

Minutes

TAB Technical Advisory Committee



Meeting Date: June 5, 2024

Time: 9:00 AM

Location: Chambers

Members Present:

- Jenifer Hager, Chair, Minneapolis
- Joe MacPherson, Anoka Co
- Lyndon Robjent, Carver Co
- Erin Laberee, Dakota Co
- Brian Isaacson, Ramsey Co
- Chad Ellos, Hennepin Co
- Craig Jenson, Scott Co
- Lyssa Leitner, Washington Co
- Andrew Witter, 7W

- Karl Keel, Bloomington
- Charlie Howley, Chanhassen
- Robert Ellis, Eden Prairie
- Jim Kosluchar, Fridley
- Paul Oehme, Lakeville
- Dan Ruiz, Brooklyn Park
- Chris Hartzell, Woodbury
- Michael Thompson, Plymouth
- Kathleen Mayell, Minneapolis
- Nick Peterson, Saint Paul
- Bill Dermody, Saint Paul
- Aaron Tag, MnDOT

- Steve Peterson, Council MTS
- Patrick Boylan, Council CD
- Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB
- Innocent Eyoh, MPCA
- Bridget Rief, MAC
- Matt Fyten, STA
- Adam Harrington, Metro Transit
- Shelly Meyer, Freight
- Colleen Eddy, DEED
- Vacant, MN DNR
- Kyle Sobota, Bicycle
- Mackenzie Turner Bargaen, Pedestrian
- Josh Pearson, FHWA (ex-officio)

= present

Call to Order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Hager called the regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee to order just after 9:00 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

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

Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Mayell and seconded by Leitner to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2024, regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee. **Motion carried.**

Public Comment on Committee Business

None.

TAB Report

Koutsoukos reported on the May 15, 2024, Transportation Advisory Board meeting.

Business – Committee Reports

Executive Committee (Jenifer Hager, Chair)

Chair Hager reported that the TAC Executive Committee met prior to the meeting and discussed agenda items for the meeting and the Regional Solicitation funding options.

1. [2024-28: Streamlined TIP Amendment Request – Two Project Adjustments](#)

Robbie King said that the first request is from Dakota County, which dividing its Veterans Memorial Greenway Trail project in Eagan and Inver Grove Heights into two phases. This project will construct a multi-use trail, pedestrian bridge, pedestrian underpass, and a boardwalk for 3.6 miles. With this request, the total project cost would decrease from \$15,000,000 to \$13,800,000. The first phase would construct project elements from Dodd Road to Alameda Path in Inver Grove Heights and Eagan in program year 2025. The second phase would construct project elements from CSAH 71 to TH 52/TH 55 in Inver Grove Heights in program year 2026. The total cost of this phase is \$7,000,000 funded with \$2,497,500 of congressionally directed spending and \$4,502,500 of other funding.

He said that the second request is from the City of Minneapolis, which requests the addition of an intersection to its intersection improvement project at various intersections on Lasalle Avenue, 15th Street, and Nicollet Avenue. This project will rebuild signals and construct ADA-compliant curb extensions. The requested project adjustment is to add an additional intersection at 15th Street and Willow Street and increase the total project cost from \$4,350,000 to \$4,850,000.

Motion by MacPherson and seconded by Isaacson to recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2024-2027 TIP to recommend that TAB recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2024-2027 TIP to adjust two projects. **Motion carried.**

2. [2024-29: Streamlined TIP Amendment Request – MnDOT's US 169, CSAH 9, and MN 282 Interchange Improvements](#)

King said that Scott County and the City of Jordan request a cost increase for the interchange improvement project at US 169, CSAH 9, and MN 282 in Jordan. Along with this, the request includes a sponsorship change from Scott County to MnDOT for one part of the project and the addition of a new locally funded roundabout at CSAH 9 and Valley View Drive in Jordan. The original project cost is \$39,600,000 funded by \$24,124,000 from FHWA and \$15,476,000 in state and local funding. The requested amendment is for a total cost increase to \$54,800,000 including an increase in federal funding of \$4,344,100 and an increase in state funding to \$10,100,000.

Motion by Robjent and seconded by Tag to recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2024-2027 TIP to increase the cost and change the sponsorship for parts of an interchange improvement project at US 169, CSAH 9, and MN 282 in Jordan and add a new roundabout. **Motion carried.**

Planning Committee/TPP Technical Working Group (Gina Mitteco, Chair)

No report.

