



ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting #12 Notes

April 28, 2025

1:00 PM – 2:30 PM

Virtual Meeting – Microsoft Teams

Working Group Members (highlighted members were present)

- Glen Johnson (Chair & TAB Citizen Rep)
- Brian Martinson (Vice Chair & TAB Non-Motorized Rep)
- James Hovland (TAB Chair)
- Hwa Jeong Kim (TAB, St. Paul)
- Mary Liz Holberg (TAB, Dakota Co)
- Peter Dugan (TAB Citizen Rep)
- Amity Foster (TAB Transit Rep)
- Aurin Chowdhury (TAB, Minneapolis)
- Mark Steffenson (TAB, Maple Grove)
- Julie Jeppson (TAB, Anoka Co)
- Stan Karwoski (TAB, Washington Co)
- Mai Chong Xiong (TAB, Ramsey Co)
- John Ulrich (TAB, Scott Co)
- Don Do (TAB, Citizen Rep)
- Alexander Ask (TAB, Non-Motorized Rep Alternate)
- Joe MacPherson (TAC Chair)
- Brian Issacson (TAC Vice Chair)
- Michael Thompson (TAC F&P Chair)
- Marc Briese (State-Aid AT Rep)
- Aaron Tag (TAC F&P, MnDOT)
- Craig Jenson (Bike-Ped WG Co-Chair)
- Jordan Kocak (Bike-Ped WG Co-Chair)

Meeting Agenda

1. Meeting Overview and today's objective
2. Incorporating Active Transportation and federal funding sources into proposed structure
3. Recommendation on the use of Active Transportation funding sources for Regional Solicitation
4. Next Steps
5. Information Item: Safe Routes To School

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES

- Members noted that as details begin to be developed that they would like to see recommendations make their way through the technical review process before making decisions, but understand the time constraints on the item to be considered.
- Member Ulrich commented that thinking about how the HSIP solicitation is handled in parallel with the Regional Solicitation and how selected projects are balanced is something that should be considered as we develop details for the active transportation solicitation as it has worked well in the past.

Considerations for the options of splitting federal and active transportation funds

- Members stated that a pro for splitting by cost is that some projects, while locally identified, can still be expensive and may be better suited for federal funds.
- Members asked if applicants would be allowed to apply in both categories for the same project.
 - Staff replied that details will be worked out to fit whichever direction is given. It is likely that there will be restrictions to keep applicants from applying to both sources of funding for the same project.
- Technical members noted their experience at the city level when participating in the Regional Solicitation – they noted that some federal projects they have applied for are only about \$1 million and that not all projects are going to be large projects on the RBTN. Something to consider when talking about federalizing projects. They also noted that when applying for larger projects, they tend to enlist the help of consultants to ensure that their application is competitive – this adds cost for these projects. They believe that cost should be considered when deciding how to split out funding sources.
- Members stated that they thought the category option would work well with timing and flexibility and having categories dedicated to local networks would open up to cities to apply for projects. Additionally, if the max was lower for local projects that would help to spread more funding around.
- Vice Chair Martinson connected a local project in his former neighborhood where an underpass was built for a trail on a local network as a positive for splitting by categories – as this would allow for a project like the one he was describing to be eligible for active transportation funding and would constrain these funds the least.
- Other members noted that the first option to split by categories is the clearest way to move forward and keep flexibility for the program.
- Member Holberg noted that she thought the question was premature to make this decision as the overall application structure had not been reviewed or approved by the TAB.
 - Chair Johnson replied that while it is true that this decision has not had a vote, it is important to move forward to develop details for both solicitations as staff and technical partners will be doing so over the next couple of months.
- Member Holberg asked what the balance of funds will be at the first solicitation.
 - Staff responded that there will be an item at the next meeting which will go into details on what we have collected so far and what we can expect at the time of the next solicitation.
- Member Ulrich asked if there have been problems in the past for smaller communities in applying for projects.
 - Staff replied that to be awarded federal funding, a city must be a state aid city – there are multiple cities in the region which do not have that status and cannot apply.
- Member Jepson stated she supports splitting the funding by category and to use the local categories to be for the active transportation solicitation. It is the most legitimate way to establish separate solicitations. Splitting by funding size gives a false narrative that any projects

over a certain dollar amount are inherently regional and under inherently local, this is not the case.

- Member Hovland stated that he supports option 1 as well, appears to be the clearest way to separate funding sources. He also noted that we can come back after a solicitation to assess and update accordingly.
- Member Karwoski also believes that option 1 is preferred. HE also stated that the timing relationship of the solicitations is going to be a very important factor and needs to be considered moving forward. They should be timed at the same time to ensure efficiency.
- Member Dugan stated he supported option 1 as well.
- Member Thompson stated that Option 1 is a good direction. But not to restrict project eligibility to certain AT project types (local vs. regional). More flexibility is always better for agencies and scoring could be sure to keep the types consistent.
- Chair Johnson noted that as the structure had not been voted on yet, that there would not be a vote to recommend an option but asked the group if there were any objections to direct staff and technical partners to begin to develop solicitation details following dedicating the fund sources by option 1, by application categories. There were no objections.
- Chair Johnson stated that topics which came up in this meeting need to be considered carefully, like how small projects on the regional networks and large projects on local networks are handled and how to encourage smaller communities to apply for project funding.

Staff will move forward with technical partners to begin developing solicitation details for the federal solicitation and active transportation solicitation along the lines of Option 1 in the presentation.