I. CALL TO ORDER
A quorum was present when Chair Hargis called the October 17, 2012 TAB meeting to order at 12:35 pm, Metropolitan Council Chambers, 390 North Robert St., St. Paul.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
Motion by Stark, seconded by Gallagher, to adopt the agenda for the October 17, 2012 TAB meeting. Motion carried.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Motion by Maluchnik, seconded by McBride, to approve the minutes from September 19, 2012 TAB meeting. Motion carried.

IV. PUBLIC FORUM
Invitation to the public to address the Board about any issue not on the agenda. Public comment on the agenda items has occurred at the respective TAB subcommittee meetings. There were no members of the public present to address the TAB at today’s meeting.

V. TAB CHAIR REPORT
a. Motion to suspend TAB Policy and Programming Committee meetings for a six-month trial period. Bill Hargis began discussion by referring to the action item in the meeting packet, which explains the background and addresses members’ requests to video stream the meetings so members could watch meetings they were unable to attend. Roggenbuck stated that the Metro Council Regional Administrator has asked that the TAB monitor the streaming effort and report back whether it is valuable to members. The committee discussed costs and benefits, pros/cons of video streaming the meetings. Motion by Ulrich and seconded, to not video stream the meetings. Discussion followed with Stark suggesting tabling the streaming decision 1 month until costs are determined. Ulrich agreed, and made a motion, seconded by Bennett to table the motion to not video stream the meetings for 1 month. Motion to table the streaming decision motion passed.
TAB Action 2012-33
Motion by Sanger, seconded by Stark:
To suspend the TAB Policy and Programming Committee meetings for a trial period of six months and conduct all TAB business at one monthly TAB meeting beginning at 12:30 PM, but the TAB Executive Committee has the power to appoint ad hoc committees to address emergency issues or special projects.
Motion passed with one no vote.

b. Transportation Policy Plan Amendment for Bottineau LPA and Transitway Corridor Study Results
TAB Coordinator Kevin Roggenbuck referred members to a memo in the TAB mailing dated October 11. Roggenbuck said in September, the TAB Policy Committee voted to table discussion of the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) amendment until their October meeting and invite a representative from Golden Valley to address the Board about the city’s concerns. Roggenbuck said Golden Valley Mayor Shep Harris requested jointly with Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council to give the three parties more time to work on a solution and take up the matter at the November TAB meeting. Since the TAB Policy Committee meetings will be suspended, the Board agreed to take up the TPP amendment at the November TAB meeting.

Roggenbuck stated he had asked TAB members their preference for a November 14 or November 21 meeting to work around the Thanksgiving Holiday. Metropolitan Transportation Services staff has since asked that the November TAB meeting be held on November 28 because the city of Golden Valley is scheduled to take up discussion of the Bottineau LPA at their city council meeting on November 20. Should the city council vote to support the Bottineau LPA, the TPP amendment could be brought to the TAB on November 28 and keep moving timely through the Metropolitan Council Transportation Committee (December 10) and the full Council (December 12). TAB members discussed meeting dates and provided a show of hands as to availability on November 28.

Motion by Isaacs, seconded by Sanger to move the November TAB meeting originally scheduled for November 21 to a new date of November 28, 2012. Motion passed.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS
Technical Advisory Committee
Pat Bursaw reported on the October 3, 2012 TAC meeting which included no action items, and three special agenda items:
  a. “A” Minor Arterial Study presentation from MTS Sr. Planner Mary Karlsson – on the TAB agenda today.
  b. MnDOT State Highway Investment Plan (highway mode) presentation from Ryan Wilson-MnDOT. The plan lays out expected revenues, performance given the revenues, and distribution of funds. Public meetings are being held throughout the state.
  c. MAP-21 programming issues, program categories, how to proceed, options. On October 18, the F&P Committee will begin to work on how to manage the program, and the Program Delivery Work Group will bring recommendations to TAC/TAB in November. There is less flexibility in MAP-21 categories.

Policy Committee
Maluchnik reported that the Policy Committee did not meet in October.

Programming Committee
Hargis reported that the Programming Committee did not meet in October.

