

# Minutes

## TAB Technical Advisory Committee



**Meeting date:** November 5, 2025

**Time:** 9:00 AM

**Location:** Council Chambers

### Members present:

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anoka Co – Joe MacPherson (Chair)</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carver Co – Lyndon Robjent</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dakota Co – Joe Morneau</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ramsey Co – Brian Isaacson</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hennepin Co – Chad Ellos</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott Co – Adam Jessen</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Washington Co – Lyssa Leitner</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Extended Urban Area – Chad Hausmann</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council MTS – Steve Peterson</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council CD – Patrick Boylan</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAB – Elaine Koutsoukos</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brooklyn Park – Marc Culver</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Chanhassen – Charlie Howley</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eagan – Russ Matthys</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eden Prairie – Carter Schultze</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fridley – Jim Kosluchar</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lakeville – Paul Oehme</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Plymouth – Michael Thompson</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Woodbury – Chris Hartzell</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minneapolis Engineering – Jenifer Hager</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Minneapolis Planning – Kathleen Mayell</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Saint Paul Engineering – Nick Peterson</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Saint Paul Planning – Reuben Collins</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MnDOT – Molly McCartney (Vice Chair)</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MPCA – Innocent Eyoh</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAC – Bridget Rief</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> STA – Matt Fyten</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Metro Transit – Adam Harrington</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Freight – Shelly Meyer</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DEED – Colleen Eddy</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> MnDNR – Nancy Spooner-Walsh</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bicycle – Kyle Sobota</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian – Mackenzie Turner Bargaen</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> FHWA – Scott Mareck (ex-officio)</li></ul> |
|---|--|--|
- ☒ = present, E = excused

### 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 MacPherson called the regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee to order at 9:00 a.m.

### Agenda approved

It was moved by Brian Isaacson, Ramsey County, and seconded by Nick Peterson, Saint Paul Engineering, to approve the agenda as presented. **Motion carried.**

### Approval of minutes

It was moved by Isaacson, and seconded by Molly McCartney, MnDOT, to approve the minutes of October 1st, 2025, regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee. **Motion carried.**

## Public comment on committee business

### TAB Report

Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator, reported on the October 15th, 2025, regular meeting of the Transportation Advisory Board.

### Business – Committee reports

#### ***Executive Committee (Joe MacPherson, Chair)***

Chair MacPherson reported that the TAC Executive Committee met and discussed agenda items along with tentatively meeting in-person in December due to the number of Regional Solicitation items on the horizon.

1. **2025-38:** 2026-2029 Streamlined TIP Amendment: Southwest Transit Station Rehabilitation

Robbie King, MTS Planning, presented.

It was moved by McCartney, and seconded by Paul Oehme, Lakeville, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2026-2029 TIP to add Southwest Transit's Southwest Transit Station Rehabilitation Project. **Motion carried.**

2. **2025-39:** 2026-2029 Streamlined TIP Amendment: Two Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Cost Increases

Robbie King, MTS Planning, presented.

It was moved by Mackenzie Turner Borgen, Pedestrian Member, and seconded by Jim Kosluchar, Fridley, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program to adjust the scope of Minneapolis' 21st Avenue South bicycle and pedestrian project and to adjust the scope and cost of Saint Paul's Payne Avenue bicycle and pedestrian project. **Motion carried.**

3. **2025-40:** 2026-2029 Streamlined TIP Amendment: Three MnDOT Project Adjustments

Robbie King, MTS Planning, presented.

It was moved by Patrick Boylan, Met Council Community Development, and seconded by Lyssa Leitner, Washington County, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board recommend adoption of an amendment to the 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program to make the following adjustments to MnDOT sponsored projects:

- Snelling Avenue mill and overlay from Highway 36 in Roseville to Grey Fox Road in Arden Hills; minor terminus change, addition of trail and RTMC, and cost increase
- Cedar Avenue unbonded concrete overlay from 138th Street/Highway 23 to Dakota/Hennepin County line in Apple Valley; cost increase and addition of ramps, loops, and RTMC
- US Highway 169 concrete pavement repair from .48 miles north of 85th Avenue North to 101st Avenue in Brooklyn Park and Osseo; reduction in project length, replacement of concrete pavement rehabilitation with bituminous pavement rehabilitation, and additional of guardrail replacement

**Motion carried.**

#### ***TAC Bicycle-Pedestrian Planning Technical Working Group (Steve Elmer, MTS Planning)***

Steve Elmer, MTS Planning, reported on October 22nd, 2025, regular meeting of the Bicycle-Pedestrian Technical Working Group.



