



TECHNICAL STEERING COMMITTEE REGIONAL SOLICITATION

June 24, 2025

Steering Committee Attendees:

Paul Oehme, Danny McCullough, Lyssa Leitner, Joe MacPherson, Jillian Linnell, Patrick Boylan, Reuben Collins, Jim Kosluchar, Doran Cote, Chris Hartzell, Gina Mitteco

Other Attendees:

Steve Peterson, Elaine Koutsoukos, Amy Vennewitz, Cole Hiniker, Joe Barbeau, Bethany Brandt-Sargent, Heidi Schallberg, Robbie King, Charles Carlson, Steve Elmer, Abe Olson, Joe Widing, Dave Burns, Jed Hanson, Connor Higgins, Cameron Kolbeck (Met Council), Peter Dugan (Transportation Advisory Board) Molly McCartney (MnDOT), KC Atkins (Hennepin County), Kyle Burrows (Metro Transit), Molly Stewart, Lydia Statz (SRF Consulting Group)

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Hybrid Meeting, Metropolitan Council and Microsoft Teams

May 30 Workshop Recap

Molly Stewart provided a recap of recent project activities, including a recap of the May 30 Special Issue Working Group workshop. During the workshop, six different working groups met concurrently to provide feedback on the project applications, including proposed criteria and measures, eligible project types, proposed project minimum and maximums and scoring. The TDM Special Issue Working Group met virtually on June 17.

Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Category

The group then discussed some potential options for the Arterial Bus Rapid Transit (ABRT) category, which had been developed in the working groups. Proposed options included continuing the current non-competitive process, which provided dedicated funding for Metro Transit's ABRT program, or developing a competitive process which other transit providers can apply for.

Through discussion, the group heard that no other transit providers in the area have projects ready that would be eligible for this category, but that could change in the next few years. The group determined to leave the category as-is for now (non-competitive) but revisit the question for the 2028 solicitation.

Interchanges Category

The group discussed the proposed Interchanges category which is a subcategory under the Congestion Management Strategies category. It was noted that projects that apply under this category would have to be identified as a priority in Met Council's Intersection Mobility and Safety Study. The group discussed that it is important that projects that are awarded funding under this category are ready for construction to minimize funding extensions as it will be difficult to shift the large award amount between funding years. The group agreed with the proposed approach for this category and recommended bringing it to the Policymaker Working Group for input.

Funding Minimums and Maximums

The group reviewed proposed minimums and maximums by project category. Overall, most maximums have increased to keep up with the increasing cost of projects. The group noted that even though project costs are increasing, the overall funding available is not, meaning the program is likely to fund fewer projects overall in the coming years.

The group generally agreed with the amounts shown but recommended decreasing the EV Charging Infrastructure maximum from \$5 million to \$2 million.

The group also discussed a proposal to increase the ABRT project maximum from \$25 million to \$35 million. Kyle Burrows from Metro Transit presented some statistics about the increasing cost of ABRT projects from the start of the program to 2024. The technical steering committee discussed the proposal. Most agreed the reasoning for the increase makes sense, but some were concerned about increasing the total amount going to transit, which would likely remove funding from other categories. The group did not feel comfortable making a recommendation, feeling it should be a policy-level decision.

Geographic Balance

The group then discussed a variety of topics related to geographic balance of the Regional Solicitation program. The first question involved a proposal to make collector roadways eligible for all roadway applications. Previously only principal and minor arterials were eligible for roadway application through solicitation funding. The group had previously made a recommendation to allow collectors to be eligible for the Safety and Bridge Connections application categories.

Member Collins noted that Saint Paul has many collector roads that carry more traffic than arterial streets so was in favor of including collector roadways. The group ultimately decided not to make a recommendation at this meeting and will take up the topic in a future meeting.

Another question centered on whether counties should be eligible for competitive active transportation sales tax funding. The 2023 legislation that creating the funding source provided counties with their own source of sales tax funding for active transportation. Therefore, some have proposed that the solicitation funding should be reserved for cities. After some discussion, the group recommended that counties should be eligible for the funding. It was suggested that maybe TAB could put some guidelines in place to limit the amount of funding that each county receives so that the funding is spread out geographically.

Finally, the group reviewed different methods of ensuring geographic balance for active transportation funding. The group reviewed three potential options, including “do nothing” and review the results of the 2026 cycle; keep maximums low and guarantee a certain number of projects in urban, suburban and rural areas; and split the funding into three geographic buckets based on population. Some in the group liked the idea of splitting the funding into buckets, but ultimately the group did not make a concrete recommendation and felt this was a policymaker decision.

The questions of county eligibility and active transportation geographic balance will also be discussed at a future Active Transportation Work Group meeting and a future Policymaker Working Group meeting.

Next Steps

- Policymaker Working Group Meeting – July 16
- Draft applications for Special Issue Working Groups, Technical Steering Committee, and AT Work Group to review – August
- Technical Steering Committee Meeting – September 4