

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD  
Metropolitan Council  
390 N. Robert St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1805

Minutes of a Meeting of the  
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
March 19, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Isaacson (acting chair), Colleen Brown, Innocent Eyoh, Mark Filipi, Jenifer Hager, Craig Jenson, Jane Kansier, Mary Karlsson, Elaine Koutsoukos, Joe Lux, Bruce Loney, Eriks Ludins, Gina Mitteco, Paul Oehme, Ryan Peterson, Lyndon Robjent, John Sass, Cory Slagle, Carla Stueve, Michael Thompson, Cynthia Wheeler, Andrew Witter, and Joe Barbeau (staff)

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. Brian Isaacson is acting as Chair in Tim Mayasich's absence.

**2. Adoption of Agenda**

MOTION: Eriks Ludins moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by Joe Lux. The motion was approved unanimously.

**3. Approval of the Minutes**

MOTION: Lux requested a change within "Regional Solicitation Release of Scores," where "connectors" was errantly noted as "collectors." Lux moved to approve the minutes from the January meeting, with this change. Seconded by Paul Oehme. The motion was approved unanimously.

**4. TAB Report**

**Elaine Koutsoukos said that** James Hovland was selected by the Council as the new TAB Chair. Chair Hovland welcomed new TAB members: Katie Rodriguez—Met Council rep replacing Adam Duininck and citizen representatives Patricia Schwiertz, Suyapa Miranda, and Peter Dugan. Katie Rodriguez reported the Council Chair Duininck will complete the 7-county meetings next week. Elaine Koutsoukos provided an update of the Regional Solicitation process. TAB approved nine action items:

1. 2015-12 **TAB Executive Committee**  
New TAB Executive Board – Chair Jim Hovland, Mary Jo McGuire, Jon Ulrich, Kenya McKnight, Katie Rodriguez, Scott McBride, Kevin Reich, Mary Hamann-Roland, Nora Slawik
2. 2015-07 **Federal Funding Reallocation Policy**
3. 2015-08 **Scope Change Consultation Process Update**
4. 2015-13 **Scope Change: City of Minneapolis TE project**
5. 2015-14 **2015-2018 TIP Amendment: CSAH 18 at CR 62, Anoka County**
6. 2015-16 **2015-2018 TIP Amendment: HSIP Project, Minneapolis**
7. 2015-17 **Streamlined TIP Amendment: E 7th Street, St. Paul**
8. 2015-18 **Streamlined TIP Amendment: CSAH 135 Bridge, Henn. Co.**
9. 2015-15 **Regional Solicitation Funding Level Adjustments**

One information item was presented to TAB; an update on the modern streetcar policy.

**5. TIP Amendment – MnDOT, Central Signal Monitoring System – Action Item**

Joe Barbeau said that MnDOT is requesting an amendment to add its Metrowide Central Signal Timing Monitoring System to the 2015-2018 TIP. Molly McCartney, MnDOT Metro District, said that the amendment would move Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding that needs to be spent in June.

MOTION: Filipi moved to recommend approval of the TIP amendment. Seconded by Mary Karlsson. The motion was approved unanimously.

**6. 2016-2019 TIP Schedule – Action Item**

Barbeau said that the proposed Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) schedule is essentially the same as last year's. Colleen Brown said that the TIP used to go through the committee twice before the schedule was adjusted last year. Karlsson said that agencies are now asked to examine the draft TIP upon its release so the public comment period can be used by the public.

MOTION: Karlsson moved to recommend approval of the TIP schedule. Seconded by Oehme. The motion was approved unanimously.

**7. 2014 Regional Solicitation Score Challenges and Approval of Final Scores – Action Item**

Koutsoukos said that nine regional solicitation applicants have challenged one or more measures from their scores. The Committee should vote on each request separately. The first three challenges are for bikeway projects. Each is appealing Measure 1: Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy. These challenges are in response to a letter that staff sent out indicating that the mapping in the online system reported scores that were too high. This letter was sent to seven applicants.

**A. Bruce Vento Bridge, City of St. Paul (Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:

- 1: Role in regional Transportation System and Economy
- 2: Usage
- 6: Risk Assessment

**1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy**

Mike Kimble, from the City of St. Paul Parks and Recreation Department, said that the City was told that it received 200 points for being on a Tier-1 Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) and that the rules seem to have changed during the process. He said that the trail runs "through" as opposed to "to" the Bruce Vento Sanctuary. Koutsoukos replied that the applicant was not informed of a 200 score; the adjusted score was provided with the letter upon release of the scores.

