



ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting #6 Notes

June 27, 2024

3:00 PM – 4:30 PM

Virtual Meeting – Microsoft Teams

Working Group Members

- 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)
- Alexander Ask (TAB, Non-Motorized Rep Alternate)
- Jeni Hager (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)

1. Meeting 5 recap and debrief TAB meeting feedback

2. 2025 Active Transportation Solicitation

Member Hovland commented on the goals and values for the active transportation funding and noted that it should state that the application be simplified and not just “simple”. Member Hovland also commented on grammar and stated he will send further comments via email.

Member Hovland asked about where the first value for the active transportation came from?

Vice Chair Martinson stated that we are trying to state what we believe the initial idea from the state legislature from when they approved the new funding. This funding is not intended solely for recreational travel – it is to help people in the region get around their communities via active means and how we can meaningfully shift people out of personal vehicles for certain trips to meet the VMT and GHG reduction goals for the state, which will require greater reductions in the metro area.

- Member Hovland replied that it would be a good idea to get language more specific for this purpose and eliminate ambiguity.

Member Holberg noted that the greenway system in Dakota County serves both a recreational and transportation purpose and that trails should be considered for the AT funding. She also stated that there needs to be some sort of match requirement. She will provide more feedback in the future.

Chair Johnson noted that this list is early draft and will continue to be updated with feedback.

Staff presented the 2025 Solicitation potential timeline, pros and cons and needed items to figure out before a solicitation can be issued by 2025.

Chair Johnson stated that due to the amount of things that would need to be done before a solicitation would be ok to release for 2025 that meetings would need to be at least monthly if not more frequently.

Member Holberg stated that she is not interested in a 2025 solicitation given the other pressing needs to be figured out for both the 2024 pilot and building a lasting solicitation.

- Member Hovland stated he agreed with Member Holberg. Need to take our time to get this right.

Member Jepson agreed, she stated she is not in favor of a 2025 solicitation and that it would a disservice to staff time to try to juggle so many priorities simultaneously. Staff at the local level are already overwhelmed as well and would not have time for a 2025 solicitation either. Lets just get this right. Member Jepson moved the motion to not hold a 2025 Active Transportation Solicitation.

Member Hovland asked about the impact on staff to create a 2025 solicitation while also reviewing and updating the 2026 solicitation at the same time. Would be a time issue if all going on at the same time.

Member Dugan stated that he is concerned with potential impact on staff and has interest in learning more on the 2024 projects before making more funding available for a 2025 solicitation.

Chair Glen added that as the feedback received thus far has been universal by the work group, that a voice vote would be held on the motion. The recommendation will be presented in an update to TAC and an information item to TAB.

Motion Voted on: To not hold a 2025 Solicitation for Active Transportation projects with AT Sales Tax Revenue.

Voice vote held, all voted in favor of motion to not hold a 2025 solicitation.

3. Revisit 2024 Regional Solicitation active transportation funding projects

Staff presented on an updated 2024 Regional Solicitation scenario which could add up to \$3 million for active transportation projects from the AT funding source.

Chair Johnson asked what proportion of the new scenario funding would come from the AT regional funding and what would come from overprogramming.

- Steve Peterson responded that the bulk of the additional funding would come from overprogramming – about \$15M in overprogramming compared to \$3M in AT regional sales tax.

Member Hovland asked if funding from AT sales tax was raised from \$15M to \$19M would there be enough funding available?

- Steve Peterson responded that yes there is expected to be enough funding, funding already accruing and expecting to have at least \$20M available by the end of this year. Also since these projects would not begin until future years, the funding availability would not be impacted by the small increase.

Member Holberg asked if the new hybrid scenario funds all projects from the other scenarios.

- Steve Peterson responded that they do.

Member Dugan stated that he was pleased to see that all the SRTS projects would be funded under the hybrid scenario and that they would be funded with local funding and not federal funding. These are small projects which should avoid the added complications of federal funding.

Member Jepson noted that she is on the fence of adding additional funding. She thinks that this new source of funding is very special and that again, applicants were not aware this funding would be available for 2024 projects, if Anoka County had known about this, they may have applied for additional projects.

Chair Johnson responded that he agrees that this funding is special and should not be thought of as just another source for TAB to draw from for RS.

Steve Peterson stated that we will have more time to discuss this at the TAB meeting on the 17th, but that this will be an action item at the next TAB meeting. This is the final time to discuss this in the AT WG.

Member Hovland stated that he is sensitive to what Member Jepson said, but thinks that this is a chance to add some more funding for specific important projects today and this is an opportunity that we have not had in the past.

Chair Johnson asked for a motion on the updated 2024 RS funding motion.

Member Hovland moved the motion to approve and member Holberg seconded. All voted in favor of increasing the 2024 Regional Solicitation Active Transportation funding up to \$19M.

Updated motion:

- To distribute up to \$19 million in regional sales tax funds for Regional Solicitation Active Transportation projects.
- To select at least one project from each active transportation category in the Regional Solicitation (Multiuse Trails, Pedestrian and Safe Routes to School).
- To select from smaller projects which requested less than \$2 million funding.
- To select from projects which can begin their projects early, either in 2025 or 2026. Projects must award a construction contract by the end of 2026.
- To select projects that can meet the additional legislative requirements.
- That the highest scoring Regional Solicitation applications will receive priority for Active Transportation funding.
- That selected projects will be required to still meet the 20% local match for Regional Solicitation projects.
- That selected projects provide a geographic balance in the region.

4. Grant management overview

Staff presented on considerations that the Work Group will need to make a decision on for administering grant funds through the 2024 RS project pilot.

Member Hovland added that he thinks if projects cannot keep to a schedule that there should be some sort of penalty to that.

Member Hager stated that at the moment we do not yet have administration requirements to these pilot project funds. We need to remember that the more requirements we put on the funds the more work we put on smaller agencies.

Chair Johnson stated that we need to get oriented in what are the requirements that other agencies are applying to funds so that we may be informed when decisions are made.

Member Holberg said that there needs to be some flexibility when it comes to project year requirements.

5. Next steps