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

2. **Adoption of Agenda**
MOTION: Brown moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by MacPherson. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Approval of the Minutes from the July 19, 2018, Meeting**
MOTION: Spooner-Mueller moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by Lehmann. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. **TAB Report – Information Item**
Koutsoukos reported on the August 15, 2018 TAB meeting.

5. **2018 Regional Solicitation Qualifying Review – Action Item 2018-45**
Peterson presented the recommendations and suggested that the committee would like to vote on each of the three qualifying recommendations separately. Oehme concurred.

Dakota County: Recommended to move from roadway expansion to reconstruction. Sass said that this was incorrectly submitted in error. Thompson moved and Lux seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

City of Anoka: Recommended to move from reconstruction to expansion. Kosluchar moved and Brown seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

City of St. Paul/HourCar: Recommended to move from transit expansion to travel demand management (TDM). Paul Schroeder from Hourcar and Bill Dermody from St. Paul were present to answer questions. Schroeder said that the program will provide a focus at rail and bus stations. Lehmann asked about the methodology used to determine projected ridership. Schroeder responded that ridership was determined using comparable programs in Paris along with today’s Hourcar service. Koutsoukos said that the trips would not be on transit but transfers from transit routes. Furthermore, FTA does not consider car-sharing to be a transit mode, despite the potential for CMAQ funds to be used for car-sharing. Hager said that this program is like dial-a-ride services, which are eligible. Burrows said that dial-a-ride takes more than one person on a trip; whereas HourCar is like car rental services. Schroeder said that this is municipally-sponsored, and therefore not car rental.

Robjent asked whether a similar project was funded recently. Peterson responded that a charging station project was categorized as a “unique project” a few years ago, but a project can’t be unique if it fits elsewhere. Lehmann asked about the scoring process for unique projects. Koutsoukos responded that those
requests go straight to TAB to determine, without scoring, whether to provide funding. Bly suggested updating the project categories in the future, but that unique is the best solution for now. Smith said that the application doesn’t exclude this kind of project under transit.

Cole Hiniker said that in the Transportation Policy Plan shared use is not included in the definition of transit; a driver’s license is required to use HourCar. Robjent asked about fee structure. Schroeder responded that the fee structure may be re-examined because electric cars are cheaper to run. The program will engage low-income communities.

Schroeder said that the solicitation supports park and ride lots. Hiniker responded that park and ride lots have drop off spaces for carpools and other high-occupancy vehicles. Hager said that the solicitation needs to get comfortable with new and different projects; this project does the same work as a transit line. Robjent asked whether the project sponsor would the project from consideration if it is moved to TDM; Dermody responded that it would. Robjent suggested it should be a unique project. Lux agreed. It likely won’t meet the TDM criteria and will score poorly. Thompson recommended scoring it as-is.

Brown said that the ridership is the biggest risk in scoring the project. Peterson said that the ridership numbers might not be able to be used, as it is difficult to determine whether car-share users are new transit riders. Koutsoukos said that the application indicated that 28% of users would be new transit riders. Schroeder said that 90% of HourCar members already use transit, but that with this program they will use transit more often.

Jorgensen asked about the benefits of membership. Schroeder responded that insurance and gasoline are included. Daniel Peña asked whether car-sharing replaces transit use. Schroeder responded that a Shared Use Mobility Center report suggested this model is good for the Twin Cities. After car2go ceased operating in the Twin Cities it is unlikely another provider will return. Bly said it is a great project, but it does not fit the Council’s Solicitation model. Smith asked what the current ridership methodology is. Hiniker responded that new routes use comparable routes. Existing routes with increased level of service use an incremental approach. The application assumes all users are transit riders. Robjent asked how the program would change behavior. Schroeder said it would facilitate increased transit use.

MOTION: Hager moved that the question progress directly to TAB at its September meeting as a unique project, and if assigned to transit or TDM, staff should work with HourCar to change the ridership projections. Seconded by Burrows. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. **Employment Flows – Information Item**

   Peterson and Patrick Haney presented requested information about population and employment flows between counties. There were no questions.

7. **2018 Regional Solicitation Maps of Applications Received and Scoring Committees – Information Item**

   Peterson presented mapping of solicitation applications. There were no questions.

8. **Other Business**

   None.

9. **Adjournment**

   MOTION: Thompson moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by MacPherson. The motion was approved unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned.