

T Transportation Committee

Business Item

Item: 2010-366

Meeting date: October 25, 2010

Council meeting: November 10, 2010

ADVISORY INFORMATION

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Date: | October 21, 2010 |
| Subject: | Presentation of <i>2030 Transportation Policy Plan Update</i> |
| District(s), Member(s): | All |
| Policy/Legal Reference: | MN Statutes Sec. 473.175 and 473.176; SAFETEA-LU |
| Staff Prepared/Presented: | Arlene McCarthy, Director, MTS 651-602-1754 Amy Vennewitz, Deputy Director Finance & Planning 651-602-1058 Connie Kozlak, Planning Manager 651-602-1720 Carl Ohrn, Planning Analyst 651-602-1719 |
| Division/Department: | Metropolitan Transportation Services (MTS) |

Proposed Action (for November 8, 2010 Committee Meeting)

That the Metropolitan Council accept the attached Public Comment Report on the Draft *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* and adopt the revised final version of the *2030 Transportation Policy Plan*.

Background

The Council, as the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization, is required by both state and federal law to prepare and update a long-range transportation plan for the region every four years. The current Transportation Policy Plan was adopted in January 2009 to comply with the required four-year timeframe. The TPP guides investment in the regional transportation system for the seven-county metropolitan area. Under federal law, the plan must be fiscally constrained and can account only for revenues that can reasonably be expected over the 20-year period. However, the plan may set a policy direction and indicate how and where additional funds would be spent should they occur.

During the last plan update it became evident that the 12 major projects contained in the 2004 plan could not be carried into the new plan as their cost exceeded available funding by over \$2.0 billion. The current 2009 plan removed these 12 projects and recommended that they be reassessed to determine if their cost and scope could be reduced. The Council committed to conducting several extensive highway studies to determine if the region could identify a different approach to highway investment that would be more compatible with expected funding levels. Because these major studies were needed to set a new policy direction, no major highway investments are identified or funded in the current 2030 TPP. As a result, in the 2009 plan the Council committed to updating the TPP in 2010 to reflect the results of the planned highway studies.

In addition to the highway studies, the 2009 plan committed to updating the aviation system plan as soon as technical studies, new forecasts and updated long-term comprehensive plans for MSP and three reliever airports were completed.

During 2009 and 2010 the following studies were conducted and completed by the Council and others:

- Metropolitan Highway System Investment Study (MHSIS)
- MnPASS II Analysis
- Major Projects Reassessments
- Congestion Management Safety Plan (CMSP)
- Travel Demand Management Study
- 2030 Aviation System Plan Update

- MSP 2020 Long-term Comprehensive Plan Update
- Long-term Comprehensive Plan Updates for Flying Cloud, Anoka and St Paul airports

Staff incorporated the recommendations and results of these studies into a draft 2030 Transportation Policy Plan. In June and July of 2009 the draft plan was brought before the TAC Planning Committee, TAC, TAB Policy Committee and full TAB for advice, review and comment. The TAB and TAC comments were addressed through draft plan revisions and the Council released the Draft *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* for public review and comment in mid August. The public comment period closed on October 7th, with a public hearing held before the Council's Transportation Committee on September 27th. In addition, four Open Houses were held in various locations around the region during the public comment period. The comments received were sorted and compiled together with proposed staff responses into the attached Public Comment Report.

Comments were received from nearly 220 different individuals and organizations, and they cited approximately 300 specific issues. Some of the comments are proposed to be addressed through recommended text changes to the draft plan. The key text changes recommended to the Draft *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* are highlighted in Attachment A. The Public Comment Report contains all proposed changes with the exception of minor grammatical and wording changes. The proposed final *2030 Transportation Policy Plan*, incorporating these changes can be found at <http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/transportation/TPP/2010/indexPROP.htm> .

Rationale

The adoption of the final *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* will meet the federal and state requirements for the region to have a 20-year fiscally constrained long range transportation plan, will allow for federal funding of planned transportation projects to continue and will provide a policy direction and vision for the spending of additional or unanticipated funds.

Funding

None required.

Known Support / Opposition

Contained in the Public Comment Report.

Attachment A

Key Text Changes Proposed to the Draft 2030 Transportation Policy Plan

1. Issue: Plan should provide a highway vision beyond fiscally constrained plan.

Response: Federal law requires the Council to prepare a fiscally constrained long range transportation plan that includes only specific transportation investments that can reasonably expect to be funded over the 20-year plan. While the investments specified in the plan must be fiscally constrained, the vision and policy direction for expenditures articulated in the plan are not fiscally constrained. The highway vision calls for expending available mobility/expansions funds in four key areas; active traffic management and technology investments, lower cost/high benefit projects, managed lane vision and on strategic capacity enhancements. Fully funding these types of highway expenditures would require \$3.0 - \$4.0 billion, while only \$900 million in mobility funds will be available through 2030. As increased or unanticipated funding becomes available it should be directed towards funding this vision.

Text in the plan will be revised in various places as shown below:

Insert on page 103 of the draft plan as the first paragraph of highway chapter section titled “Fiscally Constrained Mobility/Congestion Mitigation Priorities”

This plan provides a highway vision and identifies an investment need that greatly exceeds the revenues reasonably expected to be received over the next 20 years. The cost of implementing the Managed Lane System Vision shown in Figure 6-34 is estimated to cost up to \$1.5 billion. An early stage of the Congestion Mitigation Safety Plan (CMSP) led by Mn/DOT identified more than 184 potential lower cost /high benefit CMSP projects totaling over \$1.5 billion. Mn/DOT continues to work on identifying these potential projects and anticipates the list and cost to grow. The cost to provide Active Traffic Management (ATM) technology improvements on all Principal and “A” minor arterials as called for in this plan will require an investment in the range of hundreds of millions of dollars, while the fiscally constrained plan is able to fund only \$5 million in ATM investments annually. The plan’s highway vision also supports implementation of strategic capacity enhancements such as the completion of TH 610 or other capacity additions in strategic locations that are scoped and designed under the lower cost/high benefit philosophy. Fully funding the highway mobility and congestion mitigation investments supported by the policy direction of this plan will require funding in the range of \$3.0- \$4.0 billion.

As demonstrated earlier, the fiscally constrained state road construction budget is estimated to provide \$3.8 billion through 2030 (see figure 6-21 and 6-24), with only \$900 million (23%) available for mobility and congestion mitigation in the 2015-2030 time period. This plan calls for the \$900 million to be sub-allocated into three categories: ATM investments, lower cost/high benefit projects and Fiscally constrained funding priorities must be consistent with the projected regional transportation revenues for the State Road Construction Program shown in Table 6-21. About \$900 or about 23 percent of those funds are projected to be available for mobility and congestion mitigation in the 2015-2030 time period. The \$900M available for congestion mitigation/mobility investments shown in Table 6-39 are further sub-allocated to three categories, ATM management, lower cost / high benefit projects and managed lanes/strategic capacity projects in Table 6-29 as shown in Table 6-39. The allocation of these funds assumes the implementation of projects that meet multiple objectives, such as preservation and congestion mitigation within one project. Should any project increase in cost above that shown in Table 6-39, adjustments will be needed within the investment category or other projects will be delayed. The region, working with Mn/DOT, will continue to seek additional revenues to ensure that these projects and possibly more can be advanced to actual implementation. As additional revenues are secured through increased funding levels or competitive grants the funds should be used to increase the

spending levels for the investment categories shown in Table 6-39 and bring the region closer to fully funding the investment needs identified in this plan.

Table 6-39 allocates only a portion of the 2015-2020 funds ~~have been allocated~~ to specific projects, shown in Table 6-39. The rest of the funds have been set aside for broad project categories pending further analysis of costs and benefits. The intent is to continue to monitor, as part of the Congestion Management Process, the performance of the MnPASS lanes on I-394 and I-35W, the I-94 ATM project and the new projects proposed in Table 6-39 and to verify their costs and impacts on the system. This analysis will be used in the 2014 update of this plan, or sooner if warranted, to adjust investment priorities and include new investments that are deemed to be most beneficial to the region. Also based on this analysis, some of the 2021-2030 funds may be committed to advance MnPASS and CMSP projects through an amendment to this plan.

Other text additions:

On page 3 of the Highway Vision section of the Plan Overview add:

Fully funding these investment strategies is beyond the fiscal constraint of this plan. As additional funds are sought and become available, they should be used to more fully implement the highway investment vision articulated in this plan.

On page 32 in the Finance Chapter add the following after the first opening paragraph:

Under federal law, the region is required to develop a fiscally constrained long-range plan. This requires developing an estimate of the highway and transit revenues that ~~will~~ can reasonably be expected to be available to the region over the next 20 years. All revenue estimates are uncertain and in the end will prove to be off by some degree. This plan uses estimates of revenue based on known state and federal allocation formulas, current state revenue forecasts and also based upon past experience with receiving federal, state and other competitive or discretionary revenues. This plan contains an investment vision for highways that cannot be fully funded with reasonably assumed revenues. In addition, the transit revenues assume a high level of competitive funds that may not materialize. As additional revenues are sought and become available they should be used to more fully implement the highway and transit investment visions in this plan.

On Page 78 under the list of bullets for what the highway strategy in this plan will do add:

- Provide policy direction for the use of additional or unanticipated funds.

On page 79 under the section on ATM add:

An annual budget of \$5.0 million has been allocated to ATM investments. The needs on the Principal and "A" minor arterials greatly exceed this investment level.

On page 79 under the Lower- Cost/High Benefit Improvements section add:

In an early phase of the CMSP analysis 184 projects were identified with a cost estimate of more than \$1.5 billion. This greatly exceeds the \$320 million allocated (\$20 million annually) for lower-cost/high benefit projects in this plan.

On page 80 under the Managed Lane section add:

The managed lane vision (Figure 6-34) is estimated to cost up to \$1.5 billion. This estimate assumes most projects can be built with little or no new right-of-way. The 16-year estimate of funds available for managed lane implementation is less than \$500 million.

2. Issue: Interchange criteria in the plan are too restrictive, particularly outside the I-494/I-694 ring.

Response: The interchange criteria contained both in the Highway chapter and Appendix E were developed by the TAB and the Council in 1979 and have been part of the regional plan for many years. This plan made some adjustments to the criteria to encourage two mile spacing in less developed areas and to indicate that conversions of interchanges should occur from the developed area outward, without leaving intermediate intersections which can create safety issues when signals are interspersed with interchanges. The draft plan text will be revised as shown below to give more flexibility to Mn/DOT and the Council when using these criteria and to focus on the safety and mobility of the mainline operations.

Text on page 80 and 81 of the draft plan will be revised to read as follows:

"Conversion of at-grade intersections to grade-separated interchanges and other mobility and safety/capacity projects on non-freeway trunk highways should only occur after a Mn/DOT and Council reassessment ~~assessment to determine if the proposed project is consistent with existing plans and policies. of existing and proposed plans and projects in those corridors. Reassessments can be initiated by Mn/DOT, or conducted at the request of the appropriate local government(s).~~ The main purpose of the reassessment will be to identify cost-effective projects that can be supported by the Council and Mn/DOT for local and regional funding. Completion of this reassessment and explicit support from Mn/DOT will continue to be necessary to obtain Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds through the Regional Solicitation process for non-freeway trunk highway improvements.

Appendices D and E reinforce the effectiveness of improvements on non-freeway trunk highways in providing benefits for regional travel. As local units of government work with Mn/DOT to improve and convert non-freeway trunk highways to freeways, the following requirements are particularly important to achieve regional objectives:

The appropriate local units of government exercising land use authority along the trunk highways will be expected to incorporate access standards into their subdivision and zoning ordinances and apply ~~them~~ the standards during their development review process;

Conversion of an at-grade intersection to an interchange ~~must~~ should only occur in the urban area or in the planned MUSA (see Figure E-1 in Appendix E);

Conversion of an at-grade intersection to an interchange must provide safety and mobility improvements to both the mainline and cross-street. The new interchange should be adjacent to an existing interchange unless MN/DOT and the Council determine through the assessment that the intermediate access points can be in the urban area or in the planned MUSA modified or managed to address safety concerns;

Principal arterials ~~can only intersect~~ should only have interchanges with other principal arterial or "A" minor arterials; and

Interchange spacing outside the I-494 / I-694 ring ~~must~~ should be 2 miles or more unless physical constraints or density of existing or planned development require closer spacing.

Text in Appendix E relating to the interchange criteria 1, 3, and 6 will be revised as follows:

1. Additional interchange capacity should be considered only when it supports the Metropolitan Council's Regional Development Framework and the Transportation Policy Plan, and local comprehensive plans approved by the Metropolitan Council.

Discussion: This is a critical objective. In addition to solving highway capacity deficiencies, new interchanges or major interchange modifications should be consistent with regional plans and regionally approved local plans, and should support development in desirable locations. In most cases, a new interchange should be in the Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA) (see Figure E-1) or census urbanized area and be adjacent to another interchange rather than an intersection. New interchanges should be adjacent to an existing interchange unless Mn/DOT determines that the intermediate access can be modified or managed to address safety concerns.

3. Metropolitan Highway System interchanges may only connect Metropolitan Highways (Principal Arterials) to other Metropolitan Highways or to an “A” minor arterial as defined in the functional classification system adopted by the Transportation Advisory Board and approved by the Metropolitan Council.

Discussion: The intent of this criterion is to ensure that Metropolitan Highways connect to adequate arterials in the state and local road system. These roads should be continuous and connect to other principal or “A” minor arterials or connectors.

6. Generally, interchanges on the Metropolitan Highway System on the I-494/I-694 ring or inside should be spaced at a minimum of one mile (center to center). Interchanges outside the ring should be spaced at a minimum of 2 miles (center to center) unless physical constraints or the density of existing or planned development requires closer spacing. If it is determined appropriate to locate an interchange at less than one or 2 miles apart or modify an existing interchange, the safe operation of the main roadway must be maintained.

Discussion: Experience has shown that interchanges spaced less than one mile apart have inadequate weaving distance and require special design features such as auxiliary lanes to maintain safety. Outside of the I-494/I-694 ring, other Metropolitan Highways or “A” minor arterials are typically not needed closer than 2 miles due to the lack of intense development.

3. Issue: Update New Starts funding information to reflect new federal interpretation of the Cost-Effectiveness Index (CEI).

Response: This is correct and the existing funding language on page 37 of the draft plan regarding federal New Starts funding will be deleted and replaced with the following: "Federal New Starts funding is the source used to fund major rail and dedicated busway projects. New Starts funding is awarded nationally on a competitive basis through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Projects must apply and receive approval to enter preliminary engineering and must also apply again to enter final design and construction. New Starts projects are currently evaluated by the FTA based upon "Project Justification" and "Financial" ratings; both of these ratings, and the overall project rating for a project, must be medium or better to receive FTA New Starts funding. FTA considers six project justification factors: Economic Development Benefits; Transit-Supportive Land Use; Mobility Improvements; Cost-Effectiveness; and Environmental Benefits. The financial rating is based upon the project sponsor's ability to support the operations and maintenance of the transit system, the amount and proportion of the local funding match commitment, and the stability and dependability of that match. Historically, those projects that have been competitive for federal funds commit at least a 50 percent local match (beyond the required 20 percent minimum)."

4. Issue: Confusion over 12 major projects from the 2004 plan and the proposed improvement now proposed under the project reassessment.

Response: Table 6-36 on page 99 and Figure 6-37 on page 100 of the draft plan which describe the project scope and map the original expansion projects from the 2004 plan will be removed.

5. Issue: Expand list of non-Mn/DOT principal arterials to include Dakota County highways 23 and 32 and Scott County highway 18.

Response: The text on page 104 will be changed as follows: "At present, there are ~~three~~six principal arterials in the metropolitan area that are not under Mn/DOT jurisdiction: Dakota/Scott CSAH 42, Dakota CSAH 23 (138th St. to CR 42), Dakota CSAH 32 (TH 13 to I-35E), Anoka CSAH 14, Scott CR 18 (CSAH 42 to TH 169), and Shepard Road. Given their regional importance these metropolitan highways should be under Mn/DOT jurisdiction."

6. Issue: The TPP should recognize the determination by Anoka Co. that Viking Boulevard will be a future east-west Principal Arterial and the determination by Scott Co. that CR 17 and TH 13 will become a future Principal Arterial.

Response: Recommended new text on page 104 of the draft plan as follows: "New Principal Arterials on "A" minor arterials to support Expanding Urban Development. The need for new principal or "A" minor arterials in developing areas where the arterial grid is not adequate to serve future growth is well documented. Principal arterials are the most efficient and safe way to accommodate longer and faster regional vehicle trips. The 2004 Transportation Policy Plan already Identified needs for future principal arterials in Anoka County (east-west), Dakota County (east-west and north-south), and Washington County (north-south), and Scott County (east-west, north-south). Anoka County has determined that CSAH 22/Viking Boulevard from Sherburne County on the west to Chisago and Washington counties on the east, is the preferred location for the potential future east-west principal arterial. Scott County has determined that the future potential north-south principal arterial should be CSAH 17 and TH 13 south of TH 169. Since principal arterials should end with a connection to another principal arterial, actual endpoints can be determined in the future."

7. Issue: The results of the MnPASS 2 Study should be incorporated into the plan.

Response: Text will be added to page 92 of the draft plan as follows: "Mn/DOT, working with the Council, during 2010 completed the MnPASS 2 Study. The objective of that work was to analyze and make recommendations for the next generation of MnPASS managed lane projects for implementation in the Twin Cities metropolitan region. In the study, Mn/DOT assessed its priorities for short term (2 to 10 years) MnPASS lane implementation in light of evolving federal policies, actual experience with two operating MnPASS lanes, and in close coordination with the Managed Lane Vision developed as part of the MHSIS. An important aspect of identifying shorter term MnPASS 2 projects for implementation was the desire to avoid costly road widening and right-of-way takings. The study compared different managed lane options, but did not analyze other types of transportation investments. The recommendations of the MnPASS 2 study for short term priority investments are as follows: Tier 1 Investments: I-35E (I-94 to Little Canada Road, Little Canada Road to Co. Rd. E) A great opportunity exists to build this lane coincident with the replacement of the Cayuga Bridges, a Chapter 152 funded project which is moving forward now. This corridor has moderately high transit service, directly serves downtown St. Paul, can be built in two phases without major challenges, and

extends MnPASS to the northeastern sector of the metro region. The benefits to users will increase with a direct connection provided to downtown St. Paul via the 10th Street/Wacouta Avenue exit. Tier 2 Investments: TH 36 Eastbound from I-35W to I-35E, I-35W from downtown Minneapolis to TH 36, I-35W from TH 36 to Blaine, and I-94 between the downtowns. TH 36 is also an opportunistic project in that it can be easily and inexpensively built coincident with the replacement of the Lexington Avenue Bridge at TH 36. Combined with the I-35W project serving downtown Minneapolis it will ultimately become part of a viable northern metro MnPASS system. I-94 can provide direct connections to both Minneapolis and St. Paul and eventually connect to the existing MnPASS system. All of these corridors provide direct service to the downtown cores have high transit service levels and should be studied further. As financing and approvals are obtained, engineering challenges resolved, and opportunities arise to combine implementation of the MnPASS lane with other preservation projects, these projects should be built. All MnPASS 2, Tier 3 recommended project investments are contained in the Managed Lane Vision shown in Figure 6-34 along with other longer term implementation opportunities."

