Notes of a Meeting of the
TAC-PLANNING COMMITTEE
May 14, 2015


OTHERS PRESENT: Dave Vessel (MTS), Noel Nix (Outreach), Brad Utecht, Rachel Wiken

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Chair Lisa Freese.

2. Adoption of the Agenda
The agenda was adopted.

3. Approval of the Minutes
Notes of the meeting of the April 9th meeting were approved as submitted.

4. Information / Presentation Items

   • Performance Measures Study (Mark Filipi, Brad Utecht)

Mark Filipi gave a review of the past efforts of the Performance Measures Study. He indicated that little discussion arose concerning this in the review of the updated Transportation Policy Plan (TPP). As a result, a closer look is being taken to see if the measures are reasonable and complete. The issue arose as to what involvement the TAC-Planning Committee should have in this study. It needs to be determined as to the level of involvement and how often the group would like to meet or discuss this as the study progresses. Mark indicated that the intent is to get all of the performance rules done by October. At the present there is no ‘release’ information regarding system performance and air quality by the Federal government. It was noted that the information that is available from Map21 is geared to the National Highway System; locally the plan is to include Minor Arterials.

Brad Utecht distributed a handout on the DRAFT Performance Measures Work Plan/Tasks. Much of it is ‘highway’ based and is to be handled differently from that of the other modes. He indicated that the desire is to do performance measures on the A-Minor Arterial System. If so, city and county coordination would be needed. Brad pointed out the non-highway measures and potential non-transportation measures on the sheet. Brad asked for suggestions on how to incorporate measures regarding ‘Land Use’. There are various ways to measure this, but it is difficult to determine a performance measure to use for the future; performance measures generally relate to how something works, so future land use is awkward. Jack Byers commented that Minneapolis is currently developing performance measures for the city’s Land Use Plan to see how well it performs. This might be something to consider. Brad indicated that staff is looking for the performance measures to be consistent across the board.
Staff is working on modal groups; it is hoped that the TAC-Planning Committee would review this as a steering committee. Brad referred the committee to the bottom of the handout page for TAC-Planning input. The modal groups are identified on page 2 of the handout. It is intended to involve Council members so that it is not only the staff that is engaged from the Council. Staff will ask the Executive Committee about involvement of the TAB and its various subgroups. Page 3 of the handout shows the anticipated schedule.

Various questions were raised by the committee. Are the MAP21 measures the only ones that will be done? Safety is shown and is important. This could be looked at as a ‘before’ and ‘after’ investment. It was noted that the performance measures should be regarded as a good educational tool for the public to show why these are good projects being measured.

Staff asked that the committee members should send any comments or thoughts to either Mark Filipi or Brad Utecht. Chair Freese asked whether or not any committee member or anyone from their organization might be interested in being more involved and should contact her if so.

• **Update on Meetings with the Counties (Mark Filipi)**

Mark noted that meetings have been held and are still underway. Meetings have been held with county transportation and with public works.

Comments made included that there should be consistent methods used to meet needs. Concerns were raised on the life cycle of the state-aid system. There is some concern over showing future projects on the system; revenues and expenditures by functional classification; consistent break between capital versus operations funds. Comments at the meeting also indicated that having Thrive and the Regional Solicitation coming at the same time was problematic. Mark also noted that there are other studies coming up, and they include: Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study and the Freight Study. Counties wanted a more timely interaction as things progressed than they felt actually took place. More could have been made from the ‘grassroots’ work. It was felt by the counties that their county plans did not seem to get incorporated in the larger regional plan, and that needs differ by the various parts of the region. Mark noted that he would like to see a summer time-frame in which to get the TPP adopted.

• **MnDOT Capital Highway Investment Proposal (Mark Filipi / Josh Pearson)**

A copy of the 10-Year Capital Highway Investment Proposal (CHIP) was distributed to the committee. Josh proceeded to run through the PowerPoint presentation, noting that it identifies MnDOT’s capital investments over the next 10 years on the state’s highway network. He indicated that this makes for earlier coordination and increases the transparency of the projects being selected. Josh reported where it fits in the state’s highway planning efforts and emphasized that it is a ‘Proposal’ rather than a ‘Plan’. The proposal identifies specific projects in all years. Josh noted the timeline for the process over the course of the year, from project selection to the final edits. He indicated that the year 5-to-10 projects (2017 to 2026) are currently being reviewed.

While referencing the two pie-charts for years 1-8 and 9-10, he was asked where right-of-way was to be found. Josh responded that right-of-way is located under ‘Project Support’. It was remarked that this is a good communications tool for stakeholders. At some point, people would want to see the nature and size of right-of-way funds. Paul Czech noted that the Metro District has put substantial work into this.
5. **Other Business**

Chair Freese reiterated that anyone interested in a deeper involvement into the Performance Measures dialogue should let her know.

Chair Freese also thanked Bob for his time and work on the committee; he would be retiring before the next scheduled committee meeting.

6. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:32 PM.

Bob Paddock, Secretary