

Minutes

TAC Funding and Programming Committee



Meeting date: June 20, 2024

Time: 1:00 PM

Location: Virtual

Members present:

- Bloomington – Karl Keel
- Lakeville – Paul Oehme (Vice Chair)
- Eden Prairie – Robert Ellis
- Fridley – Jim Kosluchar
- Minneapolis – Nathan Koster
- Plymouth – Michael Thompson (Chair)
- St. Paul – Anne Weber
- Met Council – Cole Hiniker
- Metro Transit – Scott Janowiak

- TAB Coordinator – Elaine Koutsoukos
- MnDOT Metro District – Jody Carr
- MnDOT Metro District State Aid – Colleen Brown
- MnDOT Bike/Ped – Mike Samuelson
- MPCA – Innocent Eyoh
- DNR – Nancy Spooner-Walsh
- Suburban Transit Assoc. – Matt Fyten

- Anoka Co. – Jerry Auge
 - Carver Co. – Darin Mielke
 - Dakota Co. – Jenna Fabish
 - Hennepin Co. – Carla Stueve
 - Ramsey Co.
 - Scott Co. – Adam Jessen
 - Wash Co. – Madeline Dahlheimer
- = present, E = excused

Call to order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Thompson called the regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee to order at 1:00 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 Maddie Dahlheimer, seconded by Elaine Koutsoukos, to approve the minutes of the May 16, 2023, regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee with changes. **Motion carried** unanimously.

Public comment on committee business

None.

TAB report

Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator, outlined the discussion at the June 12, 2024 meeting of the

Transportation Advisory Board.

Business

2024-31: Regional Solicitation Project Selection

Steve Peterson, Metropolitan Transportation Services, presented the 2024 Regional Solicitation Funding options. S. Peterson outlined the desire of TAB to find consensus for a funding option that can result in broad support.

Innocent Eyoh, MPCA, asked about the purpose and interest of the \$30 million of overprogramming.

S. Peterson clarified that the interest in this overprogramming was to provide more projects to the bike/ped modes in the Closest to Midpoint or the Safety funding option.

Carla Stueve, Hennepin County, asked about the sentiment that she heard at TAB about safety elements. Stueve asked if that was a sentiment received by Metropolitan Council staff.

S. Peterson and E. Koutsoukos concurred that it was a point received by staff.

Karl Keel, Bloomington, asked about how much overprogramming would be needed to fund every single project in every option.

S. Peterson said that roughly \$18 million of overprogramming might be required to fund every project in all options.

Karl Keel lended support for funding all projects listed in all options.

S. Peterson noted that monies set aside might not be needed for that purpose in 2026 and beyond, because the evaluation is occurring right now that might result in removing the purpose for those set asides.

Colleen Brown, MnDOT, noted discussions with staff at MnDOT that the current level of overprogramming might be too high as it is.

S. Peterson noted that Council staff had not been made aware of this by MnDOT.

Cole Hiniker, MTS, asked if Karl Keel was considering the Midpoint option when asking about attempting to over program all projects in all options.

Nathan Koster, Minneapolis, asked if the Safety option provides projects that truly have a safety benefit.

S. Peterson discussed that when the Safety option was developed the performance measure was monetized crash benefit so this was able to be captured for this option. There are arguments to be made for other types of projects, however, those arguments might not have a measure to fairly compare.

S. Peterson outlined the three additional active transportation projects that could be added to any of the options.

Darin Mielke asked about the current level of overprogramming.

S. Peterson clarified that the level of overprogramming is 10%.



Darin Mielke asked about TAB direction on whether to stray above or below the modal funding ranges.

Elaine Koutsoukos noted that TAB has not provided direction on this, because they typically rely on being as close to the midpoint as possible.

D. Mielke lended support for the Safety option with 10% overprogramming and the additional 5-8% of overprogramming.

J. Kosluchar asked if the overprogramming included the additional active transportation funding.

S. Peterson noted that this will not include active transportation funding, overprogramming relates only to the federal money.

J. Kosluchar asked if the current options reflect the desire of survey respondents.

S. Peterson concurred that the bike/ped option does reflect survey respondents.

C. Stueve stood in support of Nathan Koster's point and reiterated that there has been an increase in fatal and serious injury crashes for all road users. As a result, the Safety option is preferred with overprogramming going into the bike/ped categories.

M. Samuelson noted that clarifying that the safety option is not the only option that captures projects with a safety benefit.

Michael Thompson, Plymouth, asked about what Steve Peterson meant when a project denied RS money and accepted HSIP dollars that it "was a wash".

S. Peterson clarified that he meant there was money that could be used for something else.

Matt Fyten, Suburban Transit, noted that it is reasonable to bring the Transit funding amount to the minimum of the modal range recommended by TAB.

C. Stueve noted that there are investments in transit in the BRT setasides.

Scott Janowiak, Metro Transit, agrees with Fyten about bringing transit funding to the midpoint level.

C. Hiniker asked about the methodology for considering trail reconstructions and other projects that are not new improvements.

S. Peterson noted that the scores were the backbone for building these options.

C. Hiniker lamented that a score driven approach might not be the best approach.

N. Koster asks what the actual midpoint for these modal ranges is, because that may differ from the modal ranges set for this solicitation.

M. Thompson concurs and asks that staff work on not having this type of scenario play out with every solicitation.

E. Koutsoukos notes that TAB typically goes towards the midpoint as a result of limitations inherent in the midpoint approach.

S. Peterson notes that this feedback is good for the ongoing regional solicitation evaluation.



N. Koster continues that TAB boxes themselves into the modal funding ranges.

J. Kosluchar is curious if TAB picked up on the discussion at TAC.

S. Peterson presented a newly developed hybrid option.

C. Stueve raised a concern of the hybrid option. The Marshall Avenue project was not included in the Hybrid scenario but was included in Safety, because of the safety benefit.

K. Keel proposes another option, something to be called like Hybrid, that includes all Safety and Bike/Ped option projects. Keel asks what is the number for overprogramming needed to make this happen.

S. Peterson states that the overprogramming amount would be about 15%.

S. Janowiak asks to clarify how this new option affects the Transit category.

C. Hiniker offered that the committee should consider adding to the motion that TAB should consider removing future Unique projects to borrow from overprogramming.

N. Koster asks for clarification on whether there was discussion on funding more pedestrian projects over funding the more expensive bicycle projects.

S. Peterson notes that there was no consensus on this topic at TAB.

M. Thompson outlines the recommended motion from staff on the action transmittal.

Chair Thompson called for a motion to make the following recommendations to TAC:

- Recommend overprogramming (to fund all projects) for Bike/Ped and Safety options, and use available \$2 Million in funding for transit modernization project
- Recommends funding the 17 Active Transportation projects shown as part of each of the funding options.
- Have staff provide pros and cons for the three 2024 Regional Solicitation funding options as described in this action transmittal.

Cole Hiniker made the motion and it was seconded by Karl Keel. **The motion passed unanimously.**

2024-32: Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Project Selection

Kaare Festvog, MnDOT, presented on the projects selected during the HSIP competitive process.

Chair Thompson called for a motion to recommend adoption to TAC that TAB approve of the 20 projects for funding through the HSIP solicitation. The motion was made by Elaine Koutsoukos and seconded by Darin Mielke. The motion passed with 13 ayes and 7 abstentions.

Information

None.



Reports

None.

Adjournment

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

Council contact:

Robbie King, Planner
robbie.king@metc.state.mn.us
651-602-1380

