

# Minutes

## TAC Funding and Programming Committee



**Meeting Date:** August 18, 2022

**Time:** 1:00 PM

**Location:** Virtual

### Members Present:

- |                                                                         |                                                                                    |                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bloomington - Karl Keel             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAB Coordinator - Elaine Koutsoukos            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anoka Co - Jerry Auge       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lakeville - Paul Oehme                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MnDOT - Molly McCartney                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carver Co - Angie Stenson   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eden Prairie - Robert Ellis         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MnDOT Metro District State Aid - Colleen Brown | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dakota Co - Jenna Fabish    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fridley - Jim Kosluchar             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MnDOT Bike/Ped - Mike Samuelson                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hennepin Co - Jason Pieper  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maple Grove - Ken Ashfeld           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MPCA - Innocent Eyoh                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ramsey Co - Scott Mareck    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plymouth - Michael Thompson (Chair) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DNR - Nancy Spooner-Walsh                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott Co - Craig Jenson     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minneapolis - Nathan Koster         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suburban Transit Assoc - Aaron Bartling        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wash Co - Joe Ayers-Johnson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> St. Paul - Anne Weber               |                                                                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = present                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met Council - Steve Peterson        |                                                                                    |                                                                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Metro Transit - Scott Janowiak      |                                                                                    |                                                                 |

### Call to Order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Thompson called the regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee to order at 1:02 p.m.

### Agenda Approved

Chair Thompson noted that a roll call vote was not needed for approval of the agenda unless a committee member offered an amendment to the agenda. Committee members did not have any comments or changes to the agenda.

### Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Keel, seconded by Spooner-Walsh to approve the minutes of the July 21, 2022 regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee. **Motion carried unanimously.**

### Public Comment on Committee Business

There were no public comments.

### TAB Report

Koutsoukos reported on the August 17, 2022, Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) meeting.

## Business

1. **2022-32:** Program Year Extension Request: MnDOT I-35W Continuous Street Lighting

It was moved by Spooner-Walsh, seconded by McCartney, that recommend that TAB approve MnDOT's I-35 W continuous street lighting project (SP# 1981-147) from fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2025.

Joe Barbeau, MTS, presented the program year extension request to extend the project to 2025 and better align with another project on the same corridor. The project did not meet the assessment but the project is ahead of schedule and will save costs and minimize reworks. Brown confirmed there were no programming concerns.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

2. **2022-33:** 2022 Regional Solicitation Scoring Appeals and Approval of Final Scores

Regional Solicitation applicants were given the opportunity to appeal their scores. A vote was taken after each appeal with a final vote approving the official scores.

*Application 17654: City of Minneapolis; ITS Upgrades and Enhancements*

The applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 1B: Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers. The applicant stated the proposed project included 0.8 mile on regional truck corridors, which is 19.3% of the 4.3-mile "Focus Corridor". The scorer noted the appeal consolidated information contained in the original application, therefore the scorer suggests a 25-point increase.

Motion: It was moved by Keel, seconded by Ellis, to approve the scorer's suggested addition of 25 points for application 17654. **Motion carried unanimously.**

*Application 17576: City of Maple Grove; Highway 169 and County Road 130 Interchange Reconstruction*

The applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 5B: KG of Emissions Reduced. The applicant stated the proposed project is projected to reduce peak hour emissions by 2.76 kg. The scorer stated the reduction reading was omitted from the WebGrants program report. The scorer suggests a 10-point increase.

Motion: It was moved by Ashfeld, seconded by Ayoh, to approve the scorer's suggested addition of 10 points for application 17576. **Motion carried unanimously.**

*Application 17563: Metro Transit; Metro Transit Wayfinding Project*

The applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 4B: VMT Reduction. The applicant stated that based on their estimate of users, they expected additional points. The scorer responded that the methodology to arrive at that estimate of users sound or realistic, therefore the scorer suggests no change.

Motion: It was moved by Koutsoukos, seconded by Spooner-Walsh, to approve no change to the score for application 17563. **The motion passed, 21 ayes and 2 nays.**

*Application 17506: Move Minnesota; 15 Minute Cities of Saint Paul*

The applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 4B: VMT Reduction. The applicant suggested that the program aims to decrease VMT by overcoming knowledge and comfort



barriers to mode shift and cited their estimate of users, which was based on data from similar programs completed in the past. The scorer responded that the methodology to arrive at that estimate of users sound or realistic, therefore the scorer suggests no change. Sam Rockwell of Move Minnesota provided additional context to the appeal and their methodology.

Jenson asked whether there were steps or discussion among technical staff to give methodology direction to applicants. Mackenzie Turner-Bargen, scoring chair, said the scoring committee did discuss how to approach this measure, but that it is very open in terms of methodology. Koutsoukos added that the appeal can correct an element, including a calculation, but that they could not consider a new methodology.

McCartney discussed how Transportation Management Organizations like Move Minnesota receive their funding as part of the Congestion Management and Air Quality program set-aside. She added that this project is related to the general TMO activities so methodology could be reviewed from those. Rockwell added that this application is like previously funded projects through the Regional Solicitation. Koutsoukos clarified the differences between TMOs and Regional Solicitation's travel demand management projects. TMOs can submit for additional work, but not for projects within their current scope of work. She also noted the default trip length was maintained but that the narrative used a different number that could have been corrected. Barbeau said the methodology was the constraining factor in the scoring, not the numbers. McCartney then asked when the last set-aside to TMOs was reviewed and suggested it is time to re-evaluate.

