

Minutes

TAC Planning Committee



Meeting date: November 14, 2024

Time: 1:00 PM

Location: Virtual

Members present:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Anoka Co – Vacant | <input type="checkbox"/> FHWA – Josh Pearson (ex officio) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> St. Paul – Anton Jerve |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brooklyn Park – Marc Culver, alternate for Dan Ruiz | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hennepin Co – Chad Ellos, alternate for Jordan Kocak | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott Co – Terri Dill |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carver Co – Whitney Schroeder | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Metro Transit – Patrick Haney | <input type="checkbox"/> Suburban Transit Assoc – Matt Fyten |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chanhassen – Charlie Howley | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAC – Bridget Rief | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAB Coordinator – Elaine Koutsoukos |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council Community Development – Patrick Boylan | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minneapolis – Kathleen Mayell | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Washington Co – Sara Allen |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council MTS – Dave Burns | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MnDOT – Lindsey Bruer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Woodbury – Chris Hartzell |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dakota Co – Gina Mitteco (Chair) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MPCA – Lauren Dickerson, alternate for Innocent Eyoh | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = present, E = excused |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ramsey Co – Kevin Roggenbuck | |

Call to order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Gina Mitteco, Dakota County, called the regular meeting of the TAC Planning Committee to order at 1:01 p.m.

Agenda approved

Committee members did not have any comments or changes to the agenda.

Approval of minutes

It was moved by Kevin Roggenbuck, Ramsey County, seconded by Lindsey Bruer, MnDOT, to approve the minutes of the August 8, 2024, regular meeting of the TAC Planning Committee.

Motion carried with 12 ayes, 0 noes, and 3 abstentions (Howley, Rief, Boylan). Culver, Mayell, and Schroeder joined after this item and did not vote.

Public comment on committee business

There were no public comments.

Business

1. **2024-51:** Review of Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) 2025-2031 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) (Joe Widing, MTS Planning) – roll call

Widing presented the business item.

Chair Mitteco asked how Dakota County will be involved in additional review related to the Airlake project. Bridget Rief, Metropolitan Airports Commission, said the MAC's long-term plan

was revised so the project no longer impacts Cedar Avenue and the industrial park. Rief said the current project will require relocation of a township road (225th Street) and coordination will occur. Rief said the project has been pushed out to 2027 to accommodate the Environmental Assessment process, as there are several pipelines crossing the airport requiring coordination with their owners and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Chair Mitteco asked if this will involve a separate review process from the CIP. Rief said yes.

Charlie Howley, City of Chanhassen, asked about the different lengths of the two runways at the Lake Elmo Airport. Rief answered that this extension is the maximum possible without property impacts and that the FAA only expects crosswind runways to be 75% of the primary runway's length.

It was moved by Patrick Boylan, Met Council Community Development, seconded by Anton Jerve, City of Saint Paul, that the TAC Planning Committee recommend that the Metropolitan Council:

- find that the Metropolitan Airport Commission's CIP process included adequate public participation;
- approve the proposed 2025 CIP runway rehabilitation and extension project at Lake Elmo Airport which meets the dollar threshold and significant effects criteria for Council approval; and
- find the remaining CIP projects to be consistent with the Transportation Policy Plan and forward any additional project comments to the Metropolitan Council for its consideration.

Motion carried with 17 ayes, 0 noes, and 0 abstentions. Mayell joined after this item and did not vote.

2. **2024-52:** Adoption of 2025 Safety Performance Targets (Jed Hanson, MTS Planning) – roll call
Hanson presented the business item.

Anton Jerve, City of Saint Paul, asked about different update frequencies between the Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan and the Transportation Policy Plan, and also asked if it may be better to wait for pending rulemaking to update the methodology. Hanson said the Transportation Policy Plan receives a major update every 10 years and a minor update every 5 years, a difference of one year from a Strategic Highway Safety Plan update. Hanson said this was an opportunity to align the targets with the Transportation Policy Plan's performance program, and the continuation option was brought forward acknowledging regulations may change the approach next year.

