Minutes

TAC Funding and Programming Committee



 \boxtimes = present, E = excused

Meeting Date: July 21, 2022 **Time**: 1:00 PM **Location:** Virtual Members Present: ☐ TAB Coordinator – Elaine Koutsoukos ⊠ Eden Prairie - Robert Ellis □ Dakota Co - Jenna Fabish - Colleen Brown ☐ Maple Grove - Ken Ashfeld □ Ramsey Co - Scott Mareck Plymouth - Michael Turner Bargen Thompson (Chair)

□ DNR - Nancy Spooner-Mueller

Aaron Bartling

Call to Order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Thompson called the regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee to order at 1:01 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 Mareck, seconded by McCartney to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2022 regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment on Committee Business

There were no public comments.

TAB Report

The July 20th, 2022 meeting of TAB was cancelled. No TAB report was given.

Business

Information

1. Minnesota State Highway Improvement Program (Brad Utecht, MnDOT)

Utecht presented the Minnesota State Highway Improvement Program (MnSHIP), which is out for public comment.

Hiniker asked whether there was a full list of revenue sources directed by MnSHIP? Or funding assumptions for the various programs? Utecht stated that all go to MnSHIP with a few exceptions, including carbon reduction, electric vehicles, but that it is not a huge change from previous rounds of MnSHIP.

Utecht led the committee members through an interactive scenario planning activity. Turner Bargen asked whether the "Improve Mobility" scenario which listed worse outcomes for bridge and pavements. Utecht clarified that it is compared against the current investment approach.

Mareck asked whether identified targets should also inform the strategic direction. Utecht said the targets currently set were used to establish the stated need, \$52 to \$57 billion, but cautioned that those targets may not be met even with the minimum investment levels.

2. 2022 Regional Solicitation Outreach Tool (Bethany Brandt-Sargent, MTS)

Brandt-Sargent gave the committee an overview of the Regional Solicitation survey tool that will go live July 29, 2022 and run through August 17th, 2022. The intent of this tool is to collect additional feedback to help inform the Regional Solicitation investment scenarios. This was requested by TAB during the last cycle.

3. 2022 Regional Solicitation Draft Scores (Joe Barbeau, MTS)

Barbeau discussed the 2022 draft Regional Solicitation scores, including the number of applications received in each category. He also reviewed the schedule and scoring reevaluation requests process.

Stenson asked about the evaluation process and whether an applicant can receive additional information without coming to the committee. Barbeau said applicants should ask questions during the review period and that there may be a satisfactory explanation that would not require an appeal. Steve Peterson, MTS, said the Funding & Programming Committee chair will have the final determination on whether the application will be reevaluated. Stenson also asked about outlier adjustments and encouraged the committee to clear up the methodology for outlier adjustments, looking for a consistent way to address outliers.

Committee chairs discussed scoring in their committees. McCartney noted that for applications in the Strategic Capacity category, additional information was requested for congestion and air quality to ensure scorers were evaluating the correct data. Keel discussed reconstruction and modernization projects including outlier adjustments. Koster, responding to Stenson's earlier comment, noted that more rigidity in the process may create more scoring challenges. Hiniker pointed out a project that received 150 points but that it received a relatively low overall score. Peterson said it was a roadway realignment project and those historically have not fared well in the scoring. Gina Mitteco, MnDOT, discussed the travel demand management and discussed the challenge with scoring these unique projects.

Stenson asked if an outlier was applied to cost-effectiveness, it might change the outcomes. Hiniker replied that the intent is to provide an advantage to low-cost projects to enable funding

more projects. Koster said that cost-effectiveness may not be the most appropriate if that is the intent, because federalizing the project may not be worthwhile.

Bartling asked about the transit category and projects that are precursors to larger bus rapid transit (BRT) projects. He pointed to a qualifying requirement in which a project is not eligible for capital or operating funds for expansion. The Route 3 Service Improvement is for routing and service improvements which will become the H Line BRT. H Line has already received funding in 2020 and will likely receive more in 2024, which is taking more and more money away from support bus service. Janowaik responded that he cannot speak to the details of the application said he can forward the concern to service development planning manager. Chair Thompson instructed staff to vet the project behind the scenes, but that the project was approved during the qualifying review. Barbeau said staff will review and be prepared to discuss during the funding scenarios.

McCartney thanked Brown for her work on the risk assessment analysis for all the application categories.

Keel asked whether agencies have or can request a review of other agency's applications. Barbeau responded that is not allowed.

Peterson noted that funding available for this round of Regional Solicitation will be between \$230 and \$240 million. This estimate includes additional money from IIJA and reductions for program year extensions, however, there are new programs that are not included in this, including carbon reduction and the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). HSIP is expected to have \$50 million, which is a significant increase over the usual \$20 to \$26 million in previous funding cycles.

Koster asked when the unique projects and HSIP projects will come through the committee. Peterson responded that HSIP will follow the same approval schedule, which may be as soon as October. The scoring committees for unique projects have not met yet. There will be a technical review and TAB will complete the actual scoring. The number of applications matched the amount of money allocated, so unless a determination is made to not fund a project, all projects will be funded.

Other Business

Brandt-Sargent proposed potential schedule shifts for the September and December meetings so that they occur after TAB. Chair Thompson directed staff to move the September meeting from September 15 to September 22 and to revisit the December rescheduling later.

Hiniker stated that the TIP public comment period closed. Eighteen comments were received and council staff are working on responses. More details will come at the Technical Advisory Committee as an info item. It will not come back to Funding & Programming, but there were no changes outside of a minor cost adjustment.

Adjournment

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 2:49 p.m.

Council Contact:

Bethany Brandt-Sargent, Senior Planner Bethany.Brandt-Sargent@metc.state.mn.us 651-602-1725