

Minutes of the

I. REGULAR MEETING OF THE TAC FUNDING & PROGRAMING COMMITTEE

Thursday, November 21, 2019

Committee Members Present: Karl Keel (Acting Chair, Bloomington), Joe MacPherson (Anoka County), Angie Stenson (Carver County), John Sass (Dakota County), Jason Pieper (Hennepin County), Joe Lux (Ramsey County), Craig Jenson (Scott County), Emily Jorgensen (Washington County), Elaine Koutsoukos (TAB), Cole Hiniker (Metropolitan Council), Anna Flintoft (Metro Transit), Shaker Rabban (MnDOT Metro District), Colleen Brown (MnDOT Metro District State Aid), Innocent Eyoh (MPCA), Nancy Spooner-Mueller (DNR), Aaron Bartling (MVTA), Nathan Koster (Minneapolis), Anne Weber (St. Paul)

Committee Members Absent: Paul Oehme (Chair, Lakeville), Mackenzie Turner Bargaen (MnDOT Bike & Ped), Robert Ellis (Eden Prairie), Jim Kosluchar (Fridley), Ken Ashfeld (Maple Grove), Michael Thompson (Plymouth)

II. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Acting Committee Chair Keel called the regular meeting of the Funding & Programming Committee to order at 1:32 p.m. on Thursday, November 21, 2019.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was moved by Eyoh to approve the agenda. Seconded by Lux. **Motion carried unanimously.**

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by MacPherson and seconded by Jorgensen to approve the minutes of the August 22, 2019, regular meeting of the Funding & Programming Committee. **Motion carried unanimously.**

V. TAB REPORT

Koutsoukos reported on the November 20, 2019, TAB meeting.

VI. BUSINESS

1. 2019-62: Public Comment Report for the 2020 Regional Solicitation

Steve Peterson from the Metropolitan Council said that TAB was provided the Regional Solicitation public comment report and made requests of the technical committees to explore potential changes related to some comments.

TAB requested input on modal funding ranges and the unique projects set aside. Jenson asked whether unique projects will be subject to an application form and scoring criteria. He also asked what would happen to the funding if no unique projects are selected. Peterson replied that the ranking process will be decided upon going into the 2022 Regional Solicitation projects and that if no projects are selected the funds will go toward traditional Regional Solicitation projects. Keel posed the question of whether the committee wants to provide direction. He added that the committee had suggested not including a Unique Projects category. Brown said that any unique projects selected need to be vetted for assurance of deliverability, to which Hiniker replied that it would be part of planning over the next year. The committee decided not to make a comment on unique projects. Keel then asked whether the committee wanted to provide any direction on the modal funding ranges. MacPherson replied that history shows the middle of the range is generally used. He added that the new Spot Mobility category and the increased maximum funding amount for Strategic Capacity may reduce the number of roadway projects funded and

recommended that historic ranges be maintained. Flintoft asked what TAB's rational for the modal shift of \$5 million towards transit was, Peterson said this was a way to fund enough transit projects after the arterial bus rapid transit (ABRT) setaside. Koster said that the \$3.5 million maximum in the new Spot Mobility category offsets the \$10 million maximum in Strategic Capacity. MacPherson asked whether \$20 million would be enough for ABRT. Flintoft replied that the \$25 million proposal is less than the \$28 million than the Council usually receives for multiple ABRT projects. Pieper suggested that the adjustment is not needed at this point because the range is flexible. Stenson said she agrees with MacPherson. Flintoft said she prefers not to offer a policy comment. Barbeau said that TAB moved toward updated midpoints under the assumption that the midpoint will be targeted when projects are programmed.

MOTION 1: MacPherson moved to stay with the ranges from 2018. Seconded by Sass. Koster said that a theme in the Solicitation is the importance of transit. Hiniker said that TAB could program to its suggested midpoints under either circumstance and suggested no change to what has been released. Eyoh said the policy work group has been through this discussion. Keel added that he does not support the motion because it is a policy issue. **Motion 1 failed by a count of nine to seven.**

Peterson said that TAB wants to know how one Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities project can be funded at \$5.5 million dollars and whether there is interest in raising any other maximum award amounts. To the first question, Hiniker asked whether applicants for a \$5.5 million project would take \$4 million if offered, to which Keel replied they would more often than not. Hiniker replied that it is then feasible. Koster suggested that applicants may change the scope based on expectations. Members agreed to provide the feedback that funding one project at \$5.5 million dollars with a lower maximum for the remaining projects is feasible but creates difficulties for applicants regarding how to size a project.

