Minutes

TAC Funding and Programming Committee

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

Meeting date: May 21, 2026, **Time**: 1:00 PM **Location:** Virtual

Members present:

- ☒ Eden Prairie – Robert Ellis
- ☒ Fridley – Jim Kosluchar (Chair)
- ☐ Lakeville – Paul Oehme (Vice Chair)
- ☒ Minneapolis – Katie White
- ☒ Plymouth – Michael Thompson
- ☒ St. Paul – Anne Weber
- ☒ Met Council – Cole Hiniker
- ☐ Metro Transit – Scott Janowiak
- ☒ TAB Coordinator – Elaine Koutsoukos
- ☒ MnDOT Metro District – Aaron Tag
- ☒ MnDOT Metro District State Aid – Colleen Brown
- ☒ MnDOT Bike/Ped – Mackenzie Turner Bargen
- ☒ MPCA – Lauren Dickerson
- ☒ DNR – Nancy Spooner-Walsh
- ☒ Suburban Transit Assoc. – Heidi Scholl
- ☒ Anoka Co. – Jerry Auge
- ☒ Carver Co. – Darin Mielke
- ☒ Dakota Co. – Jacob Chapek
- ☒ Hennepin Co. – Emily Buell
- ☒ Ramsey Co. – Codie Leseman
- ☒ Scott Co. – Jon Rudolph
- ☒ Wash Co. – Madeline Dahlheimer
- ☐ FHWA – Scott Mareck (ex-officio)

☒ = 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 Kosluchar called the regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee to order at 1:00 p.m.

Agenda approved

Chair Kosluchar noted that a roll call vote was not needed for approval of the agenda unless a committee member offered an amendment to the agenda. Committee members did not have any comments or changes to the agenda.

Approval of minutes

It was moved by Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator, seconded by Katie White, Minneapolis. to approve the minutes of April 16, 2026, regular meeting of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee. **Motion carried**.

Public comment on committee business

TAB report

Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator, reported on May 20th, 2026, regular meeting of the Transportation Advisory Board.

Business

1. **2026-31**: Adoption of the Draft 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), pending public comment (Joe Barbeau, MTS Planning and Aaron Tag MnDOT)

   Joe Barbeau, MTS Planning, presented. It was moved by Darin Mielke, Carver Co., and seconded by White, that TAC Funding and Programming Committee recommend that TAC recommend adoption of the draft 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). **Motion carried**.

2. **2026-32**: Potential Regional Solicitation Scoring Adjustment for the Excessive Delay Measure (Steve Peterson, MTS Planning)

   Steve Peterson, MTS Planning, presented. Chair Kosluchar opened discussion by sharing his initial hesitation about modifying scoring criteria midstream, while acknowledging the rationale for preserving the relative weight of the major scoring categories.

   Darin Mielke, Carver Co., asked whether new interchanges connecting to the freeway system would be eligible under the measure. Peterson confirmed that such interchanges are eligible because the cross street, typically a minor or principal arterial, is what makes the project eligible. Mielke then asked whether the excessive delay measure could be recalibrated during this cycle to focus solely on the eligible arterial system rather than including freeways that cannot score. Peterson acknowledged the idea but stated the data science team could not rerun the analysis in the available time and that the freeway and arterial systems present fundamentally different analytical challenges once signals and access points are introduced. He suggested the CMP Advisory Group could examine that question before the next cycle.

   Lyssa Leitner, Washington Co., raised concerns about the process implications of any midstream change. She stated that applicants had been planning submissions for months with the approved scoring structure in mind, and that changing the measure, even subtly, could affect which projects entities chose to submit. She expressed concern that reallocating points could alter competitive dynamics in ways that are difficult to anticipate, particularly given that the solicitation had already gone through a public comment process. She also raised the possibility of extending the application deadline if a change were made, so applicants could respond with full information. Peterson acknowledged that the qualifier in the proposed motion, that the change will only take effect if no project scores any excessive delay points, was intended to address the timing concern.