### ***Planning Committee (Gina Mitteco, Chair)***

Chair Mitteco reported on the October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2025, regular meeting of the TAC Planning Committee.

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

Chair Mitteco presented.

It was moved by Chris Hartzell, Woodbury, and seconded by Innocent Eyoh, MPCA, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board release the updated Regional Bicycle Barriers and RBTN maps for public comment as part of the 2026 Regional Solicitation.

**Motion carried.**

### ***Funding and Programming Committee (Jim Kosluchar, Chair)***

Chair Kosluchar reported on the October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025, regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming committee.

1. **2025-30:** Scope Change Request: Carver County CSAH 40 HSIP Project

Robbie King, MTS Planning, and Lyndon Robjent, Carver County, presented.

Leitner suggested sharing any changes to the safety elements with TAB.

It was moved by Leitner, and seconded by Mark Culver, Brooklyn Park, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board approve Carver County's scope change request to reduce the length of its CSAH 40 improvement project and retain full federal funding. **Motion carried.**

2. **2025-31:** 2026 Regional Solicitation Federal Funding Application Categories

Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, presented.

Leitner stated that there had been considerable discussion within the Policy Working Group about Community Considerations. She asked what the process would be if that group recommended a different structure immediately before the TAB meeting. She questioned whether changes proposed by the Policymaker Working Group would go directly to TAB or return to the Funding and Programming Committee first. Steve Peterson responded that if the Policymaker Working Group proposed a substantial change, such as creating a new application category, staff would not have the structure, measures, or minimum requirements prepared. He stated that such a change would have to be sent back through the committees and would likely delay the process by several months.

Chair MacPherson added that he and Leitner both served on the Special Interest Working Group, where the question of whether community considerations should be a separate funding category or a measure within each application was discussed early in the process. He stated that the group decided to incorporate community considerations into every application.

Isaacson asked about the purpose of the Policymaker Working Group meeting, given the minimal time between that meeting and TAB. Steve Peterson explained that any resulting recommendations would flow through the committees beginning about a month later and added that the Policymaker Working Group is not designed to review or prepare for same-day action items. He clarified that it functions more like a policy discussion body, focusing on topics TAB will see approximately one month later. He stated that the two main topics for the November 19 meeting are community considerations and the scoring structure. Chair MacPherson added that at the last TAB meeting, earlier agenda items ran long, which prevented presentation of the Policymaker Working Group materials. He stated that the items before the committee today would therefore be new information for many TAB members when they vote on them later this month.

Isaacson asked for confirmation that TAB would be voting this month on the items being advanced by the committee. Chair MacPherson confirmed that was correct.



Robjent asked whether the current discussion applied only to federal projects, and not to local trails. Chair MacPherson confirmed that the current item covered federal projects only.

It was moved by McCartney, and seconded by Robjent, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board approve the following federal funding categories to be used for the 2026 Regional Solicitation:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Proactive Safety                             | 9. New Interchanges   |
| 2. Reactive Safety                              | 10. Bridge Connections  |
| 3. Regional Bike Facilities                     | 11. Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure  |
| 4. Transit Expansion                            | 12. Travel Demand Management (TDM) Base funding (non-competitive) Competitive funding |
| 5. Transit Customer Experience                  | 13. Regional Modeling/Travel Behavior Inventory (non-competitive)                     |
| 6. Arterial Bus Rapid Transit (non-competitive) |   |
| 7. Roadway Modernization                        |   |
| 8. Congestion Management Strategies             |   |

**Motion carried.**

3. **2025-32: 2026 Active Transportation Solicitation Funding Application**

Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, presented.

It was moved by Issacson, and seconded by Robjent, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board approve the funding categories to be used for the 2026 Active Transportation Solicitation:

1. Local Bike Facilities
2. Local Pedestrian Facilities
3. Active Transportation Planning

**Motion carried.**

4. **2025-33: 2026 Regional Solicitation Minimum and Maximum Federal Awards**

Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, presented.

