



TECHNICAL STEERING COMMITTEE REGIONAL SOLICITATION

November 25, 2025

Steering Committee Attendees:

Paul Oehme, Molly McCartney, Joe MacPherson, Danny McCullough, Chris Hartzell, Patrick Boylan, Reuben Collins, Doran Cote, Jillian Linnell, Jennifer Hager, Lyssa Leitner, Matt Fyten, Lyndon Robjent, Brian Isaacson

Other Attendees:

Steve Peterson, Elaine Koutsoukos, Cole Hiniker, Joe Barbeau, Amy Vennewitz, Robbie King, Joe Widing, David Burns, Cameron Kolbeck, Wendy Duren, Heidi Schallberg, Abe Olson (Met Council), Theresa Cain (Metro Transit), Molly Stewart, Lydia Statz (SRF Consulting Group), Allison Bell (Bellwether Consulting), KC Atkins (Hennepin County)

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Virtual

Bridge Application

The group discussed how detour impacts should be measured. The intent is to make the measure more qualitative to capture details that are not strictly quantitative. When asked whether detour length should account for traffic volume, it was noted that volume is currently not considered. Member MacPherson proposed incorporating volume into Measure A and keeping that measure quantitative.

Proactive Safety

Member Robjent questioned why fatal and serious crash history points are weighted so heavily for proactive safety. Molly Stewart explained that the highest weighting comes from the connection to the Safety Plan, while crash history weighting is higher in reactive measures. The working group felt crash history was still an important element to include. Member Hager added that Vision Zero aims to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes, and this approach helps prioritize progress toward those goals. Stewart noted that currently, the applications encouraged investments in projects that appear in safety plans but also have some crash history.

Regional Bike Facilities

The group then turned toward discussion of the Regional Bike Facilities category, including how points should be distributed for inclusion in the RBTN or Regional Trail Network. The Special Issue Working Group (SIWG) had recommended a different point structure than currently appears in the draft application. As an explanation, Cole Hiniker noted that the Policymaker Working Group directed federal funding toward regional transportation, and Met Council has designated the RBTN as the region's primary bicycle transportation network and staff feel strongly that the RBTN should receive higher points than regional trails. Member Leitner noted that Washington County disagrees with the current point structure and believes TAB should be informed that the SIWG recommendation was changed. Member McCullough agreed and suggested that nearly all regional trail projects have a transportation basis, advocating for trails to receive more than 20 points. Cole Hiniker explained that plans are in place to address rural gaps before the 2028 cycle by including more RBTN alignments and corridors,

and that regional trails serving transportation purposes would already align with RBTN. Member McCullough proposed increasing regional trail points to 25. Member Collins noted that policy documents differentiate between RBTN and regional trails, reflecting the current structure. Member Leitner noted that recreation serves a transportation purpose and that few other funding sources exist for regional trails, recommending transparency about changes to SIWG recommendations and letting TAB decide. Elaine Koutsoukos emphasized that federal funding should primarily serve transportation purposes, consistent with previous TAB direction.

Active Transportation Year-Round Maintenance

Member Leitner raised concerns that requiring year-round maintenance could exclude smaller agencies that lack plowing capabilities, suggesting a phased approach or clear communication to policymakers about this qualifying criterion. Member Robjent stated that the requirement should not apply and opposed even a phased approach.

This requirement will be discussed further at upcoming meetings.

Car/Bike Sharing

The group reached consensus that carshare and bikeshare programs are not eligible under the transit category. Member Leitner asked whether shared mobility policies exist in the TPP and suggested increasing TDM category funding to advance those goals. Cole Hiniker confirmed that shared mobility is addressed at a high level in the TPP. Member MacPherson recommended maintaining a unique category for shared mobility, given emerging technologies. Cole Hiniker noted that shared mobility often involves private-sector partnerships, which the solicitation process is not currently designed for.

This topic will be discussed at upcoming meetings.

Community Considerations

Allison Bell presented information for the Community Considerations criteria and measures. Member McCartney noted that the proposal to reduce the funding priority as fair and a good compromise among all interests. Member Leitner clarified that community considerations remain part of scoring for all applications but would not a funding priority within the safety category. The group agreed to clarify to TAB that the proposal allows “up to three” priority projects, not a mandate. Member MacPherson suggested limiting priority projects to one per cycle across all categories, which Member Oehme supported.

This item will be further discussed at upcoming meetings.

Member MacPherson supported different weighting for community considerations by category. Member Oehme leaned toward reducing the percentage for safety categories. Member MacPherson noted that safety plans are data-driven and do not emphasize community engagement or engineering. Steve Peterson countered that safety applications lack other goal areas, making community considerations the only criterion for a well-rounded application.

Member Robjent asked whether scoring uses a curve; it does not, though some other criteria still apply curves based on the highest-scoring project. Amy Vennewitz observed that most projects will cluster around similar scores, with little variation expected.