

Minutes

TAC Funding and Programming Committee



Meeting Date: October 20, 2022

Time: 1:00 PM

Location: Virtual

Members Present:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bloomington - Karl Keel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAB Coordinator - Elaine Koutsoukos | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anoka Co - Jerry Auge |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lakeville - Paul Oehme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MnDOT - Molly McCartney | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carver Co - Angie Stenson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eden Prairie - Robert Ellis | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MnDOT Metro District State Aid - Colleen Brown | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dakota Co - Jenna Fabish |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fridley - Jim Kosluchar | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MnDOT Bike/Ped - Mike Samuelson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hennepin Co - Jason Pieper |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maple Grove - Ken Ashfeld | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MPCA - Innocent Eyoh | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ramsey Co - Scott Mareck |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plymouth - Michael Thompson (Chair) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DNR - Nancy Spooner-Walsh | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott Co - Craig Jensen |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minneapolis - Nathan Koster | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suburban Transit Association - Ben Picone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wash Co - Joe Ayers-Johnson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> St. Paul - Anne Weber | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = present, E = excused |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met Council - Cole Hiniker | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Metro Transit - Scott Janowiak | | |

Call to Order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Thompson called the regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee to order at 1:01 p.m.

Agenda Approved

Chair Thompson noted that a roll call vote was not needed for approval of the agenda unless a committee member offered an amendment to the agenda. Committee members did not have any comments or changes to the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Spooner-Walsh, seconded by Ashfeld to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2022 regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Public Comment on Committee Business

There were no public comments.

TAB Report

Koutsoukos reported on the October 19th, 2022 Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) meeting.

Business

1. **2022-44:** Program Year Extension Request: Maple Grove Rush Creek Boulevard/I-94/TH 610 Interchange

It was moved by Brown, seconded by McCartney, that the Funding & Programming Committee recommend that TAB approve Maple Grove's Rush Creek Boulevard/I-94/TH 610 Interchange Construction and MN 610 Extension from fiscal year 2023 to fiscal year 2024.

Joe Barbeau, MTS discussed the Maple Grove project that is being delayed due to Federal authorization taking longer than anticipated due to the design. The project meets the policy requirements. John Hagen of Maple Grove discussed project and stated they anticipate construction may still occur during 2023 but do not want to lose the funding altogether. McCartney stated the project is still in the TIP for 2023 but that can move if the letting year shifts to 2024.

Motion carried unanimously.

2. **2022-45:** 2022 Regional Solicitation Funding Options

It was moved by Hiniker, seconded by Ayres-Johnson, that the Funding & Programming Committee forward to TAC the three funding options along with a list of key differences for each option and any other technical feedback.

Steve Peterson, MTS presented a summary of the 2022 Regional Solicitation schedule, three funding scenarios, and policy direction from TAB at their October 19, 2022 meeting. Peterson asked the committee for feedback on the key technical differences between the scenarios.

Koster asked whether the Midpoint Scenario includes the new Carbon Reduction and Bridge program money. Peterson responded that neither funding programs were incorporated into the midpoint funding levels because they were new programs announced after the application was approved.

Stenson asked a clarifying question about the Bridge funds and where the additional \$5.5 million for bridges was coming from. Peterson responded that one project in Traffic Management Technologies and one project in Spot Mobility and Safety were removed to fund the fifth bridge. Pieper clarified that \$5.5 million for the fifth bridge would come from other pots of federal funding.

Koster inquired about splitting a tie in the bicycle and multiuse trail category. Peterson stated that TAB does not like splitting ties, but that Three Rivers Park District has indicated they are okay with the split. Koutsoukos added that splitting ties is not a written rule but a historical practice.

Jensen commented that previous funding scenarios showed the Scott County trail as funded but these updated scenarios only show it funded in one and that it is a high priority for the County. Peterson said one of the lenses that TAB looks at is geographic balance and that may change the scenarios.

Stenson asked with the Bike/Ped scenarios, there was one remaining transit project and questioned whether a partial funding award was considered for the last transit expansion project. Peterson stated that the amount of funding and technical feedback from the previous solicitation cycles was to avoid partial funding. Koutsoukos added that TAB did not discuss partial funding.

Stenson requested feedback from the committee regarding the roadway projects and



consistency with the midpoint project lists instead of shifting which roadway projects are selected in other scenarios, which she believes creates a very different project list.

Ayoh asked about the BRT rule, and whether TAB wanted to maintain the rule. Peterson stated that Technical Advisory Committee and TAB agreed to follow the rule, with discussions of updating the rule in the next cycle to set the rule as a percent of total funding. The remaining transit money due to the BRT rule would be shifted to other modes per TAB's direction.

Hiniker recalled TAC and TAB conversations about prioritizing roadway reconstruction. Koutsoukos clarified that TAB did have that conversation, but the focus was on safety benefits across all roadway categories.

Chair Thompson summarized the discussion as the fifth bridge project and its \$5.5 million funding source, shifting some money back to the multiuse trails to address geographic balance and the length of the project list, transit expansion with partial funding.

Koster requested updated geographic balance summary tables, noting some decisions are challenging to determine without that information. Peterson stated the summary tables are in process but that there was not time between the TAB meeting the previous day and this meeting. He committed to sending out the summary tables once complete.