8. Issue: Need a regional bike and pedestrian plan.

Response: Chapter 12, Work Plan will include a new item Regional Bicycle System Inventory and Regional Bicycle System Master Study. This project includes an inventory of existing and currently planned bicycle facilities in the 7-county Twin Cities metropolitan area, followed by a Regional Bicycle System Master Study that will include an analysis of existing conditions, connectivity and levels of use of the bikeway system with a special emphasis on connectivity to regional transitways and major travel generators.

9. Issue: Lack of discussion of ADA impacts and role of Metropolitan Council in regional pedestrian accessibility.

Response: Chapter 12, the Federal Requirements Chapter will include a paragraph on the role of the Metropolitan Council in fulfilling the requirements of the Americans With Disabilities Act, as follows: "ADA: The Americans With Disabilities Act requires that all pedestrian facilities and transit facilities that are constructed be accessible to users with all levels of functional ability. Policy 16 of the Transportation Policy Plan assures that this goal is pursued for the entire transit system including pedestrian access to that system. Chapter 9 also includes a discussion of the requirement that all owners of pedestrian facilities should strive to make them accessible and that all public entities with 50 or more employees are required by law to develop an ADA Transition Plan that will detail steps to make their public rights of way accessible."



2030 Transportation Policy Plan

**Report of Public Comment
August 23 through October 7, 2010**

Comment Overview

The 2030 Transportation Policy Plan Public Comment Report summarizes the comments received on the draft 2030 Transportation Policy Plan as adopted July 28, 2010. The comment period ran from August 23, 2010 to October 7, 2010. During that time the plan was available on the Council's website and through the Data Center.

Four open houses were held throughout the region to explain the plan to citizens, governmental staff, and elected officials. A public hearing was held at the Metro Transit offices at 5:00 PM on September 27, 2010. A list of the people who testified is attached and a video record of the proceedings is on the Council's website. The following spreadsheet summarizes the comments received, who made the comment and the staff response to the comment. There is also an index of all comment contributors with an identifying number attached. Many people made similar comments so a generalized summary of comments is followed by the identifying number of the persons or groups who made the comment. Blank lines in the comment tables are not errors. The blank entries occurred during the consolidation process when a comment was identified as duplicative and was combined with other comments OR when the comment was moved to another category group. In addition, a few sequential numbers may appear to be missing. These are intentional – either the result of a data glitch or consolidation of items.

A written record of the actual comments made via letter, email, or online comment is available from the Council's Data Center.

Speakers at September 27 Public Hearing

- Allen Lovejoy, City of St. Paul
- Dave Van Hattum, Transit for Livable Communities
- Paul Buchanan, Resident
- Jim Erkel, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy
- Helen Duritsa, White Bear Lake Bike-Walk Task Force
- Judy Johnson/Tim Bildsoe, Plymouth City Council
- Tom Lais, Resident
- Connie Bernardy, Active Living Ramsey Communities

NOTE: A video record of the hearing is on the Metropolitan Council Website

List of Comment Contributors

| ID | Organization | Name |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | Resident | Andrew Lenz |
| 2 | City of Brooklyn Center | Steven L. Lillehaug, Director of Public Works/City Engineer |
| 3 | Resident | John Plotnicky |
| 4 | Resident | Michael Johnson |
| 5 | Ramsey County, Department of Public Works | Joseph Lux |
| 6 | Resident | Lynn O. Johnson |
| 7 | Resident | Tom Resick |
| 8 | Resident | Vicki Stolt |
| 9 | Resident | Jeremy Jenum |
| 10 | Resident; Business Owner | Wayne G. Nelson |
| 11 | Resident | Michael & Donna Sankey |
| 12 | Resident | Lynne Shufelt |
| 13 | Resident; Business Owner | Lance Stendal |
| 14 | Resident | Jared M. Lawrence |
| 15 | Resident; Business Owner | David C. Stendal |
| 16 | Resident | Mike Reilly |
| 17 | Resident | Suneel Arora |
| 18 | Resident | Bobbi Grimm |
| 19 | Resident | Brandon Stendal |
| 20 | Resident | Jeff McCurdy |
| 21 | Resident | Tammy Wilson |
| 22 | Resident | Mark Steiner |
| 24 | Resident | Lisa |
| 25 | Resident | Lori Dietrich & Steven Piazza |
| 26 | Resident | Jeanie Mallberg |
| 27 | Resident | Ahmad Yassine |
| 28 | Resident | Alicia Maloney |
| 29 | Resident | Candi Wallace |
| 30 | Resident | John F. Robinson |
| 31 | Resident | Steve Terhaar |
| 32 | Resident | Christopher Tomczik |

Note: Due to a data glitch, there are a few numbers not listed. They are not missing - they were skipped in the auto-numbering system.

| ID Organization | Name |
|---|---|
| 34 Resident | Paul F. Hartford |
| 35 Resident | Richard Matt |
| 36 Resident | Mike Lurie |
| 37 Resident | N/A |
| 38 Resident | Carol L. Crosby |
| 39 City of New Hope | Eric Weiss, Community Development Assistant |
| 41 Resident | Tom Murphy |
| 42 Resident | Brigham Briggs |
| 43 City of Plymouth | Kelli Slavik, Mayor |
| 44 Resident | Shaun O'Keefe |
| 45 Resident | Bill Burns |
| 46 Resident | Peter Breyfogle |
| 47 Resident | N/A |
| 48 Resident | Mary Theresa Downing |
| 49 Resident | Julia Harrington |
| 50 Resident | James Jacobs |
| 51 MN Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities | Anni Simons, Coalition Coordinator |
| 52 Resident | Vern Gaarder |
| 53 Resident | Melissa Garity |
| 54 Resident | Mara Robinson |
| 55 Resident | Bill Devens |
| 56 Resident | Brian Forney |
| 57 Resident | Dave Groneberg |
| 58 Resident | Greg Kemnitz |
| 59 Resident | David G. Wick |
| 60 Resident | Carla West |
| 61 Resident | Richard Novak |
| 62 Resident | Jim Gagne |
| 63 Resident | Andrew Balfour |
| 64 Resident | Barb Livick |
| 65 Resident | Lisa Robb |
| 66 Resident | Pat Owen |

Note: Due to a data glitch, there are a few numbers not listed. They are not missing - they were skipped in the auto-numbering system.

| ID | Organization | Name |
|-----|---|--|
| 67 | Resident | Ralph Wyman |
| 68 | Resident | Terri Nowicki |
| 69 | Resident | Jorg Lueke |
| 70 | Resident | Dan McKenzie |
| 71 | Resident | Val Escher |
| 72 | Resident | William Dossett |
| 74 | Resident | Steve Boland |
| 75 | Resident | Annette Rondano |
| 76 | Resident | Concerned Minnesota Driver |
| 77 | Resident | Paul W. Barber |
| 78 | Resident | Sarah Curtner |
| 79 | Resident | Richard Tomassoni |
| 80 | Resident | Mary Kay Welter |
| 81 | Resident | Robert Friedman |
| 82 | Resident | Paul Moss |
| 83 | Resident | N/A |
| 84 | City of St. Paul | Chris Coleman, Mayor/Allen Lovejoy, Transportation Planner |
| 86 | Transit for Livable Communities | Dave Van Hattum, Policy and Advocacy Program Manager |
| 87 | Resident | Paul Buchanan |
| 88 | Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy | Jim Erkel, Land Use and Transportation Program Director |
| 89 | White Bear Lake Bike Walk Task Force | Helen Duritsa |
| 90 | Plymouth City Council | Judy Johnson, Council Member |
| 91 | Plymouth City Council | Tim Bildsoe, Council Member |
| 92 | Resident | Tom Lais |
| 93 | Active Living Ramsey Communities | Connie Bernardy |
| 94 | Resident | Will Harrington |
| 95 | Resident | Ann Woodson-Hicks |
| 96 | Hamline Midway Transportation Committee | Richard Hanson, Member |
| 97 | Resident | N/A |
| 98 | Resident | Mark Wasescha |
| 99 | Resident | Christie Soderling |
| 100 | Resident | Rudolph Ellis |

Note: Due to a data glitch, there are a few numbers not listed. They are not missing - they were skipped in the auto-numbering system.

| ID | Organization | Name |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 101 | Resident | Daniel Maas |
| 102 | Dakota County Board of Commissioners | Tom Egan, Chair |
| 104 | Resident | J Barbier |
| 105 | Resident | Janet Phillippe |
| 106 | Resident | Robert Wellemeyer |
| 107 | Resident | Guy Jackson |
| 108 | City of Chanhassen | Tom Furlong, Mayor |
| 109 | Resident | Paul Wiltse |
| 110 | Resident | Sue Larson |
| 111 | Resident | Jan Fleming |
| 112 | Resident | Derek Ryder |
| 113 | West Lakeland Township | David Schultz, Supervisor |
| 114 | Resident | Ron Halverson |
| 115 | Resident | Mike Keegan |
| 116 | Resident | Loren Voigt |
| 117 | Resident | Julie Tripp |
| 118 | Resident | Liesa Miller |
| 119 | Resident | Dora Jones |
| 120 | Resident | Steve Gustafson |
| 121 | Resident | Claudia Leung |
| 122 | Resident | Val Barnes |
| 123 | Resident | Grover Jones |
| 124 | Resident | Michelle Evans |
| 125 | Resident | Beth Rademacher |
| 126 | Resident | Doug Krinn |
| 127 | Resident | Ariah Fine |
| 128 | Resident | Boise Jones |
| 129 | Resident | Tim Brausen |
| 130 | Resident | Matt Kazinka |
| 131 | Resident | Dan Thiede |
| 132 | Minnesota Senate | Sen. Don Betzold |
| 133 | City of Ham Lake | Paul Meunier, Mayor |

Note: Due to a data glitch, there are a few numbers not listed. They are not missing - they were skipped in the auto-numbering system.

| ID | Organization | Name |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|
| 134 | Resident | Cindy G. Bach |
| 135 | Resident | Kristin Becker |
| 136 | City of Centerville | Dallas Larson, Administrator |
| 137 | Resident | Debbie Meister |
| 138 | City of East Bethel | Steven Channer, Council Member |
| 139 | Resident | Fernando Anderson |
| 141 | City of Minneapolis | Steven Kottke, City Engineer/Director of Public Works |
| 142 | Minnesota Senate | Sen. Sandy Rummel |
| 143 | City of Anoka | Phil Rice, Mayor |
| 144 | Resident | Dan Schueller |
| 145 | Resident | Tom Van Leer |
| 146 | Resident | John Schnickel |
| 147 | City of Ramsey | Brian E. Olson, Dir. of Public Works/Principal City Engineer |
| 148 | Resident | Mark and Karen Reed |
| 149 | Resident | Caryn Olsen |
| 150 | City of Lexington | Dot Helfort, Administrator |
| 152 | Minnesota House of Representatives | Rep. Peggy Scott/Rep. Tim Sanders |
| 153 | Minnesota Senate | Sen. Ray Vandevener |
| 154 | Minnesota House of Representatives | Rep. Jim Abeler |
| 155 | Resident | Steven Hauser |
| 156 | Resident | Wayne Gartland |
| 157 | City of Shoreview | Sandy Martin, Mayor |
| 158 | City of Plymouth | Sarah Hellekson, Transit Manager |
| 159 | Resident | Norann Dillon |
| 160 | Anoka County Board of Commissioners | Dennis Berg, Chair |
| 161 | City of Bloomington | Gene Winstead, Mayor |
| 162 | City of Eagan | Mike Maguire, Mayor |
| 163 | Minnesota House of Representatives | Rep. Jerry Newton |
| 164 | Resident | Mary Duerr |
| 165 | Carver County Board of Commissioners | Gayle Degler, Vice Chair |
| 166 | Resident | Owen |
| 167 | City of Columbus | Elizabeth Mursko, City Administrator |

Note: Due to a data glitch, there are a few numbers not listed. They are not missing - they were skipped in the auto-numbering system.

| ID | Organization | Name |
|-----|---|---|
| 168 | Resident | Clare Ann Welter |
| 169 | Resident | Kate Briggs |
| 170 | Resident | Lisa Daniels |
| 171 | Resident | Jim Ivey |
| 172 | Resident | Todd Heintz |
| 173 | Resident | James Alvey |
| 174 | Resident | Krista Leraas |
| 177 | Resident | David Kapell |
| 178 | Resident | Mike Steigerwald |
| 180 | Resident | Maureen Hunt |
| 181 | Resident | Paul Perkal |
| 182 | Resident | David Warren Ingalsbe |
| 183 | Resident | Charles Frye |
| 184 | Minnesota House of Representatives | Rep. Carolyn Laine |
| 185 | Minnesota House of Representatives | Rep. Tom Tillberry |
| 186 | SouthWest Transit | Len Simich, CEO |
| 187 | Resident | Joan Fro |
| 188 | Metro Cities-Association of Metropolitan Municipalities | Patricia A. Nauman, Executive Director |
| 189 | City of Chaska | Mark Windschitl, Mayor |
| 191 | Metropolitan Airports Commission | Roy Fuhrmann, Director of Environment |
| 192 | City of East Bethel | Douglas Sell, City Administrator |
| 193 | Washington County | Donald J. Theisen, Director/County Engineer |
| 194 | City of Nowthen | Bill Schulz, Mayor |
| 195 | SMART Trips | Jessica Treat, Executive Director |
| 197 | City of Ramsey | Bob Ramsey, Mayor |
| 198 | I-494 Corridor Commission | Steve Elkins, Chair |
| 199 | Resident | Ed Petsche |
| 200 | Minnesota House of Representatives | Rep. Denise Dittrich |
| 201 | The Transportation Alliance | Margaret Donahoe, Executive Director |
| 202 | SW Corridor Transportation Coalition | Robert J. Lindall, President |
| 203 | Minnesota Valley Transit Authority | Beverley Miller, Executive Director |
| 204 | Minnesota Trucking Association | John Hausladen, President |

Note: Due to a data glitch, there are a few numbers not listed. They are not missing - they were skipped in the auto-numbering system.

| ID | Organization | Name |
|-----|--|---|
| 205 | Minnesota Department of Transportation | Scott L. McBride, Metro District Engineer |
| 206 | Scott County Board of Commissioners | Barbara Marschall, Chair |
| 207 | Friends of the Parks and Trails | Kathy Stack, President |
| 208 | City of Shakopee | John J. Schmitt, Mayor |
| 209 | HIRE Minnesota | Marcus Harcus, Coalition Organizer |
| 210 | Board of North Metro Chamber of Commerce | Richard Helesock, member |
| 211 | Resident | Bob Neuman |
| 212 | Resident | Kevin Kirsch |
| 213 | Resident | Patrick A. McNamara |
| 214 | Resident | Paul Nelson |
| 215 | Sierra Club North Star Chapter-Land Use and Transportation Com | Spencer Agnew |
| 216 | Resident | Neil Franey |
| 217 | Saint Paul Bicycle Coalition | Andy Singer, Chairman |
| 220 | Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee | N/A |

Note: Due to a data glitch, there are a few numbers not listed. They are not missing - they were skipped in the auto-numbering system.

