuable to TAB. Peterson replied that the Council is probably a cycle away from being able to measure this.

MacPherson suggested showing the proposed funding percentage by mode in the Key Differences table.

Freese suggested that the lowest-ranked transit project in scenario A could be removed and the funding could be moved to bicycle/pedestrian given how many transit projects are being funded. Robjent expressed agreement and suggested adding overprogramming to the roadway mode. He added that he supports scenario A with slight changes such as removing some of the lower-ranked pedestrian and Safe Routes to School projects.

Ellos expressed support for Leitner's suggestion of eliminating one of the B scenarios and agreed that funding of the bottom transit expansion project could be used differently. He said that in scenario A multiuse trails should have carbon reduction funding, as this is more effective than the pedestrian and Safe Routes to School categories in terms of reducing carbon.

McCullough added support for Leitner's suggestion of eliminating one of the B scenarios, adding that it would be great to fund the Scott County multiuse trails project, which scored well. He added that getting the Scott County and Dakota County projects will add regional balance.

Keel added support for Leitner's suggestion of eliminating one of the B scenarios along with adding the Scott County project to scenario B1. He questioned Ellos's comment about bicycle projects being most effective for carbon reduction because of the large use of roadway projects.

Koutsoukos reminded members that TAB is interested in funding smaller projects and that the focus on not funding the lowest-scoring transit expansion project is not consistent with funding the lowest-ranked project in the pedestrian and Safe Routes to School categories.

Howley suggested reporting "percent of need" as a metric, as it is difficult to complete a large project without support. He also agreed that combining B1 and B2 might make the discussion easier. Peterson replied that staff has determined percent of need and can add it to the key differences table.

Robjent said that roadways has $900M of demand and bicycle/pedestrian has $230M of demand. He added that percentage of total funding by mode should be shown, including the carbon reduction and bridge funds.

Harrington said that scenario B1 makes sense whether combined with scenario B2 or not.

Laberee said that Dakota County's CSAH 42 project, which is shown just below the funding line, is a higher priority than its 140th St. pedestrian overpass, which is shown as funded. She suggested that the CSAH 42 project could be funded with Carbon Reduction funds.

Fyten said SouthWest Transit prefers scenario A and added that transit providers tend to apply for their highest priorities, which can lead to lower-ranked projects being funded.

Thompson said he could support scenario B1 along with finding a way to fund the Scott County trail and the City of Victoria pedestrian project. He added that this leaves the two $10M strategic capacity projects unfunded and that these projects can be difficult to fund without Regional Solicitation funding.

Freese said that low-scoring projects sometimes get funded but bike/ped and highway categories do not have low-scoring projects funded. She suggested that the inability for low-scoring projects to be funded be considered in the future.

MOTION 1: It was moved by Leitner and seconded by Isaacson to eliminate scenario B2 and use overprogramming to make scenario B1 resemble scenario B2 by funding bicycle and pedestrian projects from the latter. Solberg said that about $7.2M would be available to fund the Scott County and Victoria projects with overprogramming at 12%. Peterson said two ways to fund the Scott County project in B1 have been suggested: 1) use the extra overprogramming to fund the Dakota County reconstruction and 2) remove pedestrian facilities projects. He added that iterations of all three scenarios should be brought back to TAB, though preferences can be

stated. Leitner suggested that it is the job of staff to bring TAB's ideas through the committee process and therefore is comfortable not showing all three scenarios. Robjent asked whether the overprogramming going to B1 can also go to scenario A. He added that because Dakota County has expressed preference for its roadway project over its pedestrian project, there needs to be discussion about the balance between those modes. Leitner suggested that it is not in an applicant's role to shift modes by identifying a preferred project. MacPherson clarified that this only works if additional overprogramming is allowed and Solberg concurred. Robjent expressed agreement with eliminating scenario B2 because the bicycle/pedestrian mode is funded higher than the TAB-established range.

MOTION 2: It was moved by Leitner and seconded by Solberg to table MOTION 1 and MOTION 1 was tabled.

MOTION 3: It was moved by Solberg and seconded by Robjent to recommend overprogramming to 12% and programming unprogrammed funds. **MOTION 3 carried** with 19 ayes, one nay, and three abstentions.

