



## POLICYMAKER WORKING GROUP REGIONAL SOLICITATION

December 17, 2025

### Working Group Attendees:

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

### Other Attendees:

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

10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

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

### Regional Trails Application

The group discussed the two options for scoring being considered for the Regional Bike Facilities application. The consensus was to go with option 2 which prioritizes regional trails in the same bucket as RBTN tier 1 corridors and RBTN tier 2 alignments. It was noted that a RBTN Rural Connectors Study that will identify additional RBTN corridors and alignments in rural areas will be completed before the 2028 solicitation.

### Winter Maintenance

The group discussed the winter maintenance requirements for both the federal and active transportation (AT) funding. Member Johnson asked if maintenance equipment could be funded with AT funding and if this is something that could be revisited for future solicitations. Several members noted that winter maintenance was important and a commitment by the applicant was needed in order to receive the funding. Lyssa Leitner noted that the group should consider making it as easy as possible to obtain AT funding for agencies. She noted that some smaller agencies might not be equipped to perform winter maintenance activities. Member Johnson noted that we don't have detailed information on why smaller agencies aren't applying for funding, so we don't know if the winter maintenance requirement is the reason. There was consensus from the group to leave the requirements as is currently shown in the applications and to add details about what is specifically required for documentation (e.g. policies in place, letter, etc.).

### Community Considerations

The conversation then shifted to Community Considerations. Joe MacPherson presented a proposal, supported by the counties, to change the Community Considerations percentage to 10 percent for all application categories. Member Johnson asked for clarification on the reasoning for the reduction. Joe MacPherson noted that the reduction was to align with the 2024 application which allocated nine to 18 percent of the points to the equity criteria. He also noted the desire to allocate a higher percentage of the points to the main criteria for each application category. The group discussed reducing the percentage for Community Considerations or leaving it at 20 percent. Several members were in favor of maintaining the 20 percent and several supported a reduction. Many were in favor of a reduction for

both safety applications at a minimum. In the end, the final consensus from the group was to recommend a reduction to 15 percent for the two safety applications and maintain 20 percent for the rest of the application categories. For the two safety applications the group recommended adding the 5 percent that was reduced from Community Considerations to the Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles criteria.

The group then discussed the funding priority. Member Holberg suggested adding language that states "TAB may choose to fund one project that scores high-high-high" vs having it be automatic. There was consensus to add this change to the draft application materials. Amy Vennewitz noted that there will be training on how to score the Community Considerations criteria so there is consistency. The consensus from the group was to only provide a funding priority to one project each cycle and no projects in the safety category. This is consistent with the recommendation from the Technical Steering Committee.

## **Next Steps**

The next meeting will allow for further discussion of the community considerations criteria and score weighting across all criteria.

The next Policymaker Working Group meeting is scheduled for January 21.