VII. SPECIAL AGENDA
  a. “A” Minor Arterial Study
MTS Senior Planner Mary Karlsson presented on the draft final report including findings and recommendations. She stated that this study looks at what has happened over the last 20 years. The study is a
system for planning and investment prioritization tool and will provide recommendations for Thrive MSP 2040, Transportation Policy Plan, and/or Regional Solicitation. Committee members asked for clarification of the definitions, and discussed the different classifications of roads (“A” and “B” minor, expanders, connectors, augmenters) and different funding sources. Some of the comments made by members were:
- Questions about the differences between the different classification of roads, and the differences in “A” minors depending what city/county/municipality they are located.
- Land use and access spacing have major effect on development; this is important to planning and very different between urban and rural settings.
- 70% of all “A” Minor Arterials are outside the I-494/I-694 ring. There is a need to look at growth and infrastructure needs within the ring when doing the Regional Solicitation.
- Need to take into consideration the traffic volume in classifying roads. (Karlsson responded that the study does take into consideration the traffic volume)
- There may be a need for discussion about how communities are being held accountable for the designations they have given to their roads.
- Look at how much of the share of funding for the roadways is being carried by the municipalities – and if this is appropriate.
- Look at what different streets were “meant to do” – define success vs. coincidence.
- Freight data is very important, i.e. how much freight movement, damage to roads.
- Funding at the county (or local) level is more directly accountable to the public, as elected officials must answer to their constituents.

Karlsson presented the “A” Minor Arterial System & Policy, Regional Solicitation and other recommendations and noted the timeline for action. TAB members can give their comments to Roggenbuck to tabulate, prior to the November 28 TAB meeting.

Other discussion:
Regarding Recommendation #10, Isaacs stated that the recommendation should be more specific as to what data is desired. Metro Transit has quite a bit of data that may be useful. Isaacs also suggested cataloging complete streets; this information might be helpful in determining funding awards.

McBride added that MnDOT is performing a Statewide Jurisdictional Realignment Study that may provide input to the region.

b. Federal Funds Management Process
In response to a request from Hovland, TAB Coordinator Kevin Roggenbuck provided information in the meeting materials regarding the adopted policy on the use of federal funds when regionally selected projects are deferred, withdrawn or sunset; and the comments and recommendation from the TAC regarding re-use of funds from withdrawn projects or the allocation of unanticipated funds. Roggenbuck pointed out that MAP-21 has different rules and the region will need to be more involved in local advance construction funds.

c. Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21)
MnDOT Office of Capital Programs and Performance Measures – Koryn Zewers gave a briefing on the preliminary analysis of MAP-21 and a regional work plan to understand its impacts on transportation planning and programming. She reviewed the new core program categories and projected apportionments for each category. Projects programmed for SFY 2013 will still be committed. SFY 2014-2016 will likely see some changes. Fawley asked for a timeline for knowing whether projects that have been funded for outlying (2014-2016) years will be affected and need to be adjusted. Zewers responded that MnDOT will be providing funding guidance in November/December, based on information from committees formed by MnDOT to research the changes and help with the decision making. Donahoe requested a list of the MnDOT committees and members.
d. Roadmap 2040
MN Transportation Alliance – Margaret Donahoe presented on the Transportation Alliance vision for transportation. The Transportation Alliance is pulling together reports and studies from various sources, and looking at what the future transportation needs are, without fiscal constraints. Donahoe provided an executive summary of the Roadmap 2040 report – full report is on the Transportation Alliance website. This information is being presented at candidate forums, TFAC, stakeholder workshops, etc. to build a coalition and lobby for a new transportation funding package at the upcoming legislative session. The Transportation Alliance welcomes ideas from TAB members; contact the Transportation Alliance and also read the full Roadmap 2040 report on their website.

e. Thrive MSP 2040
Metropolitan Council Manager Regional Policy & Research Libby Starling addressed the TAB regarding Thrive 2040. Metro Council is looking for input from all MC advisory committees for Thrive MSP 2040. Roggenbuck has compiled comments from TAB members and provided in today’s meeting materials. Some further comments from TAB members at the 10/17 TAB meeting:
- It is important to look into water resources (aquifer) and the effect of growth.
- (Ulrich) Concern that the low-cost/high-benefit approach to transportation issues is focused within the beltway and not preparing for growth. McBride will provide a map of low-cost/high-benefit projects to Ulrich which indicates that these projects are both in/and outside of the beltway.
- Types of households (single person/no children) may drive growth within the beltway.
- Concern with arbitrary targets for development (in developing communities); development may be demand-based.
- Migration/immigration needs to be addressed and noted.
- Should assume the cost of energy will continue to rise when developing policy scenarios.
- Need to look at all resources and opportunities for economic development.

Starling stated that the next stage will be to develop “alternative policy scenarios” with options; this may include sub-regional forecasts and guidance as to where growth will be. The alternative policy scenarios should be out March-May 2013 and one preferred policy scenario by Sept./Oct. 2013. Final public meetings will take place early 2014 with an adoption date proposed for April 2014. Stark said that it will be good to see the scenarios in order to have something to react to, rather than the “open question” phase.

VIII. ITEMS OF TAB MEMBERS
Margaret Donahoe requested a report on the Metro Freight study at a future TAB meeting.

IX. AGENCY REPORTS
None

X. OTHER BUSINESS
None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT
Chair Hargis adjourned the regular meeting of TAB at 3:25 pm on Wednesday, October 17, 2012.