



ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting #11 Notes

March 14, 2024

11:00 AM – 12:30 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. New Member Introduction (Glen Johnson, Chair)
2. Active Transportation Work Recap and Grant Program Update (Glen Johnson, Chair)
3. What We've Learned: Recap of Feedback Since December 2024 (Joe Widing)
4. Discussion Item: Active Transportation's Role in the Regional Solicitation Structure (Joe Widing)
 - a) Safety Categories
 - b) Bicycle and Pedestrian Categories
 1. Potential non-infrastructure project types
5. Recommendation on Active Transportation Categories for the Proposed Structure
6. Next steps

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP MEETING 11 NOTES

Member Ulrich noted that the question of which source of funding should be used for different project types is interrelated with other more detailed questions. He also noted that there could be some inconsistencies in priorities. These details will be worked out in later meetings.

Member Karwoski stated that the active transportation funding could be used to aid local governments in paying for match requirements of projects, filling in trail gaps and that partnerships on local projects is important to consider.

TAC Chair MacPherson followed up by noting that Anoka County is focusing its efforts with new county spending on filling in gaps in the trail network.

Member Holberg stated that Dakota County has prepared an analysis of their cost share policy (with local governments on county projects) and can share with the group.

Member Karwoski stated that he does not think there needs to be a dedicated category to safe routes to school infrastructure.

Member Jepson agreed and noted having a category for SRTS could be confusing due to terminology. She did not want to see a dedicated category for SRTS infrastructure projects. She also asked how the application process for the two funding sources would be handled? Could applicants apply for both sources of funding or be forced to choose? This question will be considered at a later stage.

Technical members noted that a majority of schools do not have SRTS plans in place right now and that they would not be eligible for the SRTS category in previous solicitations (where a SRTS plan is required for eligibility). In Washington County less than half the schools have a plan in place.

Member Holberg stated that she thinks funding should be available for trails or other active transportation elements of larger roadway projects. Something which will be discussed at later points in the evaluation.

Member Foster stated that she likes the non-infrastructure category and including potential uses in this category like quick build projects is a really good idea. This would help to make quicker changes and show community what future projects will construct.

Member Hovland stated that many cities cannot afford to create dedicated plans for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and that the non-infrastructure category would be a great way to address this need. Really good to include this category to support project implementation.

Member Hovland noted that the non-infrastructure category could also support SRTS planning in the region and that could mean we do not need a specific category for it. He also stated he supports adding a non-infrastructure category.

Member Ulrich supports including a non-infrastructure category but notes there will need to be decisions made on funding caps for the category and for awarded projects.

Member Foster supports non-infrastructure category and also supports considering SRTS for a separate category.

Member Holberg stated that we could include points for SRTS in other categories and it does not need to be a separate category. She said she would like to learn more about SRTS before saying it needs its own category. Ok with the non-infrastructure category being included.

Member Karwoski stated he thinks SRTS should be criteria in other categories, no need for a separate category.

Member Jepson said she supports the non-infrastructure category's inclusion in the structure.

Member Holberg said that we should also consider if we choose to fund the same items in a statewide program the net effect may be that the metro investment will supplant state funds.

The group supported recommending the inclusion of an active transportation non-infrastructure category into the Regional Solicitation structure.