

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

Minutes of a Meeting of the
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
August 20, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Colleen Brown (acting chair), Innocent Eyoh, Jenifer Hager, Craig Jenson, Jane Kansier, Mary Karlsson, Karl Keel, Elaine Koutsoukos, Bruce Loney, Joe Lux, Paul Oehme, Ryan Peterson, Steve Peterson, Lyndon Robjant, John Sass, Cory Slagle, Carla Stueve, Tom Styrbicki, Michael Thompson, Andrew Witter, and Joe Barbeau (staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Lisa Freese (Scott County), Carl Ohrn (Metropolitan Council) Jessica Schoner (Metropolitan Council)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Adoption of Agenda

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

3. Approval of the Minutes

MOTION: Koutsoukos moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by Karlsson. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. TAB Report

Koutsoukos provided the report for the August 19m 2015 TAB meeting. Four action items were approved:

1. 2015-33: 2015-2018 Streamlined TIP Amendment was approved for a MnDOT I-94 Unbonded Concrete Overlay Project
2. 2015-36: 2015 UPWP Administrative Amendment – added Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study as a product under the Freight Planning activity
3. 2015-34: Approve 2016-2019 public comment report. Corrections and MnDOT projects added to the draft TIP
4. 2015-35: Adoption of 2016-2019 TIP

5. Scope Change Request – Anoka County CSAH 116 Reconstruction – Action Item

- Barbeau said that Anoka County received \$7,000,000 in Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding for reconstruction of CSAH 116 in the 2011 Regional Solicitation. The County is requesting a scope change that would allow for the following changes:
 - A slight increase in project cost.
 - Extend the west terminus to Crane Street to accommodate a second outbound lane.
 - Extend the east terminus to .1 mile east of Van Buren Street.
 - Add trail on the north side of CSAH 116 between Crane Street and former west terminus to fill in the gap between proposed and existing trails
 - Wintergreen Street: change access from right-in / right-out to $\frac{3}{4}$ access.
 - Butternut Street: change access from right-in / right-out to $\frac{3}{4}$ access.

- Anoka County Farms: change access from right-in / right-out to full access.
- Terrace Road: change from a cul-de-sac to right-in / right out.

The proposal was shared with the scorers to compare scores for this proposal to the original proposal. Crash reduction cost effectiveness, land use and access management planning, and access management improvements saw scoring reductions while air quality cost effectiveness and integration of modes saw increases. Barbeau provided five extra points to the latter based on the added filling in of a gap in a multi-use trail.

Four intersections are seeing additional access compared to the original application: Wintergreen Street is proposed to change from right-in / right out to $\frac{3}{4}$ access, Butternut Street is proposed to change from right-in / right out to $\frac{3}{4}$ access; Anoka County Farms is proposed to change from right-in / right out to full access, and Terrace Road is proposed to change from no access to right-in / right-out.

Witter said that the revisions are the result of public participation and further traffic modeling. The expanded access at Wintergreen Street prevents the need for U-turns while the expanded access at Butternut Street was decided upon after more modeling occurred. Anoka County Farms will maintain full access to prevent environmental issues at Coon Creek. The extension of the eastern terminus makes for a more logical transition to the single lane rural roadway.

Regarding the increased score for the trail gap, Koutsoukos asked whether it is permissible to provide more points for additional elements. Ohrn said that it is not.

Thompson asked what the average daily traffic is on 138th Avenue. Witter replied that he is not certain but that there are about 650 people that live in the area.

Keel suggested that the County be careful to design the $\frac{3}{4}$ intersections so that it is clear that left turns are not permitted.

Eyoh said that the air quality model used in 2011 has been replaced and the new model helped determine the score improvement.

MOTION: Steve Peterson moved to recommend approval of the scope change as requested. Seconded by Robjent. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. TIP Amendment – Anoka County CSAH 116 Reconstruction – Action Item

Barbeau said that this amendment accompanies the previous scope change request. The project is regionally significant and will require a 21-day public comment period. It is also an amendment for the yet-to-be approved 2016-2019 TIP and the amendment may be approved with the understanding that it is not official until the TIP is approved by the United States Department of Transportation.

MOTION: Keel moved to recommend that TAB adopt the amendment into the 2016-2019 TIP for the purpose of release for a public comment period.

7. Scott County STP Funding Change – Action Item

Barbeau said that Scott County is proposing to “defederalize” a project by moving its federal funding to another project. The defederalization will create efficiency for the County. A small group has been established to work on a policy that will address issues such as whether

defederalizations can be multi-jurisdictional and how assurances will be made that defederalized projects will be completed as approved by TAB.

Freese said that the County proposes defederalizing its County Highway 42 and Trunk Highway 13 (42/13) intersection project, providing all federal funds to the Trunk Highway 169 / Trunk Highway 41 (169/41) interchange and that it will provide a resolution stating that it will complete both projects on time and as approved by TAB.

Keel asked what funding would backfill the 42/13 project. Freese replied that this would be local money and that the project would go through the MnDOT State Aid process but not any federal process.

Koutsoukos said that if the 169/41 project is withdrawn the entire federal amount original awarded to both projects would have to be returned to the region.

Keel asked how MnDOT State Aid will assure project deliverance. Brown said that MnDOT State Aid will track the project as it does all federal projects.