Barbeau discussed a table that showed applications by project categories, resubmittals funded, equity bonus projects funded, safety high score projects, and project locations. The tables do include Carbon Reduction and Bridge funding but does not include unique projects.

Stenson asked about the third scenario (Bike/Ped Heavy scenario with extra funding to Bike/Ped projects) and it is going over the 20 percent range maximum to 21 percent. She noted Carver County was not in support to go over the range maximum. Peterson stated the difference is \$3 million and is a good technical comment, but that TAB is able to use discretion and go outside their approved ranges. Hiniker clarified that this information was presented to TAB at the previous day's meeting and still provided that policy direction.

Samuelson asked for clarification on the bridge funding and whether the \$5.5 million that is funding the last bridge and what the trade off would be. Koutsoukos stated that at the September meeting TAB discussed the \$10 million bridge target and directed staff to use the Bridge program funding to supplement the funding category, ultimately getting more funding for bridges. Peterson added that there is more Bridge money available, but the decision is whether to fund projects in this solicitation or in a future cycle. Koster asked whether the Carbon Reduction funding could be used similarly, now or in a future cycle. Peterson responded that Carbon Reduction funding was specifically directed by Transportation Committee and TAB to only use two years of money to allow planning to catch up to support the program goals.

Chair Thompson asked whether TAB has historically gone away from the midpoint scenario. Peterson stated not since 2014, but Koutsoukos said there were minor modifications to the midpoint scenario to get a better geographic balance.

Chair Thompson again summarized the discussion identifying geographic balance as an important factor, the extra transit money going to bike/ped projects would result in overtaking the 20 percent modal maximum and whether that money should be shifted to roadway projects. Hiniker stated that TAB has the authority to change the modal ranges at any given time, but the scenarios are not very different in terms of the number of projects in each modal category.



Ayoh stated his preference for the Bike/Ped Heavy with the extra funding to bike/ped projects because of the length of the project lists and the relatively low cost of the projects.

Samuelson referred to a presentation from TAB regarding poor rates of ADA compliance across the region and if there was a way to determine which scenario increases that compliance, noting that the bike/ped project types and roadway reconstruction and spot mobility were most likely to address those issues, and this should be presented to TAB. Chair Thompson agreed and acknowledged TAB's focus on ADA and safety. Koster added that bikes/peds make up a disproportionate percentage of fatal and serious injury crashes and requested this nuance should be presented in the safety discussion.

Jensen clarified that no specific scenario recommendation will be provided to TAB and that it will be to only provide technical comments. Hiniker added that with additional time to review the TAB meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee may be able to provide additional technical information and feedback on the policy questions to TAB.

Mareck suggested TAB be aware that the fifth bridge project can be funded out of the Bridge funding program to reallocate \$5.5 million to other roadway projects and that funding the two unique projects resulted in fewer bicycle and pedestrian projects. Koutsoukos clarified that TAB set aside the unique projects funding was set aside in the last regional solicitation cycle, so it is not taking away money from this cycle, but the remaining Unique Projects set aside would be reallocated to other categories. Koutsoukos also discussed the Unique Projects scoring discussion but noted TAB did not direct where the remaining funds should be reallocated.

Motion carried, 20 ayes and 1 nay.

3. **2022-46:** 2022 Carbon Reduction Funding Distribution

It was moved by Mareck, seconded by Ayoh, that the Funding & Programming Committee forward to TAC any technical feedback on the Carbon Reduction funding options.

Chair Thompson and Steve Peterson, MTS noted the Carbon Reduction

Stenson added that Carbon Reduction funds can be used on projects in all modal categories including unfunded transit projects, traffic management technologies, and other roadway projects that reduce Carbon. Koutsoukos said TAB did discuss this but that this funding is limited to projects that can be constructed in 2023 and 2024 and no roadway projects eligible could take those funds in the program year.

Pieper confirmed that the scenarios from the previously published Carbon Reduction scenario is no longer relevant due to the TAB direction from the previous day. Peterson confirmed.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. **2022-47:** 2022 Highway Safety Improvement Program Project Selection

It was moved by Koutsoukos, seconded by Kosluchar, that the Funding & Programming recommend that TAC recommend to TAB approval of the attached 38 projects for funding through the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) solicitation and inclusion of all Urbanized Area projects in the draft 2024-2027 TIP.

Koster asked whether the methodology for the HSIP funding splits decision could be shared with the committee. Peterson provided some background on the decision but that this feedback can be forwarded to MnDOT for consideration.



Stenson noted Carver County's concern with MnDOT projects that will receive funding through this process while leaving other local agency projects unfunded, noting MnDOT already receives an HSIP set aside. McCartney noted this comment has been received in the past, adding that the HSIP program is unique in Minnesota in that the State DOT shares with the MPO while most other states do not; HSIP is not regional dollars or federal formula funding; and that MnDOT initiated this sharing was because HSIP dollars were not getting spent, but it is not necessarily funding for the region. Chair Thompson encouraged McCartney to bring a history of the program to the committee.

Motion carried unanimously.

Information

Information items scheduled for this meeting were tabled until the November meeting due to time constraints.

Reports

There were no other agency reports.

Adjournment

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Council Contact:

Bethany Brandt-Sargent, Senior Planner
Bethany.Brandt-Sargent@metc.state.mn.us
651-602-1725