Funding and Programming (Michael Thompson, Chair)

Thompson said that at its last meeting, the Funding and Programming Committee recommended item 2024-27 and discussed 2024 Regional Solicitation funding options.

1. [2024-27: Adoption of the Draft 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program \(TIP\), pending public comment](#)

Barbeau said that the TIP's structure is similar to past years. He said that a public comment meeting is coming up and the public comment period ends on July 1.

Robjent asked whether projects that will be programmed into the Regional Solicitation will be included. Barbeau said that 2025 projects will need to be amended in. Robjent replied that he asked the question in light of the greenhouse gas assessment legislation that will be underway in February of 2025 and wondered whether applicable projects will be included before that date. Steve Peterson said that only a few projects would be subject and that those under consideration are going into the draft TIP. He said that there may be a TIP amendment this fall for Regional Solicitation projects that need to get in the TIP. He added that the legislation impacts projects not in the STIP by February of 2025. Eyoh said that prior to the bill, MnDOT and MPCA had an



agreement to have greenhouse gas analyses for projects with new lanes of a mile or more. He suggested that this analysis could be used for a TIP amendment.

Harrington asked whether changes to the TIP during public review would require an amendment. Barbeau said that year changes could be made during the public comment period but that bigger changes would be examined case-by-case. Koutsoukos pointed out that Regional Solicitation projects would have to go through the program year policy for a program year change.

Dermody expressed discomfort with recommending the TIP without having seen the public comments. Koutsoukos said that public comments do not typically go to the committees, to which Dermody replied that comments should go through the committees. Staff agreed to bring technical comments to the committee at the next meeting.

Eyoh asked whether public comments have ever led to modifying the TIP. Steve Peterson said that he recalled one instance over the past ten years. He said that the TIP is not a great decision-making tool but that public comments are used in other efforts. Barbeau described the instances discussed by Steve Peterson as public comments unwittingly uncovering a scoring error.

Motion by Isaacson and seconded by Robjent to recommend that TAB recommend adoption of the draft 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) pending public comment. **Motion carried.**

Information

1. Regional Solicitation Funding Options (Steve Peterson, MTS)

Hagar said that while there is no action, feedback can be provided to TAB.

Steve Peterson provided a [brief presentation](#) on [funding options](#).

Mayell asked how far short of the funding range transit falls short in the options. Steve Peterson replied that two of the three options are at 24.6% and 24.8%, respectively, which is short of the lower end of the transit funding range, 25%.

Kosluchar asked whether the Active Transportation funding was considered when the options were developed. Steve Peterson replied that it was added on top of the other funding, as the Active Transportation funding is not supposed to supplant other funds. MacPherson asked whether the Active Transportation Working Group had discussed adding more projects than shown. Steve Peterson replied that the group was not interested in expanding the pilot beyond \$15 million. Hager replied that the question was asked by TAC because the bike/ped-heavy options was not very bike/ped heavy. Koutsoukos added that the top of the bike/ped modal funding range is only 20%, making it difficult to be truly bike/ped heavy, though TAB could go beyond the range. MacPherson asked whether federal requirements will apply to recipients of Active Transportation funds and whether they would be exempt from receiving HSIP funds, adding a recommendation that HSIP funds should not be allowed for projects receiving Active Transportation funds. Hager replied that the local match will be required for the pilot, but the federal process will not apply; these items will be addressed in the evaluation. MacPherson said he would support not requiring the federal process for the pilot. Through an informal show of hands, roughly half of members agreed. Thompson expressed a preference toward simplicity in the pilot, while Isaacson suggested using the pilot to test requirements. Koutsoukos said that the work group will discuss how to administer projects relative to the federal processes. MacPherson asked whether State Aid will administer projects, to which Steve Peterson said that Council staff will do so. Koutsoukos clarified that the Active Transportation funding is made up of local sales tax funds and not state funding, which is why MnDOT is not going to administer it. Harrington suggested a reduced process that can be revisited later. Leitner said it would be helpful to show which entities have DBE goals. Hager suggested providing a summary of the federal process for

the working group. Harrington suggested that the Council's goals could be considered. Kosluchar suggested using a variety of approaches for comparison. MacPherson said that most of the applicants likely to receive Active Transportation funding do not have DBE goals and requiring them may lead to lot of effort and should not be a part of the pilot.

Robjent said that the bike/ped-heavy option is at the maximum of the range. Steve Peterson said that the 2022 program was above the range after the addition of Carbon Reduction Program funds.

