



POLICYMAKER WORKING GROUP REGIONAL SOLICITATION

October 15, 2025

Working Group Attendees:

James Hovland; Deb Barber; Glen Johnson; Peter Dugan; Khani Sahebjam; Debbie Goettel; Mary Liz Holberg; Brian Martinson; Victor Lake; Toni Carter; Anjuli Cameron; Jon Ulrich; Julie Jeppson

Other Attendees:

Steve Peterson, Elaine Koutsoukos, Charles Carlson, Joe Barbeau, Cole Hiniker, Joe Widing, Wendy Duren, Bethany Brandt-Sargent, Robbie King (Met Council); Molly Stewart, Lydia Statz (SRF Consulting Group); Lyssa Leitner (Washington County); Molly McCartney (MnDOT); Carla Stueve (Hennepin County); Paul Oehme (City of Lakeville), Joe MacPherson (Anoka County)

10:00 AM – 11:30 PM

390 Robert St N St Paul, MN 55101; Conference Room 1A

Project Recap

Steve Peterson and Molly Stewart opened the meeting by providing a brief recap of the September meeting and noted that today we are seeking input to clarify two decision points made at that meeting: the Arterial Bus Rapid Transit funding minimum, and a potential funding priority for high-scoring Community Considerations projects.

In discussion about the Arterial Bus Rapid Transit minimum, Member Ulrich inquired about the \$75 million cost of the B Line and its funding sources. Charles Carlson explained that funding came from various competitive applications, with the bulk from state appropriations, and clarified that the intent of the minimum was that TAB would retain funding flexibility within the transit category.

Steve Peterson noted that the transit new market guarantee remains in place, ensuring at least one suburban project will be funded. Member Ulrich raised concerns about previously funded lower-quality projects and suggested implementing a score minimum.

Elaine Koutsoukos clarified that fewer transit projects are submitted due to the limited number of providers and the fact that most providers will typically submit their most competitive projects.

Overall, the group expressed comfort with maintaining flexibility and allowing TAB to determine maximums.

Community Considerations Scoring

The group discussed the Community Considerations scoring measures which is currently set at 20 percent across all applications, with a funding guarantee for projects scoring high in all three measures.

Lyssa Leitner (a member of the Community Considerations working group) clarified that the first proposed measure focuses on understanding the surrounding community, not on scoring projects based on the specific populations in the area.

Group members then expressed a wide variety of views on the proposed criteria:

- Member Holberg questioned the 20 percent allocation, advocating for Safety to have the highest weight.
- Member Jeppson felt 20 percent was excessive but acknowledged the importance of the work.
- Member Martinson defended the proposed weighting, emphasizing the need for thorough community consultation.
- Member Sahebjam asked for a clearer definition of "community," which Lyssa Leitner defined as those living, working, or accessing the project area.
- Member Carter stressed the importance of measuring community engagement to ensure it happens.
- Member Cameron highlighted the difficulty of scoring inclusively and the need for clear expectations.
- Member Johnson supported the criteria but questioned whether engagement should occur at a higher level.
- Member Jeppson found the criteria too subjective.
- Member Martinson emphasized the need for training in qualitative scoring.
- Member Ulrich expressed concern about perceived harms being used to gain points.
- Member Lake argued that engagement should be foundational but felt the current criteria complicate decision-making.
- Member Cameron reiterated the importance of recognizing diverse forms of engagement and stakeholder input.
- Member Jonson suggested creating example responses to illustrate scoring levels.

The group decided to continue discussion of the Community Considerations criteria at the next meeting in November.

Project Selection Timeline

Steve Peterson asked the group for an opinion on whether the goal should be to have project selection completed by the end of 2026. Given the likelihood of new TAB members joining in early 2027, the group agreed that project selection should be completed by the end of 2026.

Active Transportation Local Match

The group then discussed proposed options for the sales tax funded active transportation categories. The Active Transportation Working Group proposed either requiring no local match, or a reduced local match for projects submitted in these categories.

Member Goettel supported removing local match requirements due to local budget constraints. Member Johnson emphasized that eliminating the match lowers barriers for smaller cities. Member Jeppson strongly supported the change, citing inclusivity and reduced complexity.

The group recommended a zero local match on regional sales tax funded projects.

TPP Goal Area Alignment

The group then reviewed a set of slides showing how the criteria for each application align with Transportation Policy Plan goals.

In the discussion, Member Martinson advocated for including Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction and anticipated long-term delay reduction in roadway project scoring. Following the meeting, Member Martinson provided some additional information on capturing anticipated delay reduction for projects.

Member Jeppson asked about Green House Gas (GHG) mitigation procedures, and Molly Stewart explained that these are better addressed at the programmatic level. Member McCartney noted that relevant laws are still evolving and lack clear guidance. Steve Peterson noted that Met Council and MnDOT are currently discussing how to implement the GHG statute.

Performance Measures

The group then reviewed a proposed set of performance measures associated with the applications. Member Holberg questioned whether population growth is factored into VMT metrics and called for clarification. Member Holberg also suggested tracking the success of similar past projects.

Additional detail and clarification of the performance measures will be provided at the next meeting.

Next Steps

The next meeting will include more information on performance metrics, allow for further discussion of the community considerations criteria, and provide an update on the application review process. The draft application materials were made available to policymakers on October 23.

The next Policymaker Working Group meeting is scheduled for November 19.