



ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting #13 Notes

July 25, 2025

1:00 PM – 2:30 PM

Virtual Meeting – Microsoft Teams

AT Work Group members (shaded yellow were present)

- 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)
- Brian Issacson (TAC Vice Chair)
- Michael Thompson (TAC F&P Chair)
- Marc Brieze (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. Introductions and Meeting Objective Overview
2. Review and Discuss
 - a) Local Match Requirements
 - b) Minimum and Maximum Awards for Active Transportation Related Categories
 - c) Funding Availability for 2026 Solicitation
 - d) Program Reserve Considerations
3. Preview Upcoming Topics
 - a) Geographic Balance Options
4. Next steps
 - a) Set up meetings through October

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES

Discussion Item 1: Local match requirements for Active Transportation projects

Staff presented local match considerations, and options for the work group to discuss

Member Karwoski noted that Washington County favors going with option 1 (no local match requirements) or option 3B (20% local match with additional project eligibility).

- Local match is not required by state law, if legislators would have intended there to be one, they would have been explicit in the legislative language.
- Option 1 would not mean no local contribution; locals would still need to maintain new infrastructure and pay for other aspects of the project than construction.
- 3B would be most simple for applicants, the same match requirement but far more flexibility in what a grant award could fund for a project (design, engineering, ROW).

Member Holberg asked if a hybrid option that combined 3B and 2 (lower match than the federal 20%) could be considered?

- Staff indicated that could be an option if the work group wanted to explore that.

Member Holberg stated that if a project is going to be built, a 5% match could be sufficient for local agencies to show ability to get project built and not be overburdensome.

- For planning grants, no match should be required and these be covered by the award amount completely.

Vice Chair Martinson noted that the listed cons for most of the no or low match options seem more hypothetical than real, whereas the pros all seem more concrete and based in past experience. We have room to modify the active transportation solicitation before 2028 as well, depending on how the 2026 solicitation goes. The maintenance requirement is also not an insignificant item and a local agency agreeing to it is in essence committing to future local contributions to any funded project and should be considered when setting local match requirements for these projects.

Chair Johnson followed up to confirm what the previous policy was regarding maintenance on regional solicitation projects and how this would be dealt with for the active transportation solicitation.

- Staff responded that for multiuse trails and bike facilities, the applicant needed to provide policy regarding trail maintenance agreements for routine maintenance and upkeep. For sidewalk projects, policy regarding property owner requirements was sufficient.
- Staff noted that for the active transportation solicitation this expectation would be the same.

Member Xiong stated that she thinks that there does need to be a match for these funds, but that 20% for federal feels too high for the local funds. Concerned on local support for projects (mainly political) and having some sort of match does better to guarantee their participation. She asked if the maintenance requirement is response to issues with maintenance.

- Staff responded that in the case of the active transportation funds, this requirement was laid out in the state law. However, they noted that this requirement was applied to the federal regional solicitation in the past to address ongoing maintenance issues that cropped up without documented agreements in place to guarantee.
- Member Karwoski agreed that a modest match would be appropriate for these funds.

Vice Chair Martinson mentioned a possibility of having a match requirement be conditional on the status or size of a city – one potential would be non-state aid cities (under 5,000 population) not be subject to a local match requirement.

- Member Holberg noted some potential issues with this approach and suggested not to make things too complicated initially as there could be unforeseen issues.
- Technical members noted that at times state-aid cities use state aid funds to cover local match but also use other sources at times when it is most appropriate. Using state aid for match can sometimes have that source compete for other priorities in local communities.
- Member Karwoski replied that while the idea should be something we look at in the future if we find smaller communities not applying or having difficulty meeting a match, it may overly complicate the solicitation for the first round. Something to come back on after results from the first solicitation.

Member Karwoski stated that to ensure local communities commit to building and maintaining projects outside of match could be to have local resolutions in support of the projects before applications.

- Staff replied that is currently required for RS projects and will be a requirement for applicants to the active transportation funds as well.

Members asked how park districts could supply a local match if not MSA or local property taxes?

- Staff responded that typically Parks dept. pay for local match with other sources of funds they receive though other sources – met council, federal, state or other sources.

Vice Chair Martinson noted that we could limit any potential issues of application volume if no match requirements by limiting the number of applications a single agency could submit to ensure more agencies can be competitive for funding.

The group generally agreed that some match should be required and that to support local agencies that more aspects of a project should be considered to be eligible for grant funding. The group directed staff to narrow options for a recommendation at the August meeting.

Discussion Item 2: Minimum and maximum award amounts for active transportation funded project categories

Member Karwoski stated that projects on the regional network may not always be more expensive and that local projects may prove to be more expensive. Limiting the local category maximum to less than regional could be an issue if this is the case. Thinks that the maxes should be the same for each category.

- Staff responded to this that while the regional category would be limited to projects found on regional networks (RBTN, Regional Trails, Regional Bike Barriers), the local category would not have similar qualifying criteria and so projects which would be on an RBTN alignment may still apply to the local category, but would not get additional points for regional priority.

Chair Johnson noted that for most other categories there is not such an overlap as with the regional/local bike categories. Having some differentiation is good and that the smaller max on the local category would go towards funding more projects per solicitation and help regional balance considerations.

Vice Chair Martinson noted a conversation at the Policymaker Workgroup on the impact of inflation on project costs. He stated that inflation is just as big of an impact on pedestrian and bike infrastructure projects as it is for larger roadway or bridge projects. He thinks that is appropriate for some categories to raise their maximum award in response to this.

Generally, the group felt ok with the proposed minimum and maximum awards for the infrastructure related projects.

The group discussed the option for the planning category to be either a direct contractor administered by the council in support of selected local planning efforts or awarded funds to allow local communities to procure and administer planning contracts themselves.

Members asked if the Active Transportation funds could be used to hire a staff member to administer this if the group decided to recommend this approach (Council managed contract)?

- Staff noted that these funds allow up to 10% of them to be spent on staff time or other administrative needs. Staff has not used these funds for this purpose as of now, but the option would be available if this was the route that the TAB wanted to go.

Members agreed this should be something worth exploring further. Doing it this way would allow for greater input in the planning process to ensure plans meet the goals of the TAB and active transportation funding legislation.

Technical members stated that they have experience working with this model with MnDOT on Safe Routes to School projects and other planning projects and have had good experiences with it, administrative burden is lowered.

A concern of this model is that local communities do not get to pick their own consultant who may have a better working relationship with and a centrally administered contract may not have as much local or institutional knowledge with any one local community.

Member Holberg stated that we would not need to completely replicate the MnDOT model, but use it to build something that works for the region. There could be value to aid very small communities that may not be able to administer their own contract.

Minimum and maximum awards will come back to the group in August for a recommendation.

Discussion Item 3: Funding availability for 2026 Solicitation / program reserves

The group previewed this item for further discussion in August.