Mayell suggested examining the proportion of points to the top-scoring project within the modes. She added that within roadways, spot mobility and safety, reconstruction, and bridges are most impactful to bikes and pedestrians yet are under-funded compared to Strategic Capacity.

Leitner said that TAC could show a bike-heavy option that exceeds the bike/ped range. Koutsoukos said that TAB looks at the ranges as guidance more than policy. Jenson said that exploration of going outside the ranges should come along with minimum points thresholds. Fyten said that there should be consideration for not going below the model minimum. Thompson said that the Midpoint option is the one that funds transit within the range.

Kosluchar asked whether there is an option that better meets the greenhouse gas emissions requirements and, if not, whether it would make sense to develop an option. Steve Peterson said that this can be better considered in 2026 when there is more data.

Hager asked for feedback on whether to provide TAB with a more bike/ped-heavy option. Thompson suggested that funding it more Active Transportation funding could be considered as a way not to take from roadways and transit. Leitner said that the Working Group said it didn't want to add funding. Steve Peterson said that other options include using \$4 million to \$5 million more overprogramming or rearranging the categories within bike/ped. Kosluchar said he would not support moving outside the funding ranges because TAB is unlikely to approve. Hager suggested TAC could push TAB to go outside of the funding ranges.

Harrington suggested presenting the Active Transportation funding as extra to help increase bike/ped funding. Hager said that presentation is difficult with Active Transportation considered to be on top of the traditional Regional Solicitation categories. Leitner suggested telling TAB that if it wants to see a fourth option it could give Council staff some boundaries. Koutsoukos said that the public survey included recommendations for more bike/ped funding and that TAB will be considering that information.

Robjent said that every roadway and transit project has bike/ped elements. MacPherson said that a lot of people see the ranges as policy, including when they are applying.

Fyten asked that TAC note to TAB that in two of the options, Transit does not meet the minimum of the range. Members favored this via a show of hands.

Isaacson said that the modal ranges are based on former federal funding pots and even after allowing for more flexibility in 2014, TAB is staying the same. Kosluchar said that TAB should explore whether the ranges should be broadened in the future.

Thompson said that the regional sales tax is a large influx of funds going towards trails, which could inform the ranges starting with the 2026 Regional Solicitation.

Hager suggested that TAC frame the discussion to TAB as a reminder of flexibility, that TAC is not recommending any one option, and that revisiting ranges could be looked at as a future task. Members supported this via a show of hands.



Hager opened the discussion for including minimum scoring to be funded, using 50% of the maximum points as an example of a threshold. Fyten said that minimum scoring should not be considered if it brings a category below the modal range. Jenson said that with meeting the minimum range, nothing different will occur. Barbeau expressed caution about scoring minimums, providing the examples that transit scoring is set up to give large points to the top-scoring project and big scoring gaps, the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category is prone to bunching of scores and high scores due to measures that lend themselves to high scores, and in one highway category, all the projects scored full points in one measure despite earning zero points, per the Regional Solicitation's rules. Hager said that TAB has frequently noted sharp vs. gentle drops in scoring across the categories. Koutsoukos added that Spot Mobility and Safety scores lower than in Bridges. Mayell said that the difference within each category could be shown. Eyoh said that some projects score very low in air quality due to some of the volumes, often scoring zero in Strategic Capacity.

Leitner asked whether the recommendation is to go to the bottom of the modal ranges in roadways and transit and then fund higher in bike/ped. Thompson suggested that an option showing roadways at the top of its range could be shown, as well.

Nick Peterson suggested flagging low scores without setting a minimum. Robjert said that at the end of the process, decisions will be made based on geography regardless of scores.

Mayell asked whether there is a way to show how the ranges have related to policy. Steve Peterson said the ranges date prior to 2014 and that they will be revisited during the evaluation.

Leitner asked whether the winning scenario will be decided with math versus the safety and active transportation that TAB has discussed. She added that TAB should be asked what objectives it wishes to achieve.

Hager said that she will share with TAB that there is flexibility in the funding ranges, suggest that the ranges be examined in the evaluation, suggest that ranges be tied closely to the region's goals and policies, say that TAC is not making a recommendation, and remind TAB that transit does not meet the minimum of its range. Regarding the active transportation pilot, Hager said that members could suggest that more funding could be added and that at its next meeting TAB is unlikely to get into federal requirements for Active Transportation.

Other Business

None.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned.

Committee Contact:

Joe Barbeau, Planning Analyst

Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us

651-602-1705