

Minutes of the

REGULAR MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD (TAB)

Wednesday, November 15, 2017

Metropolitan Council Chambers, 390 Robert St. North, St. Paul

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Hovland, James, Chair	McGuire, Mary Jo	Goins, William
Look, Matt	Maluchnik, Randy	Gaylord, Kathleen	Callison, Jan Goettel, Debbie (Alt)
Ulrich, Jon	Bigham, Karla	Anderson, Doug	Tabke, Brad
Sandahl, Suzanne	Villella, Sam	Parsons, Rolf	Van Hattum, David
Dugan, Peter	Rodriguez, Katie	McBride, Scott	Thornton, David
Wosje, Jeff	Reich, Kevin	Petryk, Becky	Swanson, Dick
Giuliani Stephens, Mary	Tolbert, Chris	McKnight, Kenya Hollinshead, Matt (alt)	Fawley, Ethan
ABSENT:	Hamann-Roland, Mary	Laufenburger, Denny	Christensen, Carrie
Hansen, Gary	Sanger, Sue	Staples, Jamez	Crimmins, Carl
LIAISON/STAFF PRESENT:	Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator		

I. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Hovland called the regular meeting of the Transportation Advisory Board to order at 12:04 p.m., on Wednesday, November 15, 2017.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A motion was made by Gaylord, seconded by Look, to adopt the agenda. Motion carried.

III. PUBLIC FORUM

Invitation to the public to address the Board about any issue was not on the agenda. There was no one in the audience who wished to speak on items not on the agenda.

IV. REPORTS

1. TAB Chair's Report

Hovland welcomed Jenna Ernst as the new Recording Secretary of the TAB Committee.

Hovland reminded members to express their interest in serving on the Executive Committee by the end of December as selections will be made at the January TAB meeting. Ten members are needed, currently only three have noted interest.

2. Agency Reports (MnDOT, MPCA, MAC and Metropolitan Council)

MnDOT Scott McBride reported: Nothing today.

MPCA: David Thornton reported on the status of the Volkswagen settlement. He requested input from the Board regarding when they wanted to provide feedback on the allocation of settlement funds. Thornton will provide feedback at the December or January meeting.

MAC: Carl Crimmins was absent, therefore nothing today.

Metropolitan Council: Katie Rodriguez reported on the latest information impacting public transit during the Super Bowl. MetroTransit will be operating light rail at regular levels, plus providing bus bridges during the Super Bowl. Rodriguez emphasized that this event will showcase the region, however, that comes with disruptions that everyone is trying to accommodate and minimize any inconvenience. She noted that this will be the first Super Bowl allowing ticket holders to use LRT to get to the Super Bowl. Hovland asked about hours of transit service with the late closure with bars and restaurants during the Super Bowl festivities. Rodriguez offered an additional report to the Board at a future meeting as more details are put in place.

3. Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Report

TAC Chair Steve Albrecht reported he had nothing to add other than the agenda items today.

V. CONSENT ITEMS

1. TPP Update (Cole Hiniker)

Cole Hiniker, MTS, continued the TPP presentation on transit where he left off at the October 18th meeting.

Bigam confirmed that the Red Rock Corridor is included, but that it will be phased in when funding is approved. She recommended ongoing policy discussions at future TAB meetings regarding the next Regional Solicitation, scoring proposed routes and how to help communities develop ridership to ensure access to existing, and develop new routes.

Petryk inquired about how community development is measured and impacted for businesses that don't have as much of an impact on public transit, such as senior care facilities. Hiniker noted the assessment looks at density through a number of factors including housing, employers, educational facilities and people needing access to jobs and education.

Wosjie was concerned about the growth of Metro Mobility and its impact on available funding. Thompson and Hinkier confirmed that due to increase in both the population and the aging of the population they are projecting continued growth in Metro Mobility in 2020 and 2040. Thompson explained that Metro Mobility is a federally mandated program and it is wholly funded through the state's General Fund. Recognizing that the 6-9% annual growth is not sustainable, the state and has asked the Metro Mobility Task Force to identify new funding models and find ways to bend the cost curve. And he noted that the tradeoff in supporting the growth of Metro Mobility takes away from supporting growth in bus service.

Hovland asked Transportation Committee Chair Rodriguez how Metro Council can get a more sustainable funding source for transit than having to regularly go to the state legislature. Rodriguez acknowledged the challenge and noted that the recently updated their fare policy is part of the solution. She also noted that ongoing communications is occurring with the state legislators to make a case that transit is vital to keep people moving cost effectively, and critical for regional economic growth. And that emerging technologies are being explored for how they can create more service at a lower cost.

