

### MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

Wednesday | July 17, 2019  
Metropolitan Council, Chambers | 12:30 PM  
390 Robert Street North, Saint Paul, MN 55101

#### REPORTS

1. TAB Chair's Report – Hovland reported on the fourth meeting of the Policy Work Group. Notes attached.
2. Agency Reports –

MnDOT – Michael Barnes reported that MnDOT is submitting federal BUILD grant applications. The Commissioner is providing letters of support for BUILD applications.

MPCA – Craig McConnell reported more on the VW settlement. MPCA closed the RFP for Diesel on-road truck and transit bus replacement grant. MPCA received 48 applications for the \$3.7 million available funds. A Heavy-duty electric vehicle grant program will open this summer. This round will fund electric alternatives to heavy-duty vehicles and equipment or their engines. A Minnesota Clean Diesel off-road DERA grant will open this summer/fall. This round will continue to fund off-road projects from industries such as locomotive, marine, and construction, <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/air/diesel-replacement-program-grant-opportunities>. MPCA is holding a public comment period for Phase 2 of the settlement. A plan will be drafted in the fall and shared for additional input. <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/air/vw-phase-2>

MAC – Carl Crimmins reported that Rick King was appointed as Chair of the MAC board. Bridget Rief reported that the airport received two international awards. The final food courts will be open by the end of the year. In mid-September there will be a new exit to baggage claim from concourse G. MAC is working with MnDOT to notify passengers of the construction on Highway 5 from April through November 2020. The construction will impact travel times to the airport. The construction will also impact Route 54 bus.

Metropolitan Council – Deb Barber reported on the Orange Line groundbreaking. The Orange Line received a small starts full funding grant agreement. Two Transit Values Workshops will be held on July 23 and 24. Council members and TAB members are invited to attend one of the workshops. Barber responded to a question on the remaining D Line funding, that bonding funds will be requested from the next Legislature.

#### BUSINESS

TAB approved the following items and they will be forwarded to the Transportation Committee on the dates indicated.

1. 2019-33: Streamlined TIP Amend: MnDOT TH 21 Reconstruct (TC 7-22-2019)  
Transportation Advisory Board adopted an amendment into the 2019-2022 TIP to change the description and cost of MnDOT's MN 21 bridge replacement and reconstruction project (SP # 7002-48).
2. 2019-30: Scope Change Request for the City of Burnsville's Lake Marion Greenway  
Transportation Advisory Board approved the City of Burnsville's request to change the scope of its Lake Marion Greenway project (SP # 179-090-005) to shift some of the off-road trail to an on-road facility, including a \$40,400 reduction in federal funds.

3. 2019-31: Scope Change Request for Hennepin County's CSAH 81 Bridge Replacement  
Transportation Advisory Board approved Hennepin County's request to change the scope of its CSAH 81 bridge replacement project (SP # 027-681-038) to replace a third bridge and move the bicycle and pedestrian access.
4. 2019-32: TIP Amendment for Hennepin County's CSAH 81 Bridge Replacement (TC 8-12-2019)  
Transportation Advisory Board approved an amendment to the 2020-2023 TIP to add to the project scope and cost for Hennepin County's CSAH 81 bridge replacement project (SP 027-681-038).

## INFORMATION

TAB heard a presentation on the Regional Bicycle Barrier Study. TAB members asked whether traffic data was included in the analysis of the barriers for different roadway crossings. Staff will check. There was a question on whether points will be allocated in the solicitation by the different barrier tiers. The technical committees are discussing this now. There was a question on which facilities were included in the analysis; trails, bikeways, sidewalks, crossings. The study included bicycle facilities identified locally. Are the barriers challenges to existing trails or future trails? Washington County mentioned that the Greenway Corridor has a railway obstacle that is not identified. Suggestion that the information be shared with communities to include in their comprehensive plans.

TAB listened to and discussed information on changes to the Regional Solicitation. TAB discussed the maximum funding request for trail applications. A lower maximum creates breaking up large projects to be completed over several cycles, which is different than the recommendations in other categories to increase the maximum for more efficient construction. Request the technical committees to discuss the feasibility of options for different maximums. Consider a different maximum for projects with barriers and those without. For applicants not getting funding (just missing getting funded), how are they rating in future solicitations? Are they funded in a future cycle or are they continuously just missing being funded? What is the median project cost compared to the average cost? What is the amount of local match of projects selected and what is the source of funding? What is the historical projected usage in the application compared to the usage of the built project?