Kevin Roggenbuck, Ramsey County, asked if the Met Council has directed that it establish its own targets rather than support Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) targets. Hanson said it has been historical practice to set region-specific targets, and the option to just support MnDOT targets does not set a regional target. Hanson said in the early years of this performance rule, the Met Council was setting its own target but using MnDOT's methodology. Hanson said state departments of transportation have different performance measure requirements, both related to funding and reporting, that do not align with prior Met Council or Transportation Advisory Board policy direction to not set increasing targets. Hanson said basing targets on the MnDOT method could carry risk of increasing targets in some years, though MnDOT has chosen to hold its statewide targets flat for several years due to this reason.

Roggenbuck asked if a MnDOT member if there is concern with the metro area having slightly different targets. Hanson said that the Met Council has developed this method in consultation with MnDOT's Performance Measurement and Office of Traffic Engineering staff. Hanson said the existing Met Council method was developed in collaboration with a safety targets workgroup in previous years including these stakeholders. Lindsey Bruer, MnDOT Metro

District, said it is acceptable for a metropolitan planning organization to have different targets than MnDOT.

Kathleen Mayell, City of Minneapolis, asked what is the motivation for Option B (base targets on the Transportation Policy Plan) and if that motivation is more than perception that the region is failing to meet its targets. Hanson said this was not prompted by perception of worsening performance, but the option was informed by interest in keeping targets in an achievable range for communication with policymakers, and better aligning with federal guidance for these measures. Hanson said that some metropolitan planning organizations have set their targets to extreme values in both directions, ranging from very close to actual performance or to zero in all measures.

David Burns, MTS Planning, asked if subsequent committees will consider both options. Hanson said going forward the recommended motion will follow TAC Planning's recommendation, though the committee's discussion and background on the other option will be included in the materials.

Lindsey Bruer said Option A is fewer fatalities than Option B, and she asked if policymakers would have concern with that difference. Hanson said these targets are similar approaches: reducing the target from a baseline year toward a goal-based year, and Option A reaches zero sooner than Option B, resulting in a different magnitude of change between years. Hanson said these are targets not predicted outcomes, and ultimately investment processes effect actual performance.

Chris Hartzell, City of Woodbury, asked if there are financial consequences related to this performance measure. Hanson said statewide targets do effect MnDOT's Highway Safety Improvement Program allocation, but regional targets do not have an impact on funding. Hanson said there is an action in the draft Transportation Policy Plan that provides guidance to the Regional Solicitation Evaluation on pedestrian and bicyclist crash outcomes relative to programming processes, but there are not presently measures in regional grant programs related to these targets. Cole Hiniker, MTS Planning, said there is an important message in aspirational targets wanted by policymakers, though a more realistic target may better inform measurement of investment decisionmaking. Hiniker said this is an opportunity to bring targets into better alignment with that purpose, though reiterated the flexibility and range of targets other regions have set.

Kathleen Mayell asked if this is just a recommendation for 2025 targets. Hanson said yes, federal regulations currently require a short-term target be set annually, and there has not been a regional policy discussion about setting a medium-term target. Mayell asked if the Option B method would just continue down that line to 2050 guided by the plan objective. Hanson said yes, until the TAC Planning committee recommends otherwise. Mayell asked if the Option B targets shift the burden of advancing the safety improvement goals in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to other areas of the state. Hanson said he did not know and that the 2020-2024 SHSP is due for an update, including its medium-term goal that was set for 2025. Hanson said a draft SHSP is not yet available to consider how Option B may or may not align with a future SHSP goal.

Chair Mitteco asked when the Option A targets reach zero. Hanson said the 2020-2024 SHSP supports Towards Zero Deaths; it does not set a target zero year, but it does set a medium-term target in 2025. Hanson said if the same rate of target decline were continued past the 2025 SHSP medium-term goal, that each measure would reach zero between 2032-2035.

Chair Mitteco said based on discussion and presentation she does not see a huge difference between these target setting options that would incentivize different investment and policy decisions, that she does not have a strong preference for either option, and observed that selection of Option B with a higher level of death may be difficult for policymakers to accept.