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---|----------|---|--|
| Overall Plan Comments | | | |
| 4, 5, 86, 101, 162, 188, 190, 193, 205, 215 | 1a | Overall support for the plan. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 3 | 1b | Plan does not address pipelines as a mode of transportation, or the safety implications of pipelines. | While pipelines are an established and vital transportation mode, they are owned, operated, and maintained by private oil companies. The TPP is the federally required, metropolitan long-range plan for public surface and air transportation modes of which pipelines (and other privately owned utilities) are not included. Planning to avoid or manage transportation-related disasters comes under the authority of the Minnesota Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management and the federal Department of Homeland Security, as well as owners of the transportation facilities themselves. No change recommended. |
| 84, 102 | 1d | Plan reflects good faith effort to balance needs with available resources; makes strong statement about improving existing highway system | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 84 | 1e | Discussion involving the counties outside the seven-county area is overdue and valuable. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 88, 101, 195 | 1f | Overall plan is good in acknowledging can't expand highway system to address congestion. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 100 | 1g | Transportation is essential to the vitality of a community. If any one aspect is lacking, everyone suffers. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 102, 167, 192, 208 | 1h | What does the plan include for highways, interchanges, park-and-rides to support development outside the 494/694 ring? | Chapter 6-Highways and Chapter 7-Transit enumerate the investments envisioned for the highway and transit system over the next 20 years, including facilities outside the 494/694 ring. In addition, these chapters provide a vision and policy direction for investing in the system that is beyond the fiscal constraint of the plan. Specific investments outside the ring include the completion of TH 610, Active Traffic Management (ATM) and lower-cost/high-benefit investments on freeways and non-freeway trunk highways and investments in the Transitways and bus system as shown on the maps in chapter 7. Specific interchange projects are generally not included in the plan as most often these projects are not major projects (in excess of one mile) that must be specified in the plan. Interchanges that meet the criteria specified in Appendix E and identify funding through the regional solicitation or other sources will occur. The 2030 Park and Ride plan is shown in Figure 7-22, which contains many existing and planned facilities outside the ring. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---|----------|--|--|
| 161 | 1i | Plan is improved from previous plans. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 161 | 1j | Thank you for including suggested changes in previous plans. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 132, 133, 136, 138, 142, 143, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 160, 163, 167, 184, 185, 194, 200, 201, 202, 208, 210 | 1k | Do not support updating the plan at this time. | The current policy plan was adopted in January 2009 to comply with a federal deadline and meet the requirement that the plan be updated every four years. Because several studies were incomplete at the time, no highway expansion projects beyond 2012 were included in the fiscally constrained plan, and the previous lists of major projects were removed from the plan for reassessment. In the January 2009 plan, the Council committed to updating the TPP in 2010 with results from the studies. It would be a significant disservice to the region to not adopt a new plan, and choose instead to retain the existing plan, which includes no highway expansion projects. No change recommended. |
| 138, 160 | 1l | Plan will impede progress on projects where prior investments and work have already been made. | This plan is intended to let communities know what transportation investments are realistically possible and most likely will occur over the next 20 years. This allow communities to make better planning and land use decisions and plan accordingly for what is expected to occur. To send anything other than a clear signal about the realities of future transportation investment would be a disservice to the community and may result in expenditure of local funds and effort on projects that will not occur for many years or not at all. No change recommended. |
| 152, 184 | 1m | Plan will negatively affect communities outside the 494/694 ring. | The TPP no longer gives priority to projects inside the 494/694 ring and has not since 2001. This policy is not included in the current or proposed plan. No change recommended |
| 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 139, 145, 149, 199, 209 | 1n | Plan does not address diversifying the workforce. | The TPP is the long-range plan that describes what will be built by 2030, not how it will be built. The major highway and transit infrastructure investments in this plan will be built by the Council and Mn/DOT, both of whom have policies for diversifying the workforce to construct and operate transportation facilities and services. No change recommended. |
| 118, 131, 137, 166, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 195, 214, 220 | 1o | Plan does not address Council's role in assuring mobility for all through ADA. | As the transit operator for the region, the Council's ADA role is primarily to assure that the transit services and facilities we provide are fully accessible. This is acknowledged in Policy 16 and on p. 106-107 (dial-a-ride/Metro Mobility services) and p. 130 (transit passenger facilities). The transit vehicle fleet has been fully accessible for several years. The need for bicycle and pedestrian facilities to be ADA compliant is also mentioned in several places in Chapter 9. Policy 16b will be revised to clarify that certification is by the Council. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|--|
| 193, 208 | 1p | Plan seems to be inconsistent in encouraging major transit projects while discouraging major highway projects. Plan lacks regional balance for both highways and transit. | Both Chapters 6-Highways and 7-Transit provide a vision and policy direction for how available revenues should be spent over the next 20 years. The investments specified in the TPP are required to be fiscally constrained, however, both the highway and transit chapters provide a policy direction for how additional funds will be spent should they become available. Investments are based on revenue estimates that can reasonably be expected to be available over the next 20 years. While the actual investments are fiscally constrained, the highway and transit visions will require a higher level of funding to be implemented. The highway vision in particular will require \$3 to \$4 billion while only \$900 million in expansion funds are available. (See response to Issue 1z for additional information.) Expected highway funds are heavily dependent on existing formula allocations while a significant amount of the estimated transit funds are dependent on existing competitive programs such as the federal New Starts program, which specifically are for Transitway expansion. The highway system has largely been built over the past 40 to 50 years and will require a majority of the funds to be directed towards preservation of the existing investments. Congestion mitigation expenditures will be focused on smaller cost effective projects that provide the most system-wide benefit. The Transitway system is still in the process of being built into a true system of interconnected bus and rail transitways. Preservation of the existing transit system is the highest priority, but as expansion funds become available they will be directed towards continuing to build the system. In addition, most of the funds that are planned for transit infrastructure expansion are not flexible funds - they cannot be used for highway purposes or transit operations. No change recommended. |
| 208 | 1r | Plan does not provide complete transportation vision, and is inconsistent with Council's land use policies | All Council system plans are based on the Regional Development Framework, which defines where growth is expected within the seven county area. Because the systems of sewers, parks and transportation are all funded from different sources, with varying amounts of funding available, it is not always possible that all services are provided to an area simultaneously. The transportation system plan is the only one that is required by law to be fiscally constrained. No change recommended. |
| 203 | 1s | Plan includes statement that highway expansion should not be implemented at the expense of system preservation and management. A similar statement should be made for transit. | Strategy 2a states that preservation of the existing system is the highest priority for all modes, including highways and transit. Strategy 2c state that after preserving, operating and maintaining the existing transit system, investments will be made to grow the bus system and develop a system of transitways. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---------------|----------|--|---|
| 165, 188, 202 | 1t | Plan is not consistent with other Council plans. | All Council system plans are based on the Regional Development Framework, which defines where growth is expected to occur within the seven county area. Because the systems of sewers, parks and transportation are all funded from different sources, with varying amounts of funding available, it is not always possible that all services are provided to an area simultaneously. The Transportation system plan is the only one that is required by law to be fiscally constrained. No change recommended. |
| 192, 217 | 1v | Plan does not discuss passenger rail connections. | Strategy 5b states that the Council will work with Mn/DOT to pursue improved regional and national connections using modes such as intercity passenger rail. Passenger rail is also discussed on page 150 of the draft plan and Figure 7-42. The 2030 Transitway System indicates where the high priorities identified by Mn/DOT for intercity and high speed passenger rail connect to the metropolitan area. No change recommended. |
| 201 | 1w | Plan should more clearly identify the importance of partnerships. | Strategy 6b states that the Council will coordinate with cities, counties and government agencies in planning and implementing regional transportation investments and policy. In addition the Non-Freeway Trunk Highway Improvements section on page 80 of the draft plan specifies that cooperative agreements between Mn/DOT and local governments should be used to fund and implement these types of investments. No change recommended. |
| 165, 201 | 1x | Studies that relate to changes in the TPP (e.g. MHSIS and MnPASS II) should be included with the plan. | Recommendations from both studies are included in the plan. The full reports are available on the Council's website as are other studies, such as the Transit Master Study, that were utilized in preparing the TPP. No change recommended. |
| 188 | 1y | Support assertion that transportation needs are underfunded. | Many studies prepared over the last 10 years by both Mn/DOT and the Council, such as the Metropolitan Highway System Investment Study (MHSIS), the Principal Arterial study, and Mn/DOT statewide plan, document the needed improvements and the expected revenues. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| 165, 190, 193, 201, 206, 208 | 1z | Plan should provide transportation vision beyond fiscally constrained plan. | <p>Federal law requires the Council to prepare a fiscally constrained long range transportation plan that includes only specific transportation investments that can reasonably expect to be funded over the 20-year plan. While the investments specified in the plan must be fiscally constrained, the vision and policy direction for expenditures articulated in the plan are not fiscally constrained. The highway vision calls for expending available mobility/expansions funds in four key areas; active traffic management and technology investments, lower cost/high benefit projects, managed lane vision and on strategic capacity enhancements. Fully funding these types of highway expenditures would require \$3 - \$4 billion, while only \$900 million in mobility funds will be available through 2030. As increased or unanticipated funding becomes available it should be directed towards funding this vision.</p> <p>Text in the plan will be revised in various places as shown below: Insert on page 103 of the draft plan as the first paragraph of highway chapter section titled "Fiscally Constrained Mobility/Congestion Mitigation Priorities:" <u>This plan provides a highway vision and identifies an investment need that greatly exceeds the revenues reasonably expected to be received over the next 20 years. The cost of implementing the Managed Lane System Vision shown in Figure 6-34 is estimated to cost up to \$1.5 billion. An early stage of the Congestion Mitigation Safety Plan (CMSP) led by Mn/DOT identified more than 184 potential lower cost /high benefit CMSP projects totaling over \$1.5 billion. Mn/DOT continues to work on identifying these potential projects and anticipates the list and cost to grow. The cost to provide Active Traffic Management (ATM) technology improvements on all Principal and "A" minor arterials as called for in this plan will require an investment in the range of hundreds of millions of dollars, while the fiscally constrained plan is able to fund only \$5 million in ATM investments annually. The plan's highway vision also supports implementation of strategic capacity enhancements such as the completion of TH 610 or other capacity additions in strategic locations that are scoped and designed under the lower cost/high benefit philosophy. Fully funding the highway mobility and congestion mitigation investments supported by the policy direction of this plan will require funding in the range of \$3.0- \$4.0 billion.</u> <u>As demonstrated earlier, the fiscally constrained state road construction budget is estimated to provide \$3.8 billion through 2030 (see figure 6-21 and 6-24), with only \$900 million (23%) available for mobility and congestion mitigation in the 2015-2030 time period. This plan calls for the \$900 million to be sub-allocated into three categories: ATM investments, lower cost/high benefit projects and Fiscally constrained funding priorities must be consistent with the projected regional transportation revenues for the State Road Construction Program shown in Table 6-21. About \$900 or about 23 percent of those funds are projected to be available for</u></p> |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---------|--|
| | | | <p>mobility and congestion mitigation in the 2015-2030 time period. The \$900M available for congestion mitigation/mobility investments shown in Table 6-39 are further sub-allocated to three categories, ATM management, lower cost / high-benefit projects and managed lanes/strategic capacity projects in Table 6-29 as shown in Table 6-39. The allocation of these funds assumes the implementation of projects that meet multiple objectives, such as preservation and congestion mitigation within one project. Should any project increase in cost above that shown in Table 6-39, adjustments will be needed within the investment category or other projects will be delayed. The region, working with Mn/DOT, will continue to seek additional revenues to ensure that these projects and possibly more can be advanced to actual implementation. <u>As additional revenues are secured through increased funding levels or competitive grants to the extent possible the funds should be used to increase the spending levels for the investment categories shown in Table 6-39 and bring the region closer to fully funding the investment needs identified in this plan.</u></p> <p>Table 6-39 allocates only a portion of the 2015-2020 funds have been allocated to specific projects, shown in Table 6-39. The rest of the funds have been set aside for broad project categories pending further analysis of costs and benefits. The intent is to continue to monitor, as part of the Congestion Management Process, the performance of the MnPASS lanes on I-394 and I-35W, the I-94 ATM project and the new projects proposed in Table 6-39 and to verify their costs and impacts on the system. This analysis will be used in the 2014 update of this plan, or sooner if warranted, to adjust investment priorities and include new investments that are deemed to be most beneficial to the region. Also based on this analysis, some of the 2021-2030 funds may be committed to advance MnPASS and CMSP projects through an amendment to this plan.</p> <p>Other text additions:</p> <p>On page 3 of the Highway Vision section of the Plan Overview add: <u>Fully funding these investment strategies is beyond the fiscal constraint of this plan. As additional funds are sought and become available, they should be used to more fully implement the highway investment vision articulated in this plan.</u></p> <p>On page 32 in the Finance Chapter edit the following after the opening paragraph: Under federal law, the region is required to develop a fiscally constrained long-range plan. This requires developing an estimate of the highway and transit revenues that will <u>can reasonably be expected to</u> be available to the region over the next 20 years. All revenue estimates are uncertain and in the end will prove to be off by some degree. This plan uses estimates of revenue based on known state and federal</p> |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---------|---|
| | | | <p>allocation formulas, current state revenue forecasts and also based upon past experience with receiving federal, state and other competitive or discretionary revenues. <u>This plan contains an investment vision for highways that cannot be fully funded with reasonably assumed revenues. In addition, the transit revenues assume a high level of competitive funds that may not materialize. As additional revenues are sought and become available they should be used to more fully implement the highway and transit investment visions in this plan.</u></p> <p>On Page 78 under the list of bullets for what the highway strategy in this plan will do add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provide policy direction for the use of additional or unanticipated funds.</u> <p>On page 79 under the section on ATM add: <u>An annual budget of \$5.0 million has been allocated to ATM investments. The needs on the Principal and "A" minor arterials greatly exceed this investment level.</u></p> <p>On page 79 under the Lower- Cost/High Benefit Improvements section add: <u>In an early phase of the CMSP analysis 184 projects were identified with a cost estimate of more than \$1.5 billion. This greatly exceeds the \$320 million allocated (\$20 million annually) for lower-cost/high benefit projects in this plan.</u></p> <p>On page 80 under the Managed Lane section add: <u>The managed lane vision (Figure 6-34) is estimated to cost up to \$1.5 billion. This estimate assumes most projects can be built with little or no new right-of-way. The 16-year estimate of funds available for managed lane implementation is less than \$500 million.</u></p> |

