

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

Minutes of a Meeting of the
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
December 17, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tim Mayasich (chair), Colleen Brown, Kyle Burrows, Jenifer Hager, Craig Jenson, Jane Kansier, Karl Keel, Andrew Korsberg, Jim Kosluchar, Elaine Koutsoukos, Bruce Loney, Eriks Ludins, Molly McCartney, Gina Mitteco, Paul Oehme, Ryan Peterson, Steve Peterson, John Sass, Lyndon Robjent, Cory Slagle, Amanda Smith, Carla Stueve, Andrew Witter, and Joe Barbeau (staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Jeff Handeland (City of Minneapolis), Mary Karlsson (Metro Transit), Steve Love (City of Maplewood), Carl Ohrn (Metropolitan Council), and Katie White (Metropolitan Council)

1. Call to Order

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

2. Adoption of Agenda

Steve Peterson suggested adding two items to the agenda. They were 2016-05 (Funding Category Minimum and Maximum Funding Amounts) and 2016-08 (Forms and Qualifying Criteria).

MOTION: Ludins moved to adopt the agenda with the additions of the additional items. Seconded by Mitteco. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the November 19, 2015 Meeting

MOTION: Koutsoukos moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by Oehme. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. TAB Report – Information Item

Koutsoukos reported on the December 16, 2015 TAB meeting. Task Force Chair Hamann-Roland reported that TAB directed the Bylaws Task Force to look at a broader range of alternates for all forms of representation on the TAB. The Council recently established an Advisory Committee on Equity-Related Policy. The Committee will advise the Council on advancing Equity in all Council areas. TAB approved four action items: The 2016 Regional Solicitation Funding Categories, a request from TAB for the technical committees to create a list of pros and cons for three options on funding functional classifications in the Solicitation, inclusion of a cost effectiveness criterion in the Solicitation applications, and the Metropolitan Airports Commission Capital Improvement Program.

5. TDM Scoring and Appeals – Action Item

White said that scores were released at last month's meeting. Since then one score has been appealed, resulting in a change of score to one project, and the changing of two items on the ranked score sheet.

MOTION: Hager moved to approve the scores after the appeal process. Seconded by Loney. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. Scope Change Request – City of Minneapolis East-West Pedestrian Improvements – Action Item

Barbeau said that in the 2011 Regional Solicitation, The City of Minneapolis received \$1,120,000 in Surface Transportation Enhancement (TE) funding for improvements on 7th Street South and 8th Street South from 1st Avenue North to Chicago Avenue and on 6th Street South and 9th Street South from 1st Avenue North to Second Avenue South for FY 2016. In winter of 2015, the City requested, and was granted, a scope change to eliminate improvements from several intersections and replace them with improvements at other intersections. The City is requesting a scope change that would eliminate more intersection improvements. The reason for this is that the

City has been awarded other funds for signal replacement projects and other intersection improvements. The city is requesting removal of work from 11 intersections and individual project elements from others.

Review by staff and original scorers indicated that the project would have been funded with the requested scope.

The applicant budget included proportionate decreases in the intersection elements but replaced that funding in the lighting and landscaping categories. Staff suggested not allowing for those increases and suggested a total project budget of \$1,437,369. Staff suggested two potential funding scenarios with this budget:

- Providing the full \$1,120,000, as requested. This would be just under 80% of the staff-suggested total of \$1,437,369.
- Maintain the federal proportion. The current project budget is \$2,050,000. The federal contribution, \$1,120,000, is 54.6%. From the staff-suggested budget, a 54.6% federal contribution would be \$785,294.

Mayasich asked whether there is a per-project limit to the number of scope change applications that can be submitted. Barbeau replied that there is no such limit. Mayasich replied that a limitation should be considered. Koutsoukos said that some of the intersections in this project had already been completed and it would have been problematic to not allow the City to apply for a scope change.

Hager said that the primary purpose of the original project was to establish east/west pedestrian improvements, which has not changed. The City wishes to add additional lighting that will provide Downtown lighting consistency. The City is amending its request to leave the landscaping budget at \$400,000 and requests a federal funding amount eliminating that from the budget.