Hollinshead inquired about the extent cities and counties contribute funding to public transit. Hiniker referred the Board to the developing TPP report which will have a chapter describing funding sources.

2. Approval of Minutes from October 18, 2017

Motion by Anderson, seconded by Wosjie, and carried to approve the minutes of the October 18, 2017, regular meeting of the Transportation Advisory Board.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

1. 2017-26 Approval of TAB Bylaws: Maluchnik speaking on Hamann-Roland's behalf motioned, second by Anderson, motion carried.

Discussion: Swanson noted a change needed under Article VI, section B., Executive Committee Selection and Tenure, which states that the Chair shall annually be responsible for recommending a slate of seven (versus six) candidates, and a correction to include "a modal representative".

Swanson offered friendly amendment, accepted by Maluchnik.

Swanson also noted the order of business (page 6) needs to read as follows:

1. Adoption of the agenda and amendments thereto
2. Public Forum
3. Agency Reports/Reports of Committees, Task Forces and Actions of the Board
4. Consideration of the consent list
5. Approval of the minutes of previous meetings
6. Action Items
7. Special agenda items and Information items
8. Other business and items of TAB Members
9. Adjournment

Swanson offered friendly amendment, accepted by Maluchnik.

With the acceptance of these revisions, this concludes the work of the Bylaws Task Force. Motion passed.

Discussion: Look requested a current list of committee member list and their positions/who they represent.

2. 2017-27 MPO Memorandum of Understanding with MnDOT
Albrecht presented this item. With no further discussion, it was moved by Bigham, seconded by McBride. Motion carried.
3. 2017-28 TIP Amendment: I-394 and MN-62 Land Re-striping Projects
Albrecht presented this item. There was discussion about the public's tolerance for re-striping lanes that remove lanes that were added to mitigate congestion during construction. Although some push back is expected, a firm commitment to FHWA is in place to re-stripe the lanes as they were prior to the construction. It was moved by Reich, seconded by Rodriguez. Motion carried.
4. 2017- 40 Streamlined TIP Amendment: Add West St. Paul Trail
Albrecht presented this item. It was moved by Fawley, seconded by Gaylord, that the 2018-2021 TIP includes the City of West St. Paul's Wentworth Avenue Trail project. Motion carried.
5. 2017-29 2018 Regional Solicitation: Measures and Scoring Guidance
Albrecht presented an overview of the Regional Solicitation Final Approval Recommendations from the Technical Advisory Committee, which includes members from city, county, federal, and state agencies; citizens are not represented. There was a question about where the city representation originated. Katie White, MTS, explained that representation was determined by the League of MN Cities. This includes seven representatives from the League, plus two from

Minneapolis and two representatives from St. Paul, the goal of which is a regional balance in the Metro Area.

Discussion: Chair Hovland noted that the changes to this item were responsive to Board's feedback from last month.

Van Hattum noted his concern about the lack of specificity in Item "I" related to travel time savings and liability improvements. Joe Barbeau and Cole Hiniker, MTS, explained that the vague language was intentional because it is difficult to agree on the specific measure that should be used to quantify time saving measures. The Board's concerns will be taken back to staff for further consideration.

Dugan inquired about whether the plowing projects on a winter-intended trail for cross-country skiing comes under this Transportation Regional Solicitation. Staff clarified that the Transportation Regional Solicitation covers transportation and recreational use over non-motorized trails, therefore its inclusion was correct.

It was moved by Malunchuk, seconded by Goettel. Motion carried.

6. 2017-30 2018 Regional Solicitation: Criteria/Measure Weighting
Albrecht noted a number of changes in the criteria, measures and scoring weights. Without discussion, Parsons moved, seconded by Anderson. Motion passed.
7. 2017-31 2018 Regional Solicitation: Awarding One Roadway Project per Functional Classification
Albrecht presented this item. Without discussion, Gaylord moved, seconded by Goettel. Motion passed.
8. 2017-32 2018 Regional Solicitation: Modal Category Minimum and Maximum Funding Amounts
Albrecht presented this item. Fawley shared concerns about protecting funding for bridge replacement. Peterson, MTS, outlined recent history that \$10M has been set aside in the past, but it was eliminated two years ago. Fawley encouraged the Committee to reinstate the \$10M set aside to emphasize the importance of bridge maintenance and make it a priority.