Chapter 2 - Policy

| | | | |
|-----|----|---|---|
| 160 | 2a | The plan should not dictate the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) process. | The plan reiterates the existing TAB solicitation qualifying criteria that projects must be consistent with TPP. The text on page 80 of the draft plan will be changed to clarify that explicit support from Mn/DOT will continue to be necessary to obtain Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds through the Regional Solicitation process. This is a continuation of existing TAB practice. No change recommended. |
| 155 | 2b | There is no existing mention of preservation, operations, and maintaining pedestrian and bicycle investments in Policy 2. | Although not mentioned in Policy 2, these issues are addressed in the plan itself, in Chapter 9 on p. 175 (Reconstruction of existing facilities) and on p. 178 (Pathway maintenance). No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|--|
| 217 | 2c | Creating a system of managed lanes creates a potentially significant new revenue stream with limited public input. | The plan does not suggest the addition of a system of managed lanes for the purpose of raising additional revenues. Managed/priced lanes are part of the regional highway vision because they can offer a congestion-free alternative for transit, HOVs and single occupant vehicles willing to pay. The revenue generated by managed lanes is anticipated to be used for highway and transit operations in the corridor, but will not provide a significant revenue stream. There has been a significant level of public involvement, both in the adoption of the draft TPP and in the Metropolitan Highway System Investment Study, which laid the foundation for the highway plan. No change recommended. |
| 201 | 2d | Plan reiterates goal to eliminate congestion, but also notes that it cannot be eliminated. It will continue to be important to evaluate congestion levels including the cost of time and fuel lost, and to measure the impact of approaches used to manage congestion. | Strategy 9a states that the Council, Mn/DOT and local units of government will plan for the Metropolitan Highway System with the understanding that congestion will not be eliminated or significantly reduced. The plan suggests five key objectives to mitigate congestion: implementing active traffic management system-wide; constructing low-cost high benefit improvements; developing a system of managed lanes; implementing strategic capacity enhancements and investing in non-freeway trunk highway improvements. Congestion levels and the impact of improvements will continue to be measured and monitored to gauge the impact of these investments. Mn/DOT continues to use the Urban Mobility Report to identify the region's travel time index, which includes cost of time and fuel lost. No change recommended. |
| 190, 220 | 2f | Supports Policy 16 - Transit for People with Disabilities. Policy should perhaps emphasize that the ADA law is the minimum and that operators and communities should exceed requirements. | Policy 16 states that the Council will provide transit services that fully comply with ADA. While actual practice has been to provide service that exceeds minimum when it is financially feasible, growth in demand and competition for operating funds make it unlikely this service level can be sustained through 2030. No change recommended. |
| 220 | 2g | Include stronger language than "encourage" for making transit stops accessible and removing snow. | Strategy 16c will be changed to read: <u>"Providing adequate access to transit stops and stations, including removal of snow in a timely manner, is required by law. Local communities and transit providers should coordinate to ensure that all fixed-route transit stops are accessible."</u> |
| 155 | 2h | Bicycle and Pedestrian system and network are left out of Policy 5, National and Global connections. | The bicycle and pedestrian modes are not appropriate modes at the scale of national and global connections. No change recommended. |
| 155 | 2i | Limiting vehicle weight and limiting routes for heavy vehicles will preserve highways. | Vehicle weight limits are set by state law. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---|----------|---|---|
| Chapter 3 - Finance | | | |
| 78, 82, 87, 118, 131, 137, 166, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 195, 214, | 3b | Funding for transportation should be to encourage cleaner, greener, safer, healthier, efficient, equitable, and sustainable modes. Funding should be directed at alternative transportation and increasing options for residents. | The revenues estimated to be available in the plan are driven by existing funding formulas and rules. No law changes regarding how the funds may be spent are assumed to occur, i.e. highway revenues must still be spent for a highway purpose. The Highway plan directs revenues estimated to be available for mobility to four primary categories of expenditure; lower-cost/high-benefit projects, active traffic management investments, managed lane investments and strategic capacity investments. These investments will improve air quality, provide benefits to transit and HOVs, and result in a safer, more efficient highway system. The Council and the Transportation Advisory Board have a long history of directing funds with more flexibility, such as Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, to alternative modes. No change recommended. |
| 102, 188, 190 | 3c | The Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT should become advocates for additional transportation funding. | Policy 1 of the plan states that the Council will identify and pursue an adequate level of resources for regional transportation investments. This plan identifies the resources estimated to be available for both highways and transit and provides a plan for the spending of these resources. Both Chapter 6 - Highways and Chapter 7 - Transit also contain a policy direction for the spending of additional funds that may become available. No change recommended. |
| 141 | 3d | Consider developing a regional strategy for pursuing federal funding. | Federal funds for highways are heavily driven by distribution formulas, though special multimodal competitive programs such as the Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA), American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) have recently become available on a one-time basis. Transit funds come from both formula distributions and competitive programs such as New Starts. Federal competitive programs typically contain rules specifying the policy emphasis and types of projects eligible to apply for the funding. As programs become available, the Council will seek competitive federal funds for the investment priorities identified in the plan. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---------------|----------|--|---|
| 141, 193 | 3e | Update New Starts funding information to reflect new interpretation of the Cost-Effectiveness Index (CEI). | The language on page 37 of the draft plan regarding federal New Starts funding will be revised as follows: <u>"Federal New Starts funding is the source used to fund major rail and dedicated busway projects. New Starts funding is awarded nationally on a competitive basis through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Projects must apply and receive approval to enter preliminary engineering and must also apply again to enter final design and construction. New Starts projects are currently evaluated by the FTA based upon "Project Justification" and "Financial" ratings; both of these ratings, and the overall project rating for a project, must be medium or better to receive FTA New Starts funding. FTA considers six project justification factors: Economic Development Benefits; Transit-Supportive Land Use; Mobility Improvements; Cost-Effectiveness; and Environmental Benefits. The financial rating is based upon the project sponsor's ability to support the operations and maintenance of the transit system, the amount and proportion of the local funding match commitment, and the stability and dependability of that match. Historically, those projects that have been competitive for federal funds commit at least a 50 percent local match (beyond the required 20 percent minimum)."</u> |
| 165, 206, 208 | 3f | Plan is fiscally constrained in terms of highway funding, but not transit funding. Principles of fiscally constraining plan should apply to all modes. | Under federal law the plan must be fiscally constrained for the investments that it specifies over the 20 year period. However, the plan can and does provide a vision and policy direction for how additional or unanticipated funds will be spent. In particular the highway vision is estimated to require between \$3.0 -\$4.0 billion while only \$900 million is available. (see response to comment 1z). Fiscally constrained means the region should account for revenues "that can reasonably expect to be received" over the 20-year plan. Page 23 of the plan states that the plan uses estimates based on known state and federal allocation formulas, current state revenue forecasts and past experience with receiving federal, state and other competitive or discretionary revenue. The Highway revenue estimates are largely driven by existing funding formulas with approximately \$100 million of the \$900 million available for congestion relief to be obtained through discretionary or competitive appropriations. Transit revenue estimates, particularly for transitway capital, are heavily dependent on the assumption that the region will be successful in obtaining competitive revenues, primarily through the federal New Starts program, but also through the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) and state bond funding. Competitive funds are not flexible and generally can only be assumed for specific types of projects such as transitways. The assumption for competitive funds contains a higher level of risk and uncertainty than do the formula driven highway revenue assumptions. In order to achieve the goal of doubling transit ridership, these competitive funds will need to be realized. See changes recommended under comment 1z. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|---|
| 208 | 3g | There should be balance between investments in highway expansion and transit expansion. | As noted in previous responses, the revenue estimates in the plan are based upon existing formula distributions and availability of competitive programs, primarily for transit. Funds generally are not flexible from highway to transit programs. Federal flexible funds that are available are typically allocated through the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) Regional Solicitation Process. Every two years the TAB reviews its process and determines how funds will be allocated across the various types of transportation programs. No change recommended. |
| 202 | 3i | Plan is overly restrictive and may limit ability of coalition groups to solicit additional funding. | The plan distributes revenues reasonably estimated to be available over the next 20 years. It does not place restrictions on or limit the ability of advocacy groups to seek additional funds. Over the past 20 years, advocacy groups in the region have secured funding for many projects that were not shown in the region's fiscally constrained plan. No change recommended. |
| 165, 201 | 3j | Plan underestimates funding that will be available. Estimates should not be based on today's funding levels. | The revenue estimates in the plan do not assume the level of funding available today is what will be available in the future. The estimates use the highway distribution formulas that are in place today, but assume an increased level of funds will be available to distribute. The highway revenue estimates in particular assume an increase in federal funding levels of 1.6% annually which results in more than a 30% increase in federal highway funding levels over the 20 year plan. No change recommended. |
| 189 | 3k | Plan should expand Mn/DOT's Cooperative Project Program for financial partnering. | The Mn/DOT Metro District Highway Investment Plan shown in Figure 6-24 on page 84 of the draft TPP calls for \$45 million, which includes Community Improvement investments. These investments will require partnering between Mn/DOT and local communities to both fund and accomplish these locally prioritized projects. No change recommended. |
| 162, 197 | 3l | Plan should address funding opportunities for non-freeway principal and A-minor arterials | The highway plan supports the use of available mobility funds for lower-cost/high-benefit improvements and active traffic management (ATM) improvements on both freeway and non-freeway principal and A-minor arterials. The plan also notes that federal Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds available through the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) Regional Solicitation should be used for ATM improvements on non-freeway trunk highways and A-minor arterials. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|-----------------------------|----------|--|--|
| 197, 203 | 3m | Plan does not support creative approaches to funding highway projects. Council should coordinate efforts to leverage other funding sources (such as with the UPA project). | Council staff is currently participating in Mn/DOT's Innovative Finance initiative and will closely follow any demonstration activities for innovative financing. As these financing methods are tested and proven successful as a means of financing projects, they will be incorporated into future updates of the TPP. The Finance chapter is primarily focused on actual funding and revenue sources that will be available, not necessarily on "financing" which typically is focused on different ways of structuring payments or debt, but does not result in more total funds being available. The draft TPP acknowledges on page 30 that many recent federal programs have been competitive funding programs that can offer significant amounts of one-time funding for specific projects. The TPP acknowledges regional community improvements, when local governments participate in projects with Mn/DOT. The draft plan also assumes approximately \$100 million will be gained competitively. No change recommended. |
| 206 | 3o | Full levy for RALF funds should be used annually. | The Council continues to levy the full amount for the right-of-way acquisition loan fund. Funds available for expenditure will be allocated after adoption of the TPP, and the work plan item calling for an evaluation of RALF to help implement the TPP is developing a recommendation for Council consideration. No change recommended. |
| Chapter 4 - Land Use | | | |
| 56, 75, 82, 86 | 4a | Need better incentives and land use planning in transit corridors to support goals. | The Council and local partners are engaged in planning for the design and development of transitways throughout the region. The plan strongly supports the use of existing resources and technical assistance. The recent awarding to the Council-led collaboration of several regional agencies of a HUD sustainable communities regional planning grant project will also be significant. No change recommended. |
| 84, 190 | 4b | Transit should be a catalyst toward higher-density growth. | Strategy 4d specifically calls for transitways and the arterial bus system to be used as catalysts for the development and growth of major employment centers and residential nodes. No change recommended. |
| 84 | 4c | Land use practices should include discussion of shifting demographics and related future demands. | The regional economy and demographic character are changing. The 2010 Census, the Council's 2010 Travel Behavior Inventory, and information from the 2008 local comprehensive plans, will provide a base for new regional forecasts for population, households and employment. The Council's research and transportation staff are developing a new integrated land use and transportation forecasting model that will provide key inputs for the next Regional Development Framework and policy plans. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---------------|----------|--|--|
| 101 | 4d | Transportation choices will affect where people choose to live - transit, walking, and biking make an area attractive, particularly for aging populations. | Policy 4 addresses various transportation policies and strategies to link and coordinate land use with an integrated multimodal transportation system. Expanding the use of alternative modes and the development of land use patterns that will support them are key to increasing regional mobility for all. No change recommended. |
| 161, 190, 198 | 4e | Council should consider a closer link between land use planning and transportation planning. | The strategies listed under Policy 4 recognize the important link between land use and transportation. The strategies seek to balance the development and transportation needs for all planning areas. Recent trends show an increasing market for housing in the developed portion of the region consistent with Regional Development Framework policy and local comprehensive plans. The Council's research and transportation staff are also developing a new integrated land use and transportation forecasting model that will provide key inputs for the next Regional Development Framework and policy plan updates. No change recommended. |
| 161, 198 | 4f | Council should modify Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) grant scoring criteria to discourage projects on edges of metro area. | TAB is currently revising criteria for their 2011 solicitation. This comment will be passed on to TAB for consideration. No change recommended. |
| 161 | 4g | By encouraging new housing growth close to employment centers, the need for transportation infrastructure is reduced. | The TPP and the Regional Development Framework support the development of higher density housing and mixed use in and adjacent to job and activity centers, specifically, strategy 4d addresses this important point. The Council's Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) guidebook is a resource for communities to use. No change recommended. |
| 161 | 4h | Rail funding should support transit-supportive development. | Strategy 15g in the plan states that the Council will work with local units of government to ensure that transitways (rail and bus) promote efficient development and redevelopment. In addition, Strategy 4d states the Transitways (rail and bus) and Arterial Bus System should be catalysts for the development and growth of major employment centers and residential nodes to form an interconnected network of higher-density nodes along transit corridors. |
| 161 | 4i | Consider creating a wage tax for people who live outside the metro area, but work in the metro area for use on transportation infrastructure. | Oregon uses a similar payroll tax to support transit in Portland, but in Minnesota the legislature has chosen a different transit subsidy method. No change recommended. |
| 161, 198 | 4j | Use capacity expansion funding to control land use. | The coordination of land use and transportation at the regional and local levels is at the heart of the section on the role and importance of local comprehensive plans and the Metropolitan Land Planning Act. Both TAB and this TPP recognize the Metropolitan Urban Services Area (MUSA) in funding decisions. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|--------------------|----------|---|---|
| 157 | 4k | Land use decisions should not be disconnected from transportation impacts in neighboring communities. | Access issues are important in how land use affects neighbors. The Council encourages intercommunity dialogue and communication and local comprehensive plans are required to be shared with neighboring communities prior to adoption. The access management section of the plan addresses this issue. No change recommended. |
| 192, 197, 202 | 4l | Not consistent with existing comprehensive plans. | The regional/local comprehensive planning system laid out in the Metropolitan Land Planning Act has provided the Twin Cities with an effective, coordinated long-range planning structure. When regional plans change, notices sent to local communities allow them to change their plans as necessary to maintain conformity. Resources and incentives to implement the transportation elements of both regional and local plans have always been limited, requiring staging and the setting of priorities. This plan sets a balanced approach to providing transportation services and infrastructure. No change recommended. |
| 190, 215 | 4m | Support improved transit-supportive land-use policies. More specific land use policies should be included in the TPP that support transit, bicycling and walking. | This plan, along with the Regional Development Framework, supports the development of an integrated, multimodal transportation system for the region as a whole and for each community that meets both land use and mobility needs. No change recommended. |
| 165, 206, 208, 217 | 4o | TPP does not acknowledge transportation-related aspects of local comprehensive plans. | The recent 2008 round of local comprehensive plans were prepared in response to systems statements issued following the adoption of the Regional Development Framework, TPP and other system plans in 2004. Local comprehensive plans were reviewed using those system statements and policy plans. After the adoption of this TPP, state law requires that local communities re-examine their plans to see if changes or updates are necessary to ensure continued conformity with this updated regional transportation system plan. No change recommended. |
| 217 | 4p | Plan does not address urban quality of life and how various transportation modes contribute or detract. | The strategies in Policy 4 recognize the need for development of a multimodal transportation system that is integrated with land use planning and development. No change recommended. |

Chapter 5 - Regional Mobility

| | | | |
|----|----|--|--|
| 81 | 5a | Support and fund projects to stagger work hours to reduce travel demand. | The TPP supports travel-demand management (TDM) strategies such as flexible employment arrangements that do not require peak period travel (i.e., flexible schedules or staggered hours) or would allow employees to avoid the commute altogether by working from home (i.e., telecommuting). The Metropolitan Council does not have authority to dictate a region-wide mandate; it is up to individual employers to implement staggered hours schedules for their employees. No change recommended. |
|----|----|--|--|

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|---|
| 84 | 5b | Travel-demand management (TDM) principles should include more program details and should include outreach to large employers, particularly those considering relocation to the region. | The Council has an active TDM program working closely with Transportation Management Organizations (TMOs) and private employers to promote alternative transportation modes. As recommended in the recently completed TDM Evaluation & Implementation Study, the Council will focus local and regional TDM efforts on corridors with significant investments in multimodal options. No change recommended. |
| 161, 198 | 5c | Document and encourage best practices identified by Transportation Management Organizations (TMOs) in encouraging use of travel demand management and alternate transportation modes. | The Travel Demand Management (TDM) Evaluation and Implementation Study, conducted by the Council in 2010, documented national best practices for implementing TDM by TMOs and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and recommended strategies most likely to succeed in the Twin Cities region. No change recommended. |
| 160 | 5d | Congestion Management Process should not exclude non-freeway portions of the metro-area transportation network. | The congestion management process as described in detail in TPP Chapter 5 recommends numerous strategies that apply to non-freeway arterials in addition to principal arterial freeways. These include developing lower-cost/high-benefit projects to improve existing traffic flow as envisioned by Mn/DOT's Congestion Management & Safety Plan (under development), strategic capacity enhancements, travel demand management strategies, transit investment opportunities (which are primarily non-freeway related), and land-use policies that strengthen the ability of transit to serve urban corridors and take single-occupant vehicles off the system. No change recommended. |
| 118 | 5e | Include more financial incentives for transit-oriented development. | As stated in TPP Strategy 15g, the Council is committed to working with local units of government to ensure that transitways promote efficient development and redevelopment. Funds are available through the Council's Livable Communities Program. Financial incentives to promote transit-oriented development can also be provided by local units of government which interact directly with prospective developers. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|---|
| 217 | 5f | The transportation model measures vehicle miles traveled and doesn't include other aspects, or the impact rising gas prices will have on the highway system of the future. | <p>The Metropolitan Council is required to use the most current planning assumptions to prepare its travel demand forecasts. Most of the region's communities just completed updates to their comprehensive plans, which included updates to the population, household and employment expectations for each community for the year 2030. Each community was required to allocate this data to the Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) within their community for use in the travel demand forecasting model. Generally, it is true that these plan updates were typically prepared prior the recent economic downturn, but it is too soon to project the long-term effects of this economy. The Council will be preparing new forecasts of population, households and employment subsequent to the release of the 2010 Census data and that information will be used in the travel forecasts procedures for the next policy plan update.</p> <p>The impacts of the increase of fuel costs on personal travel is also unclear. Typically, an increase in gas costs does result in a short-term decline in personal travel, which rebounds to historic growth rates in the long-term. Whether this will be the case this time remains to be seen. As more fuel efficient vehicles and vehicles using alternative fuels gain greater penetration into the vehicle fleet, the cost of gasoline will become less of a consideration in personal travel decisions. This will likely require a change in the structure of the regional travel demand model, switching from a fuel cost basis of the average cost of a gallon of gas to some other measure such as the fleet average cost of energy per mile traveled. The Metropolitan Council is currently conducting another in its series of Travel Demand Behavior Inventories to gather data on the characteristics of personal travel. This data will be used to update the regional travel demand model for use in future policy plan updates.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p> |
| 212 | 5g | Supports flexible transportation network with options for biking, walking, transit, park-and-ride facilities. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 217 | 5i | Transit-oriented development reduces travel demand. | Plan states this in multiple locations in Chapters 4, 5 and 7. No change recommended. |
| 162 | 5j | Council should provide the resources needed to identify potential costs and benefits of how ATM can be utilized on the non-freeway arterial improvements. | ATM strategies (e.g., corridor signal coordination) are and will be deployed on non-freeway arterials; Mn/DOT, as the implementing agency for trunk highways, will determine how best to assess costs/benefits of ATM applications in collaboration with local governments. No change recommended. |

Chapter 6 - Highways

| | | | |
|---|----|---|--|
| 5 | 6a | Multimodal investment strategies should be given a higher priority than pedestrian and bicycle investments. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
|---|----|---|--|