Robjent asked whether or not completion of the project could be in jeopardy if it does not receive all of its federal funding. Hager replied that a reduction in the lighting budget would impact uniformity in Downtown lighting. Steve Peterson asked whether MnDOT State Aid would be able to redistribute funds removed from the project, to which Brown replied in the affirmative.

Keel said that the project, as of the first scope change, was presented as providing a certain level of amenity and federal funding should be reduced proportionately.

MOTION: Hager moved to recommend approval of the scope change at a total project cost of \$1,843,384 and a federal contribution of \$875,317. Seconded by Sass. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. TIP Amendment – City of Minneapolis East-West Pedestrian Improvements – Action Item

Barbeau said that a TIP amendment is needed along with the previous scope change item. He suggested that the amendment be approved with updated amounts based on the previous action item: Total funding at \$1,843,384; FHWA at \$875,317; and local at \$968,067.

MOTION: Keel moved to recommend approval of the TIP amendment with the updated funding amounts. Seconded by Hager. The motion was approved unanimously.

2016 Regional Solicitation: Functional Classification Scoring – Information Item Resulting from 12/16/2015 TAB Meeting

Steve Peterson presented on the Draft 2016 Regional Solicitation. At its December 16, 2015 meeting, TAB tentatively approved the adjustment of scoring to accommodate the ability for all functional classifications to compete for roadways funds. Jenson said that the key to this discussion is connectors, which proved unable to compete in 2014. Robjent suggested providing total mileage of all A-minor classifications to TAB members. Keel said that adjusting the criteria provides artificial rankings and suggested that a policy decision would be more appropriate. Kansier agreed, stating that a policy decision would be more transparent. Stueve suggested that safety issues on connectors are better-addressed by the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP).

Koutsouks suggested that projects could be funded by merit and over-programmed projects could be funded with consideration for accommodating certain functional classifications.

Ryan Peterson said that the projects that would have been funded by a suggested scoring change would not have been connectors but that other, unintended, results would have occurred.

Burrows suggested that if a guarantee of one project funded in each functional classification was established that a minimum score be established to assure that no inadequate projects are funded.

Ryan Peterson suggested creating a new category for connectors. Steve Peterson replied that TAB has specifically asked that no categories be added.

MOTION: Robjent moved to recommended funding at least one connector. Seconded by Sass. No vote was taken, as this is not a part of an action item for this meeting. Group consensus was that the solicitation should provide guaranteed funding for at least one connector.

8. 2016 Regional Solicitation: Applications – Action Item

Steve Peterson presented an action item that shared key proposed changes on the measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation.

A new cost effectiveness criterion would be included in each application category, requiring elimination of cost effectiveness from other criteria and measures. Stueve suggested that cost effectiveness be determined by dividing the federal funding by the total points. Robjent replied that smaller projects would be at a disadvantage.

Hager asked how total project cost would be calculated. Ohrn said that it would be a total of all federally eligible costs.

Koutsoukos reminded the group that there had been discussion of not including noise walls in the cost.

MOTION A: Koutsoukos moved to recommend that cost effectiveness be included in each application category and be determined by calculating federally eligible cost, not including noise walls, divided by points scored in the other measures. Seconded by Robjent. Motion A was approved unanimously.

Kansier suggested removing Measure 1B, Existing population within 0.25 mile (bus stop), 0.5 mile (transitway), and/or 2.5 miles (park & ride lot) from the Transit Expansion and Transit System Modernization applications. She added that if it is not removed, the park-and-ride lot distance should be increased. Burrows said that the 2.5-mile radius captures population. He added that transit is dependent on density near routes and most park-and-ride usage comes from within 2.5 miles. Kansier said that many users come from further away and added that population numbers are outdated. Koutsoukos said that the 2.5-mile distance was taken from the region's Park-and-Ride Plan and seems roughly equivalent to a quarter-mile walk.

Kansier said that population is captured in the "Usage" criterion. Barbeau replied that existing ridership was removed from "Usage" in the Transit Expansion application category.

MOTION B: Kansier moved to recommend removal of measure 1B from the Transit Expansion and Transit System Modernization applications. Seconded by Slagle.

McCartney said that some riders drive to park-and-ride lots that are not their closest lots to get further down a transit line.