Issacson stated that if there is no expressed Arterial Bus Rapid Transit (Arterial BRT) maximum award, the implication is that the award could rise as high as the total federal availability. He recommended that policymakers clarify explicitly whether this is the intent.

Matt Fyten, STA, sought clarification about intent, asking whether all competitive projects would be funded before money is shifted to arterial BRT, regardless of score. Steve Peterson responded that out of the \$250 million total, transit would be targeted at \$60 million and that the Policy Working Group discussed whether funds should shift to arterial BRT only if insufficient applications exist, or whether more flexibility should be allowed for reallocation. He recommended specifying this explicitly in a footnote, outlining when and how shifts to arterial BRT may occur.

Leitner explained that Washington County supports ensuring all other transit projects are funded before allocating funds to arterial BRT. She objected to decisions being made based on arbitrary scoring differences, warning that this could set a precedent for reallocating across categories without policy backing. She also questioned why additional funds would default to arterial BRT rather than other transit projects.

Koutsoukos observed that arterial BRT may not belong in this motion, as the item concerns minimum and maximum amounts applicants can request. She suggested moving the arterial BRT discussions to the funding targets motion instead.

Adam Harrington, Metro Transit, commented that the lack of minimum scoring thresholds is a broader policy issue. He said some projects may appear beneficial to applicants but offer less regional impact. He clarified that the \$60 million cap applies only to the transit portion, not the entire \$250 million. Koutsoukos noted that \$60 million represents a target as opposed to a maximum.

Issacson noted policymakers retain discretion to adjust allocations. He recommended setting clearer boundaries by specifying both minimum and maximum amounts to reduce confusion and establish a reasonable framework.

Leitner expressed that any minimum score for funding should be across all categories. She expressed concern that transit and bike-pedestrian projects receive disproportionate scrutiny compared to roadway projects.

Chair MacPherson proposed moving the \$30 million figure into the “maximum” column and adding an asterisk to indicate that additional funds could go to arterial BRT if other transit categories are not fully funded.

Fyten suggested adding language to prioritize competitive projects before shifting funds to non-competitive categories. Leitner agreed but reiterated the need for clarity on how such flexibility applies across categories.

It was moved by Leitner, and seconded by Isaacson, to recommend approval as presented with the exception of moving the arterial BRT \$30 million from minimum to maximum with an asterisk denoting that additional funds can go to non-competitive categories after targets are met in all the other categories.

Koutsoukos clarified that funding targets are not meant to prescribe exact amounts. Leitner agreed and suggested amending her motion to say, “...the intent of the targets is achieved...” to clarify flexibility.

Robjent asked whether the asterisk would apply to all categories or only to arterial BRT. Chair MacPherson confirmed it applied only to arterial BRT. Leitner clarified that the asterisk should be on the \$30 million in the “maximum” column, specifying that additional funds could go to arterial BRT if transit targets are not fully met.

Issacson noted that because arterial BRT is non-competitive, the key issue is defining what amount is available at the outset, so all applicants understand potential funding levels.

Jenifer Hager, Minneapolis Engineering, asked for clarity on whether the motion referred to all categories or only transit. She supported applying it to transit categories but not to other modal categories. Leitner clarified that her intent was to ensure that all modal categories meet their funding targets before shifting any funds to arterial BRT out of concern about TAB reallocating money arbitrarily across modes.

Harrington recommended simplifying by listing arterial BRT separately at \$30 million with an asterisk stating that if funding remains within the transit category, TAB may allocate additional funds to arterial BRT.

Koutsoukos advised considering the order of motions, suggesting TAB adopt funding targets before acting on this item.

Issacson proposed clarifying that the arterial BRT maximum is contained within the 24% transit funding target. Harrington supported showing arterial BRT as a \$30 million line item on the funding grid with an explanatory note. Steve Peterson stated that the confusion arose because a non-competitive category (arterial BRT) was merged into a table meant for competitive categories. He agreed that separating it would make the structure clearer.

Leitner proposed creating a separate motion stating that all other transit projects must be funded before any additional funds are awarded to arterial BRT, keeping the process transparent.

Koutsoukos suggested creating two motions—one for minimum and maximum awards, and one specifically for arterial BRT. She expressed concern about the possibility of applicants submitting excess projects to manipulate scoring. Fyten acknowledged that concern but noted that recent funding model changes make it unlikely.