Kimble said that because the bridge is part of the Bruce Vento Trail corridor, the City believes that it meets the requirements for full points. Ludins said that the Bruce Vento Trail is a planned connection to the RBTN. Steve Elmer, Metropolitan Council, said that the map in the agenda packet, which does not show the entire Bruce Vento Trail as part of the RBTN, is the official RBTN map. Craig Jenson said that the bridge provides a connection between the two lines, so the scorer interpreted it as a "connection" and not a "segment." He therefore agrees with the scoring committee, as this map was used throughout the process.

Kimble said that other Metropolitan Council studies show the Bruce Vento Trail as an extension on the RBTN. Elmer replied that regional trails from the parks department are not always on the RBTN.

**2. Usage**

Kimble said that most of the area has little population or employment due to the project's bluff location. Therefore, it would make more sense to use visits rather than jobs and population to indicate usage. Michael Thompson said that this is a valid point for consideration for future solicitations but that adjusting the score at this point would be unfair to other applicants.

**6. Risk Assessment**

Lux said that reviewing trails for impacts is inconsistent and this may be something to look into for the next solicitation. Brown replied that this still needs to be a consideration as letters of support are needed.

MOTION: Thompson moved to accept the response from the scorer and not change any scores. Seconded by Filipi. The motion was approved.

## **B. North Creek Regional Greenway – CSAH 42, Dakota County (Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:

- 1: Role in regional Transportation System and Economy

Koutsoukos said that less than 50% of the trail is on the RBTN alignment and the project is therefore considered a connection.

Jonn Mertens, Dakota County Senior Planner, said that he felt the rules were changed during the process. He added that the trail is within 1,000 feet of the RBTN corridor, which seems to be denoted by an arbitrary buffer. Galaxie Avenue is a busy corridor and the County feels that it is better to use a grade-separated path and that the RBTN should reflect that.

Robgent asked whether counties are part of the RBTN planning process. Mertens replied in the affirmative but said that inclusion of Galaxie Avenue and Country Road 42 was errant. Robgent replied that that is a different issue than the issue of whether this measure was correctly scored.

Stueve said that the rules have not changed, but that the online system had a glitch. Mertens replied that the clarification of parallel versus perpendicular was made after the fact.

Jenson said that there had to be some human interpretation, including where to draw the line between “along” and “connected.”

MOTION: Filipi moved to accept the response from the scorer and not change any scores. Seconded by Lux. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **C. River to River Greenway, Robert St. Overpass & Connections, City of West St. Paul (Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:

- 1: Role in regional Transportation System and Economy
- 4A: Critical Links
- 5B: Pedestriran Connections
- 5C: Multimodal Facilities

### **1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy**

Ben Boike, Assistant Community Development Director and City Planner for the City of West St. Paul said that he felt the rules changed in the middle of the process and that the trail should have been considered Tier-1. He added that the trail has five existing at-grade crossings, with Robert Street being the only one missing.

Gina Mitteco said that the proposed trail runs east/west while the Tier-1 corridor runs north/south. Boike replied that the trail has some, north/south orientation.

Koutsoukos said that the primary reason the West St. Paul application did not score as high as other projects is the fact that it has an existing signalized crossing at Robert Street and Wentworth Avenue. The scorer saw the bridge at Crawford Drive as redundant and out of the way for users. Many of the competing projects may cross lower volumes streets than Robert Street but they lack control or are confusing. The applicant cited the Gateway Trail project as a project it should have outsourced. The scorer acknowledged that that project was overscored. The Gateway Trail Crossing at Hadley has lower roadway volumes as well, but here we have lane transitions and peak hour stacking that blocks the existing trail crossing. Given the proximity to the Highway 36 crossing, driver sightlines are focused on that intersection and not the trail. Furthermore, the application mentions a documented serious bicycle/auto crash at this location. Here points were given in the gap category too because of the perpendicular trail connections the MnDOT interchange project makes.

Boike said that the signalized intersection hurt the project’s score because the alignment is out of the way. However, it is as close to the alignment as a grade separation could have been. He said that he does not agree that

the presence of an existing crossing should punish a project versus routes with no signal. Jenson replied that presence of nearby crossings was part of the criteria.

Peterson asked whether applicants receive points for writing a lot of words as opposed to checking the box. Koutsoukos replied that all applicants provided written replies, which were used to differentiate the projects.

### **5B. Pedestrian Connections**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant was appealing this measure because existing pedestrian facilities are limited with the project area. The applicant cited the Gateway Trail applications at Hadley and CSAH 9 as projects it felt it should have outscored. For each of these projects, the 30-point score recognizes that there are significant pedestrian destinations along the Gateway Trail. Though these destinations are some distance away from the immediate crossing improvements, the extremely high use of this trail was taken into consideration in determining that people would likely use the improved trail to access pedestrian centers, employment, and transit along the corridor.

Mitteco said that there are different ways to consider effective multimodal facilities and proximity is not necessarily the most important thing.

