

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
Metropolitan Council
Minutes of a Meeting of the
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
October 18, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Oehme (Chair, Chanhassen), Ken Ashfeld (City of Maple Grove), Colleen Brown (MnDOT State Aid), Robert Ellis (Eden Prairie), Innocent Eyoh (MPCA), Anna Flintoft (Metro Transit), Craig Jenson (Scott County), Emily Jorgensen (Washington County), Karl Keel (Bloomington), Jim Kosluchar (Fridley), Nathan Koster (Minneapolis), Jen Lehmann (MVTA), Joe Lux (Ramsey County), Joe MacPherson (Anoka County), Molly McCartney (MnDOT), Gina Mitteco (MnDOT Bike/Ped), Steve Peterson (Metropolitan Council), Jason Pieper (Hennepin County), Lyndon Robjent (Carver County), John Sass (Dakota County), Michael Thompson (Plymouth), Anne Weber (St. Paul), and Joe Barbeau (staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Marie Cote (SRF) and Katie White (Metropolitan Council)

1. Call to Order

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

2. Adoption of Agenda

MOTION: Ashfeld moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by Thompson. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the August 16, 2018, Meeting

MOTION: MacPherson moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by Lux. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. TAB Report – Information Item

Barbeau reported on the October 17, 2018 TAB meeting.

5. 2019-2022 TIP Amendment: Chaska US 212 and CSAH 44 Interchange – Action Item 2018-49

Barbeau said that the City of Chaska requested an amendment to the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add a project to construct an interchange at US 212 and CSAH 44. This is a regionally significant project and the Committee will vote on whether to recommend releasing it for public comment.

MOTION: Thompson moved to recommend approval of the TIP amendment to release it for a public comment period. Seconded by Brown. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. 2019-2022 TIP Amendment: Anoka County CSAH 14 Reconstruction – Action Item 2018-50

Barbeau said that Anoka County requested an amendment to the 2019-2022 TIP to change the cost, year, and description for its CSAH 14 reconstruction project. The project will no longer be expanding from two to four lanes. This is a regionally significant project and the Committee will vote on whether to recommend releasing it for public comment.

MOTION: Lux moved to recommend approval of the TIP amendment to release it for a public comment period. Seconded by Robjent. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. 2019-2022 TIP Amendment: MnDOT I-94 Reconstruction and Expansion in Wright County (7W) – Action Item 2018-48

Barbeau said that MnDOT requested an amendment to add to the TIP a new project that was selected for funding under MnDOT's 2018 Corridors of Commerce program. The project is located in Wright County, within the extended Twin Cities urbanized metropolitan area. This is a regionally significant project but because it MnDOT wants to let the project early in 2019, the process is being sped up. TAB, at its October 17, 2018 meeting, released it for public comment so that it can vote on whether to approve it in November. Therefore, the Committee will make a recommendation on whether to approve the project. McCartney added

that the project will be done as a “design-build” and authorization must occur before it is advertised for bid, which helps contribute to the urgency.

Eyoh said that MPCA provided an air quality approval letter today.

MOTION: Ashfeld moved to recommend approval of the TIP amendment. Seconded by Robjent. The motion was approved unanimously.

8. 2019-2022 TIP Amendment: MnDOT I-94 Bridge Replacement in Wright County (7W) – Action Item 2018-51

Barbeau said that MnDOT requested an amendment to add a new project into the TIP. The project consists of the replacement of two bridges crossing over I-94 in Wright County.

MOTION: Robjent moved to recommend approval of the TIP amendment. Seconded by MacPherson. The motion was approved unanimously.

9. 2018 Regional Solicitation Release of Scores – Information Item

With the draft scores completed for the 2018 Regional Solicitation, the Committee discussed the process in each scoring committee.

Lux, chair of the Roadway Expansion scoring committee, said that at times, scorers seemed to overanalyze the projects. Jorgensen questioned the zero that Washington County received for crossing, but not providing access to, a truck corridor. Lux said that this was discussed at the Committee meeting. Lux said that Ramsey County will be challenging its score in equity. Sass asked whether studies used for scoring will need to be updated before the next Regional Solicitation.