MOTION 4: It was moved by Leitner and seconded by Isaacson to recommend removing scenario B2 and using overprogramming discussed in MOTION 3 to reflect the sentiment of scenario B2 in scenario B1. MacPherson said that in the comments, Freese pointed out that that the carbon reduction proposed totals for Midpoint and B1, the proposed totals were roughly $15.1M but $18.6M in B2, leading to the question of whether the latter could be used on scenarios A and B1. Peterson replied that it could not. Keel noted that there has been discussion of two projects: the Scott County bike trail and the Victoria pedestrian project, adding that the Scott County project was tied with a Three Rivers Park District project. He suggested that the Three Rivers project should be funded before the Victoria project adding that the Victoria project has a large scoring gap with the project ranked just in front of it. Solberg stated the preference to talk about modes as opposed to projects, though TAC has typically not liked to see tied scores split. He added that splitting the tie can help with fiscal constraint. Leitner replied that the motion is to use the overprogramming to add bicycle/pedestrian projects to scenario B1 and make it reflect scenario B2. Ellos suggested that the action will merge scenarios B1 and B2 into one "B" scenario though Keel added that it includes additional resources. Koutsoukos and Peterson said that scenario B2 should be shown to TAB but TAC's preferences can be shared. Koutsoukos suggested that TAB could be shown scenarios A and B with B1 and B2 in the background. Leitner clarified that the motion is related to scenario B1 and not scenario A. MOTION 4 **carried** with 18 ayes, two nays, and three abstentions.

Peterson said that this will result in the addition of a bike trail project or a traffic management technologies project and a roadway spot mobility project. Ellos expressed interest in funding a trail project and a roadway project. Laberee asked whether the lowest-ranked transit expansion project can be removed to increase funding available. Peterson said that funding was already added to a roadway project.

Members expressed preferences for use of extra funds between roadways and bicycle/pedestrian with more members preferring the former. It was decided that that no motion was needed in response to this discussion with Solberg summarizing that there is more preference towards roadways and for any extra carbon reduction funding going towards bicycle and pedestrian projects.

3. [2022-46: 2022 Carbon Reduction Program Funding Distribution](#)

Solberg said that this action is reflected in the Carbon Reduction Program projects in 2022-45. He added that there has been a question of whether the funding program, currently proposing 2023 and 2024 distribution, could also program beyond those two years. He said that MnDOT is required by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) to develop a carbon reduction strategy by November of 2023, which will lay out the framework for how the funds should be distributed. MnDOT requested that Met Council program the first two years only but did not require this.

Peterson said that the Council was involved in how to distribute the Carbon Reduction Program funding because it is a new funding source and there is no process outlined in the memorandum of understanding between MnDOT and the Council.

It was moved by Isaacson and seconded by Eyoh to forward to TAB technical feedback on the Carbon Reduction Program funding options. **Motion carried** unanimously.

4. [2022-47: 2022 Highway Safety Improvement Program Project Selection](#)

Peterson said that this has not changed a lot since TAC last saw it. He added that TAC and TAB members have not wanted to fund single projects from both the Regional Solicitation and the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) solicitation. IIJA provides over double of the previous cycles.

Robjent asked whether Carbon Reduction Program funds can be used towards HSIP projects. Peterson replied that most projects cannot accept those funds, though some bike and pedestrian projects are eligible. Solberg added that the carbon reduction strategy can help lay this out.

It was moved by Thompson and seconded by Isaacson to recommend to TAB approval of the attached 38 projects for funding through the HSIP solicitation and inclusion of all Urbanized Area projects in the draft 2024-2027 TIP. Freese asked how much MnDOT's own HSIP allocation increased considering the number of MnDOT projects shown as funded in this slate of projects. Thompson said that this came up at the last Funding & Programming committee meeting and MnDOT is willing to provide an overview and discuss the process. Freese suggested if any of the MnDOT-sponsored projects could go into their own program so that other locally sponsored projects could be funded. Solberg said that the state's ability to match projects is limited, though that should be temporary. Robjent said that he had not realized that MnDOT was going to apply in the HSIP solicitation. He added the question that if TAB selects a Regional Solicitation scenario that does not include a project that scored well enough for funding in both scenarios whether those projects get the HSIP money. Peterson replied that two projects scored well enough to be funded in both solicitations and that both are shown as funded in the Regional Solicitation because that is a higher award. Solberg said that if one or both projects is removed from the Regional Solicitation, there can be discussion about including them in the HSIP program.

Motion carried unanimously.

Information

1. TAC Chair Nomination Committees – Breakout Groups

Barbeau suggested that the breakout groups meet and report the results to him and Chair Solberg, adding that there may be need to schedule meetings for the near future. Solberg added that per the unwritten historic rule, it is the cities' turn to chair. He added that counties or agencies could nominate potential chairs in case no interest comes from the cities.

Other Business
None

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned.

Committee Contact:
Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner
Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us
651-602-1705

Metropolitan Council