
*Transportation Advisory Board
Of the Metropolitan Council*

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 2, 2012
Metropolitan Council Chambers
9:00 A.M.**

Members Present: Jon Olson, Lyndon Robjent, Brian Sorenson, Tom Johnson, Tim Mayasich, Lisa Freese, Ted Schoenecker, Kevin Roggenbuck, Mark Filipi, Adam Harrington, Pat Bursaw, Innocent Eyoh, Robert Vorpahl, Susan Moe, Karl Keel, Jennifer Levitt, Chuck Ahl, John Powell, Kim Lindquist, Richard McCoy, Jenifer Hager, Beth Elliott, Allen Lovejoy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as prepared.

3. Approval of March Minutes

The April 4, 2012 meeting minutes were approved as written.

4. TAB Report

Kevin Roggenbuck reported that at its April 18th meeting, The TAB adopted three TIP amendments: for TH 149 improvements in Eagan, rail crossing safety projects (MnDOT) and a cost increase for the TH 36/English Avenue interchange in Maplewood and lowering the grade of TH 36 in the project area. The Board also adopted the development schedule for the 2013-2016 TIP. The Tab approved the distribution of \$5.6 Million in additional federal funds from the extension of SAFETEA-LU.

TAB heard two special agenda items: mark nelson provided a brief information item on the statewide multimodal Plan and Cole Hiniker and John Levin presented "transit and transitway expansion plans" including the Regional Service Improvement Plan.

5. Special Agenda Items

- Corridor Investment Management Strategy Schedule,

Philip Schaffner gave a status report on MnDOT's CIMS, a corridor based initiative that brings MnDOT together with its local, modal and state partners to identify opportunities for collaborative and innovative investment. It offers a means to share information and identify opportunities to apply MnDOT's suite of lower cost, high benefit investment strategies. Over 30 corridors just in the Metro area have been identified. MnDOT will hold a series stakeholder meetings beginning May 8. He said there will be a competitive solicitation for a limited amount of funds, and the first round will be limited to TH partners. MnDOT districts are collaborating with local partners. There could be locally led projects on the trunk highways, but it is expected the Districts will be the applicants. L. Robjent said he doesn't think TED is a big enough program and \$5.10 Million statewide is insufficient. K. Garwood asked how they can have input. P. Schaffner replied that they can evaluate criteria, work closely with the districts to identify projects for submission and make sure those projects address local and regional concerns.

6. Committee Reports

A. Executive Committee (Pat Bursaw, Chair)

- **Action Item 2012-24: TAC 2012 Bylaws**

A. Braden reviewed the proposed changes to the Bylaws and noted that an FHWA representative (non-voting) will be added to the membership of the two standing committees, the ad hoc modal task force and the CIC. K. Keel moved and M. Filipi seconded a motion to approve the Bylaws and forward them to the TAB for information.

- **Action Item 2012-25: Transportation Planning and Programming Guide**

K. Keel moved and J. Powell seconded a motion to review and recommend approval of the Transportation Planning and Programming Guide to the TAB. K. Roggenbuck said the language describing the TAB's relationship to the MPO should be considered by the TAB and T. Johnson suggested that it be called to the Board's attention. B. Bursaw suggested that it be raised at the next TAB executive Committee. **Motion Carried.**

- **Federal Program Status and Program Delivery Task Force**

T. Mayasich said the work group continued discussion of the sunset policy and performance options; ways to improve the process including the pros and cons of keeping a sunset date; the possibility of implementing various incentives and penalties; the possibility of doing more public reporting of the status of projects; and more clearly defining what a scope change is. The group will meet again on May 11th.

B. Funding and Programming Committee (Karl Keel, Chair)

Action Item 2012-20: K. Keel moved and C. Ahl seconded a motion that the TAB approve the final project scores for the 2011 Solicitation. **Motion Carried.** (Discussion of the pros and cons of making actual project selections at this time is discussed below, under "other business").

Action item 2012-21: K. Keel moved and T. Schoenecker seconded a motion that the TAB adopt an amendment to the 2012-2015 TIP that adds SP#s: 8217-82045PE and 8217-82045PR: Bridge Plan Design, Analysis and Review for the St. Croix River Crossing. **Motion Carried.**

Action Item 2012-22: K. Keel moved and T. Johnson moved that the TAB adopt an amendment to the 2012-2015 TIP that adds projects selected by MnDOT to receive FTA Section 5310, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program funds. **Motion Carried.**

Action Item 2012-23: Following a brief presentation by J. Andrew, K. Keel moved and I. Eyoh seconded a motion that the TAB adopt the Draft 2013-2016 TIP and development schedule for the purpose of a public hearing to be held on June 20, 2012. **Motion Carried.**

C. Planning Committee (Allen Lovejoy, Chair)

The committee did not meet in April.

7. Agency Reports

There were no agency reports.

8. Other Business and Adjournment

TAC members discussed the pros and cons of selecting projects from the 2011 Solicitation ranking versus waiting until the next federal highway bill is passed.

A. Harrington asked how could we select projects without knowing how much money is available? P. Bursaw said: we never know how much funding will be available within the next 5 years but it always seems to work out. At this time we don't know either the funding level or program eligibility requirements A. Harrington said the situation is different this time in that there is a higher risk. T. Johnson said the biggest risk of not selecting projects is that they go stale and fall by the boards. He would support a funding level that's reasonable and said he's more concerned about eligibility changes than exact funding levels.

K. Garwood and L. Robjert said we should be developing the STP projects now. It will be challenging to meet the sunset dates. We'll be at risk in getting them delivered. L Robjert suggested drawing lines now based on past funding levels—but also talk to project sponsors “on the bubble” and let them know the funding may not be there. We need to keep moving with right of way and environmental studies.

C. Ahl said he's probably more pessimistic: Some proposals are cutting funding by as much as 36%. We may not be able to fund many of the projects that have already been selected, let alone new ones. We're at about the 10th continuation of the federal program. We need to look at the worst case scenario—there may be no solicitation for 2017.

K. Keel suggested drawing two lines—one at the “standard funding level” and one at a 60% level (worst case scenario). L. Freese commented that if we don't start working on projects we risk not being able to deliver them if and when the money does come in. We need to let our elected officials know that.

P. Bursaw said MnDOT has continued to program projects based on continuation of same funding level as in the past and is also concerned about eligibility. Although their belief is that most, if not all of the selected projects, will still be eligible for funding, however they may not be the focus of a new program.

K. Lindquist said she doesn't think local city councils and county boards really understand that current projects may not have funding—it's not just the next phase of projects that could be affected. T. Mayasich suggested we develop an outline of options for the region at 100% and at 60% funding levels and put it into language that elected officials understand.

- **Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 AM

Prepared by:

Ann Braden