Isaacson said that this measure was subjective and difficult to score.

### **5C. Pedestrian Connections**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant felt that the automobile orientation of Robert Street poses a challenge to users and this project can help mitigate that. Boike said that he feels the project is better than the Hadley project and it should score at least 35 points, which is what that project scored.

MOTION: Filipi moved to accept the response from the scorer and not change any scores. Seconded by Karlsson. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **D. Oakdale and Marie Streetscaping, City of West St. Paul (Pedestrian Facilities)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:
  - 5B: Bikeway Connections
  - 5C: Multimodal Facilities

### **5B. Bike way Connections**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant asked for a re-evaluation of this measure because its score of 45 points was substantially lower than the 60 points awarded to a similar project submitted for CSAH 14. As stated in the appeal letter, CSAH 14 provides a direct connection to Marie Avenue, while this project does not provide a similar connection because the project involves the bicycle route itself.

### **5C. Pedestrian Connections**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested a re-evaluation of this measure as the project provides significant, quality improvements to all modes of transportation, yet the score awarded of 35 points would seem to indicate that the improvements are minimal.

MOTION: Karlsson moved to accept the response from the scorer and not change any scores. Seconded by Filipi. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **E. Routes to School Infrastructure Project, City of Forest Lake (Safe Routes to School)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:
  - 2A: Average Share of Student Population that Currently Bikes and Walks to School

Koutsoukos said that the applicant asked for a re-evaluation of the score. Based on the low score, the applicant feels that it is being penalized for the existing conditions and policies in place to maximize student safety rather than looking forward to the many benefits, including adjustments to policies, this project will provide

MOTION: Filipi moved to accept the response from the scorer and not change any scores. Seconded by Robjent. The motion was approved unanimously.

**F. Beltline LRT Station Park & Ride Structure, City of St. Louis Park (Transit Expansion)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:

- 1C: Role in the Regional Transportation System & Economy – Transit Connectivity
- 3A: Equity and Housing – Socio-Economic

**1C: Role in the Regional Transportation System & Economy – Transit Connectivity**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant asked that the entire Green Line be considered a transitway connection.

**3A: Equity and Housing – Socio-Economic**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that the criterion be reconsidered to include the entire Green Line and be considered as a project that directly connects to Racially Concentrated Areas of Poverty.

MOTION: Karlsson moved to accept the response from the scorer and not change any scores. Seconded by Oehme. The motion was approved unanimously.

**G. East Bush Lake Road/I-494 Westbound On-Ramp, City of Bloomington (Roadway Expansion)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:

- 2B: 2030 Forecasted ADT

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that the measure be re-scored because it appears that the projects did not receive scores in a proportional share of the full points based on ADT. The scorer subtracted the existing AADT in measure 2A from the forecasted ADT volume to determine increased volumes as a benefit for the improvement. The scorer pro-rated the scores on the increased ADT. The scores are shown in the “Original Score” column in the agenda packet. Additionally, when evaluating this challenge, staff found an errant transposed number in the original score and has provided a corrected score. Finally, the “Alternate Score” column shows how scoring would have been based on the pro-rated 2030 ADT forecast numbers.

Lux said that in the Roadway Expansion scoring committee meeting there was a lot of discussion about this change in method and it was a thoughtful approach.

MOTION: Andrew Witter moved to accept the response from the scorer but to change to the corrected score. Seconded by Loney. The motion was approved unanimously.

**H. 77th Street Underpass, City of Richfield (Roadway Expansion)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:

- 1B: Daily Heavy Commercial Traffic
- 2A: Usage
- 3A: Socio/Economic
- 4: Age
- 7A/B and C: Multi-modal

**1B: Daily Heavy Commercial Traffic**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that the measure be re-scored because it does not capture the benefits of the project for commercial vehicle traffic. The applicant with the highest AADT received the highest number of points and the other applicants received pro-rated scores. The measure looks at current volumes, not benefits. Future volumes are accounted for in the 2030 Forecasted volumes in Measure 2B

**2A: Usage**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that the measure be re-scored because it does not allow for explanation of benefits.

### **3A: Socio/Economic**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that the measure be re-scored because no projects received the full 30 points. The rating awarded for the response was 7.5 out of 10, which was multiplied by 100% for being a project in a Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty, multiplied by 30 points for a resulting score of 22.5 out of 30. The top project was not in a Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty, rendering the top score below 30. An adjustment of the top score to 30 would result in adjusting all scores.

### **4: Age**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that the measure be re-scored based on incorrect guidance for completing the application and that the project application form did not provide information how to address new roadways. The scorer used the 2014 as the current year, since that was the year the applications were submitted to determine the age of the roadway; 2014 minus the weighted year provided to get the age of the roadway. The guidance provided to the applicants was that a roadway age of "0" be used for any new roadway. No other guidance was provided. All new roadways entered "0" and received 0 points. This project scored the same as other new alignments, per the design of the measure.

