



## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP

### Meeting #16 Notes

October 27, 2025

11:30 AM – 1:00 PM

Virtual Meeting – Microsoft Teams

Members highlighted yellow were in attendance

- Glen Johnson (Chair & TAB Citizen Rep)
- Brian Martinson (Vice Chair & TAB Non-Motorized Rep)
- James Hovland (TAB Chair)
- 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)
- Jim Kosluchar (TAC F&P Chair)
- Marc Brieese (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 Objective Overview
2. Decision Point Topics
  - a) Active Transportation Planning Funding Target
  - b) Geographic Balance Options
3. Review and Discuss Topics
  - a) Active Transportation Solicitation Timing
  - b) Active Transportation Categories Scoring Measures and Criteria
  - c) Looking Ahead – Future Program Considerations
4. Next steps

## Meeting Notes

### Active Transportation Planning Funding Target

Staff presented the considerations for the Planning target.

Member Ulrich asked how the planning funding target works for project selection.

- Staff replied that the target is meant to provide an idea to applicants on what the expected funding amount will be for the project category and to provide final flexibility when selecting projects. The intent is not to provide a specific number to meet and select projects for the sake of meeting a number, but rather to provide a target and if the final funded projects is over or under that target that is ok as long as good projects are selected for funding.

Member Hovland noted that the flexibility is good to be sure good projects get funded.

Chair Johnson stated that Member Ulrichs questions were good to flag what may need additional explanation for when items get to TAB, the funding target topic needs some more background.

Chair Johnson asked if there was great demand beyond the \$2 million target for planning, could there be a second solicitation in 2027 to be sure that all comprehensive planning efforts are covered as possible.

- Staff replied that would be possible if desired or needed.

Chair Johnson stated that should be a topic for the 2026 debrief, to consider any needs for a 2027 solicitation.

**The motion to recommend a \$2 million funding target for the Active Transportation Planning Category was approved on a consensus voice vote.**

### Geographic Balance Options

Staff went over geographic balance options and previous discussions.

Member Holberg stated she thought that any geographic balance options selected for the active transportation solicitation projects should also be done for the federal solicitation. It is important to apply any options consistently. She noted that in the previous solicitation the active transportation funds were used to balance out selected projects and so are linked in the thinking of TAB on this topic. Not sure there should be anything additional done for the options presented, counties will want to see projects and the geographic options don't guarantee a project in any specific part of the region.

Chair Johnson replied that if the two solicitations remain at the same time, we could think of these two at the same time for geographic balance, however if there are conducted at different times in the future, that would be more difficult.

Member Chinitz asked if the nature of the suburban areas, with wider roads and locations more spread out, impacts the amount of projects we see from those areas. Some concern that the suburban communities are not thinking of active transportation as much as the urban communities.

Staff replied that demand in the suburban communities is robust. In the previous solicitations the suburban areas saw the most demand for projects and the need to continue to retrofit suburban areas for more active transportation will mean there will continue to be robust demand from these areas.

Member Ulrich noted that he preferred option 1, but thinks that the naming of the option needs to be changed, choosing the "do nothing" option would not mean nothing is done and the naming should reflect that.

Member Jepson agreed on the naming issues, it should be renamed to better reflect the option. She also noted that if the intent of this program is to be more simple for communities to access funding, applying additional measures onto the funds like a geographic balance requirement may be against the spirit of simplification. She agreed with Chair Johnson that a debrief and analysis of the 2026

solicitation will be needed before understanding if different measures are need for future solicitations. She also confirmed staff response to member Chinitz question about suburban demand and noted that active transportation is broadly defined and there is a lot of need in suburban areas.

Chair Johnson stated that this will be another area that needs to be evaluated after the 2026 solicitation by staff.

Member Holberg noted that she liked option 2 but only if this option were to be applied to all TAB selected projects and not just for active transportation. She doesn't think the Regional Solicitation should be evaluated differently in this regard. If not, then the typical TAB process would be fine to go with.

Member Hovland stated he was leaning toward option 1 for the first solicitation. It is important to be consistent for the first solicitation and evaluate how it goes before making additional layers for project selection.

Member Foster agreed that option 1 for the first solicitation seems the best way to go. The other options force decisions early and not ready to be made. She did like trying to use the new community designations in decision making for the future however and thinks there needs to be more thinking in the future on how to align the Regional Solicitation better with these community designations.