Koster suggested that TAB could set a general goal to fund \$10 million in bridge projects, as opposed to a rigid rule. Members agreed to provide this as a comment to TAB. Stenson added that a target would help set expectations regarding the potential for category split within the highways mode.

Peterson said TAB wanted feedback on whether the proposed ABRT program could be broadened to include all BRT project types. Bartling said he is not fond of the ABRT program because not all applicants can apply and the process to establish it bypassed technical groups. Jorgensen added that the Gold Line cannot compete in the category. Flintoft said that ABRT will not receive any more money than it usually does. Members agreed to provide a recommendation that a scoring process be completed for 2022 so all BRT project types can compete. MOTION 2: Keel moved to retain the ABRT category as is out for review. No second.

Peterson said that TAB wanted to know whether any technical changes should be made to the requirement that transit applicants must have capital and operating funds to implement the entire project. The following language is removed from that requirement: "and commit to continuing the service or facility beyond the initial three-year funding period for operating costs." Hiniker said that demonstration projects do not always last in the long term and that the intent of the requirement is that the applicant pay for operations itself. MOTION 3: Hiniker moved to replace the eliminated language with "and certify that they will provide funding, if the service or facility project continues beyond the initial three-year funding period for transit operating funds." Seconded by Bartling. **MOTION 3 was approved unanimously.**

Peterson said that TAB posed the question of whether Washington County's request to add a Tier 1 Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) trail alignment along the Gold Line be

considered. Members agreed that this is an issue for the RBTN map discussion at TAC. Koster asked whether all applicants will get a chance to update the RBTN map.

Peterson said that Minneapolis made several comments on Roadways topics, most related to the Spot Mobilities category. Koster said that most of the comments were submitted for general consideration moving forward.

Peterson said that TAB requested whether anything can or should be done to address concerns about outdated information in studies or to address interest in giving full credit in the Truck Corridor Study under certain circumstances. MOTION 4: Jorgenson moved to give the at-grade intersection with the highest traffic volumes on Highway 36 the full 80 points from the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study and to give roadways with a heavy commercial vehicle volume of 1,000 the full 80 points from the Truck Freight Corridor Sstudy map. Seconded by Sass. Koster said that studies become outdated quickly, so how to update them should be examined; however, it is difficult to base changes on specific problems. Jorgensen added that the Truck Corridor Study change would be universal, as opposed to helping one project. **Motion 4 failed by a split vote.**

MOTION 5: It was moved by Spooner-Mueller and seconded by MacPherson, to recommend acceptance of the public comments. **Motion carried unanimously.**

2. 2019-63: Adopt 2020 Regional Solicitation Packet for Release

MOTION: It was moved by MacPherson and Seconded by Hiniker, to recommend release of the 2020 regional solicitation inclusive of the change made in item 2019-62. **Motion carried unanimously.**

VII. INFORMATION

1. . Review of Streamlined TIP Amendment Policy

Joe Barbeau from Metropolitan Council said that staff is looking into amending the streamlined TIP Amendment Process for the following reasons:

- The process is five years old and has not been reviewed.
- The qualifying criterion related to cost effectiveness is outdated.
- As of November 29, 2019, The Twin Cities area will become an attainment area for carbon monoxide but a small part of the region will be a maintenance area for particulate matter – 10 (PM₁₀). This means that an updated definition of “regionally significant” is likely to be written. It makes sense to remove the definition from the policy and simply reference the definition in the Transportation Policy Plan.
- There has been feedback from TAB members that it does not make sense for TAB to hear the details of routine amendment requests and that it might be better for these to be included on the consent agenda. However, staff believes that each request should be on at least one primary agenda, so it may be appropriate to place streamlined amendment requests on TAC’s agenda.

Changes shown in the draft include elimination of the cost-effectives reference, moving the actions directly to TAC, and referencing the Transportation Policy Plan’s definition of regional significance.

Eyoh said that he was recently informed by the Environmental Protection Agency that the PM₁₀ maintenance area is going to be enforced.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by MacPherson and seconded by Eyoh to adjourn the meeting. **Motion carried unanimously** and the meeting was adjourned.

Joe Barbeau
Recording Secretary