

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD  
Metropolitan Council  
Minutes of a SPECIAL MEETING of the  
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
November 29, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Oehme (Chair, Chanhassen), Joe MacPherson (Anoka County), Lyndon Robjent (Carver County), John Sass (Dakota County), Chad Ellos (Hennepin County), Joe Lux (Ramsey County), Craig Jenson (Scott County), Emily Jorgensen (Washington County), Elaine Koutsoukos (TAB), Steve Peterson (Metropolitan Council), Anna Flintoft (Metro Transit), Molly McCartney (MnDOT Metro District), Colleen Brown (MnDOT Metro District State Aid), Innocent Eyoh (MPCA), Gina Mitteco (MnDOT Bike & Ped), Nancy Spooner-Mueller (DNR), Aaron Bartling (MVTA), Michael Thompson (Plymouth), Jim Kosluchar (Fridley), Ken Ashfeld (Maple Grove), Nathan Koster (Minneapolis), Anne Weber (St. Paul) and Joe Barbeau (staff)

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Adoption of Agenda**

MOTION: Brown moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by Lux. The motion was approved unanimously.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from the November 15, 2018, Meeting**

MOTION: Koutsoukos moved to approve the minutes, with one correction: for the motion in item 8, part E to reflect changing the Traffic Management Technologies scores to reflect the scorer's recommendation. Seconded by McCartney. The motion was approved unanimously.

**4. TAB Report – Information Item**

Koutsoukos reported on the November 21, 2018 TAB meeting.

**5. Regional Solicitation Funding Scenarios – Information Item**

Peterson said that this meeting is being held because the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) wanted two full months to discuss the Regional Solicitation funding scenarios. He showed four potential funding scenarios, along with accompanying tables: the “base scenario,” an expansion-heavy scenario, a modernization-heavy scenario, and a bike/pedestrian-heavy scenario.

Robjent said that roadway projects are underfunded in the base scenario by nearly \$3 million vs. the modal midpoint. He added that many roadway projects leverage funding from other sources, stating roadways make up 62 percent of the total project cost of all applications. This perhaps indicates higher roadway demand versus other modes. Peterson said that the modal ranges are based on historic funding allocations.

Robjent said that it is unusual to see MnDOT submit applications in the Roadway Expansion and Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization categories. The MnDOT project, which is likely to be funded, will take \$7 million away from the pool for locally led projects.

Robjent suggested that points could be awarded to projects that provide more than 20 percent match. McCartney added that the Transportation and Economic Development (TED) program awards points to projects that secure other funds.

Eyoh asked what role the Committee has in recommending funding scenarios. Peterson said that while all four scenarios will be provided to TAB, the Committee can make recommendations on which scenarios are better.

Robjent asked why over-programming is set at eight percent. Peterson replied that MnDOT suggested this as roughly how much the region should over-program. More over-programming leads to increased likelihood of

delayed payments. He added that perhaps the application should be more explicit about that possibility. McCartney added that MnDOT is interested in reigning in over-programming.

Peterson shared the draft funding scenarios in the roadway categories. He pointed out that the scenarios all show Anoka County's Viking Boulevard Bridge funded, which helps meet the TAB-established \$10 million Bridge minimum and the requirement to fund at least one project from all A-minor classifications. The other option to meet the bridge minimum would be to fund two additional projects, which have a tied score, at \$14 million in federal funds. Peterson posed the question of what would need to be removed in order to make this scenario happen. Koster asked whether there is any flexibility around the \$10 million Bridge minimum, to which Koutsoukos replied that TAB set this threshold but could change it if they so choose.

Robgent asked whether applicants are given the option to take less than their requested funding amount. Peterson replied that that could happen, which could bring roadways up to the mid-point of its range while reducing the number of bicycle and pedestrian projects.

MacPherson said that there are only two true A-minor connector projects and the other two projects that include connectors primarily improve roadways on other functional classifications.

Peterson moved on to the transit and travel demand management (TDM) categories. While the usual allotment for the competitive TDM category is \$1.2 million, funds were returned from a previously funded project and therefore \$1.5 million is available. He added that \$2.2 million was returned from transit projects. He also said that while Metro Transit dominated scoring in the Transit Expansion category, a lot of cities are served by those projects.

Koster asked whether a hybrid scenario could be recommended, to which Koutsoukos replied in the affirmative.

Oehme noted that there is a large gap between the fourth- and fifth-ranked Transit Modernization projects, so going to the latter, as was done in the modernization-heavy scenario, may not make sense. Peterson replied that inclusion of an additional Transit Modernization project was necessary to meet the intent of the modernization-heavy scenario. Flintoft said that it would be good to add the sixth-ranked project, MVTA's Burnsville Transit Station project, since it is low-cost and scored almost as well as the fifth-ranked project. Members expressed agreement with this sentiment.

Referencing the projects tagged to be removed should the City of St. Paul's unique project be selected, Ellos expressed concern with removing one of the only two Pedestrian Facilities projects shown as funded and suggested reducing the unique project's award by \$1 million. Mitteco added that the second-ranked Pedestrian Facilities project scored very well in comparison with the fifth-ranked Transit Modernization project.

Moving on to the bicycle/pedestrian scenarios, Peterson said that the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category shows more funded projects as a result of the large number of applications, the cost of the projects, and the effort to include what could be the only project in Washington County. Ellos said that the third-ranked Pedestrian Facilities project, Hennepin County's ADA retrofits at the Blue Line and Green Line stations, which is not shown as funded outside of the bike/pedestrian-heavy scenario, will serve a lot of people. Peterson replied that more pedestrian projects could be funded, though how this would be accomplished would have to be determined. Mitteco said that the effort to fund at least one Washington County project leaves only a one-point gap between the lowest-ranked funded project and the highest-ranked unfunded project. She also said that from a safety perspective, the bike/pedestrian-heavy scenario makes sense, since biking and pedestrian are the only modes that are seeing increased collisions.

## **6. Adjournment**

MOTION: Eyoh moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Spooner-Mueller. The motion was approved unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned.