Minutes

TAC Planning Committee



Meeting date: October 9, 2025 **Time**: 1:00 PM **Location:** Virtual Members present: ☐ MAC – Bridget Rief Koutsoukos ☐ Brooklyn Park – Marc Culver □ Carver Co – Drew Pflaumer Dahlheimer, alternate for Sara □ Chanhassen – Charlie Howley Allen □ Ramsey Co – Kevin Development – Patrick Boylan Roggenbuck ☐ FHWA – Scott Mareck (ex-Council MTS - Dave Burns St. Paul − Anton Jerve officio) □ Dakota Co – Scott Peters Scott Co - Craig Jenson \boxtimes = present, E = excused Suburban Transit Assoc − Sunita Kasichhwa

Dakota Land, Water, and People Acknowledgment

The Metropolitan Council acknowledges that the land we currently call Minnesota and specifically the seven-county region is the ancestral homeland of the Dakota Oyate who are present and active contributors to our thriving region. As part of the Metropolitan Council's commitment to address the unresolved legacy of genocide, dispossession, and settler colonialism and the fact that government institutions, including the Metropolitan Council, benefitted economically, politically, and institutionally after the forceable removal of the Dakota Oyate, the Metropolitan Council is dedicated to instilling Land, Water, and People Commitments in regional policy. These commitments support the Dakota Oyate, the eleven federally recognized Tribes in Minnesota, Ho-Chunk Nation, and the American Indian Communities representing over 150 diverse Tribal Nations that call the seven-county region home.

Call to order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Mitteco, Minnesota Department of Transportation, called the regular meeting of the TAC Planning Committee to order at 1:01 p.m.

Agenda approved

Committee members did not have any comments or changes to the agenda.

Approval of minutes

It was moved by Patrick Boylan, Community Development, and seconded by Drew Pflaumer, Carver County, to approve the minutes of the September 11, 2025, regular meeting of the TAC Planning Committee. **Motion carried.**

Public comment on committee business

There were no public comments.

Business

1. **2025-37**: Recommendation of Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) and Regional Bicycle Barrier map changes and related actions (Steve Elmer, MTS Planning)

Steve Elmer, MTS Planning, presented the item.

Scott Peters, Dakota County, asked for clarification about the removal of a corridor in Inver Grove Heights. Steve Elmer answered that corridor, County State Aid Highway 28, is being replaced with a designated alignment and further new alignments are added at the ends of this alignment.

It was moved by Drew Pflaumer, seconded by Patrick Boylan, that the TAC Planning recommend that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommend to the Transportation Advisory Board to release the updated Regional Bicycle Barriers and RBTN maps for public comment as part of the 2026 Regional Solicitation. **Motion carried.**

Information

1. Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Metro District Freight Plan Update (Gina Mitteco, Mackenzie Turner-Bargen, and Jack Johansen, MnDOT Metro District)

Mackenzie Turner-Bargen and Jack Johansen presented the item. Turner-Bargen informed the committee that the draft plan would be available for public comment through October 19, 2025.

Kevin Roggenbuck, Ramsey County, asked if the plan identifies needs specific to modes, specifically rail crossing safety. Turner-Bargen said the needs identified based on the plan's scoring methodology are largely highway segments, and that they would follow-up after checking.

Innocent Eyoh, MPCA, asked what major factors were found during the plan, such as safety or economic development. Turner-Bargen said the plan was focused on state highway system safety and mobility, including factors that would limit mobility, like pavement and bridge condition. Eyoh clarified interest in how the plan considers moving products throughout the state or throughout the metro area, and how economic development may affect system expansion. Johansen said the plan considers how multimodal freight can improve efficiency.

2. Federal Roadway Safety Performance Targets (Jed Hanson, MTS Planning)
Jed Hanson, MTS Planning, presented the item.

Maddie Dahlheimer, Washington County, asked if there are any ramifications to the region or agencies for not meeting targets. Hanson said there are not ramifications for not meeting regional targets other than the safety outcomes themselves, though statewide targets can affect how state DOTs allocate Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds. Hanson said the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) prefers targets that are achievable; our region has historically set aspirational targets and provided some history on target setting.

Chair Mitteco asked how the state performance measures affect HSIP allocations. Hanson said he did not know the answer; Boylan said he was also interested in this question.

Chair Mitteco asked if staff were coordinating with MnDOT's Office of Traffic Engineering. Hanson said yes, and detailed some other stakeholders these targets would be screened with.

Scott Peters, Dakota County, asked if the actual performance remains higher than the adopted target, if the region should consider holding flat until that gap narrows. Chair Mitteco referenced previous committee discussions that considered flat or increasing targets, and described the debate between targets closer to actual performance or towards zero death messages.

Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator, and Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, referenced the previous question on HSIP allocation and answered that state DOTs not meeting their targets face more specific HSIP requirements.

Charlie Howley, City of Chanhassen, stated preference for Option B targets and noted the different nature of safety performance measures that discuss death and the message that can send.

Chair Mitteco asked Hanson to clarify the action requested of the committee between this meeting and next meeting. Hanson asked committee members to review the content, send comments, and discuss the content with any Transportation Advisory Board members they may staff.

3. Regional Solicitation Update (Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, and Molly Stewart, SRF Consulting)

Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, and Molly Stewart, SRF Consulting, presented the item. Committee members did not offer comments.

4. Active Transportation Solicitation Update (Joe Widing, MTS Planning)

Joe Widing, MTS Planning, presented the item.

Maddie Dahlheimer, Washington County, said from an application perspective she did not feel if it mattered if the Regional Solicitation and Active Transportation were solicited together or separate, but from a scoring perspective there may be a staffing challenge finding scorers depending on application volume. Widing acknowledged the comment and indicated this next year will have learning opportunities.

Chair Mitteco suggested an annual solicitation could offer more responsive opportunities to fund projects, particularly planning projects, that miss funding one year. Drew Pflaumer, Carver County, offered a comparative example from Massachusetts DOT. Widing acknowledged some features of the Massachusetts program.

Drew Pflaumer said the RBTN may require more frequent revisions with an annual solicitation. Widing clarified that the RBTN is not a scoring criteria for the local funds; those facilities are still eligible, but that priority is reflected in the Regional Solicitation bicycle facilities category.

Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator, said with an annual solicitation, the amount of funding and therefore amount of projects would be half of a biennial solicitation. Koutsoukos asked if applicants would have to consider the effort of applying multiple years. Widing acknowledged this consideration. Mitteco, Widing, and Koutsoukos discussed previous years' Regional Solicitation trails application volume and funding amounts.

Widing prompted conversation on geographic balance considerations. Maddie Dahlheimer offered suggestions on the geographic buckets option, how those relate to the minimum or maximum awards, and suggested adjustments to ensure at least 2 projects in each of the geographic buckets and then base on percentages. Widing acknowledged the issue of low population percentage for the rural designated areas.

Widing clarified that the "do nothing" option is to continue to use the Transportation Advisory Board's typical deliberative project, and not literally "do nothing."

Other business

There were no other business items.

Adjournment

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 2:51 p.m.

Council contact:

Jed Hanson, Senior Planner

<u>Jed.Hanson@metc.state.mn.us</u>
651-602-1716