It was noted that there is a typo in the subject line of the Business Item, and it will be changed to Modal Funding Ranges. Fawley moved with the addition of \$10M minimum set aside for bridge improvement/roadway category (no maximum), seconded by Van Hattum. Motion passed with 14 votes to approve and 7 objections.

9. 2017-33 2018 Regional Solicitation: Qualifying Criteria and Eligibility
Albrecht reviewed the twenty changes to the scoring criteria, measures and their scoring values, qualifying requirements, project eligibility and other policy concerns.
Discussion included comments on:
 1. TAC recommendation to allow funding of transit maintenance and support facilities and garages. No discussion.
 2. TAC recommendation that two-to-three-lane conversions will be eligible in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization category. Language was clarified regarding two-to-three lane expansions still being eligible in the Roadway Expansion category. No discussion.

3. TAC recommendation to allow scoring committees the flexibility to deviate from the approved scoring guidance (with a rationale provided to the Funding & Programming Committee). No discussion.
4. TAC recommendation to allow scorers the option to prorate scores based on the second-highest scoring project (as opposed to the top-scoring project) in cases where strict adherence to the scoring guidance creates an outlier. No discussion.
5. TAC recommendation to leave the restrictions in restriction that TAB will only fund one roadway, bridge, bicycle, or pedestrian trail within the same corridor. Any projects in the same corridor must prove independent utility as a qualifying requirement. No discussion.
6. TAC recommendation to include additional language notifying transit applicants the opportunity to have their ridership projections reviewed by Council staff prior to submittal in order to determine whether the scoring methodology is sound.
Bigham why wouldn't we use the same methodology for consistency? Steve Peterson, MTS, explained that different types of projects measure their ridership differently, and a consistent method may count against certain types of projects. For example, transitways have ridership forecasts prepared with their alternatives analyses. Koutsoukos noted that applicants can currently contact staff to review methodologies, although not all were aware. Adding the language will let all applicants know this is available.
7. TAC recommendation to add a rule that higher-scoring-projects cannot be skipped over to funding lower-scoring projects within the same category, except if it is needed to satisfy another rule (e.g., funding of one application per functional classification).

Van Hattum noted that the TAB Committee has a role to achieve regional balance in projects we believe in and this item takes TAB out of the decision-making process. Bigham concurred and advocated for the TAB having greater input. Hovland asked for staff's evaluation input. Peterson noted that this item was included as a rule because it had only been included as a point of guidance in the past.

8. TAC recommendation to not require an application earn a minimum score to be eligible for funding. Fawley, inquired about how many projects this rule would have impacted in the last solicitation. Albrecht noted that it would have impacted one TDM project.
9. TAC recommendation to add a qualifying criterion requiring that any sponsoring agency with at least 50 employees must be substantially working toward completing its ADA Transition Plan.

Gaylord noted her concerns not to one specific item, but in general, TAC is getting into the details beyond its role determining eligibility and scoring, and making additions to the rules, and determining how projects are selected. She shared her concern about how TAC is stepping beyond its role, a little concerned.

10. TAC recommendation to require that all roadway projects that involve the construction of a new or expanded interchange or new interchange ramps have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal. No discussion.

11. TAC recommendation to not require that Roadway Expansion projects expanding thru lanes or building a new interchange on an existing signalized corridor have completed signal retiming within the five-year time period before the project was submitted for funding.

Rodriguez inquired about not making this a requirement, but, rather, collecting information and granting points, and asked for discussion on this item to encouraging low cost solutions to increase mobility. Albrecht affirmed that this is being done already.

McBride offered his observation of whether the recently completed conversion study offers to potential solutions on corridors. Regarding roadway expansion, he concurred with Albrecht and noted that this region does well with great roadway management before expansion planning. Local traffic engineers are doing at great job at local levels.

McGuire concurred with Rodriguez to add a more details to this rule to emphasize low-cost solutions before building new roads. Parsons also endorsed and noted that while this may be redundant, it's an important principle to reinforce.

Gaylord voiced concern about how redundant additional information collecting is and why make projects more complicated than they already are; she questioned the real purpose. Bigham voiced her support of Rodriguez to find a happy middle ground awarding points on the information being collected.

At Chair Hovland's request, Albrecht offered to take this item back to Funding and Programming for further discussion.