Link to June 17, 2019, TAB agenda and materials - <https://metro council.org/Council-Meetings/Committees/Transportation-Advisory-Board-TAB.aspx>

## Regional Solicitation Policy Work Group Meeting #4 Notes

### Equity Discussion

1. Station planning is important to equity, including housing and trails near stations. Transit planning is important, but don't see the connection to jobs.
2. Connecting people with jobs should be part of equity. Can people get to suburbs to where the jobs have moved?
3. The counties have workforce development. Stable housing helps create stable families. An example, a company in Plymouth trains people from workhouse, but not able to hire them full-time after training because they can't find housing nearby.
4. Not enough information to make major changes to equity criteria. The Equity Task Force deals with these issues. We need to talk to people to find out what equity means to them to make sure we are making significant outcomes and gains in equity.
5. How does TAB want to make a difference? This is a long-term discussion. In the short-term, set up an Equity Task Force and ask what do we do to impact?
6. Does TAB want to be more proactive? Need strategy to approach this.
7. Consider a possibility of a category of super-equity with innovation.
8. Question on how the ABRT lines are affecting areas of poverty. How is equity considered in selection of ABRT lines? Is there data on reverse commute routes? For example, a route to Shakopee was successful at first, but later lost ridership because the trip was too long.
9. Have the Equity Work Group come up with how to evaluate whether equity improvements are made with the projects selected.
10. How does TAB do something that has an impact on equity? How is it reflected in the scoring? When submitting applications to submit, applicants look at the highest scoring measure first. Equity is addressed later in filling out the application. An option is to adjust the points in the solicitation criteria. Recommend modest changes until data is gathered.

### Transit Discussion

- 1) When considering New Market areas for transit, include later hours of transit service to serve 3<sup>rd</sup> shift positions. While the area is the same, it is a different market of people needing transit service. Form a technical committee to discuss what is included in the definition of "New Market".
- 2) Include looking at east-west routes. Most routes are north-south. There are a lot of spokes, but no connects to make the wheel. The connections would help suburb to suburb travel.
- 3) Metro Transit will start identifying new routes in the Network Next study. Recommend meeting with county and city staff, getting more people involved with zoning and plat reviews involved in transit decisions.
- 4) Would like to see a separate category for ABRT, but not to the amount of \$28 M. It concentrates money into smaller geographic area. A set aside of \$28 M doesn't solve the problem identified from the existing solicitation. Philosophically, TAB needs to determine the allocation for funding types of projects. It is set at \$28 M based on previous solicitations. Is this appropriate?
- 5) With higher federal amount awarded to an ABRT project, there is concern that the state is not having to step up to provide as much match, but counties will still have to match other large transit projects. How will this look to the state legislature in the future? There will still be a need for local participation from the state. Work Group members asked for a breakdown of the state contribution of funding; it is included in the Met Council amount in the pie chart. Counties bond for large transit capital projects. Metropolitan Council bonds for the Metropolitan Council funds. Would the Council consider bonding for the larger transit projects in place of the counties?
- 6) Question on how ABRT projects are selected. Need more transparency.
- 7) Concerns about funding the METRO Red Line as expressed about the funding of the Arterial BRT system: incremental implementation of BRT can impact ridership and the overall success of a BRT system.
- 8) According to the TPP, the second phase of the METRO Red Line should be completed by 2021. There are a number of items yet to be completed on the second phase and it's important that the METRO Red Line remains a priority for the region.

- 9) There needs to be a set aside for suburban transit providers like there currently is for Metro Transit.
- 10) Investments in transit and BRT in the Region should include investments in highway BRT.
- 11) Regarding setting a lower maximum of \$4 M, this artificially caps larger projects, especially for expansion projects. There is a lot of resistance from suburban providers. There could be possibilities of caps for new market or modernization. Have a technical group review options for the amount for maximum to be set.
- 12) Regarding the percent cap on vehicle purchases for transit expansion projects, is there an approach for TAB to deal with vehicle purchases? Where do buses go after they have been in service three years? What is meant by “not successful” after three years? This needs to be clear. Recommend going to the transit technical group to determine what is “not successful” and what to do with the buses.
- 13) Discussion of support facilities and not being able to score well or skewing scores. An option is to remove support facilities from eligibility in the transit modernization category and make them eligible in the unique category.

### Unique Projects

A powerpoint on Unique Projects was distributed to the Work Group members to review for the next meeting on July 22, 2019.