Ludins said that moving forward, there should be a new category for new alignments, which scored poorly given that this measure resulted in an automatic score of zero.

### **7A/B and C: Multi-modal**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that Metropolitan Council staff review the application against the Measure 7 criteria and in comparison with the other applications to ensure that the score reflects the benefits associated with the project. The applicant received 40 out of 50 points for measure 7A/7B and 35 out of 50 points for measure 7C. Without specific information from the applicant indicating where they believed the measure was mis-scored relative to other applicants, staff feels that it would be difficult to change the scores.

MOTION: Lux moved to accept the response from the scorer and not change any scores. Seconded by Ludins. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **I. CSAH 78 Expansion from 139th Lane to CSAH 18, Anoka County (Roadway Expansion)**

- Requests re-evaluation of:

- 4: Age
- 7A/B and C: Multi-modal
- 8: Risk Assessment

### **4: Age**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that the measure be re-scored based on an incorrect age provided in the application.

### **8: Risk Assessment**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that the measure be re-scored based on information that was not included in the response; that the County had met with stakeholders as evidenced with a Resolution of Support from the City of Andover that was submitted with the application.

Witter said that that Anoka County accepts that measures 4 and 8 cannot be re-scored because no new information is allowed.

### **7A/B and C: Multi-modal**

Koutsoukos said that the applicant requested that this measure be re-scored because the project includes a trail that is adjacent to the road. Measures 7A and 7B are combined into one score. The measure was scored based on connections to transit and bike and pedestrian facilities that are not part of the project. The multiuse trail and bridge on CSAH 78 and the project's non-motorized facilities that will provide direct access to high pedestrian-traffic activity centers (all included in this response) are included in the project and are scored accordingly in

Measure 7C: Multimodal Facilities. While the application does describe that activity centers are identified in the Andover 2008 Comprehensive Plan Update, it does not describe any adopted plan or study that describes the bicycle and pedestrian facility. Figure 1, referenced in the response, identifies an existing trail, with a majority of the trail facilities on one side of the roadway. The trail already exists and from the project description, there will be improvements to, not expansion of, the multiuse trail. There is no reference to bike facilities. The applicant's responses for connections were considered relative to the responses of the other applicants.

Witter said that while the application does not reference bicycle facilities, it does reference non-motorized facilities. He feels that the nearby bicycle trail warrants more points.

Koutsoukos said that scoring instructions may need to be clearer.

Robgent said that the idea was that areas with no transit, or no trails, should not be penalized. Witter said that the project has nonmotorized connections and should be scored higher.

MOTION: Filipi moved to accept the response from the scorer and not change any scores. Seconded by Eyoh. The motion was approved.

### **J. Approval of Final Scores**

Barbeau said that the committee should vote on approval of final scores, which are included in the agenda packet and reflect the "corrected" scores for Roadway Expansion Measure 2B.

MOTION: Lux moved to accept the scores. Seconded by Filipi. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **8. 2014 Regional Solicitation Development of Funding Alternatives – Information Item**

Steve Peterson, Metropolitan Council, said that staff is looking for feedback on allocation of 2017 funding, along with potential funding scenarios.

For the funding scenario included in the agenda packet, staff used the mid- and high-point of the range that TAB assigned to each mode. For sub-categories within the modes, staff roughly matched the percentage of funds applied for with the percentage of funds awarded. Committee members should be aware that scores are not apples-to-apples between the sub-categories.

The scenario includes roadway projects funded for 2017. Three Expansion projects are shown as funded, but a project from another sub-category could also be tabbed for the funding.

In the Roadway System Management sub-category, \$4.32 million is reserved for 2017. However, only one project applied for 2017 funding and that project ranks 10 out of 10 projects submitted. Applicants of some 2018 and 2019 projects have said their projects could absorb 2017 funds. There are two approaches to how to address 2017 funds for System Management: fund the 10<sup>th</sup> place project that applied for 2017 before funding other projects that can move up or fund other, higher-scoring, projects first regardless of original year of application. Traditionally, about \$3.5 million per year has been spent on system management in the solicitation, so it is possible that all ten projects could be funded.

Robgent expressed discomfort with funding all projects in a category and suggested that relative scores within a category be examined before that happens. Ludins replied that he'd feel better funding all projects in a category than funding no projects in a category.

Robgent asked that scenarios be shown on a map since TAB favors geographic balance.

Lux suggested future consideration of allowing "B" minor bridge projects.

## **9. Other Business**

None.

**10. Adjournment**

MOTION: Filipi moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Lux. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting adjourned.