Metropolitan Council

Minutes

TAB Technical Advisory Committee



Meeting Date: May 1, 2024	Time : 9:00 AM	Location: Room 1A
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 Anna Flintoft, Metro Transit Shelly Meyer, Freight Colleen Eddy, DEED Vacant, MN DNR Kyle Sobota, Bicycle Mackenzie Turner Bargen, Pedestrian Josh Pearson, FHWA (ex-officio)

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

Motion by Koutsoukos and seconded by Ruiz to approve the agenda with removal of references to roll call voting and to table item 2024-24, TIP amendment for MnDOT's S 169, CSAH 9, and & MN 282 interchange improvements.

Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Ellis and seconded by Nick Peterson to approve the minutes of the April 3, 2024, regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee. **Motion carried**.

Public Comment on Committee Business

None.

TAB Report

Koutsoukos reported on the April 17, 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.

1. 2024-23: Streamlined TIP Amendment Request – Two New Projects

Robbie King said that MnDOT requests addition of a new project for a design consultant agreement associated with a project on MN 65 from 37th Ave to I 694 in Columbia Heights and Hilltop. This agreement is for final design for road construction to include a shared use trail and bus-only lane. This project is assigned a state project number for each year in which the agreement applies. MnDOT requests adding a new project installing bituminous mill and overlay MN 316 from US 61 in Welch Township to Tuttle in Hastings and constructing turn lanes on MN 316 in various locations in Ravenna Township. This project is split into two state project numbers to correspond with the different funding sources, NHPP and HSIP, respectively. The total project cost is \$11,800,000 with 92 percent of the funding from NHPP and the remainder, for the HSIP-funded portion.

Motion by MacPherson and seconded by Leitner to recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2024-2027 TIP to add two new MnDOT projects:

- Design consultant agreement for a MN 65 from 37th Avenue and I 694 in Columbia Heights and Hilltop project;
- Bituminous mill and overlay and added turn lanes on MN 316 (Red Wing Blvd) from US 61 in Welch Township to Tuttle in Hastings.

Motion carried.

2. <u>2024-24: Streamlined TIP Amendment Request – MnDOT's US 169, CSAH 9, and & MN 282 Interchange Improvements</u>

Item tabled when agenda was approved.

3. 2024-25: Streamlined TIP Amendment Request – Six NEVI Projects

Robbie King said that in 2023 MnDOT published the Minnesota Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Plan to receive \$68 million from the federal NEVI formula program, which reimburses 70% of grantee costs. This funding was included in the 2024-2027 STIP as a statewide set-aside. In December 2023 MnDOT released a Request for Proposal to install 18 charging stations along Alternative Fuel Corridors I-94 and I-35. Six of the stations are located within the MPO planning region and need to be added to the 2024-2027 TIP.

Motion by Kosluchar and seconded by Mayell to recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2024-2027 TIP to add installation of six new National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program-funded charging stations:

- Within 1 mile from exit 205, 207, or 213 on I 94
- Within 1 mile from exit 30, 31 or 33 on I 94
- Within 1 mile from exit 17C, 234C or 235A on I 94 and I 35
- Within 1 mile from exit 235B, 237, 238, 239A, 239B, 240 or 241A on I 94
- Within 1 mile from exit 147 on I 35
- Within 1 mile from exit 88B, 86, 85, 84 or 81 on I 35

Motion carried.

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

Mitteco said that the TAC Planning Committee did not meet but the TPP Technical Work Group met. She provided a summary of recent meetings.

Funding and Programming (Michael Thompson, Chair)

1. 2024-24: Program Year Extension Request: Washington County's CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Ave) and MN 36 Intersection Improvement Project

Thompson said Washington County wants to extend its Lake Elmo Avenue-to-MN 36 interchange project from 2025 to 2026. The county has said several efforts to engage the community and

work through potential alternatives were initiated. The county is looking to have final plans completed in 2025. He added that Colleen Brown from MnDOT Metro District State Aid is supportive.

Motion by Ruiz and seconded by MacPherson to recommend that TAB approve the program year extension request for Washington County's CSAH 17 (Lake Elmo Ave) and MN 36 intersection improvement project from 2025 to 2026. **Motion carried.**

2. 2024-21: Regionally Significant TIP Amendment Request – US 10 Expansion Project

Thompson said MnDOT requests an amendment to the 2024-2027 TIP to add its regionally significant US 10 expansion project for the purpose of release for public comment.

King said that this is a regionally significant request, which is subject to a 21-day public comment period. Thompson added that it is regionally significant because it will go from two to three lanes. When asked about different TIP amendment processes, Barbeau said that a streamlined TIP amendment is not regionally significant and not related to a scope change from a Regional Solicitation project and very few applications go through the "standard" amendment process. Eyoh said that a project is only considered regionally significant if it is a mile in length or more. He added that in the past, regional modeling would have been done to explore whether emissions would have been in the region's budget but now that the region is in air quality attainment, this is not done.