Karlsson suggested that staff revisit the 2.5-mile park-and-ride radius.

Motion B was approved unanimously.

Stueve said that Synchro cannot be used to model traffic delay caused by trains and added that the only way to do so would involve "tricking" the program. Karlsson said that since applying for funds would be a planning

exercise, it is acceptable to “trick” the program. Stueve disagreed. Steve Peterson said that staff will develop alternatives.

Stueve asked how crash reduction will be determined for railroad crossings. Steve Peterson replied that this would be a proactive measure based on risk factor.

Stueve said that points should not be awarded for load-posted bridges, as this could be an incentive to load-post early. Karlsson replied that engineers, following their code of ethics, would not likely do that. General consensus was to leave the points for load-posted bridges in.

MOTION C: Stueve moved to keep educational institutions in measure 1C, Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs, in the Roadways applications as part of the recommended application package. Seconded by Robjent. Motion C was approved unanimously.

Steve Peterson informed members that education has changed from simply touching an educational institution to counting the enrollment.

MOTION D: Koutsoukos moved to recommend the measures and scoring guidance, inclusive of the changes agreed to by the Committee members. Seconded by Mitteco. Motion D was approved unanimously.

9. 2016 Regional Solicitation: Criteria and Measures – Action Item

Steve Peterson presented the criteria weighting and measure scoring.

Burrows suggested that the cost effectiveness score be worth 150 to 200 points.

MOTION A: Robjent moved to recommend that the cost effectiveness score be worth 100 points. Seconded by Kosluchar. Motion A was approved unanimously.

MOTION B: Robjent moved to recommend increasing Role in the Regional System by seven percent and Usage by .5 percent in lieu of the former Total Bridge Cost Effectiveness criterion in the Bridges application category. Seconded by Loney. Motion B was approved unanimously.

Peterson said that staff suggested increasing measure 1C to 30 points for all roadway measures, as 20 points proved not to be impactful. He said that after the recommendation to eliminate population from the Transit application categories, he suggested that Measures 1A and 1C each be worth 50 points.

Robjent said that for the Roadway application categories, the Risk Assessment criterion should be worth more than 7.5 percent. Oehme expressed agreement.

MOTION C: Robjent moved to recommend increasing the Risk Assessment criterion in the Roadways application category from 7.5 percent to 10 percent while reducing the Multimodal Connections category in the same applications from 10 percent to 7.5 percent. Seconded by Witter. Motion C was approved unanimously. Oehme said that the increased value to the Risk Assessment Criterion will lead to better preparation and fewer scope changes.

MOTION D: Robjent moved to recommend the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation, inclusive of the changes agreed to by the Committee members. Seconded by Kansier. Motion D was approved unanimously

10. 2016 Regional Solicitation: Funding Category Minimum and Maximum Funding Amounts– Action Item

Peterson said that the Funding & Programming Committee had discussed federal maximum and minimum funding amounts at a previous meeting. While most amounts are proposed to remain unchanged, committee members felt that the maximum federal amount for Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities should be reduced from \$5.5 million to \$3.5 million in order to facilitate the funding of more projects. Previous Regional Solicitations had

a \$1 million maximum for Transportation Enhancements, though STP funds could be used in larger amounts. The \$5.5 million maximum was based on the previous maximum for STP. Staff suggested the increased minimum amounts for the three Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities applications in order to avoid funding projects that are too costly from a federal compliance perspective.

MOTION: Robgent moved to recommend the award maximums and minimums. Seconded by Sass.

Jenson asked why the maximum federal award is proposed to be reduced to \$3.5 million and suggested that it could potentially be reduced even further. Ohrn said that \$3.5 million had been used in the STP Bikeway category in the past. Mitteco added that this was viewed as an adequate federal contribution to fund a grade-separated crossing.

The motion was approved unanimously.

11. 2016 Regional Solicitation: Forms and Qualifying Criteria – Action Item

MOTION: Kansier moved to recommend approval of the 2016 Regional Solicitation Introductions, Forms, and Qualifying Criteria along with the measures and weighting into a draft Regional Solicitation for public comment, inclusive of changes agreed upon earlier in this meeting. Seconded by McCartney. The motion was approved unanimously.

12. Other Business

No other business.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.