Member Hovland stated that option 2 seems to weigh projects toward the urban areas which already have more robust networks and facilities. He thinks that there is more of a need in the suburban and rural areas where networks might not exist yet or are still being built out. He agrees to go with option 1 and evaluate after the 2026 solicitation.

Member Ulrich responded that generally urban projects will be the most expensive due to limited ROW and existing utilities and so that generally weights project spending to the urban area.

Member Dugan stated that he supported the first option as he thinks the collegiate nature of the TAB and the process to ensure regional balance during project selection serves the region well and he does not think that an additional process is needed for 2026.

**The motion to support the first option, which represents deferring to the existing TAB project selection process which balances regional investments with deliberation and agreement by TAB members with a post selection evaluation was moved by the Chair.**

**Motion approved on a consensus voice vote.**

### **Active Transportation Solicitation Timing**

Staff presented considerations for the future Active Transportation Solicitation ongoing schedule.

Member Jepson stated that she did not think that additional application periods would present much of a burden for staff and does not think that is a con of an annual solicitation.

Member Holberg noted a pro of annual solicitations would be to move TAB funding out for projects more often which would obligate funds and not leave them in the account to be reallocated by the state for other purposes.

Member Jepson stated that she would like to see a recommendation from the technical partners before making any final decision, but her initial thinking was to keep the active transportation solicitation in-line with the federal solicitation as it would allow for more flexibility for applicants.

Chair Johnson asked about the current process with HSIP and the Regional Solicitation as they are done concurrently.

- Staff replied that applicants are allowed to apply for either solicitation but it is more difficult to offset the HSIP solicitation than what would be for the active transportation solicitation as HSIP is also a federal program. The HSIP application window is usually offset a couple of weeks to allow for Staff also noted that a new safety category will also allow for active transportation

projects to apply there as well. Staff noted that they will check in with technical partners for more guidance on the future solicitation timing.

### **Active Transportation Categories Scoring Measures and Criteria**

Staff presented the draft scoring measures and criteria for the active transportation funded categories.

Member Ulrich asked if the community considerations criteria was envisioned to be dealt with in the same way as with federal projects, specifically the project selection guarantee. He said he does not support that provision.

- Staff replied that the intent was that would also apply for active transportation projects but opened for further discussion on this topic from policymakers. The community considerations measure will be further discussed in future meetings.

Member Holberg replied that a lot of discussion needs to still happen before an action is taken. The community considerations should be set aside for right now and discussed later.

Member Holberg asked if parks are also considered under key destinations and why are schools singled out but not parks.

- Staff replied that schools specifically have their own measure to account for the removal of the safe routes to school category and to ensure those types of projects are still competitive in scoring. Technical members and staff wanted to specifically give points to school connections as schools are not typically found in areas with high safety risks or in areas abundant in other destinations.

Member Holberg stated that she thinks parks are another place where many kids congregate and travel to and should be considered to be scored similarly to schools or be included with the school measure and any other facilities where children go (community centers, recreation centers, etc).

Member Hovland replied that Edina does have its own Safe Routes to Parks program which is similar to Safe Routes to School.

Member Hovland asked why is the complete street criteria only 5% of the score if it's a legislative requirement.

- Staff replied that this is because of two reasons. First all scoring measures are designed to meet the legislative requirements, and so some will be scored lower based on a number of factors, so this set up still meets the spirit of the legislation in measuring based on this, but because most communities in the metro (and especially smaller, less well resourced communities) do not have policies. Overweighting this score could make projects from smaller communities less competitive which would go against some of the TAB goals to reach more communities in the region. The measure here, even if weighted less than others, may encourage communities in implementing these policies and practices, but for this time around, keeping the measure small should not block any communities from applying for funding.

Member Hovland stated that as safety is a major priority for TAB it feels under considered in the scoring and community considerations is over considered in scoring. These should change.

Member Ulrich reiterated his opinion on the community considerations measure but will continue that conversation with the Policy Maker Work Group and the full TAB.

Member Holberg asked if there has been the test projects run through the community considerations criteria to understand how they would do in a future solicitation.

- Staff replied that those test had been completed and that results were shared but will be discussed again in the future.

## **Looking Ahead – Future Program Considerations**

Chair Johnson read a list of project types and discussions which the group was not able to get to before the 2026 solicitation but should be considered in a future iteration of this group.

Staff noted that a hold will be placed on members calendar in January in case further discussion on application criteria and measures is needed following the public comment period. The meeting hold will be cancelled if not needed.