Lux asked whether an inflation adjustment would occur for the project moving into 2018. Brown replied that such an adjustment would not occur.

Loney asked whether the County's half-cent sales tax would fund some of the 42/13 project. Freese replied that the tax would fund part of the project.

Keel asked what happens if the defederalized project is not completed. Brown replied that this is addressed in the County resolution.

Steve Peterson asked whether the defederalized project can get its federal money back if the 169/41 project fails. Freese said that this would be logistically difficult.

MOTION: Lux moved to recommend approval of the County's defederalization request. Seconded by Loney. The motion was approved unanimously.

8. Quarterly Report on Streamlined TIP Amendments – Information Item

Barbeau said that three TIP amendments started in Quarter 2, April through June. Two amendments were streamlined and needed an average of 14 days between their first meeting—TAB—and Council concurrence while the one standard amendment needed 49 days from Funding & Programming to Council concurrence. To date, the 2015-2018 TIP has seen 11 of 17 amendments streamlined, with an average of 11 days between TAB and Council concurrence while standard amendments needed an average of 57 days between Funding & Programming and Council concurrence. .

9. Regional Solicitation Update – Action Item

Steve Peterson provided a brief update on the 2016 Regional Solicitation schedule. Evaluation of the 2014 Regional Solicitation will occur over the next five months. The Solicitation will be released on May 18, 2016 with applications due on July 15, 2016. Awards will be made in January of 2017.

Steve Peterson said that intern Jessica Schoner created a sensitivity analysis that examined the impacts of each measure on total scores within eight of the categories. Projects were re-scored

with each measure removed. Measures with high point values tend to be most impactful, which is not a surprise.

The Roadway Expansion category has no surprises.

Keel asked whether any measures did not differentiate at all and suggested they be removed. Steve Peterson replied that measures can be changed and re-weighted. Karlsson cautioned that this analysis represents small sample sizes and added that the “funding line” is somewhat arbitrary so the number of projects to shift across it may not be very meaningful.

Keel asked whether a regression analysis could be done. Schoner said that she conducted some regression analyses and found similar results to the analysis provided to the Committee.

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization showed Infrastructure Age/Condition and Congestion/Air Quality to have minimal impact, the former potentially due to lacking guidance provided to the measure’s scorer.

Roadway System Management saw no change in rank order when Housing was removed, due to projects being clustered within a few cities.

Bridges had no change upon removal of three categories worth at least 70 points each, Geometric, Structural, or Infrastructure Deficiencies; Risk Assessment Form; and Housing. It was noted, though, that only six applications were provided for the Bridge category.

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities had extremely high clustering near the funding line. The most noteworthy measure was Deficiencies and Safety, which only changed the rank order of 17 of 31 projects despite being worth 150 points. All projects scored between 120 and 150 points. Robjent suggested that the measure may be worth too many points. Koutsoukos said that the measure was difficult to score. Styrbicki suggested that this measure could be more of a “pass/fail” measure.

Pedestrian Facilities saw no change created by Deficiencies and Safety, which was worth 180 points and only two projects change as a result of Barriers and Gaps, which was worth 120 points.

Safe Routes to School only had three applications, so the results are not particularly valuable. The most interesting thing to note is that Barriers and gaps saw all submissions score at least 96 out of 100 points, while all submissions scored between 38 and 45 out of 45 points for Public Engagement.

Many measures provided no or few changes in rank order in Transit Expansion. All points, 33, were awarded to all projects for Connection to Job Concentrations, Manufacturing/Distribution Locations, Educational Institutions, and Local Activity Centers, which makes sense given the connectivity that transit routes tend to plan.

Because only one Transit Modernization application was completed, no analysis was provided.

Ohrn provided a list of key questions that will be responded to prior to the September meeting:

1. There were concerns expressed about the rules for bundling and how wide of a geographic area projects can cover.
2. Should “new roadways” be a separate category or can the scoring criteria be adjusted to so that new roadways can be more easily compared to expansions of existing roadways.

3. Should B-minor bridges be eligible for funding?
4. Can trail usage be based on actual counts rather than amount of people or employees within one mile of the trail facility?
5. There is feeling that the scoring for transit expansion projects should favor new riders more than existing riders.
6. Should inflation be added to all transit and travel demand projects similar to other types of projects?
7. Some feel that too much interpretation of the scoring guidelines occurred. Should the scoring guidelines be included alongside each measure?
8. Some feel that the final program of projects should have a cut-off point on the score sheet, below which projects cannot be funded. A common suggestion was 50% of the possible points (i.e., 500 points).
9. Is cost-effectiveness being measured as part of the most appropriate measures?
10. Frequently cited criteria that need modifications:
 - a. "Multimodal Facilities" was perhaps the most difficult criterion to score.
 - b. "Equity" drew a lot of comments from those who felt it provided an advantage to urban projects as well as those who felt the criteria was confusing. Others felt it does not belong in roadway categories.
 - c. "Infrastructure Deficiencies" was difficult to score because the criterion was too vague for something with so many variables.
11. Prioritization of railroad safety
12. Which category should accommodate reduced conflict intersections?
13. Should the interchange approval process be complete before an interchange project is applied for?

Robgent suggested exploring flooding and accommodating connectors, which were not funded in 2014.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Adjournment

MOTION: Keel moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Steve Peterson. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting adjourned.