11. TAC recommendation to add a requirement to the Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization categories that each application must show independent utility and the points awarded in the application should only account for the improvements listed in the application. No discussion.
12. TAC recommendation to add a requirement that Travel Demand Management (TDM) applicants must be properly categorized as a subrecipient in accordance with [2CFR200.330](#). No discussion.
14. TAC recommendation to not require that TDM applicants not have received any audit findings, material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, or material non-compliances in either of the two preceding fiscal years because the impacts are unclear and even the Council has had audit findings. No discussion.
15. TAC recommendation to add a requirement that TDM applicants must adhere to Subpart E Cost Principles of [2CFR200](#) under the proposed sub award. No discussion.
16. TAC recommendation to require that all applications include a "before" photo. No discussion.
17. TAC recommendation to not request documentation of local support, by listing any public involvement completed to date because listing public involvement activities without tying them to points or qualification would not provide any purpose. No discussion.
18. TAC recommendation to limit application attachments to fewer than 15 pages for each attachment. No discussion.
19. TAC recommendation to require applicants to submit a one-page project summary to be used by the scoring committees and TAB members. No discussion.

20. TAC recommendation to require applicants to include a letter or resolution from their governing boards committing to fund the entire local match if the agency is not successful in securing other funding sources for the local match.

Rodriquez was concerned about how the Regional Solicitation works and discourages smaller communities from applying. Several board members voiced similar concerns. Look made the observation that this requires that applicants to fund only the entire local match (20%). He posed the question of what is the real impact when those applying for projects have no idea where/how to fund it. Koutsoukos noted that the current requirement in making an application with a partner requires the city had to sign a letter acknowledging, but not the applicant. This now requires that the applicant to acknowledge they will fund the entire local match, if they do not secure other sources for the local match. Rodriquez supported this as an important part of the risk assessment.

It was moved by Bigham, seconded by Anderson, to accept the changes in the 2017-33 2018 Regional Solicitation: Qualifying Criteria and Eligibility, with the exclusion of items 7 and 20.

Motion carried. A friendly amendment was offered Bigham, Anderson seconded to amend the acceptance of 2017-33 with exception of #7 & #20, and send #11 back to TAC.

Discussion: McGuire inquired about the language on #5 re: only one roadway can be funded with independent utilities. Staff clarified that this keeps the existing language in place, and the recommendation does not make any change.

10. 2017-34 2018 Regional Solicitation: Funding Category Minimum and Maximum Funding Amounts

Albrecht presented this item. Fawley noted a perennial concern has been reducing the funding maximum, with a number of projects over the past couple of years exceeding the previous \$3.5M maximum limit, this would have disqualified several projects. Fawley moved, Reich seconded, to accept and keep the maximum for Multiuse Trails at \$5.5M and increase the TDM maximum to \$500,000.

Discussion: Ulrich spoke against this motion to fund more projects in order to have a larger impact. The larger limit limits the number of trail projects and diminish the impact with fewer larger projects.

Albrecht spoke to Funding and Program's viewpoint that you get the biggest bang for your buck through the larger limit. Rodriquez said this rule could also apply to roadways. This gets away from projects that score better. Albrecht noted there is a real pent up demand for these projects, and this is intended to get more projects now, but no one is certain about the impact. In fact, it may slow down how larger projects are done.

Van Hattum supported the motion suggesting going through another Regional Solicitation to watch this. And he is concerned that this reduces our discretion a bit. Motion carried.

11. 2017-35 2018 Regional Solicitation: Inflation Rate and Year of Cost Estimate

Albrecht presented this item. It was moved by Anderson, seconded by Sandahl. Motion carried.

12. 2017-36 2018 Regional Solicitation: Release Regional Solicitation Package for Public Comment

Albrecht presented this item. It was moved by Look, seconded by Bigham. Motion passed.

VII. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSTION ITEMS

1. TPP Update (Chapter 1/Transportation System and Performance-Based Planning, Chapter 2/Strategies, Chapter 3/Land Use)

Steve Peterson, MTS, announced the release the drafts to the first three chapters of the TPP. Katie White and Elaine Koutsoukos are contacts for feedback.

2. Corridors of Commerce Solicitation

Scott McBride, MnDOT, made a presentation on MnDOT's Corridors of Commerce Solicitation program. Rodriguez inquired about how projects on the edge of neighboring counties will be handled. McBride noted that MnDOT is creating parameters as a metro district and it wouldn't make a decision on individual projects. He expects that this program will balance the allocation of funds between the Twin Cities Metro and the Greater Metro area projects, with an estimated \$200M coming into the Twin Cities Metro area.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS AND ITEMS OF TAB MEMBERS

There was no other business.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Sayre Darling
Recording Secretary