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---|----------|--|--|
| 5 | 6b | Supports Highway Strategy 9f, assuming funding is available to assure turnback doesn't become a financial burden. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 2 | 6c | Highway 252 expansion to a freeway between 694 and 610: supports complete, but not partial, expansion. | The TH252 project is a lower cost-high benefit project that partially addresses the northbound congestion. The recommendation was made realizing there isn't consensus in the community if this should be a freeway or an expressway and also recognizing the limited availability of funds. The recommended lower-cost/high-benefit project can be funded with existing resources while the larger project cannot be funded. In addition, due to confusion regarding the list of projects to be reassessed, Table 6-36, Figure 6-37 and any accompanying text from the TPP will be removed from the draft plan. |
| 5, 102, 162, 165, 192, 193, 197, 201, 205, 206, 208 | 6d | The interchange conversion criteria are overly prescriptive. Reassessment should be necessary only when a proposed at-grade-to-grade-separated-interchange conversion is inconsistent with existing plans and projects. Concerns expressed regarding the spacing criteria requiring 2-mile spacing for freeway interchanges outside the 494/694 ring. Urge flexibility. Adjacency of interchanges should only be required when it affects the safety and mobility of the mainline. Criteria should use the term "should" rather than "must." | <p>The interchange criteria contained both in the Highway chapter and Appendix E have been part of the regional plan for many years. The draft TPP made some adjustments to the criteria to encourage two mile spacing in less developed areas and to indicate that conversions of interchanges should occur from the inside-out, without leaving in-place intermediate intersections. The draft plan text will be revised as shown below to give more flexibility to Mn/DOT and the Council when using these criteria and to focus on the safety and mobility of the mainline operations.</p> <p>Text on page 80 and 81 of the draft plan will be revised to read as follows: "Conversion of at-grade intersections to grade-separated interchanges and other mobility and safety/capacity projects on non-freeway trunk highways should only occur after a <u>Mn/DOT and Council reassessment</u> assessment to determine if the proposed project is consistent with existing plans and policies. <u>of existing and proposed plans and projects in those corridors.</u> Reassessments can be initiated by Mn/DOT, or conducted at the request of the appropriate local government(s). The main purpose of the reassessment will be to identify cost-effective projects that can be supported by the Council and Mn/DOT for local and regional funding. Completion of this reassessment and explicit support from Mn/DOT will <u>continue to</u> be necessary to obtain Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds through the Regional Solicitation process for non-freeway trunk highway improvements. Appendices D and E reinforce the effectiveness of improvements on non-freeway trunk highways in providing benefits for regional travel. As local units of government work <u>with Mn/DOT</u> to improve and convert non-freeway trunk highways to freeways, the following requirements are particularly important to achieve regional objectives: The appropriate local units <u>of government</u> exercising land use authority along the trunk highways will be expected to incorporate access standards into their subdivision and zoning ordinances and apply them <u>the standards</u> during their development review process;</p> |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---------|---|
| | | | <p>Conversion of an at-grade intersection to an interchange must <u>should</u> only occur in the urban area or in the planned MUSA (see Figure E-1 in Appendix E);</p> <p>Conversion of an at-grade intersection to an interchange must <u>provide safety and mobility improvements to both the mainline and cross-street. The new interchange should be adjacent to an existing interchange unless MN/DOT and the Council determine through the assessment that the intermediate access points can be in the urban area or in the planned MUSA modified or managed to address safety concerns;</u></p> <p>Principal arterials <u>Arterials can only intersect should only have interchanges</u> with other principal arterial or "A" minor arterials; and</p> <p>Interchange spacing outside the I-494 / I-694 ring must <u>should</u> be 2 miles or more <u>unless physical constraints or density of existing or planned development require closer spacing.</u></p> <p>Text in Appendix E relating to the interchange criteria 1, 3, and 6 will be revised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional interchange capacity should be considered only when it supports the Metropolitan Council's Regional Development Framework and the Transportation Policy Plan, and local comprehensive plans approved by the Metropolitan Council. <p>Discussion: This is a critical objective. In addition to solving highway capacity deficiencies, new interchanges or major interchange modifications should be consistent with regional plans and regionally approved local plans, and should support development in desirable locations. In most cases, a new interchange should be in the <u>Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA) (see Figure E-1)</u> or census urbanized area and be adjacent to another interchange rather than an intersection. <u>New interchanges should be adjacent to an existing interchange unless Mn/DOT determines that the intermediate access can be modified or managed to address safety concerns.</u></p> 3. Metropolitan Highway System interchanges may only connect Metropolitan Highways (<u>Principal Arterials</u>) to other Metropolitan Highways or to an "A" minor arterial as defined in the functional classification system adopted by the Transportation Advisory Board and approved by the Metropolitan Council. <p>Discussion: The intent of this criterion is to ensure that Metropolitan Highways connect to adequate arterials in the state and local road system. These roads should be continuous and connect to other <u>principal or "A" minor arterials or</u></p> |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---|----------|---|--|
| | | | connectors. |
| | | | 6. Generally, interchanges on the Metropolitan Highway System on the I-494/I-694 ring or inside should be spaced at a minimum of one mile (center to center). Interchanges outside <u>the ring</u> should be spaced at a minimum of 2 miles (center to center) <u>unless physical constraints or the density of existing or planned development requires closer spacing</u> . If it is determined appropriate to locate an interchange at less than one or 2 miles apart or modify an existing interchange, the safe operation of the main roadway must be maintained. Discussion: Experience has shown that interchanges spaced less than one mile apart have inadequate weaving distance and require special design features such as auxiliary lanes to maintain safety. Outside of the I-494/I-694 ring, other Metropolitan Highways or "A" minor arterials are <u>typically</u> not needed closer than 2 miles due to the lack of intense development. |
| 5, 157 | 6g | Support lower-cost, high-benefit option for reconstruction of 694/51/10 interchange. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 1 | 6h | Poor condition of Highway 169 - bad pavement, regular flooding, congestion, lack of park-and-ride facilities. | Preservation and maintenance needs are the first priority for available funding. TH 169 north of I-394 is not a transit corridor so there are no park-and-rides in the corridor. Improving parallel corridors (i.e., 494 and TH 100) will provide an indirect benefit by attracting trips from TH 169. No change recommended. |
| 6 | 6i | Concern over merging traffic on 62 | This is a temporary condition due to reconstruction of Crosstown/I-35W interchange. No change recommended. |
| 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 49, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 62, 70, 90, 91, 94, 95, 97, 103, 105, 107, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, 126, 134, 148, 164, 183 | 6j | Do not support a managed lane on I-494 through Plymouth. | Managed lanes provide an alternative to congestion for those using transit or car-pooling, or who are willing to pay to use the managed lane. At the same time, the amount of traffic on general purpose lanes is reduced when single-occupant vehicles shift to the managed lane. Managed lanes help to manage traffic flow in a more cost effective manner than the addition of another general purpose lane that would become congested within a relatively short time. Furthermore, another general purpose lane in this location would prevent the region from being able to implement an expanded managed lane in the future. Given available resources, and efforts to invest in cost-effective solutions, Mn/DOT and the Council have identified a number of highway segments, including I-494 through Plymouth, where MnPASS lanes have the potential to improve mobility. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---|----------|--|--|
| 31, 204 | 6k | Need to expand highway system for commerce. | Further study is needed to determine the most cost-effective solutions to improve freight mobility at congestion bottlenecks. A Twin Cities Metropolitan Area Regional Freight Study is underway by the Council and Mn/DOT to examine regional freight patterns and explore ways to improve the movement of freight through the region. In Chapter 8, page 158, at the end of paragraph 3, the following text will be added: <u>"NHS routes in the Twin Cities region include all interstates and specific connector roadways to designated regional intermodal terminals. The interstate system in particular, is vital to the movement of freight and goods through and within the region."</u> |
| 41, 53, 58, 59, 61, 65, 76, 83, 99, 107, 164, 183 | 6l | MnPASS concept does not improve traffic flow. Supports general purpose lanes. | The MnPASS lane on I-394 has proven to be very effective at managing congestion and improving mobility, both key objectives of the TPP. Managed lanes provide an alternative to congestion for those using transit or car-pooling, or who are willing to pay to use the managed lane. At the same time, the amount of traffic on general purpose lanes is reduced when single-occupant vehicles shift to the managed lane. Managed lanes also help to manage traffic flow in a more cost-effective manner. Recommended ATM concepts, such as queue warning systems and ramp meters, are proven strategies to maintain more consistent traffic flows. Given available resources, and efforts to invest in cost-effective solutions, Mn/DOT and the Council have identified a number of highway segments in the region where MnPASS lanes have the potential to improve mobility. No change recommended. |
| 50, 66, 69, 72, 77, 79, 81, 104, 118, 190, 217 | 6m | We do not need more freeways. | Council policy promotes a multi-modal transportation system that provides a range of transportation choices. Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 56, 86 | 6n | Clearly define how person-throughput will be measured on highways. | The Council is currently working with Mn/DOT to review, identify and evaluate methods and measures to better assess performance for the regional transportation system. Financial resources will determine the extent and method of data collection. No change recommended. |
| 60, 98 | 6o | Finish the 494/694 loop so there are the same number of lanes all the way around. | Today there are segments of the ring that have 10 general purpose lanes. This level of capacity is not required in many locations. The addition of general purpose lanes provide immediate benefits in the short-term, but over time these lanes also become congested. Funding is not available for this level of capacity expansion especially in light of many other problem areas in the region. No change recommended. |
| 66, 74 | 6p | Do not continue to reinforce single-occupancy vehicle use through freeway expansion. | The draft TPP promotes a multi-modal transportation system that provides a range of transportation choices. Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| 77, 96 | 6q | Supports HOV lanes, but not necessarily MnPASS lanes. | MnPASS priced lanes have proven more effective in providing a congestion-free alternative; HOV lanes in the I-394 corridor were underutilized. Converting the HOV lanes to priced lanes ensures a congestion-free trip for transit and HOVs and increases use. No change recommended. |
| 84 | 6s | Congestion evaluation should involve corridor-wide focus, including impact on local streets; don't give advantages to mainline trips to the detriment of local traffic. | Policy 9 calls for the Council, Mn/DOT, and local governments to plan the Metropolitan Highway System and local roads to provide a cost-effective, multimodal and safe roadway system. This requires coordination between regional and local plans. The purpose of the Metropolitan Highway System is to serve regional trips while the local system provides for local access and circulation. No change recommended. |
| 86, 72, 77, 79, 92, 141, 190 | 6t | Supports preserving and maintaining existing system, rather than expanding system. | The region supports preservation and management of the existing system, prior to expansion. Due to the region's fiscal, social, and environmental constraints, the TPP recommends no new freeways and strategic capacity enhancements at critical bottlenecks to get the most out of each investment dollar and to maximize the region's ability to maintain and preserve the existing system infrastructure. No change recommended. |
| 86, 190 | 6u | Managed lanes and highway improvements should be developed in corridors where increased transit service is also developed. | Existing and planned transit service were important criteria in assessing the best candidate corridors for managed lanes. However, there may be instances where managed lanes will be developed ahead of transit service improvements due to opportunities created by planned non-managed lane construction projects (e.g., bridge reconstruction). These projects allow for implementation of an affordable managed lane project along with the planned preservation project. No change recommended. |
| 88, 201 | 6v | More specifics on how investments will be prioritized, including safety and preservation considerations. | The prioritization of highway investments is very complicated and varies with the type of project and funding source. This TPP supports Mn/DOT's work on the Congestion Management and Safety Plan, which will be a key part of the process to prioritize the \$10 million per year allocated in the plan for lower-cost/high-benefit projects. Mn/DOT works closely with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to allocate earmarked Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) money. Since this is a "core" funding priority for FHWA, a process must be followed to allocate these funds for all roads. A detailed discussion of this can be obtained from the Mn/DOT Office of Traffic Engineering. The process used to allocate preservation money utilizes computer programs to indicate when various investments are needed for bridges and highway pavements. Mn/DOT Metro District staff uses these tools to determine what type of work is required on which highways and when. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| 98 | 6w | Does not support managed lane on I-694 between I-35E and I-35W. | The draft plan and adopted TIP include funded near-term improvements for the Snelling Avenue/694/TH10 interchange to address this bottleneck. A managed lane improvement from I-35E to I-35W is currently not funded in the plan, and it is not in the top tier of recommended managed lane projects. No change recommended. |
| 101 | 6x | We need more intelligent transportation systems to encourage less driving. | The draft TPP recommends Intelligent Transportation Systems technologies in the form of Active Traffic Management strategies (e.g., priced-dynamic lane systems, real-time vehicle messaging, dynamic re-routing of traffic due to mainline incidents, signal coordination, changeable message signs) that improve traffic flow. The use of transit and carpools is encouraged by providing congestion-free alternatives in the form of managed lanes. No change recommended. |
| 102, 162, 190, 193, 205, 206 | 6y | Supports lower-cost, high benefit investments to mitigate congestion. | Council estimates only \$900 million will be available for major capacity and safety investments to address congestion. The TPP proposes spreading limited expansion dollars system-wide to provide a greater benefit across the region. Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 102, 162, 205, 215 | 6z | Supports system of managed lanes. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 102 | 6aa | Supports recognition of need for some expansion projects, and that major expansion project reassessment recognizes preservation, safety and mobility needs. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 102 | 6cc | Consider developing a funding plan for mid-level projects (\$25 million to \$50 million) | In Chapter 12 a work program item has been included which notes that if a new federal transportation act increases the level of funds for the region, the Council should work with the TAB to determine how best to respond. One of the ideas proposed for consideration is to support larger highway projects. No change recommended. |
| 102 | 6dd | Supports Figure 6-1 should reflect Principal Arterial Study. | Figure 6-1 is the Metropolitan Highway System as it exists today or is planned. While the Principal Arterial Study and Metropolitan Highway System Investment Study (MHSIS) recognized that additional principal arterials are needed, incorporating them into this map would not be appropriate. Additional Principal Arterial needs have been recognized and recorded on Page 104 of the Draft TPP under "Additional Highway Needs." No change recommended to Figure 6-1. |
| 102 | 6ee | Support inclusion of Hwy 77 in managed lane vision. | Comment acknowledged. The draft TPP includes TH 77 in the vision for managed lanes in the region. No change recommended. |
| 102, 193 | 6ff | Reconsider inclusion of St. Croix River crossing in list of projects to be reassessed shown in Table 6-36. | The St. Croix River crossing was not included in the list of projects for reassessment because it was already in the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) as a Chapter 152 funded bridge replacement. However, due to confusion regarding the list of projects to be reassessed, Table 6-36, Figure 6-37 and any accompanying text will be removed from the draft plan. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|--------------------|----------|--|---|
| 102 | 6gg | Expand non-Mn/DOT principal arterials to include Dakota County highways 23 and 32. | Recommend changing the following text on page 104: "At present, there are three principal arterials in the metropolitan area that are not under Mn/DOT jurisdiction: Dakota/Scott CSAH 42, <u>Dakota CSAH 23 (138th St. to CR 42)</u> , <u>Dakota CSAH 32 (TH 13 to I-35E)</u> , Anoka CSAH 14, <u>Scott CR 18 (CSAH 42 to TH 169)</u> , and Shepard Road. Given their regional importance these metropolitan highways should be under Mn/DOT jurisdiction." |
| 161, 190 | 6hh | Policy 9, to create a multi-modal, interconnected network endorsed; we can do better to improve this effort. | Comments acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 161, 165, 198, 201 | 6ii | Plan should include guidance when a proposed design on the freeway system shifts traffic on local roads. | When a freeway project is designed a significant part of the analysis is to forecast traffic impacts that might occur to the surrounding roadways. Adding or eliminating an interchange will affect traffic on the intersecting road and roads that connect to it. The amount of the traffic that occurs on the connecting roads is considered in the comprehensive approval process. No change recommended. |
| 161 | 6jj | Projects need to complete NEPA requirements to be included in the TIP - we should have a discussion on the burden this places on local agencies. | This comment refers to a relatively new policy of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The full ramifications of this policy are not well understood. The TAC has indicated the desire to discuss this new policy with FHWA and the other regional partners soon. No change recommended. |
| 161, 198 | 6kk | Supports lower-cost, high-benefit highway improvements. Would like to include I-35W/I-494 interchange, and additional lane on I-494 from I-35W to France. Also supports adding fourth lane from Highway 212 to the airport as lower cost solution if possible. | A good example of reassessing a major project is the design work at the I-35W/I494 interchange. A flyover of I-35W northbound to I-494 westbound with an auxiliary lane on I-494 westbound from I-35W to France or TH100 would help relieve a significant congestion problem area. These projects are recognized in the new plan. The plan calls for the auxiliary lane to be managed so as not to preclude a future managed lane for a greater distance on I-494. No change recommended. |
| 161 | 6ll | Supports elimination of Nicollet Avenue I-494 interchange only after consolidation of 12th Avenue and Portland Avenue. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 161 | 6mm | Consider levying additional funds for RALF program. | After adoption of the Plan, the use of RALF will be clarified. The new Council, working with the new Governor, will decide if the region's economy can support an additional levy. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---------------|----------|---|---|
| 160, 206 | 6nn | Viking Boulevard (Anoka County) is not shown as a principal arterial. The TPP should recognize the designation of principal arterials in Scott County today and in the future. | Text on page 104 of the draft will be changed as follows: "The need for new principal or "A" minor arterials in developing areas where the arterial grid is not adequate to serve future growth is well documented. Principal arterials are the most efficient and safe way to accommodate longer and faster regional vehicle trips. The 2004 This <u>This Transportation Policy Plan already identified identifies</u> needs for future principal arterials in Anoka County (east-west), Dakota County (east-west), and Washington County (north-south). Subsequently, the need for additional principal arterials in Dakota County (north-south) and Scott County (north-south) have also been identified. <u>Anoka County has determined that CSAH 22/Viking Boulevard from Sherburne County on the west to Chisago and Washington counties on the east, is the preferred location for the potential future east-west principal arterial. Scott County has determined that the future potential north-south principal arterial should be CSAH 17 and TH 13 south of TH 169. Since principal arterials should end with a connection to another principal arterial, actual endpoints can be determined in the future.</u> " |
| 160 | 6oo | Interchange-related requirements are unnecessarily prescriptive and will impede progress on projects underway. | The draft TPP text relating to the conversion of intersections to interchanges will be revised as shown in the responses to comment 6d. |
| 102, 160, 162 | 6pp | Plan should support local investments that will help preserve regional highway system. | The Transportation Policy Plans over the past years have supported local investments that preserve and improve the Regional Highway System. This plan directs these local investments toward lower cost/high benefit projects, active traffic management and management investments that are the most cost effective projects. No change recommended. |
| 160 | 6qq | System-wide management principles should address impacts on local roads. | Since Active Traffic Management (ATM) and managed lanes (as system-wide management strategies) add capacity or facilitate traffic movement, they will help to move longer, regional trips off local roads. These projects are attractive because their high return on low investments make their completion feasible. A regional project that is proposed, but cannot be built because of its cost, will not remove traffic from local roads. No change recommended. |
| 157 | 6rr | The Unweave the Weave project on I-35E and I-694 has exacerbated congestion on I-694 to the west of the interchange. | The Snelling Avenue/694/TH 10 interchange reconstruction project is planned to improve this condition. No change recommended. |
| 108, 165, 201 | 6ss | Plan should include expansion projects on minor arterials. | The TPP focuses on Principal Arterials. The seven counties and approximately 25 cities are responsible for planning "A" minor arterials. The Council does not create a region-wide minor arterial plan, but relies on cities and counties to identify needs. Since funds are only allocated on projects that are consistent with the regional TPP, projects are evaluated based on the policies within the plan, rather than specific project plans. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|-------------------------|----------|---|---|
| 108 | 6tt | Highway 101 river crossing should be included in the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). | Mn/DOT's reassessment of TH 41 river crossing may find lower cost/high benefit projects in the TH 41 or TH 101 corridors. The only projects that are included in the TIP are those projects that are fully funded. No change recommended. |
| 108, 165 | 6uu | Plan should include a strategy to expedite turnback projects. | The Council has supported turnbacks where appropriate. A key issue is the cost of upgrading a trunk highway before a county or city will accept it. The costs of these upgrades have been significant. If lower cost improvements were acceptable (i.e. an overlay instead of reconstruction), then the process would be expedited. The philosophy of the TPP is to look for lower cost/high benefit solutions to all transportation issues. This should extend to Mn/DOT's turnback process. No change recommended. |
| 132, 143, 167, 185, 200 | 6vv | Plan would place too much burden for interchanges on local property taxpayers. | A key philosophy of the TPP is to fund lower-cost/high-benefit solutions to transportation problems. This should extend to Mn/DOT, county, city and regional projects. The plan makes it clear Mn/DOT has limited resources. If a local unit of government wants to pursue the conversion of an intersection to an interchange or to build a new interchange, the state contribution may be limited. The local unit of government should approach such projects with the realization they will be responsible for a significant share of the cost even if they receive regional solicitation funds. A decision made on this TPP philosophy will be more realistic. No change recommended. |