   Mielke raised a second question, asking whether the existing Synchro analysis already required of applicants in those categories could serve as a substitute measure for excessive delay this cycle. He explained that applicants could submit their existing no-build delay data as a proxy, with higher existing delay yielding more points, which would avoid reassigning points while still using the 10% weighting. Peterson said the idea had merit as a substitute measure and had not been part of the original discussion, noting it would be comparing projects against each other rather than against a fixed threshold.

   Codie Leseman, Ramsey Co., asked Peterson to clarify the difference between the Synchro-based approach and the excessive delay mapping measure and asked what staff's preferred alternative to the reliability reallocation would be. Peterson explained that the Synchro measure under criterion one compares a project's anticipated delay reduction against a no-build condition, while the excessive delay map represents corridors meeting a fixed standard tied to the TPP. He said that keeping any adjustment within criteria one and two, both focused on congestion and delay, would be less disruptive than moving points to unrelated categories. Leseman stated that from Ramsey County's perspective, preserving criteria one and two combined at 40% would be relatively straightforward to support, though he noted that the only segment in Ramsey County appearing on the corrected map was a stretch of TH 61/10 already being addressed by MnDOT, which created some concern about supporting the measure as-is.

Koutsoukos clarified for the record that even if no one scores points under option one, an entity planning to apply could still do so. The concern Leitner raised was not just about whether a project lands on the map, but whether a change in point allocation would have led an applicant to choose a different project category entirely. Leitner confirmed that was correct and reiterated that she could not support a change that effectively rewrites the scoring without returning for public comment, stating it would undermine the integrity of the process that preceded it.

Emily Buell, Hennepin Co., asked how applicants would be notified of any change. Peterson said staff would need to think through the communication approach, noting a list of entities that have signed up for updates would be the first point of contact.

Aaron Tag, MnDOT Metro District, stated that corridors meeting the definition of excessive delay do still exist on the eligible system and that changing the measure midstream would be somewhat disingenuous when projects on those segments could still compete for those points.

Chair Kosluchar stated his position that on balance he favored making no change, citing concerns about notification logistics, mid-process disruption, and the difficulty of reaching a defensible decision under time pressure.

After extended discussion, no member moved either of the two proposed options. Leitner moved, and Leseman seconded, to forward the item to TAC without a committee recommendation, transmitting the discussion and range of perspectives for TAC's consideration. Chair Kosluchar restated the motion as forwarding the item to TAC without taking immediate action, allowing TAC to consider the proposed options or an additional option, including the Synchro substitute measure suggested by Mielke. Mielke added a suggestion that staff evaluate whether a hybrid approach awarding full points to any project qualifying under the current map while applying the Synchro substitute for remaining points might be viable before the TAC meeting. **Motion carried.**

Information

1. EV Public Charging Needs Analysis (Tony Fischer, MTS Planning; Siri Simons, HDR)

Tony Fischer, MTS Planning, presented. Siri Simons, HDR, was also present to assist with questions.

Chair Kosluchar asked whether the trip data underlying the multifamily and low-income weighting represented all vehicle trips or only EV trips. Fischer confirmed the data reflects all trips, as the analysis is planning for a future transition rather than current EV behavior.

Leseman asked about the 1925 home construction year used as a threshold for assumptions about home charging access. Simons explained the assumption that owners of pre-1925 single-family homes would seek a public charge 20% of the time, reflecting the likelihood of older wiring and lack of attached garages, but acknowledged the specific year was not grounded in robust data and was developed with stakeholder input and HDR's electrical engineers. She noted the threshold could reasonably be set in other years without strong empirical evidence favoring any cutoff.

Leseman also asked whether the forecast accounted for a more pessimistic trajectory than the scenario reflecting 2025 federal rollbacks. Fischer acknowledged that scenario could itself prove optimistic but noted that the prioritization framework is designed to direct investment toward the highest-need locations first, which helps manage uncertainty regardless of the pace of adoption.

Chair Kosluchar noted that the scale of estimated Level 2 need represented a substantial build-out, observing that the private sector would need to carry a significant share of that investment. Fischer agreed and noted that revenue potential makes Level 2 charging commercially viable in many locations.

Reports

Adjournment

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Council contact:

Robbie King, Senior Planner
Robbie.King@metc.state.mn.us
651-602-1380