Peterson reported on the Roadway Reconstruction & Modernization and Traffic Management Technologies scoring committee. Applicants neglected to include some of the safety information and the scorer suggested deductions may be needed. Outlier adjustments were used on three measures in the Roadway Reconstruction & Modernization category. In Traffic Management Technologies, the measure on integration with existing systems did not differentiate and the scorer brought up the idea of eliminating the measure. Pieper said that safety is based entirely on reactive criteria but given that the HSIP program now funds proactive projects, perhaps some of the points in the Regional Solicitation should be based on proactive criteria.

Hager, chair of the Bridges scoring committee, said that the measure related to distance to the nearest parallel bridge needs to be clarified, as it became an exercise of drawing a line from one side of the bridge to the other. In the equity measure, clarification is needed on the intent of outreach in the past versus future. In the multimodal measure, clarity is needed regarding awarding of points for replacing existing infrastructure. Also in that measure, points should be awarded for improvements under a bridge, such as stopping debris from falling on a sidewalk.

Peterson said that TAB approved requiring funding of at least one project in each functional classification, in large part due to the difficulty of A-Minor connectors to compete with other classifications. He posed the question of whether connectors at intersections with other classifications should qualify as connector projects. He also asked whether a bridge project should qualify. Sass replied that he thinks a corridor project should be selected because these are the projects that are unable to compete. MacPherson asked what kind of connector project was funded in the 2016 Regional Solicitation, to which Peterson replied that only corridor projects were applied for. Lux suggested that each of these projects should count as connectors, while Thompson and Jenson expressed agreement with Sass.

Peterson reported on the Transit scoring committee. In the Transit Expansion category, scorers had difficulty determining how to compare SouthWest Prime service to fixed-route service. For the first time, applicants were given an opportunity to have new ridership calculations reviewed by Council staff prior to the application deadline. In turn, the scorer for ridership was given more flexibility to reduce points based on flawed methodology. Based on flawed methodology submitted, some projects lost some or all their points for

new riders and emissions; these reductions were agreed upon by the scoring committee. In Transit Modernization, there had been discussion prior to 2018 cycle about removing transit support facilities like garages. TAB decided to keep them as an eligible project type. Scorers commented that it was difficult to compare route improvements to support facilities in the measures.

Barbeau reported that there were no major concerns at the Travel Demand Management scoring committee meeting.

Jenson, chair of the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities scoring committee, said that the trail maintenance measure was difficult to score, as some applications received zero points for not mandating snow removal. Mitteco suggested that clarification may be needed in the measure. Jenson said that usage, which is population-based, favors projects in more populated areas and that the top-three scores were all for projects over \$5 million, which will reduce the number of projects funded.

McCartney, chair of the Pedestrian Facilities and Safe Routes to School scoring committee, said that two measures used an outlier adjustment. She added that for the risk assessment sheet, the term “layout” may need to be better-defined. She said that each project scored a zero for one measure, the student population within the school’s walkshed. Barbeau said that the scorer discovered that one project had a higher student population than the enrollment of the school it was to serve. Applicants had varying determinations of how to define the measure, which will need to be written with more direction for the next Regional Solicitation.

10. 2018 Regional Solicitation Funding Scenario Options – Information Item

Peterson discussed various options for funding scenarios. Ellis commented that the scores show that one provider is likely to receive all of the transit funding, based a great deal on the usage measures; this is something to discuss for the 2020 Regional Solicitation.

11. Regional Solicitation Before and After Study – Information Item

White introduced Cote, who shared information about the Regional Solicitation Before and After Study. The purpose of the study is to document the regional benefits achieved through the Regional Solicitation, including the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) solicitation.

Ashfeld asked how traffic diversion is accounted for in no-build versus build scenarios, to which Cote replied that Synchro would be used.

Keel asked whether travel demand management projects were a part of the study, to which Cote replied that they are not in part because in changes with how the funding is distributed.

12. Adjournment

Jenson asked when the HSIP projects will be decided upon. Peterson replied that that will occur in December.

MOTION: Eyoh moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mitteco. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.