| 141 | 6ww | Consider improvements to minor arterials in regional solicitation process. | Since the regional solicitation allocates funds today to the "A" minor arterials, it is assumed this comment refers to "B" or other minor arterials. The "A" minor arterial system has been designated due to its regional importance. If a "B" minor qualifies, it can be elevated to the "A" status through the TAC/TAB process. No change recommended. |
| 141 | 6xx | Include 35W/Lake Street project in plan, and include Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) elements. | I-35W is shown in the Transit chapter as a Highway BRT project that is under construction. Significant components of the I-35W BRT were accomplished with the Urban Partnership Agreement which implemented the MnPASS lane, 46th Street station and completed a number of park-and-rides in the corridor. Station-to-station service will begin in 2012. The Lake Street station is a planned element of the I-35W BRT but the scope and funding for this phase of the project have not yet been identified. Hennepin County is currently leading a study that will design the project and develop cost estimates. Funding will need to be identified after completion of this study. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|--------------------|----------|---|---|
| 187, 218 | 6yy | MnPass lanes are toll lanes - taxpayers have already paid for these. | The MnPASS lane on I-394 was an HOV lane when originally built. With the permission of U.S. Department of Transportation and the Minnesota Legislature, Mn/DOT was allowed to make this a variable-priced, managed lane to increase the use and provide a congestion free alternative for eligible users. The I-35W MnPASS lane was partially an HOV lane but the northern part was created new and was never a general purpose travel lane. The pricing in both cases is intended to manage traffic so these lanes will operate uncongested into the distant future. That is the intent of the additional managed lanes recommended in the TPP. No change recommended. |
| 217 | 6zz | We are building a network of highways we won't be able to afford in 25 or 30 years. | A majority of investments recommended in the TPP are directed at the preservation, management and optimizing the operation of the existing trunk highway system. The only new freeway funded in the plan is to connect the existing portion of TH610 to I-94. No change recommended. |
| 215 | 6aaa | Does not support Highway 36 St. Croix River Crossing. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 211 | 6bbb | Reconsider the location of the Highway 41 river crossing in Chaska. | The Council has recommended Mn/DOT reassess the plans for the new TH41 project to bring down the anticipated cost of this project. Mn/DOT may choose to look at alternative locations. The comments related to this project will be sent to Mn/DOT so they are aware of this concern. No change recommended. |
| 165, 189, 206, 208 | 6ccc | Plan makes no significant progress in planning for Minnesota River crossings. | The Council has recommended Mn/DOT reassess the plans for the new TH41 project. Mn/DOT may choose to look at alternative locations. The comments related to this project will be sent to Mn/DOT so they are aware of this concern. No change recommended. |
| 206, 208 | 6ddd | Object to new criteria that benefitted property owners should be involved in paying for interchanges. The same principle should be applied to benefitting property owners along transit developments. | Since the 1970s, Appendix E of the TPP has contained a Highway Interchange Request process. Criteria 5 states that "local governments and the owners and developers of properties that would benefit from an additional interchange should share the cost of additional construction or right-of-way to the extent that they receive tangible benefit." This is not a new policy direction. This policy may or may not be applicable to transit, but at this time no change recommended. |
| 165, 201, 206, 208 | 6eee | Major highway/highway expansion projects do improve congestion. | Major highway expansion increases the capacity of that specific roadway and may relieve a bottleneck. There are other issues that must be recognized when considering such projects. The cost of these major projects is very high. The 12 major projects in the Council 2004 Plan increased in cost by \$1 billion from 2004 to 2008, totaling over \$3 billion. Each one of these projects would have increased the capacity of a fairly short length of highway but in many cases cause a bottleneck at the point they intersect with the next highway section. Over time these roads again become full, congestion builds and the mobility benefits are greatly reduced. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---|--|
| 203, 208 | 6fff | Expand usage of RALF funds to improve highway capacity for transit. | State law limits how RALF can be used. In the past highway right-of-way purchased with RALF has allowed the creation of a park-and-ride lot. If any of the managed lane projects which provide a transit advantage need right-of-way, RALF could be used. In addition a work plan item calls for the review of the RALF criteria and procedures and could result in recommended law changes. No change recommended. |
| 206 | 6ggg | Plan should include east/west principal arterial in south metro, even if beyond 20-year fiscally constrained plan. | The draft plan on page 104 recognizes the need for a number of future principal arterials including an east/west corridor in the southern metro area. The plan supports the work of cities, counties and Mn/DOT to determine if there are opportunities to provide future Principal Arterials. No change recommended. |
| 202, 206 | 6hhh | Non-freeway trunk highways need upgrading, particularly since they move significant amounts of traffic on and off the freeway system. | The TPP specifically recognizes the needs for the non-freeway trunk highways. This is a key element of the draft plan on page 80. Many of the strategies in the plan are intended to make cost effective investments in these highways. The Active Traffic Management investments have a cost benefit ratio much higher than expansion projects. These types of investments are affordable for many miles of the non-freeway trunk highways. MnDOT's Congestion Management and Safety Program (CMSP) process in part will identify lower cost/high benefit projects to address existing safety and mobility projects on these trunk highways. Where there are needs for new interchanges the plan puts forward policies to ensure these investments provide the highest benefit to the region at the lowest cost. No change recommended. |
| 193, 206 | 6iii | More emphasis should be placed on expanding the 494 employment corridor, including interchange upgrades and supporting transit development. | The plan calls for lower cost/high benefit projects on the I-494 corridor and the addition of a managed lane. The plan notes the potential for an Arterial BRT along American Blvd. No change recommended. |
| 204 | 6kkk | Reducing congestion and increasing the efficiency of major roadways are important short- and long-term priorities. | The plan includes a variety of techniques to improve trunk highways and "A" minor arterials. Budgets are provided and priorities are set for both short and long term investments. No change recommended. |
| 204 | 6lll | Infrastructure needs adequate maintenance and preservation. | The Council and Mn/DOT strongly support this position. More than 70% of the state road construction formula funding will be invested in the ongoing preservation of the state trunk highways in the metro region. No change recommended. |
| 204 | 6mmm | Oppose toll-financing on existing general purpose lanes. | The TPP does not recommend pricing on existing general purpose lanes, nor is this allowed under current state law. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|--|
| 205 | 6000 | Consider adding results of MnPASS 2 study to plan. | <p>The following text will be added on page 98 of the draft plan: <u>"The recommendations of the MnPASS 2 Study are incorporated into the plan. The text below will be added to Page 92 of the Draft Plan: "Mn/DOT, working with the Council, during 2010 completed the MnPASS 2 Study. The objective of that work was to analyze and make recommendations for the next generation of MnPASS managed lane projects for implementation in the Twin Cities metropolitan region. In the study, Mn/DOT assessed its priorities for short term (2 to 10 years) MnPASS lane implementation in light of evolving federal policies, actual experience with two operating MnPASS lanes, and in close coordination with the Managed Lane Vision developed as part of the MHSIS. An important aspect of identifying shorter term MnPASS 2 projects for implementation was the desire to avoid costly road widening and right-of-way takings. The study compared different managed lane options, but did not analyze other types of transportation investments. The recommendations of the MnPASS 2 study for short term priority investments are as follows: Tier 1 Investments: I-35E (I-94 to Little Canada Road, Little Canada Road to Co. Rd. E) A great opportunity exists to build this lane coincident with the replacement of the Cayuga Bridges, a Chapter 152 funded project which is moving forward now. This corridor has moderately high transit service, directly serves downtown St. Paul, can be built in two phases without major challenges, and extends MnPASS to the northeastern sector of the metro region. The benefits to users will increase with a direct connection provided to downtown St. Paul via the 10th Street/Wacouta Avenue exit. Tier 2 Investments: TH 36 Eastbound from I-35W to I-35E, I-35W from downtown Minneapolis to TH 36, I-35W from TH 36 to Blaine, and I-94 between the downtowns. TH 36 is also an opportunistic project in that it can be easily and inexpensively built coincident with the replacement of the Lexington Avenue bridge at TH 36. Combined with the I-35W project serving downtown Minneapolis it will ultimately become part of a viable northern metro MnPASS system. I-94 can provide direct connections to both Minneapolis and St. Paul and eventually connect to the existing MnPASS system. All of these corridors provide direct service to the downtown cores have high transit service levels and should be studied further. As financing and approvals are obtained, engineering challenges resolved, and opportunities arise to combine implementation of the MnPASS lane with other preservation projects, these projects should be built. All MnPASS 2, Tier 3 recommended project investments are contained in the Managed Lane Vision shown in Figure 6-34 along with other longer term implementation opportunities."</u></p> |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|--|
| 165, 202 | 6ppp | Need to expand Highway 212 as an Inter-regional Corridor (IRC). | TH212 is designated an IRC by Mn/DOT. It is part of the Metropolitan Highway System and it is an important facility for the region. TH212 generally meets the performance measures established in the State Transportation Plan. There are many IRCs that enter the region. The financial resources are not available to expand these highways or to turn them into freeways. The TPP provides policies to guide local initiatives proposing to replace intersections with interchanges as the surrounding area urbanizes. Regional Solicitation funds have and continue to be available for such projects. In addition, the TPP establishes funding set-asides to provide ATM and lower cost/high benefit safety and congestion mitigation projects on these non-freeway trunk highways. No change recommended. |
| 202 | 6qqq | Need to expand Highway 5 from two lanes to four. | TH5 is an "A" minor arterial that is important for the region. The financial resources are not available to expand these highways or to turn them into freeways. The TPP provides policies to guide local initiatives proposing to replace intersections with interchanges as the surrounding area urbanizes. Regional Solicitation funds have and continue to be available for such projects. In addition, the TPP establishes funding set-asides to provide ATM and lower cost/high benefit safety and congestion mitigation projects on these non-freeway trunk highways. No change recommended. |
| 165, 193 | 6rrr | Expansion should be a tool for managing congestion. | Capacity expansion projects can help alleviate congestion at a given place at a given time. The plan supports enhanced capacity projects such as TH610 extension to I-94 and bridge replacement. The plan also notes congestion will never be eliminated and adding significant capacity cannot be afforded due to financial, environmental, social and political impacts. No change recommended. |
| 193 | 6sss | A-minors and principal arterials are key to moving people and goods in the region. They need to be maintained at a high level. | The TPP and the Mn/DOT Metro Highway Investment Plan support the maintenance of all trunk highways. As a condition of receiving federal funds, cities and counties must preserve any highway thus funded for its useful life. No change recommended. |
| 193 | 6ttt | Support Mn/DOT turning back certain roads to counties so they can be maintained to meet congestion and safety needs. | The Council has supported turn-backs for many years. Requiring significant investments to these highways prior to such turn-backs will frustrate these efforts. The TPP notes the need to promote lower cost/high benefit projects across the region This includes any negotiations for turn-backs. No change recommended. |
| 193 | 6uuu | Plan should include more detail about what should be examined prior to consideration of a new interchange. | Appendix E: Highway Interchange Requests, Evaluation Criteria and Review Procedures provides six pages that address when and how new or reconstructed interchange projects should be developed. Also see the response to comment 6d which contains some additional text modifications that will be made based on comments received. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|--------------------|----------|---|--|
| 217 | 6vvv | So-called "safety" projects are highway expansion projects that do not reduce congestion or improve air quality. | The primary focus of safety projects is to reduce the number and severity of accidents. Some projects are proactive such as rumble strips and some are reactive and specifically designed to address a high accident location. In some cases such as turn lanes, they do improve movement through an intersection so they may add capacity. When safety money is spent there must be a definite safety issue addressed. No change recommended. |
| 217 | 6www | Highway project philosophy basically advocates doing projects piecemeal, which avoids public review of projects. | The highway improvements are advanced depending on many factors. The size or extent of a project is many times dictated by the funds available and the extent of the problem. If federal funds are used the project must have "independent utility" which means it has benefit on its own merit and is not dependent on the next project or the past projects to show benefit. No change recommended. |
| 201 | 6xxx | Plan does not discuss need for Inter-regional Corridors or how the metro-area system connects to the rest of the state. | All IRCs are included in the Metropolitan Highway System recorded in Figure 6-1. A key element of this system is the connection it provides to greater Minnesota and the United States, Canada and Mexico. No change recommended. |
| 201 | 6yyy | More information on how managed lanes will affect congestion and reduce it. | There is a wealth of information in the professional literature on the benefits of managed lanes. Two consultant studies were completed in preparation of this plan to help evaluate various highway improvement strategies including managed lanes. These studies, the Metropolitan Highway System Investment Study and the MnPASS 2 Study, can be accessed through the Council or Mn/DOT's web sites. No change recommended. |
| 201 | 6zzz | Additional future principal arterials should be included in the plan. | A number of potential future principal arterials are identified on page 104 of the draft plan in the section titled "Additional Highway Needs". No change recommended. |
| 162, 165, 189, 190 | 6aaaa | Plan should include more guidance for non-freeway arterials and minor arterials, that aren't addressed in the plan. | The improvements described for non-freeway principal arterials apply to all such highways. The plan provides more guidance than any plan in the past as to what should be done on these highways plus it designates budget set asides to fund ATM and lower cost/high benefit CMSP projects on non-freeway principal arterials. Concerning the other arterials the plan notes the "A" minor arterials help make up the regional highway system. There is a long history of what these roads are and should be that is recorded in the Transportation Advisory Board's regional solicitation materials. These are available through the Council's web site. In addition, Appendix D contains details on criteria and characteristics of Principal and Minor Arterials. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 6bbbb | Safety is as important as managing congestion and in some cases adding lanes is the best way to address safety. | Adding a lane can improve safety in some cases. How the benefits and cost of these improvements compare to lower cost/high benefit projects must be considered due to the significant budget limits faced by Mn/DOT. Very low cost projects like rumble strips can provide high benefit for certain accident types. Safety will be a major consideration in Mn/DOT's process for selecting CMSP projects. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|---|
| 165 | 6cccc | Strategy 3H should only be implemented on the principal arterial system. It is not achievable on all roads. | Monitoring traffic levels and congestion is important on many roads to identify various problems. The type of monitoring or the equipment will vary with the type of highway. No changes recommended. |
| 165 | 6dddd | TPP lacks investment in mobility projects or improvements to trunk highways in Carver County. | The TPP provides an investment strategy that attempts to focus on the full range of problems faced by the regional highway system. More than 70% of the state road construction formula funds are dedicated to preservation of the trunk highway system. Trunk highways in Carver County receive investments based on the age and condition of the highway. Safety funds are allocated based on proactive and reactive strategies. Carver County highways will receive funding as these investment strategies dictate. The \$900 million available for additional investments have been allocated to Active Traffic Management, lower cost-high benefit and Congestion Management and Safety Program (CMSP) projects, and managed lanes and capacity enhancements. Carver County can and will receive ATM and CMSP projects based on a technical prioritization process. There are no managed lanes or capacity enhancement projects recommended for funding in Carver County. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 6eeee | Add map similar to 6-2 for through lanes on principal and A-minor arterials | A map of this nature would be unreadable at the required scale. This information may be obtained through the Council or Mn/DOT's web site. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 6ffff | Add cost to table 6-4. | This would be a very lengthy task. As projects move from project letting to completion, the costs change. It is not until years after the initial project development that final cost can be determined for major projects. Adding costs at this time would not be comparable for all projects and would be confusing. Mn/DOT can on request provide a cost for a project at a specific time. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 6gggg | Add a strategy to evaluate A-minor and non-freeway principal arterials to identify safety, capacity and operational issues. | The improvements described for non-freeway principal arterials apply to all such highways. Mn/DOT, counties and cities monitor and evaluate their "A" minors and non-freeway principals continuously in order to receive federal and county and State Aid funds. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 6hhhh | Table 6-25 should be revised to indicate the current favorable bid climate. | The most recent data available was reviewed and while some bids were lower than estimated, they did not include costs such as right-of-way or delivery. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 6iiii | The safety section on page 89 should identify the Surface Transportation Program (STP) as a source of capacity safety funding. | The STP funds allocated by the region use safety as one of many criteria in evaluating projects. Since there are many factors used to select these projects, they have not been identified in this discussion. In addition they are allocated competitively and are not available at Mn/DOT's discretion to use on trunk highways. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|--|
| 165 | 6jjjj | The Community Improvements section says Mn/DOT will focus Regional and Community Investment Priorities (RCIP) investments on noise walls. Can those be funded out of the preservation fund? Could the funds for the Cooperative Agreements Program be increased? | The RCIP funds are currently directed toward noise walls and cooperative agreements. Mn/DOT has designated this funding to implement noise walls in the region. These are not preservation investments and therefore need their own funding source. Given fiscal constraint any increase in cooperative agreement funding would have to be taken from some other allocation category unless new funds become available. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 6kkkk | Please clarify whether the Council does not support building general purpose capacity to eliminate congestion or if there is not enough money for this strategy. | The draft TPP recognizes that there never will be enough money to add enough capacity to eliminate congestion. Given this fact, the policy direction of this plan is to support funding for projects that can provide the most system-wide benefit including active traffic management, lower-cost/high-benefit investments, managed lanes and strategic capacity enhancements rather than supporting a small number of expensive projects that attempt to fix congestion in a very few select locations in the region. Some projects will provide general purpose capacity in strategic locations. No change recommended. |
| 157 | 6llll | Major projects have been built in the southwestern part of the region, and it is not equitable to eliminate projects that benefit Shoreview (and neighbors). | The intent of the TPP is to spend the available funds as cost effectively as possible in the future. Some major projects have been built recently that will serve parts of the region better than others such as the I-35W/Crosstown project and the I-35E/I-694 Unweave the Weave project. The TPP suggests more Active Traffic Management (ATM) and lower cost-high benefit projects be built to benefit more geographic areas and provide system-wide rather than localized benefits. No change recommended. |
| 197 | 6mmmm | Supports flexible management and lower-cost solutions, but they are focused more on the freeway system. | The highway plan on pages 89-92 of the draft plan specifies Active Traffic Management investments and lower-cost/high-benefit investments on all trunk highways, both freeways and non-freeways, where problems exist. The TPP helps to direct state road construction funds which can only be spent on trunk highways or related needs. The TPP provides the policy basis to also extend this philosophy to local road projects funded through the Regional Solicitation. The Council will work with the TAB to attempt to implement this philosophy. No change recommended. |
| 157 | 6nnnn | Proposed modification to I-35W near the Arden Hills Twin Cities Army Ammunitions Plant (TCAAP) property will negatively impact streets in Shoreview. | Any modifications to I-35W access will have to undergo extensive review prior to being implemented. Any addition or modification of freeway access will impact the intersecting highways. The impacts on local streets are part of the required analysis. No changes recommended. |
| 157 | 6oooo | Wants clarification on whether the managed lane (at 694/51/10) is considered in the reassessed project. | Mn/DOT reassessed the major project on I-694 from I-35W to I-35E and developed a lower-cost/high-benefit project to modify I-694 from I-35W to Lexington Ave. This project will provide an added through lane at the 694/51/10 interchange, addition of frontage roads, rebuild bridges and eliminate some bridges. The TPP recommends a managed lane be added from I-35W to I-35E sometime in the future but this project is unfunded. This would be in addition to the lower cost project now being developed. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|-------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| Chapter 7 - Transit | | | |
| 31, 62 | 7a | Too much attention given to light-rail. | The plan identifies LRT as the mode for two corridors - the Central and Southwest Corridors - where a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) has been selected through an Alternatives Analysis process. Nine additional corridors are shown on the Transitway map to be developed as LRT/Busway/Highway BRT/Commuter Rail after Alternatives Analysis. No mode for these corridors is yet selected. No change recommended. |
| 44 | 7b | Bus and rail expansion for more mass transit should be implemented as soon as possible. | Chapter 7 of the plan calls for expanding the transit system by maintaining and growing the bus system and building a system of transitways. This will be implemented as available funding and project development allows. No change recommended. |
| 48 | 7c | More investment in public transportation will offset continued cost of and need for road maintenance. | Chapter 7 of the plan recognizes the needed investment in the transit system. No change recommended. |
| 50 | 7d | Hiawatha proves LRT transit improves communities and saves environmental costs. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 56, 102, 165, 203 | 7e | Identify funding for buses to keep it stable compared to other modes. | The plan recognizes the uncertainty of available funding for maintaining transit operations under existing financing mechanisms. It does not advocate for specific new funding sources, but recognizes that additional transit operating funds will be needed. No change recommended. |