Motion: It was moved by Mareck, seconded by Auge, to approve no change to the score for application 17506. **The motion passed, 19 ayes and 4 nays.**

*Application 17637: Carver County; Highway 5 Lake Minnewashta and Arboretum Access and Mobility Improvement*

The applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 7: Multimodal Elements and Connections. The applicant discussed a separated trail previously constructed in their application and suggested points are deserved based on the rubric provided by the scorer. The scorer responded that no score change should be provided because the project was seeking points for a project previously constructed and that this project would not enhance the bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities. Stenson provided additional context, noting the paved shoulders could be bikeable, and requested 35 points be added to the project's score. McCartney clarified that the original appeal was for a previously funded and constructed trail and that was how the scoring was completed and that the bikeable shoulder width was not clearly identified, but could be identified, in the application.

Keel asked whether the committee should be making a score suggestion based on the bikeable shoulders discussion. McCartney responded that 35 points may be a reasonable adjustment. Koster stated that the narrative provided was different than the current appeal for points on the bikeable shoulders and asked whether this information should be considered new. McCartney responded that the information is different from the original appeal. Thompson asked whether the language on the shoulder was in the application. Stenson said it was likely bikes will be on the road and that no other infrastructure would be permitted through the area.

Samuelson said that at MnDOT there has been concern about expressways and pedestrian and bike safety. He also noted that the MnDOT guidance for bicycle facility selection is 10 feet, instead of the 8 feet planned, based on the context. Samuelson asked whether the RBTN would be revised to account for the constructed boardwalk and not use the shoulders. Koutsoukos replied that the RBTN and functional class is reviewed before each solicitation.



Jenson suggested design standards be added to the TPP for projects on the Regional Bikeway Transportation Network and that in rural areas, pedestrians and bicycles will use shoulders and that 8 feet is sufficient. Samuelson responded that MnDOT guidance is based on FHWA guidance and that with the speed and traffic volumes is 10 feet, but people will use shoulders if they are available. Stenson added that the County has been instructed by MnDOT to keep the bridge as narrow as possible due to the environmental context of the project.

Koster asked whether the shoulder was called out in the application as walkable and bikeable or whether this was new information. Thompson said that it was unlikely called out as a bikeable and walkable corridor. McCartney confirmed the 8-foot shoulder is called out in the layout. Keel added that Samuelson claimed it does not meet the guidance and asked whether there is a possibility that MnDOT would prohibit bicycle and pedestrian usage. Samuelson said there are other locations that are similar that have been prohibited but there is not enough detail at this point to make that determination.

Auge asked if there is a definition of rural for the Regional Solicitation because rural in roadway design means a different thing than rural in land use. The definition of rural in the state aid standards is with ditches but the cross section shows curb and gutter and that based on the scoring rubric multimodal facilities in rural areas should not include curb and gutter. Stenson said that would be a new interpretation based on her understanding that rural/ urban is based on land use context.

Keel asked McCartney, the scoring chair, whether the suggestion to add 35 points stood based on the conversations. McCartney said it is worth consideration.

Bartling expressed concern that the committee is now considering a new appeal, which is outside the appeal window. Barbeau reviewed the appeal letter that focused on the previously constructed trail but said answering that question is difficult because it could be interpreted either way. Koutsoukos discussed that the appeal should be given public and committee notice but that Funding and Programming committee is the final determiners of the score. Stenson disagreed that the appeal was different.

Motion: It was moved by Jenson, seconded by Mareck, to approve the scorer's suggested addition of 35 points for application 17637. **The motion passed, 18 ayes and 5 nays.**

### *Approval of Final Scores*

It was moved by Koutsoukos, seconded by McCartney, to approve the final Regional Solicitation scores with any changes from the scoring appeals. **Motion carried unanimously.**

## Information

### 1. Regional Solicitation Outreach Tool Results (Steve Peterson, MTS)

Peterson presented a brief summary of the Regional Solicitation outreach tool results, including number of responses, the average and median budget expenditures, and the modal priorities.

### 2. Regional Solicitation Funding and Next Steps (Steve Peterson, MTS)

Peterson discussed the available funding, funding sources, and modal funding ranges. He stated two scenarios will be developed using the modal funding midpoints and the previously anticipated funding levels and new funding levels from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. Staff will be looking for more direction from the committees and the Transportation



Advisory Board for additional funding scenarios.

Koster asked whether there would be a summary of the geographic balance question. Peterson responded that it will be part of the options throughout the funding scenario process, but he is unsure that it will come at the September meeting. Koster also asked whether Highway Safety Improvement Program projects (HSIP) would be separate from the Regional Solicitation geographic balance analysis this cycle due to its significant funding levels. Koutsoukos replied that historically it has been on a different cycle, but an analysis could include historical HSIP investments. Koster suggested that all projects selected through TAB should be included in the geographic balance analysis.

Pieper asked if there was a concern about the local match because of the significant increase of funding. Peterson said earlier year money is about \$38M and that the program year is generally discussed later in the process allowing top ranked projects to select their program years.

Peterson requested the committee to consider whether they would want to fund partially funded projects from the previous Regional Solicitation cycle. Pieper stated that Hennepin County received a partial award in 2018 and would not be supportive of fully funding previously awarded projects. Koutsoukos added that fully funding those may be a last decision if enough projects are not available to spend the money in early years.

### 3. TIP Public Comments (Joe Barbeau, MTS)

Barbeau presented a summary of the TIP public comments noting there were no major themes and fewer comments than previous years.

## Reports

There were no reports.

## Adjournment

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

---

### Council Contact:

Bethany Brandt-Sargent, Senior Planner  
[Bethany.Brandt-Sargent@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Bethany.Brandt-Sargent@metc.state.mn.us)  
651-602-1725