Hiniker said staff will summarize discussion and will forward it for the Technical Advisory Committee's (TAC) consideration. Hiniker said there are significant differences between



technical and policymaker perspectives on these measures, and it is important to document those technical perspectives here and at TAC.

Lauren Dickerson, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, asked about the widening gap between the targets and actual outcomes, and asked if this gap is related to investment decisions or factors outside of our control. Hanson said the main lever for metropolitan planning organizations is investments and programming processes, and one of the challenges since onset of the COVID-19 pandemic is behavioral changes worsening outcomes. Hanson said the Met Council has not done a rigorous causal analysis about this change and there is not an exact answer about what can be done differently, though noted some topics of discussion in the safety field include reductions in peak hour congestion increasing speeding and risk-taking behavior and milder winters reducing driver cautiousness in that season. Hiniker said that the Met Council has been looking at this issue in the Regional Solicitation Evaluation, and there are some early findings that suggest there are ways the region could be better programming to reduce deaths and serious injuries, which could be shared in the future. Dickerson said that from an outside transportation perspective, if you are not meeting a target, the solution is not to change the target but to work harder on meeting the target. Dickerson said that if it isn't possible and unreasonable, then recalibrating the target would be justified, but that these two options are not that far apart and she would prefer Option A and "buckling-down" harder on the issue.

Chris Hartzell said fatalities are also influenced by education, enforcement, and engineering and infrastructure elements. Hartzell said infrastructure elements could reduce fatalities, but he questioned if it was reasonable given available funding. Hartzell said it would be reasonable to adjust the target knowing this, but that he would not make a big shift unless there were a real reason to do so.

Lindsey Bruer said this performance target is quite different than other performance targets, like pavement condition, where you can clearly tie investments to returned improvements. Bruer said this target is different and more challenging to measure investment impact on outcomes. Bruer said MnDOT is looking at the Safe Systems Approach, and that MnDOT would be supportive of either option.

Chair Mitteco said that the TAC Planning committee usually only discusses this topic at target adoption each year, and asked if the committee may take interest in work feeding into the target like the SHSP update, and deferring change until that plan's direction is known. Hiniker said the Transportation Policy Plan is not yet in effect and will be adopted in February shortly after these targets are adopted, so it would be reasonable to delay a change until next year.

Anton Jerve requested that for next year's action, that this item include discussion of how it may effect funding sources or project scoring.

Hiniker said that for next year, members should consider how long we let the actual performance and target performance diverge before adjusting approach and the trend basis for the target.

It was moved by Terri Dill, Scott County, seconded by Chris Hartzell, that the TAC Planning Committee recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board recommend adoption of the 2025 safety performance targets based on the 2020-2024 Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) goal, which advance a long-term goal of zero deaths:

- Number of all fatalities: no more than 74
- Fatal injuries per 100 million VMT: no more than 0.26
- Number of all serious injuries: no more than 464
- Serious injuries per 100 million VMT: no more than 1.64
- Pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and serious injuries: no more than 115

Motion carried with 16 ayes, 0 noes, and 0 abstentions. Culver and Rief left the meeting prior to the action and did not vote.

Information

3. Imagine 2050 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) Public Comment Summary (Jed Hanson, MTS Planning)

Hanson presented the information item.

Chair Mitteco noted that the Technical Advisory Committee already heard this information item.

Terri Dill asked if a list of comments each agency submitted were available. Hanson said the public comment report is not yet available but will be available before adoption actions.

Chair Mitteco asked if this item will go to the Transportation Advisory Board this month. Hanson said yes.

Other business

Joe Barbeau, MTS Planning, said that with the new year there is a new two-year term for this committee's chair, and solicited interest in members serving as chair. Chair Mitteco said she is willing to serve again, or willing to hand off the committee if someone else is interested.

Adjournment

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Council contact:

Jed Hanson, Senior Planner
Jed.Hanson@metc.state.mn.us
651-602-1716