| 68, 75, 80 | 7f | Bus system service requires so much extra time it's not a practical alternative to driving alone. | Transit is not a good trip alternative for all trips being made across the region, but in a number of high volume corridors, particularly those bound for major destination centers such as downtown Minneapolis and St. Paul, it does provide a good, comparable alternative to a single occupant vehicle and plays a significant role in reducing highway congestion. No change recommended. |
| 69, 72, 79, 86, 101, 190, 215 | 7g | Support policies that enhance public transportation. | Chapters 2 and 7 of the plan contain a number of regional policies and strategies to operate, maintain and improve the transit system. No change recommended. |
| 84, 141 | 7h | Transit development should include more limited stop service, paired with local transit for development, within corridors. | Chapter 7 of the plan calls for the implementation of a system of Arterial Bus Rapid Transitways in corridors with existing high ridership local routes. Arterial BRT will provide more limited-stop service in these corridors. In addition, Figure 7-20 identifies future improvements on the arterial bus network that will include implementation of more frequent and limited stop service. Exact investments will be determined by the Regional Transit Service Improvement Plan and implemented as expansion funding becomes available. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|-------------|----------|--|--|
| 84 | 7i | Transit investment should be prioritized, first to corridors of high transit dependency, next to cost-effective locations, third to areas with development/re-development potential. | Strategy 14c of the plan calls for the region to develop a Regional Service Improvement Plan (RSIP) to identify where and how to expend funds available for transit expansion. The RSIP will include criteria for investment that will consider transit dependency, cost-effectiveness and development potential. The RSIP will be developed during 2011 with participation and input from transit providers and stakeholders. No change recommended. |
| 86, 88, 102 | 7j | Transit development should be focused more on connecting employment clusters. Transitways should be developed in areas with significant potential ridership and should coincide with development. | Chapter 4 Land Use, Strategy 4d states that Transitways and the arterial bus system should be catalysts for the development and growth of major employment centers. Local units of government should ensure that more intensified development occurs along transitways and arterial bus routes. The Alternatives Analysis for each potential transitway estimates ridership and considers development potential. No change recommended. |
| 102, 190 | 7k | The goal of doubling transit ridership in the next 20 years is not aggressive enough, particularly considering the new funds that will be provided by the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) sales tax. | The plan calls for the doubling of transit ridership over the next 20 years and recognizes the people moving capacity of transit in key corridors (see Figure 5-3). The region is currently ahead of the doubling goal in large part due to the opening of Hiawatha LRT in 2004. Each new transitway will have an impact on increasing ridership, but will also draw riders from existing bus service as demonstrated in Figure 7-17. The doubling of ridership goal by 2030 is an aggressive but achievable goal for the region. The revenue estimates used in the transit plan account for CTIB revenues. No change recommended. |
| 102, 162 | 7l | Supports transitway system vision including I-35W, Cedar, Robert Street, Red Rock corridors. | Support noted. No change recommended. |
| 102, 206 | 7m | The operational costs of new transitways should not detract from bus operations. | Policy 2a and 2c state that preservation, operations and maintenance of the existing transit system are the first priority. Investments in expansion of the bus and transitway system will be made after preservation to meet the goal of doubling transit ridership by 2030. No change recommended. |
| 102 | 7n | The Transitway section does not include the Robert Street corridor. An Alternatives Analysis (AA) is underway for Robert Street and the plan will need to be amended to reflect the locally preferred alternative (LPA) for Robert Street. | The plan includes Robert Street as an Arterial BRT corridor and it will be part of the Arterial Transitway Corridor Study included in the TPP work plan and getting underway in late 2010. Any corridor may undergo an alternatives analysis led by the county or another entity. If the AA results in an LPA different from what is in the current plan, the plan will be amended at that time to reflect the LPA. For example, the TPP was amended after LPA selection for both Central and Southwest corridors. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---|--|
| 102 | 7n-1 | Figures 7-18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 do not identify sufficient levels of local, arterial, express and park-and-ride service for Northern Dakota County by 2030. Figures 7-19 and 7-20 do not reflect all Cedar Avenue Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) facilities planned by 2030. | Figures 7-19, 20, 21, and 22 show potential improvements to the arterial network, local bus, express bus and park-and-ride system based upon predicted needs and development currently contained in the regional model. This analysis was done as part of the 2008 Transit Master Study. These figures are meant to provide examples of where service will grow based upon what we know today. As funds become available for transit service expansion, they will be distributed to high priorities and needs identified in the Regional Service Improvement Plan (RSIP). The RSIP is called for in the TPP and will be produced in 2011. The RSIP will set transit investment priorities for the short-term (3-5 years) and will be based on analysis of actual demand and development taking place in the region. Figures 7-19 and 7-20 will be reviewed and revised to assure that it accurately reflects planned facilities for the Cedar Avenue BRT. The draft Cedar Avenue BRT Implementation Update calls for a study to determine additional park-and-ride demand and locations. |
| 102 | 7o | Transit chapter assumes only one New Starts project is under construction at a time. | The Transit plan does assume only one New Starts project will be under construction at any point in time. Given the past funding history of New Starts in this region this assumption is a reasonable expectation of funding that was used to develop the fiscally constrained transit plan. No change recommended. |
| 102 | 7p | The plan should include more detail on streetcars, including the possibilities and constraints with respect to their operations and facilities. This information would aid local governments in determining whether streetcars are an option in a corridor. | Chapter 7 contains a section on Other Modes which provides information on streetcars and their typical operations. Streetcars are not a mode identified for regional transitways given they are similar to local bus operations. The plan states that the Council will collaborate with local units of government to determine where and when streetcars are an appropriate transportation option. Streetcars can also serve as development tool for local units of government. No change recommended. |
| 102 | 7q | Region's population growth may increase demand for dial-a-ride services. The plan should identify what other programs will meet this growth in demand if dial-a-ride service will not grow. | Chapter 7 contains a section on Metro Mobility and Dial-a-Ride Services (page 129 of the draft plan) that states that between 2005 and 2030 the demand for services for people who cannot use regular route transit is expected to grow substantially. Metro Mobility will grow to meet the demands of persons with disabilities. The Dial-a-ride service overall is not expected to grow, but will reallocate resources within service areas as regular route services are expanded and implemented to meet the demands of the growing population. No change recommended. |
| 104 | 7r | Should create a system of connected rail lines throughout metro-area. | Figure 7-42 identifies the planned 2030 Transitway System for the region. This system will provide an interconnected system of bus and rail lines. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|--------------------|----------|---|--|
| 106, 203, 208, 213 | 7s | Support greater transit development outside the central cities and between communities outside Minneapolis and St. Paul. Transit should also be developed in east-west corridors not just to the downtowns. The developing communities need more transit. Inver Grove Heights needs more transit. | Appendix G contains a section on transit market areas. Different types and levels of transit service are appropriate for each market area. The cost effectiveness of transit and expected ridership for various market areas is heavily dependent on the population and employment density of an area. Major employment centers/destinations such as the two downtowns and the University of Minnesota can make transit successful because of the density provided at the destination end of the trip. Table G-2 lists the types of transit services that should be provided or expanded in each market area. No change recommended. |
| 106 | 7t | Does not support development of Union Depot as a transit hub. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 161, 198 | 7u | Support concept of a regional network of transitways. | Support noted. No change recommended. |
| 161 | 7v | I-494/American Boulevard transitway is currently identified for Arterial BRT study. Mode should not be pre-determined until a study is prepared. | The Transit Master study conducted in 2008 screened a number of corridors for potential ridership and cost of various modes. Based on the results of this analysis, Arterial BRT was identified as the most promising mode for the I-494/American Boulevard corridor. The Arterial Transitway study in 2010-2011 will determine if Arterial BRT is appropriate for this corridor and recommend further study or investments. No change recommended. |
| 102, 160, 188, 208 | 7w | The region needs to identify stable and growing funding sources of funding for transit and to augment MVST. More transit operating funding needs to be identified. | The plan acknowledges that MVST revenues have been volatile and will not be adequate to expand the bus system. New revenues provided by the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) sales tax, along with continued federal New Starts funding will be important to the development of a system of transitways in the region. The plan acknowledges that a new source of revenue will need to be identified to grow the bus system, particularly to fund expanded transit operations. No change recommended. |
| 160 | 7x | Transit capital expansion is dependent on New Starts and Small Starts approval from the federal government - a source that is not guaranteed and may not be enough to meet needs. | Plan notes that these are discretionary, competitive funding sources. No change recommended. |
| 158 | 7y | Suburban transit providers should have greater access to capital and operating funds without oversight by the Metropolitan Council. | In Chapter 7, Strategy 14e calls for the Council to develop and maintain policies in consultation with regional transit providers to guide investments in regional fleet and facilities. A regional policy and procedure related to the distribution of regional MVST funding were adopted by the Council in September 2010 after extensive consultation with the Suburban Transit Providers. No change recommended. |
| 158 | 7z | Transit information systems in downtown Minneapolis are only relevant for Metro Transit buses. They are not accurate for Plymouth routes (or other suburban operators). | This comment was passed on to Metro Transit as it is an operational issue not specifically addressed in the plan. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|--|
| 158 | 7aa | Too many forms of fare payment are allowed and confuse riders. | Specific fare payment methods are not included in the plan. This comment will be passed on to the Regional Fare Committee for consideration and recommendation to the Metropolitan Council. No change recommended. |
| 158 | 7bb | The TPP should not refer to operating procedures and policies (for suburban providers) that local governments have not yet had an opportunity to consider or ratify. | In Chapter 7, Strategy 14e calls for the Council to develop and maintain policies in consultation with regional transit providers to guide investments in regional fleet and facilities. Regional policies and procedures were adopted by the Council in September 2010 after extensive consultation with the Suburban Transit Providers. No change recommended. |
| 156 | 7cc | More information on carpooling. | Carpools are mentioned in various places within the plan including Chapter 5-Regional Mobility and Chapter 7-Transit. In particular on page 106 of the draft plan the existing services section mentions a program of public vanpools run by the Council. Information on this program, known as VanGo, can be found on the Council's website. The plan also mentions that the Council partners with Transportation Management Organizations to promote carpooling and runs a Rideshare system which can be found on Metro Transit website. No change recommended. |
| 116 | 7dd | Support initiatives that limit sprawl and encourage people to use transit or carpool to work. | Comment acknowledged. Chapter 4-Land Use and Chapter 5-Regional Mobility both describe land use strategies and a Congestion Management Process that can help in mitigating travel demand and encouraging transit use. No change recommended. |
| 141 | 7ee | The plan should mention and include the High Frequency Network (HFN) including objectives and plans for improving the HFN and should include a map of the HFN and a photo of the HFN branding. | High frequency routes are typically implemented on the highest ridership arterial routes. The High Frequency Network is a subset of the arterial routes. Figure 7-20 Potential 2030 Arterial Network will be revised to include the existing High Frequency Network. Text describing the arterial routes (on page 124 of the draft plan) will be revised to include the following: "A subset of arterial routes has a very high level of service branded as the High Frequency Network, offering 15-minute or better frequency from 6 am to 7 pm on weekdays and 9 am to 6 pm on Saturdays (provide a link to the HFN). <u>The High Frequency Network will also expand and improve along with the arterial routes.</u> " A photo of the HFN branding will be added to the document. |
| 141 | 7ff | Arterial BRT network should be redefined as arterial transitway network. There should be a discussion of the modes and service improvements for these corridors, i.e. arterial BRT, streetcar, local bus improvements. | The Transit Master Study conducted in 2008 established Arterial BRT as the transitway mode for the nine corridors that appear in the plan. The Arterial Transitway Corridors Study called for in the TPP's Work Program will conduct a more detailed examination of these corridors, and two additional corridors, to establish if BRT is the appropriate mode and to recommend specific investments. Text in the Arterial BRT section of the plan will be revised as shown below. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---------------|----------|--|--|
| 141 | 7ff-1 | There should be a discussion of the studies completed in the Arterial BRT corridors and a discussion of the physical constraints and land use potential of these corridors. | Text in the Arterial BRT section of the plan (page 143 of the draft) will be revised to include the following sentences: <u>"These areas also have existing high density and mixed-use development characteristics that foster strong existing and potential transit ridership. Furthermore, local communities have focused growth in these corridors through infill development and redevelopment opportunities."</u> <u>"Some of the corridors have been studied and recommended for modes in addition to arterial bus rapid transit. The results of these studies will be incorporated into the Arterial Transitways Corridor Study and considered in selecting appropriate modes, alignments and prioritization of corridor investments."</u> |
| 141 | 7gg | Arterial transit corridors and local bus service should be given equal emphasis to express bus service and facilities. Specific changes recommended include breaking out transit ridership into express, urban local and suburban local; modifying figure 7-10 to include transit centers that do not have a park-and-ride; and including text and a map on bus stop and bus shelter facilities. | The plan currently recommends improvements for the local bus system (Figure 7-19), the arterial network (Figure 7-20) and Express services (Figure 7-21). All are important components of the bus system and will need to expand and grow to double transit ridership. Ridership in Figure 7-13 would be difficult to break into more detail in the plan. This information is available online in the Council's Transit System Performance Evaluation published bi-annually. Text will be added to page 124 of the plan to state that <u>"In 2008 local urban bus routes carried 63 million rides - 66% of the total regional transit ridership."</u> Figure 7-10 will be modified to include transit centers that do not have a park-and-ride. The number of regional bus shelters and bus stops in the region are too numerous to show on the scale of map available in the regional plan. |
| 141 | 7gg-1 | The plan should clarify when I-35W and Cedar Avenue BRTs will be completed. | Page 138 of the plan states that station-to-station service is scheduled to open on both I-35W and Cedar Avenue BRTs in 2012. The projects are still on schedule to meet this date. The I-35W MnPASS lane and express service to the new 46th Street station will open in late 2010. No change recommended. |
| 215 | 7hh | Council should use a larger percentage of flexible federal funding for transit and lobby for additional funds. | Regional federal Surface Transportation Program funds are allocated by the TAB as part of the biennial regional solicitation process. The allocation of federal funds among the various eligible categories including highway projects, transit and other eligible projects is made every two years by TAB. TAB membership includes local government and modal representation. This issue should be brought to their attention for consideration. No change recommended. |
| 201, 206, 208 | 7kk | To achieve transit expansion goals, improvements need to be made to the highway system. | The Highway Chapter of the plan emphasizes development of a system of priced/managed lanes. These lanes will provide a travel time benefit to transit through a congestion-free alternative for those willing to use transit. Improvements to the highway system will be necessary to implement this transit advantage. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|--------------------|----------|---|--|
| 208 | 7ll | Unconstrained funding for transit (particularly LRT and commuter rail) is in conflict with policy 15h that requires operating funding to be ID'ed prior to making transitway investments. | The Transit investments are fiscally constrained and account for revenues that the region can reasonably expect to occur. Many of the expected transit revenues are competitive funds through federal New Starts, state bonds, and the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) that have a high level of uncertainty. The operating funding formula for rail transitways is 50% provided by (CTIB) and 50% provided by the state, as specified in state law. The plan assumes that this operating funding will be provided. No change recommended. |
| 186, 198, 208 | 7mm | Include Highway 169 as a transitway corridor. | TH 169 is included in the plan as an Express Bus with Transit Advantages Transitway. This does not preclude study or an alternatives analysis to identify other types of transitway improvements that could be implemented in the TH169 corridor. No change recommended. |
| 198, 203, 206, 208 | 7oo | The TPP reduces the independence of suburban transit providers. Plan should support suburban providers. | The Transit System Policies contained in Chapter 7 (policies 12, 13, 14, and 15) are meant to guide the overall development and operation of the regional transit system regardless of provider. In particular Strategy 13a calls for the Council to promote coordination among the different transit services provided by various authorities throughout the region to ensure that the overall regional transit system functions as a seamless and user-friendly network. No change recommended. |
| 203, 206 | 7pp | Transitway development should not be limited to Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) projects/communities. | Figure 7-42 shows the potential 2030 Transitway System. This figure contains corridors with various modes including LRT, Commuter Rail, Highway BRT, Arterial BRT and Express Bus Corridors with Transit Advantages. CTIB has determined that its funding may only be used on corridors developed as LRT, Commuter Rail and Highway BRT. Arterial BRT and Express Bus Corridors with Transit Advantages will be developed using funding sources other than CTIB revenues. No change recommended. |
| 203 | 7qq | TPP should acknowledge the role of suburban transit providers. | Chapter 7 of the TPP recognizes all of the existing transit service provided in the region. Strategy 13a specifies that the Council will promote coordination among the different transit providers to ensure that the overall system functions as a seamless and user-friendly network. No change recommended. |
| 203 | 7rr | Plan includes too many priorities and not enough funding for transit. Should support existing bus system expansion. | The plan acknowledges that to double transit ridership by 2030 will require expansion of the bus system and development of a system of transitways. CTIB and federal New Starts revenues will allow for significant transitway expansion, while it is unclear whether adequate revenues can be identified to expand the bus system. Both will need to occur to meet the regional goal of doubling ridership. No change recommended. |
| 193 | 7tt | Update information about Red Rock Corridor to reflect alternatives analysis and other planning. | In chapter 7 on page 138 of the draft plan the Red Rock corridor is recognized as having completed an alternatives analysis in 2007 with express bus service with transit advantages identified as the interim strategy toward a possible long-term commuter rail investment. It also notes that station area planning was initiated in 2009. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---|---|
| 193 | 7uu | Transitway recommendations should not preclude commuter rail development by basing evaluations on Northstar performance. | Transitway recommendations are based upon the 2008 Transit Master Study which screened over 29 corridors for their potential ridership and cost of implementation. Under this analysis no corridor other than Northstar looked promising for implementation given the low ridership projections and potential cost of implementation. If Northstar ridership had proved to be successful beyond projections, other corridors might have been expected to also generate higher ridership and therefore prove to be feasible. Northstar ridership has not exceeded projections. Therefore without other significant changes such as in land use and development at this time it does not appear that any other commuter rail corridor will generate ridership to justify implementation. No change recommended. |
| 193 | 7vv | Identify I-94 corridor as Gateway Corridor, and include related study information. | References to the I-94 East corridor are changed to Gateway Corridor throughout the plan. |
| 198 | 7ww | Complete I-494/American Boulevard transit study as soon as possible. | The I-494/American Boulevard corridor will be included in the Arterial Transitway Corridors Study that is beginning November 2010 and will be completed by late 2011. This study will recommend specific improvements to the arterial transitway corridors, including I-494/American Boulevard. No change recommended. |
| 186, 198 | 7xx | Include Highways 5 and 212 as potential transitway corridors. | Transitway corridors in the plan were recommended through analysis conducted as part of the 2008 Transit Master Study which screened corridors for potential ridership and cost. Corridors were included in this study based upon participation and recommendation by the counties and transit providers. Highway 212 was included in the study and is recommended in the plan as an Express Bus with Transit Advantages Transitway. All corridors, including those not currently in the plan, may still undergo additional study or an alternatives analysis and may be included in the next plan update or amended into the plan if shown to be promising. No change recommended. |
| 198 | 7yy | Council should develop local benchmarks and goals for transit in coordination with suburban transit providers. | Appendix G contains Regional Transit Standards which provide guidance on appropriate transit market areas, service design standards and performance standards. The TPP including this appendix was developed with a significant amount of input from the TAC and TAB, which includes participation by suburban transit providers, and also with significant public outreach and comment. No change recommended. |
| 189 | 7zz | Plan should provide a more complete needs analysis for existing and proposed transit improvements region-wide. This analysis should realistically indicate what is possible in the next 20 years. | Chapter 7, Transit, identifies both bus system improvements to 2030 (local, arterial and express) and a system of Transitways to be developed by 2030. Additional and competitive funds will be needed to implement all of the envisioned transit improvements. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 7aaa | Bus-only shoulders should not be used on all roadways. | The plan identifies bus-only shoulders as a transit advantage that should be implemented in corridors that have express bus service or on arterial routes with high ridership. Bus-only shoulders can offer significant travel time savings to transit. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---|---|
| 197 | 7bbb | Include a Northstar station in Ramsey. | Northstar commuter rail service has just been underway since late 2009 and ridership is still building. At this point ridership is running slightly below projections and additional stations do not appear to be necessary based upon demand. Local funding could be used to implement additional stations. No change recommended. |
| 190 | 7ccc | Various textual corrections throughout Transit Chapter. | Non-significant technical changes made as recommended throughout the chapter. |