Steve Peterson added that future funding options may include scenarios where transit receives more than the \$60 million target, possibly directing additional funds toward arterial BRT, consistent with broader policy discussions.

Leitner suggested rescinding her original motion, but Koutsoukos noted that under Robert's Rules of Order, a motion cannot be withdrawn once seconded.

Leitner suggested a friendly amendment to approve the table as-is but remove arterial BRT from it, addressing arterial BRT in a separate motion. Harrington suggested instead listing arterial BRT as a single \$30 million entry with an asterisk stating that TAB may award additional arterial BRT funding only after all transit projects are funded and targets across other categories are met or nearly met. Members agreed to vote the motion down.

#### **Motion failed.**

It was moved by Leitner, and seconded by Isaacson, to recommend minimum and maximum federal award for each 2026 Regional Solicitation funding category as recommended by the Funding and Programming Committee except that arterial BRT is funded at \$30 million, with an asterisk noting that TAB may award additional funding to arterial BRT only if all other transit projects are funded and the funding targets are met or close to being met in the other modal categories.

Cole Hiniker, MTS Planning, recommended that TAB be presented with two options—one to fund all transit projects first, and one not to—reflecting differing views. Leitner responded that the committee's role is to make a technical recommendation and that TAB could strike or amend language as it sees fit.

Chad Ellos, Hennepin County, expressed concern that the motion might overly constrain TAB, preferring language that recommends—rather than requires—funding all projects first. Culver clarified that TAC serves an advisory role, and TAB may accept or reject its recommendations. Leitner added that if TAB wishes to apply score-based funding cutoffs, consistent thresholds should apply across all categories.

Kosluchar expressed support for the motion because it removes the "N/A" entry. Isaacson expressed confidence that the Funding and Programming Committee Chair and TAC Chair would clearly convey the intent of the motion to TAB and refine its language as needed.

#### **Motion carried.**

### **5. 2025-34: 2026 Active Transportation Minimum and Maximum Awards**

Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, presented.

Robgent asked for the rationale behind setting such a low number for the minimum funding amounts. Chair MacPherson explained that the rationale from the Active Transportation Committee was to encourage the submission of many projects, even small ones along with encouraging smaller applicants to apply.

Leitner noted that Washington County had advocated previously for bicycle facilities to match the regional maximum awards. She explained that some elected officials perceive the term "regional" to imply more expensive projects, which is not necessarily the case. She expressed hope that during the TAB discussions, this would be clarified, noting that the purpose of a lower maximum award is likely to distribute available funding more broadly.



Turner Bergen asked for background information about why the pedestrian facility maximum award is lower than the bicycle facility maximum. Joe Widing, MTS Planning, explained that the rationale for the lower pedestrian facility maximum was based on the 2024 regional solicitation, where the pedestrian facility category maximum award was \$2 million. The proposed maximum award shows a slight increase to account for inflation. However, in the previous round, there were few requests at the maximum level in the pedestrian category, while there was more demand in the bicycle category. He also noted that this is the first round using this approach and adjustments may be made in future solicitation cycles depending on how much demand there is for the maximum funding levels. Turner Bergen noted that if comparisons were based on federal funding applications, she would expect additional demand under local funding due to its greater flexibility. She added that local agencies that may have avoided federalized pedestrian projects might now apply for local funds. Koutsoukos added that in previous years—either 2022 or 2024—the local pedestrian project maximum was only \$1 million. Steve Peterson commented that geographic balance might also play a role in the decision.

McCartney asked local participants whether the suggested maximum for local planning awards is sufficient. Widing stated that the upcoming planning allocation target will be about \$2 million. Because there have not been many large, dedicated planning applications in the past, the lower maximum award helps prevent a few large projects from dominating the available funds. He explained that there is no minimum award for planning grants to support a broad range of comprehensive planning activities beginning next year. For example, communities developing or expanding bicycle and pedestrian elements of their comprehensive plans could use this funding source. Widing emphasized that keeping the maximum award lower allows more jurisdictions to benefit without crowding out other applicants.

It was moved by Robjent, and seconded by Eyoh to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board approve a minimum and maximum award for each 2026 Active Transportation funding category as follows:

- Local Bike Facilities -- Minimum: \$150,000. Maximum: \$3,500,000.
- Local Pedestrian Facilities -- Minimum: \$150,000. Maximum: \$2,500,000.
- Active Transportation Funding -- Minimum: N/A. Maximum: \$200,000.