Motion by Oehme and seconded by MacPherson to recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2024-2027 TIP to add a regionally significant project expanding US 10 in Coon Rapids from two lanes to three for the purpose of release for public comment. **Motion carried.**

3. 2024-22: Scope Change Request – Metro Transit Regional Mobility Hubs

Thompson said Metro Transit was awarded was awarded \$1,600,000 in the Unique Projects category to fund seven mobility hubs; four in Minneapolis and one each in Brooklyn Center, Saint Paul, and Maplewood. On behalf of the City of Minneapolis, Metro Transit is requesting the relocation of two hubs along with shift of budget from technology amenities to multimodal amenities to better fit the identified project needs. This includes moving the Penn Avenue/Lowry Avenue hub south a few miles and the 26th Avenue and Central Avenue location about one mile. Meredith Klekotka, Metro Transit, said that the request includes flexing some funding from technology elements to multimodal elements.

Kosluchar asked when the funding was applied for. Koutsoukos replied that it was awarded in the 2022 Regional Solicitation.

Motion by Leitner and seconded by Fyten to recommend that TAB approve Metro Transit's scope change request to two hub locations and shift budget from technology amenities to multimodal amenities. **Motion carried.**

Information

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

Steve Peterson provided a brief presentation on initial funding scenarios.

MacPherson asked whether active transportation projects will have to follow federal processes. Steve Peterson replied that the projects will be managed by The Council and the Active Transportation Work Group is still discussing what processes should be followed. Hager added that the years of 2026 and 2027 will be used for the pilot and that a 20 percent match will be used to be fair to all applicants. However, future solicitations may not include a match.

Eyoh asked whether TAB members are still concerned with regional balance based on these scenarios. Steve Peterson said that TAB has not seen these scenarios yet. Hager provided a

timeline, which includes a final decision on funding scenarios in July, though the active transportation project selection could be sooner.

Leitner said that TAB should be reminded that active transportation funding is not supposed to supplant other funding and therefore perhaps it should not be used to support a roadway-heavy scenario. She asked Steve Peterson to provide an HSIP funding timeline. Steve Peterson said that the HSIP scorers will meet soon and funding decisions are on the same timeline as the Regional Solicitation.

Robjent asked that STPBG, TA, and CMAQ be broken out individually. Steve Peterson said that this can be added and that STPBG is over \$60 million per year, CMAQ is about \$33 million per year, and TA is about \$14 million per year.

Hager said that TAB members have been interested in total project scores from category-tocategory to inform how far down a category list to go to fund projects. Steve Peterson added that staff added a column for each project to denote the proportion of points received to the top score.

Hartzell asked how and when decisions on requirements for active transportation projects will be made. Peterson said that this, along with whether to have a 2025 active transportation solicitation are being discussed by the Active Transportation Work Group. Hager added that the formal decision will work through the TAC-TAB process. Steve Peterson said that the legislation does not discuss oversight so there are several available approaches. Hager said that TAC and work group staff have expressed preferences for simplicity and suggested members look at the MnDOT application. Leitner asked whether the working group will discuss the application process going forward or whether that will be a part of the regional solicitation evaluation. Steve Peterson replied that this depends on whether there is going to be a 2025 solicitation; if not it will most likely be part of the evaluation.

Thompson suggested having MnDOT present on its process. Kosluchar expressed encouragement to have MnDOT well-represented in discussions on the process.

MacPherson suggested that TAB could consider going over \$15 million for the pilot if there is not a 2025 Solicitation.

Hager said that given that the Unique Projects category process led to discussion on whether to fund studies, the topic of whether active transportation funding can be used for non-traditional project types could come up.

Leitner said that about 10% of the cities in the region have applied to the Regional Solicitation and therefore encourages the working group not to have active transportation funding go through the Regional Solicitation process.

Thompson said that counties are getting funding off the top and TAB will have to wrestle with how to award funding between cities and counties, particularly in the context of local participation requirements. Leitner said that Washington County is getting \$1 million for complete streets. Robjent added that metro cities are not allowed to apply for the statewide program.

Turner Bargen expressed agreement with providing a simple process, given the number of communities that are not state-aid cities.

Dermody suggested a bike/pedestrian scenario that is heavier in pedestrian projects should be created. MacPherson suggested updating the amount of active transportation money to achieve this.

2. Scope Change Policy Updates (Joe Barbeau, MTS)

Barbeau provided the presentation and discussed proposed updates to the scope change policy.

Hager suggested that the amounts shown should be noted as needing to meet the federal match minimums.

MacPherson asked whether the amounts and percentages indicated are the lesser of the two. It was suggested that either a percentage or dollar figure should be picked. Hager expressed preference for a percentage. Barbeau said that it can be provided to TAB with 20% for the projects under \$1 million and 10% for projects over \$1million. Hager suggested sharing examples of that has happened in practice.

Other Business

None.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned.

Committee Contact:

Joe Barbeau, Planning Analyst Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us 651-602-1705