

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
Metropolitan Council
390 N. Robert St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1805

Minutes of a Meeting of the
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
February 21, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karl Keel (Chair), Eriks Ludins, Craig Jenson, Joe Lux, Brian Isaacson, Colleen Van Wagner, Steve Albrecht, Mary Karlsson, Lyndon Robjent, Greta Alquist, Chuck Ahl, Richard McCoy, Tom Johnson, John Sass, Jenifer Hager, Adam Harrington, Kevin Roggenbuck, and Heidi Schallberg (staff)

1. Call to Order

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

2. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as presented.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the January 17, 2013, Meeting

Minutes from the January meeting were approved without change.

4. TAB Report

Kevin Roggenbuck said the TAB now uses a consent list and action items. A future informational item will focus on programming. A question was asked about the criteria for the consent list. There are no set criteria; it is decided in consultation with the chair and also considers the agenda length and if the item has already been through the process before, such as a project moving to a different year. Any item can be pulled from the consent list by a member, and the complete information is included in the member meeting packets. The February meeting included presentations from Susan Haigh, Council Chair, on the Governor's transit funding proposal and from Charles Zelle, MnDOT's Commissioner, on the Transportation Finance Advisory Committee funding recommendations. TAB approved four sunset date extension requests and four TIP amendments. In addition, TAB approved the Program Year Policy and also the Highway Safety Improvement Program criteria for MnDOT's solicitation conducted on behalf of the TAB. TAB also discussed the public input process for a TIP amendment for the 2015-16 projects selected in the 2011 solicitation and opened a public comment period.

5. TIP Amendment: 2015-2015 Solicitation Projects & Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Safety Projects

This amendment included the projects recommended from the most recent solicitation now that MAP-21 impacts have been better understood. MnDOT will cover the funding amounts in the current TIP set asides, but for 2017, the STP funding will be lower at \$41 million. STP was overprogrammed by \$10 million in the state, so MnDOT split the overprogrammed amount in half between the metro area and out state after multiple reviews. The region's portion was \$5 million in 2016. Due to overprogramming in the STP program for 2015 and 2016, staff recommends, with agreement from project sponsors, that two projects totaling \$13.9 million in federal funds should be moved to 2017 to balance the funding. Because 2017 is beyond the scope of the 2013-2016 TIP, these two projects will be included in the draft 2014-2017 TIP that is currently being developed instead of being included in this amendment. The two projects are listed separately on the project list attachment.

In addition, because the STP program was overprogrammed by \$5 million in 2016 and to avoid deferring an additional amount from 2016 to 2017, staff proposes to program a trail project that was selected for STP funding using CMAQ funding instead. The CMAQ program has funds available, and staff has consulted with

DRAFT

the Federal Highway Administration about the change. The Three Rivers Park District pedestrian/bicycle trail between Tracy Avenue and France Avenue in Edina (SP # 091-090-028) is shown in the CMAQ program on the attached list of projects. The project sponsor will provide documentation that the project is eligible for CMAQ funds before the TAC Funding & Programming Committee takes action on the amendment.

MOTION: Chuck Ahl made a motion to recommend the TAB approve the TIP amendment, Brian Isaacson seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

6. **Implementation of the Regional Funding Priorities Policy Discussion**

Ted Schoenecker from MnDOT State Aid said as projects move to 2014, State Aid is looking for guidance on options for prioritizing projects using advance construction. Some options were:

1. Projects with the least amount of federal funding, which allows the greatest number of projects to be funded. This would be State Aid's preference.
2. Projects with the most amount of federal funding, which would focus on big projects and may only fund one or two.
3. Fund the same percentage across all projects. An example would be if \$1 million is available, five projects would receive \$200,000 each. This would be more time consuming for State Aid to administer, and there would be issues with projects that drop late in the year.
4. Fund by population with the smallest populations receiving funding first. Smaller communities tend to have less financial capacity. If a jurisdiction has multiple projects on the list, it would receive one first, then after each jurisdiction received funding, it could be funded on later rounds as funding becomes available.

Funding would generally be distributed around the second program review in March, when it becomes clear which projects are on schedule. The committee discussed another suggestion of first come, first served, but some thought that approach would penalize project sponsors who are working hard to meet their deadlines. Another discussion should occur about how to fill in a current funding year as the fiscal year end nears. Incentives to deliver projects faster were discussed. Historically projects that were finished earlier had good odds of receiving funding from projects that slipped behind without having to use advance construction. Regular reports from State Aid will help revisit the funding priorities policy in this transition time and also how often projects fall behind schedule. A point was made about the equal percentage funding option treating all projects the same instead of trying to make judgments about some projects being better than others. However, the equal percentage would be more of an administrative burden for State Aid with more potential for inequity with financial capacity. Funding small projects first would clear the books faster than larger ones. Committee consensus supported this option with the consideration that jurisdictions with multiple projects multiple projects on the list, it would receive one first, then after each jurisdiction received funding, it could be funded on later rounds as funding becomes available. MnDOT could show how these priorities applied to developing the draft TIP when it is brought to the committee in April.

7. **Adjournment**

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.