**Motion carried.**

6. **2025-35: 2026 Regional Solicitation Modal Funding Targets**

Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, presented.

Chair MacPherson stated that having a target is beneficial because it gives applicants a clear goal. He explained that knowing what the committee expects applicants to spend helps guide project proposals. He pointed to the 2024 roadways range of 45% to 65%, noting that this wide variance is significant and that clearer targets would help avoid such discrepancies.

Leitner noted that there had been one vote against the proposal at the Funding and Programming Committee meeting based on the low weighting of the environmental category. Leitner emphasized that although the environmental allocation appears low, it is important to note that transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects inherently promote environmental benefits and added that roadway projects also include a “natural systems protection and restoration” scoring metric. Kosluchar stated that the rationale for not increasing the safety target from its historical level was like the rationale discussed regarding environmental scoring. He explained that safety is already integrated into bicycle, pedestrian, and roadway projects.

Eyoh reiterated concerns about the environmental category being weighted at only 6%. He acknowledged that certain project types, such as bicycle facilities and transit projects, offer



significant environmental benefits by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants. He argued that the current weighting still undervalues environmental factors. He proposed increasing the environmental score weighting to 10%, suggesting that 4% could be reallocated from the roadway category. Eyoh noted that even with this adjustment, roadway projects would remain the highest category at 40%.

It was moved by Leitner, and seconded by Kosluchar, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board approve the following federal funding targets for the 2026 Regional Solicitation:

- 12% to Safety
- 14% to Bike and Pedestrian
- 24% to Transit
- 44% to Roadways
- 6% to Environment

**Motion carried.**

7. **2025-36: 2026 Active Transportation Funding Targets**

Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, presented.

Reuben Collins, Saint Paul Planning, asked whether the committee would be providing a recommendation on how the \$50 million would be split between bicycle and pedestrian projects. Chair MacPherson responded that the current action item does not include such a recommendation, but if the group would like to add one, it could be considered. Collins asked if there was a specific reason why a split was not being proposed. Koutsoukos explained that, historically, federal funding was allocated to broader modal categories rather than being divided among specific application types. Chair MacPherson confirmed that a similar approach is being applied to the safety categories, noting that the proactive and reactive components were not split either.

Steve Peterson added that one reason the safety category was split out was because it is a new program area. He explained that providing an approximate allocation helped applicants understand the funding scale. The decision to identify a portion for safety planning will help applicants gauge project feasibility.

Issacson noted that some funds were already flowing and asked whether the program allows flexibility in determining when the funds would be available for various uses. Chair MacPherson said approximately \$15 million had already been spent as part of the last Regional Solicitation. Steve Peterson added that approximately \$21 million per year in revenue is generated from the funding source. He stated that the work group had taken a conservative approach, avoiding spending several years of anticipated revenue in advance. Widing elaborated, explaining that the \$50 million allocation originates from a combination of previously obligated projects and anticipated revenues. About \$18 million has already been obligated to projects from 2024, with an additional \$2 million designated for the University of Minnesota's Washington Avenue Bridge project. The remaining funds are expected to accumulate by the end of 2026. The work group decided that allocations should be based only on funds currently available or expected by the end of the solicitation period. This approach simplifies bookkeeping and ensures that project funding aligns with actual cash flow. He confirmed that the plan is to allocate funds for each cycle based on available balances, not projected revenues.

Issacson sought clarification, asking whether the first grantees would receive their funding in 2026 rather than 2028. Widing confirmed that the first awards would indeed be distributed in 2026.



Chair MacPherson noted that Metropolitan Council staff will administer this program directly. He noted that funds will not flow through State Aid, which will make the process more streamlined and efficient for applicants and recipients.

It was moved by Issacson, and seconded by Eyoh, to recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board approve a \$50 million funding target for the 2026 Active Transportation Solicitation and a sub-target of \$2 million for the active transportation planning category.

**Motion carried.**

## Information

Regional Solicitation and Active Transportation Update

Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, and Molly Stewart, SRF, presented.

## Other business

## Adjournment

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

---

### Council contact:

Joe Barbeau, Planning Analyst  
[Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us)  
651-602-1705

