

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD  
Metropolitan Council  
390 N. Robert St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1805  
Minutes of a Meeting of the  
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
December 15, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tim Mayasich (chair, Ramsey County), Lynne Bly (MnDOT Metro District), Colleen Brown (MnDOT Metro State Aid), Innocent Eyoh (MPCA), Anna Flintoft (Metro Transit), Jenifer Hager (Minneapolis), Craig Jenson (Scott County), Jen Lehmann (MVTA), Karl Keel (Bloomington), Jim Kosluchar (Fridley), Elaine Koutsoukos (TAB), Lyssa Leitner (Washington County), Bruce Loney (Shakopee), Joe MacPherson (Anoka County), Paul Oehme (Chanhassen), Ryan Peterson (Burnsville), Steve Peterson (Metropolitan Council), Carla Stueve (Hennepin County), Anne Weber (St. Paul), and Joe Barbeau (staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Joe Lux (Ramsey County) and Carl Ohrn (Metropolitan Council)

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Adoption of Agenda**

MOTION: Keel moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by Bly. The motion was approved unanimously.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from the November 17, 2016, Meeting**

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

**4. 2016 Regional Solicitation Funding Options – Action Item 2017-02**

Steve Peterson said that members had been asked to put a tentative hold on their calendars for a second December Committee meeting on December 22 due to the fact that the meeting happens to fall before TAB, which is not usually the case. It was decided that the meeting will not be held and anything brought to light by TAB could be deferred to TAC.

Barbeau reported that Lyndon Robjent, Carver County, wrote to express support for using the base scenario.

Keel said that the awards tend to be provided to urban areas but that transit plays a key role.

Leitner said that Washington County favors the roadway-heavy scenario because it provides the best geographic balance. MacPherson echoed that, adding that Scott and Washington Counties are well-served by that scenario.

Stueve expressed support for the base scenario due to good modal balance.

Leitner suggested that the degree to which scoring in the Transit Modernization category was contested could indicate that it is not ideal to fund that category heavily.

Keel said that 2022 projects could be selected to try to achieve better modal balance.

Ryan Peterson said that the Regional Solicitation is a rare opportunity for highway expansion and that he therefore favors either the base or the expansion scenario.

Steve Peterson said that the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) does not address modal balance but does favor roadway maintenance over roadway expansion.

Keel expressed support for the base scenario, as it is consistent with the TPP.

Flintoft said that both highway and transit modes had more modernization than expansion applications, indicating need for modernization.

MOTION: Stueve moved to recommend the base scenario and the use of 2022 projects to address geographic balance. Seconded by Ryan Peterson.

Leitner said that there needs to be a way to address geographic balance. Steve Peterson said that the modernization-heavy scenario shows a decent balance of funding vs. population. He added that while it is difficult to precisely achieve balance in one Solicitation, it has evened out over time.

The motion was approved.

Leitner said that she prefers the modernization-heavy, base, and highway-heavy scenarios. Flintoft said that the transit/bicycle/pedestrian-heavy scenario provides the most projects and the highway-heavy scenario provides the fewest.

Hager suggested that it does not make sense for geographic balance to drive the types of projects selected and suggested that TAB will probably use project types as a starting point.

Keel suggested that the information provided could show total versus federal funds to provide a sense of how much the region is getting for its dollars.

**5. Programming Regional Solicitation Projects for FY 2022 – Action Item 2017-03**

Steve Peterson said that by selecting a small number of projects to program for 2022 and encouraging sponsors of those projects to prepare them for 2021 authorization, the region will be in a better place when reallocation of funds is needed. This approach would put these projects first in line when a 2021 project in the same mode withdraws or when additional 2021 funding becomes available for other reasons. The potential risk in this approach is that if 2021 funds do not become available or the 2022 sponsors are unable to move their projects up to 2021, these projects would come “off the top” from the 2022 program as part of the 2018 Regional Solicitation. This is why staff is suggesting programming only one 2022 project per mode.

Leitner said that in the base scenario, the next project in both roadway expansion and modernization is sponsored by Hennepin County so it would make sense to let the County decide which project to fund.

Leitner asked why the projects 2022 projects were chosen. Steve Peterson replied that the roadway modernization project in Minnetonka had qualification questions, the Roadway System Management project was at the bottom of the category ranking, and bridges are already funded within the TAB-mandated range. The transit expansion project was selected for regional balance and the bicycle project was selected because of the number of projects applied for along with the minimal four-point gap versus the project just ahead of it. Koutsoukos said that this project was tied with another project, to which Steve Peterson replied that the less expensive project was selected. Keel suggested that these two bicycle projects could be skipped in favor of the next project, which scored only one point less and would help with regional balance. Koutsoukos and Ohrn reported that policy prohibits skipping projects in favor of lower-scoring projects.

MOTION: Keel moved to recommend programming of one 2022 project per mode. Seconded by Stueve. The motion was approved unanimously.

**6. 2016 HSIP Project Selection – Action Item 2017-04**

Joe Barbeau said that MnDOT conducts the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Solicitation and TAB approves the project selection. Proactive and reactive projects are funded. Chisago County is eligible due to the fact that the funds are provided to the MnDOT districts.

MOTION: Stueve moved to recommend to TAC approval of the projects selected by the scoring committee for funding through the HSIP solicitation and including all the urbanized area projects in the draft 2018-2021 TIP. Seconded by Oehme. The motion was approved unanimously.

**7. 2017 Meeting Schedule – Discussion**

Barbeau said that in any month that starts on a Thursday, the Committee meets one week before TAB as opposed to the day after TAB. In 2017 this will happen in June. He asked whether rather than being scheduled for the “third Thursday of the month” the meetings should be scheduled for “the day after TAB.” Koutsoukos added that the TAC bylaws do not specify when any committees should meet.

Leitner suggested moving the June meeting back one week. Mayasich directed the June meeting to be scheduled one week later. Barbeau said he would send a calendar invitation reflective of this.

**8. Other Business**

None.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned.