TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
Metropolitan Council
390 N. Robert St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1805
Minutes of a Meeting of the
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
July 20, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tim Mayasich (Chair, Ramsey County), Lynne Bly (MnDOT Metro District), Colleen Brown (MnDOT State Aid), Bob Byers (Hennepin County), Robert Ellis (Eden Prairie), Innocent Eyoh (MPCA), Anna Flintoft (Metro Transit), Jenifer Hager (Minneapolis), Craig Jenson (Scott County), Karl Keel (Bloomington), Elaine Koutsoukos (TAB), Jen Lehmann (MVTA), Lyssa Leitner (Washington County), Steve Love (Maplewood), Joe MacPherson (Anoka County), Gina Mitteco (MnDOT Bike & Ped), Ryan Peterson (Burnsville), Steve Peterson (Metropolitan Council), John Sass (Dakota County), Nancy Spooner-Mueller (DNR), Anne Weber (St. Paul), and Joe Barbeau (staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Steve Elmer (Metropolitan Council) and Heidi Schallberg (Metropolitan Council)

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

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

3. **Approval of the Minutes from the May 18, 2017, Meeting**
    MOTION: Koutsoukos moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by MacPherson. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. **TAB Report – Information Item**
    Koutsoukos reported on the July 19, 2017, TAB meeting. Scott McBride reported that the St. Croix River Crossing opening is August 2. MnDOT has two solicitations out, one for $20 million in federal funds for highway construction projects in years 2019 through 2022 with discernable freight transportation benefits. The other is for $18 million in state matching funds for state highway construction projects in 2018-2022 with measurable economic benefits. The Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development has a parallel program that funds projects on local roads for $4 million. Streamlined TIP amendments were approved to add a MnDOT median barrier HSIP-funded project on US 10 and to add a railroad crossing project in South St. Paul, in both cases to start projects earlier.

5. **ADA Transition Plans**
    Heidi Schallberg from Metropolitan Council staff reported that agencies with at least 50 council employees will have to be making progress on Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plans or federal funding could be in jeopardy. The Council intend to survey local agencies to get a sense of how far along most entities are in this process. Mayasich asked whether plans need to be in place before the start of the next Solicitation, to which Steve Peterson replied probably not. Koutsoukos said that most agencies have plans, though Schallberg replied that she is looking into whether updates are required.

    Ellis asked whether the requirements pertain only to public right-of-way, to which Schallberg replied that she is looking for clarification from FHWA.

    Brown said that transition plans are different from the construction plans that State Aid checks for ADA compliance.

    Steve Peterson said that a requirement could be placed in the qualifying criteria or the risk assessment. Flintoft said that it will be important to find out about update requirements.

6.   **2018 Regional Solicitation: Qualifying Requirements and Forms – Information Item**

Steve Peterson asked whether there is interest in interchange projects having their own category. In the 2016 Regional Solicitation, five of seven interchange applications were funded. Barbeau said that interchange projects scored better than non-interchange projects in several measures. Leitner asked whether the dominance of interchanges in the category is a recent issue, to which Steve Peterson replied that it could be connected to the 2014 Solicitation overhaul along with the increased frequency in cities and counties applying for projects on the MnDOT system. Sass added that many of these projects are low-match projects. Keel said that the more categories there are, the more often that the best projects are eliminated. Mayasich said that he would like a sense of who wants to apply for interchange projects. MacPherson suggested limiting the number of projects by type. The group expressed no desire to add a category.

Steve Peterson said that staff proposes that titles of some categories change to match categories in the TPP. The draft includes addition of language that mandates applicants show local support. Keel replied that applicants should just be referred directly to the locals. Committee members agreed that this addition is not needed.

Steve Peterson said that a one-page project summary could be either required or optional. Keel suggested providing a template and making applicants submit it. Koutsoukos said that most of the information is already complete and the form could be auto populated. Lehmann said that a summary sheet would be helpful to scorers who need to see more than just their measures.

Steve Peterson said that the risk assessment did not make a significant difference in the scoring, as the many elements of the measure spread the points too thinly. He said he and Brown worked to remove the ineffective elements. Brown said that the draft removes the elements on which applicants scored most similarly. Ryan Peterson said that the "funding" element could be subjective. Leitner said that the "confirmed" language is vague and suggested making it specific to applications waiting on state funding.

Sass suggested increasing spacing lengths for the interchange approval. Keel suggested simply requiring the approval process to be completed with no other requirements attached.

Sass questioned the proposed inclusion of a requirement that signal timing must be completed within five years of project submittal when thru lanes are expanded. Ryan Peterson added that local agencies cannot force MnDOT to re-time signals.

Mayasich asked for a definition of "spot mobility," to which Steve Peterson said that "spot mobility" is something like a roundabout or another intersection improvement and that the term is used in the TPP.

Sass asked whether the requirement of student travel tallies and parent surveys needs to be included, as schools are not always a part of the project. Brown said that this is a Safe Routes to School program requirement. Barbeau said that he would contact Safe Routes to School personnel at MnDOT for clarification.

Steve Peterson said that the draft shows a requirement in transit applications must show independent utility and that the points awarded should only account for improvements shown in the application. This is meant to assure that riders and other elements are not double-counted.

Koutsoukos asked why the budget shows committed private sector contribution. Steve Peterson replied that it notes any private sector contributions, which would be worth points in the Roadway Expansion application. Koutsoukos replied that this is not a budget element and should be removed from that sheet.

Mayasich said that the requirement of a letter of support from any agency that owns a facility should refer to an agency that "owns and operates" a facility.

Ryan Peterson recalled that a proposed project did not meet the federal minimum in the last Regional Solicitation and asked whether the project was allowed to proceed. Steve Peterson replied that it did. Ryan Peterson suggested exploring that requirement, given that it was not enforced strictly.

7. **2018 Regional Solicitation: Safe Routes to School and Pedestrian Facilities – Information Item**
    Barbeau said that the Deficiencies measure of both the Safe Routes to School and Pedestrian Facilities applications show an adjustment to the scoring ranges of applications that provide data and those that do not so that there can be overlap.

    Ellis said that some school districts do not want to participate in Safe Routes to School applications.

8. **Bicycle Barriers Study – Information Item**
    Steve Elmer from Metropolitan Council staff discussed the ongoing Regional Bicycle Barriers Study (RBBS), which will assess existing and potential bicycle crossing opportunities of regional barriers; analyze regional physical barriers to bicycling and where they impact continuity of regional and local bicycle networks; and inform the TPP and Regional Solicitation updates.

    Lehmann asked how demonstration projects are selected. Elmer replied that that is still undecided.

    Ryan Peterson said that the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) is worth a lot of points in the Regional Solicitation and that this could increase the degree to which some projects are favored. Elmer replied that the RBBS will address projects not on RBTN corridors. Ryan Peterson pointed out that all areas identified by the RBBS are within the RBTN network buffer.

    Koutsoukos asked whether a project would have to be on the RBBS list to score well, to which Elmer replied that this depends on the particulars of the scoring.

9. **Other Business**
    None.

10. **Adjournment**
    The meeting was adjourned.