Chapter 8 - Freight

| | | | |
|-----|----|--|---|
| 5 | 8a | A large percentage of freight traffic goes through the metro area, and preserving capacity is important to freight movement in the region. | Preserving capacity on the interstate system is vital to maintaining freight mobility through and within the region, but Figure 8-10 was based on national-level data that may not translate well to a localized map. In addition, a Twin Cities Metropolitan Area Regional Freight Study is underway by the Council and Mn/DOT to examine regional freight patterns and explore ways to improve the movement of freight through the region. In Chapter 8, page 158, at the end of paragraph 3, add the following: <u>NHS routes in the Twin Cities region include all interstates and specific connector roadways to designated regional intermodal terminals. The interstate system in particular, is vital to the movement of freight and goods through and within the region.</u> |
| 84 | 8b | Examine railroad capacity, particularly with likelihood of shared track situations (where freight and passenger rail use same tracks). | This is an important issue regarding how we can preserve freight rail capacity at the same time we are introducing new passenger rail service through sections of shared track. This issue is being studied and modeled via the ongoing East Metro Rail Capacity Study led by Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority for the east metro rail corridors including Red Rock and connections to the St. Paul Union Depot and downtown Minneapolis. In addition, Mn/DOT, in developing its Statewide Freight and Passenger Rail Plan, evaluated specific corridors for potential intercity rail service. Additional technical capacity studies may be needed, as expansion of passenger rail service is planned for new corridors. No change recommended. |
| 155 | 8c | Heavy trucks destroy highways. Vehicle weight should be limited to protect roadways. | The movement of heavy trucks carrying raw materials and manufactured goods is vital to a sustainable and healthy economy. Vehicle weights are regulated by Mn/DOT and movements of specific loaded weights and axle combinations are effectively managed by limiting specific truck/weight combinations on the designated 9-ton and 10-ton routes. Also, locals have the authority to protect neighborhoods by banning trucks on certain roads such as parkways. No change recommended. |
| 204 | 8d | Government should remain neutral on intermodal freight movement. Motor carriers should not be forced to construct intermodal facilities. | The TPP does not suggest or imply any preference or support for private industry's use of intermodal business models or construction of intermodal facilities. The plan notes under "Trends" that intermodal has been a growth area. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---|--|
| 204 | 8e | Managed lanes do not benefit the trucking industry. Large commercial trucks would not use managed lanes, even if allowed. | As described in Ch. 8, managed lanes will benefit single-unit trucks that may use the MnPass lanes and may benefit larger trucks by removing buses, HOVs, small trucks, and toll-paying autos from the general purpose lanes. In addition, ATM strategies may improve traffic flow in general purpose lanes used by trucks. No change recommended. |
| 193 | 8f | Ability of trucks to use MnPASS HOT lanes may help alleviate congestion and improve on-time deliveries. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 165 | 8g | Council should do a comprehensive intermodal plan for the region to allow potential terminals to compete for federal funding. | Only publicly owned terminals (i.e., port authorities) are eligible for federal funding; however, ancillary infrastructure like access roads are eligible through the appropriate jurisdiction. The Council and Mn/DOT are jointly developing a regional freight strategy that will include an evaluation of intermodal facilities. No change recommended. |
| 204 | 8h | Dynamic pricing disrupts the ability of the trucking industry to establish rates for customers. | MnPASS rates are typically charged during times of congestion. Trucks could choose to pay the fee and use the MnPASS lane if savings will be realized by moving freight faster, in a congestion-free lane. The costs should be less than the cost of congestion or the driver would not make the decision to use the MnPASS lane. No change recommended. |

Chapter 9 - Bike/Ped

| | | | |
|--|----|---|---|
| 39, 63, 64, 75, 102, 131, 135, 137, 157, 166, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 190, 195, 214, 217 | 9a | Need more detail related to Complete Streets. Should be included in all sections of the TPP. Complete streets language should be stronger to ensure accommodation on arterials. | The complete streets strategy is cross-referenced in the highway chapter under Associated Policies and Strategies. The TPP is organized this way so as to avoid a heavy amount of duplication throughout the document. The TPP supports the Complete Streets law and encourages all communities to enact similar policies but does not go into detail about how to implement it because Mn/DOT has not completed its work in developing implementation steps. No change recommended. |
| 4, 109 | 9b | Strong support for funding and improvements to encourage bicycling as a way to reduce congestion. | Support acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 44, 71, 74, 79 | 9c | Improve bike trails and bike lanes to encourage less use of cars. | The TPP supports investments in improving bicycle trails and completing on-street bicycle networks. The decision to support bicycling with off-road trails like the Midtown Greenway or with on-road improvements like adding bike lanes or installing bicycle boulevards comes from local plans and priorities. The TPP supports both kinds of investments but makes a particular point of supporting improvements within roadway rights-of-way when possible because it is more cost effective, which makes completing more projects possible. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---|----------|--|--|
| 46, 161, 195 | 9d | Need a regional bike and pedestrian plan. | In Chapter 12, the Work Plan will include a new item: <u>Regional Bicycle System Inventory and Regional Bicycle System Master Study. This project includes an inventory of existing and currently planned bicycle facilities in the 7-county Twin Cities metropolitan area, followed by a Regional Bicycle System Master Study that will include an analysis of existing conditions, connectivity and levels of use of the bikeway system with a special emphasis on connectivity to regional transitways and major travel generators.</u> |
| 46 | 9e | Lack of information about developing systems to support biking and walking, and developing a statewide bike map. | The Metropolitan Council is not in charge of statewide bicycle planning. Mn/DOT will be coordinating work to develop a statewide bike map and the Metropolitan Council will participate. No change recommended. |
| 46, 51, 86, 217 | 9f | Lack of discussion of ADA impacts and role of Metropolitan Council in regional pedestrian accessibility. | In Chapter 12, the Federal Requirements Chapter will include a paragraph on the role of the Metropolitan Council in fulfilling the requirements of the Americans With Disabilities Act, as follows: <u>"ADA: The Americans With Disabilities Act requires that all pedestrian facilities and transit facilities that are constructed be accessible to users with all levels of functional ability. Policy 16 of the Transportation Policy Plan assures that this goal is pursued for the entire transit system including pedestrian access to that system. Chapter 9 also includes a discussion of the requirement that all owners of pedestrian facilities should strive to make them accessible and that all public entities with 50 or more employees are required by law to develop an ADA Transition Plan that will detail steps to make their public rights of way accessible."</u> |
| 63, 64, 82, 86, 89, 93, 102, 118, 131, 137, 141, 144, 146, 155, 166, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 195, 207, 214, 217 | 9g | Work to develop a regional bike and pedestrian system map. Council should take lead in coordinating. | The Metropolitan Council has a bikeways map, referenced in Figure 9-6 on page 170. Discussion of the Council's ongoing work in this area is on page 169. The work plan will include an added item: Regional Bicycle System Inventory and Regional Bicycle System Master Study that will result in a revised bikeways map. |
| 69, 92 | 9h | Support improvements to walk and bike paths. | Support acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 80, 92, 93, | 9i | Invest in safer bike/walk trails crossings. | The Plan supports investments that overcome barriers for bicyclists and pedestrians on trails. The priorities in the plan inform the priorities that the region uses when allocating federal funding for transportation projects and the region funds many improvements to connections on trails across roadways. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|---------------|----------|---|--|
| 159 | 9k | Roadways should be widened to more safely accommodate bicycle riders. | The Metropolitan Council's Transportation Policy Plan does not dictate design specifications for transportation projects. However, the Plan supports flexibility in design in order to better accommodate all users of roadways. Communities can pursue variances to existing state aid standards using a couple of alternative guides mentioned in the plan on page 179. This plan does not go into detail on these issues because Mn/DOT has only begun its work on how to implement the Complete Streets law, which may include new recommendations about design. No change recommended. |
| 157 | 9l | Clarify local government responsibilities for Complete Streets, including funding impacts, etc. | The Metropolitan Council's Transportation Policy Plan does not dictate cost participation specifications for transportation projects. The Plan supports flexibility in design in order to better accommodate all users of roadways most cost effectively. This plan does not go into detail on these issues because Mn/DOT has only begun its work on how to implement the Complete Streets law, which may include new recommendations about design and cost participation. No change recommended. |
| 140 | 9m | Do not turn existing streets into bikeways. | Many roads in the region have traffic volumes and characteristics that make them safe for bicycling. Bicyclists have the same need to reach their destinations as users of any other mode of transportation. Since we do not have the opportunity or funding to construct off-road trails in all areas where bicyclists need to travel, the Council supports designating on-road bicycle routes along major streets that have bicycle facilities or on low-volume roadways that are safe and comfortable for bicycling. No change recommended. |
| 190, 207, 216 | 9n | Support trail plan. Walking and biking are important to a community's health. | Support acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 190, 215 | 9o | More funding for biking and walking | The issue of inadequate funding for improvements is recognized on page 174 of the plan. Bicycle and walking projects are funded primarily by local governments and by the Transportation Advisory Board in its programming of federal funding through the Regional Solicitation. The TAB may choose to direct more of these federal resources to bicycling and walking and still be consistent with the TPP. This is primarily a programming issue that is not covered in the plan. Local governments can also allocate more funding for biking and walking facilities. No change recommended. |
| 212 | 9p | Thank you for including bicycles in the plan. We need more bike friendly routes. | Support acknowledged. No change recommended. |
| 196 | 9q | Provide funding and a better system for plowing sidewalks/bike trails | The Plan acknowledges the requirement to keep pathways to transit stops accessible including the removal of snow. The Plan also includes language on Page 178 that year-round maintenance of pathways should be a priority for local governments. No change recommended. |
| 196 | 9r | Encourage safer pedestrian crossing (avoid creating medians that encourage jaywalking on city streets). | Medians are sometimes installed on busy arterials as an effective way to manage access on the roadway so that only right-turns are allowed onto and off the arterial. No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---|---|
| 196 | 9s | Add a bike lane on University Avenue. | Comment acknowledged. The TPP does not dictate design specifications for specific projects but provides overall policy direction. No change recommended. |
| 207 | 9t | Sidewalks and bike lanes should be considered when roads are constructed or reconstructed. | The plan agrees with this statement in Strategy 18e. However, the TPP does not dictate design specifications for specific projects such as what kind of facility should be provided. No change recommended. |
| 207 | 9u | Separate facilities should be planned for recreational biking and commuter biking, where possible. Combined biking/walking facilities can be dangerous. | This issue is recognized on page 183 with the statement that "local governments shall consider the needs of all bicyclists – experienced, commuter, and recreational – when planning and designing bicycle facilities and programs." No change recommended. |
| 193 | 9v | Marked crosswalks should not be identified as safe pedestrian crossings, because they are not proven to be safer. | Comment acknowledged. On page 176, the word "marked" will be removed. |
| 193 | 9w | Complete Streets language on page 179 should allow flexibility of looking at existing right-of-way and other possibilities. | The plan does this by encouraging the use of existing right-of-way and infrastructure before constructing new facilities. However, it does not dictate design specifications and provides flexibility to local governments to meet multimodal objectives. No change recommended. |
| 193 | 9x | Pathway maintenance language is too strong. | The TPP acknowledges the need to keep pathways to transit stops accessible including the removal of snow in the transit chapter. In Chapter 9, page 178, the wording on pathway maintenance will be changed to state " <u>should</u> " rather than "must." |
| 206 | 9y | How does requirement for providing safe accommodation for bicycles and pedestrians on bridges apply to rural areas? | The requirement to provide safe accommodation on new or reconstructed bridges if no alternative exists within a ¼ mile for pedestrians or ½ mile for bicyclists does not dictate design specifications for how accommodation can be achieved. Areas with little pedestrian or bicycle traffic may be able to accommodate such travel with a wide marked shoulder consistent with best practices on roadways in such environments, rather than providing a separated pathway. No change recommended. |
| 220 | 9z | Mn/DOT did not complete its 2010 transition plan; it updated the plan. Mn/DOT adopted PROWAG standards, so the language should say that designers should consult the PROWAG (not "may consult") | Comment acknowledged and Chapter 9, page 181, text will be changed to read " <u>Designers of roadways and walkways should consult the Access Board's Public Rights-of-Way guidelines at the board's website for guidance on developing an accessible pedestrian system. Mn/DOT has adopted these guidelines as their standards.</u> " |
| 190, 197 | 9aa | Plan should support/prioritize bikeway and walkway projects that connect with transit. | The Plan does this on page 174 under "Investment Priorities and Requirements" under "Multimodal Projects" and on page 176 under "Connections with Transit." No change recommended. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|---|
| 144 | 9bb | Plan should emphasize long distance bicycle commute trips, not the average 2 to 3 mile trip. | The regional trails provide many opportunities for long distance bicycle commuting and their continued development should increase these opportunities. The reason to plan for trips close to the average length is to increase the number of trips made by bicycle. There are many long-distance bicycle commuters in the region but the vast majority of bicyclists are traveling for less than five miles. It is therefore strategic to focus on trips that are shorter in length. The Work Plan will include a new item: Regional Bicycle System Inventory and Regional Bicycle System Master Study. This should increase the opportunities for coordinating planning across communities and therefore support long-distance bicycle commuting. |
| 190 | 9cc | Support position that local governments are best positioned to conduct detailed bike and pedestrian system planning. Should coordinate bike and pedestrian development with community plans. | Comment acknowledged. No change recommended. |

Chapter 10 - Aviation

| | | | |
|----------|-----|--|---|
| 84 | 10a | Supports classification for downtown St. Paul airport. | Support acknowledged. No change required. |
| 113 | 10b | More accurate method needed to calculate aircraft operations at reliever airports. | Change recommended. The existing methodology is accurate; however the Council is committed to continually improving system data and forecasts. The Council supports the Transportation Research Board efforts through its Airport Cooperative Research Program (see ACRP synthesis report 2 Airport Aviation Activity Forecasting and ARCP synthesis report 4 Counting Aircraft Operations at Non-Towered Airports). Council and Mn/DOT staff have preferred a video imaging system to meet their needs and have suggested a pilot project at metro system airports. The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) has implemented a multilateration system at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) for noise analysis; this system also has multiple capabilities and can be expanded to include the reliever airports and is consistent with FAA NextGen technology. The Chapter 12 Work Program will be revised to include an aircraft activity-count project to be reviewed/coordinated by the TAC Aviation Technical Task Force, assessing the capabilities for improving aviation forecasts and data by the next system plan update. |
| 141, 191 | 10c | Discrepancy between number of aircraft based at MSP in tables 10-31 and 10-39. | Correction made. Based on aircraft numbers for MSP have been changed in Tables 10-5 and 10-31 to be consistent with the Table 10-39 number of 24 aircraft. |
| 141 | 10d | Figure 10-42 does not illustrate the right data. | Correction made. Reference to Table 10-41 on page 218 should read "Table 10-42" and following text moved to follow last paragraph on page 216: " <u>As can be seen in Figure 10-42, product liability suits decimated manufacturing from about 1982 until the mid-1990's, when a federal government recovery program was defined and a 20 year limitation on product liability was instituted.</u> " |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|---|
| 141 | 10e | Cost estimate on page 224 does not include cost of noise mitigation - the costs are understated here. | Costs are currently unknown; following sentence is added to end of first paragraph page 224: " <u>Environmental evaluation and potential noise mitigation costs for the MSP 2030 LTCP are not included in Table 10-47.</u> " |
| 213 | 10f | There are too many parking ramps at MSP - tax dollars should not be used to compete with private business. | The number of parking spaces is primarily a reflection of user demand, availability of space, and efficiency of landside services. These and other factors are periodically reviewed in long-term, comprehensive plan (LTCP) updates and special traffic studies or environmental evaluations. Fees generated by air-transportation users, rather than general taxes, provide the funds for airport capital projects such as parking ramps. No change recommended. |
| 162 | 10g | Plan does not address future noise levels that might affect local land use decisions; please clarify. | <p>Changes recommended. The TPP includes a map (Figure M-7) that indicates the potential 2030 noise contours at MSP airport. This contour was created using the Integrated Noise Model (INM) and inputs reflect the latest aviation forecast for MSP that were approved as part of the review process for the airport's long-term comprehensive plan. These contours will be used for applying preventive measures to new development and major redevelopment until the next time that the comprehensive plan is amended or updated. For corrective measures the most recently developed Federal Aviation Regulation Part 150 program or locally funded program approved by Federal Aviation Administration will be used until completion of the specific program agreement. Council approval of the MSP airport's 2030 long-term comprehensive plan included a number of specific actions concerning update, capacity study, Part 150 update, etc. These are added as the second paragraph under the System Planning and Development Priorities on page 226 of the draft plan as follows: <u>The 2030 LTCP was found by the Council to be consistent with the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) if, the following issues are addressed in the final plan:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>The LTCP should note that the MAC will update the plan every five years and that the MAC will budget for this in the appropriate years to ensure that the first update is prepared by 2015.</u> 2) <u>The MAC should initiate a capacity study two years in advance of when MSP is expected to have 540,000 annual operations and incorporate the results of this study into the following LTCP update.</u> 3) <u>The MAC should initiate an FAA Part 150 study update (which includes a comprehensive noise analysis and mitigation program), in consultation with the MSP Noise Oversight Committee (NOC), when the forecast level of operations five years into the future exceeds the levels of mitigation in the Consent Decree (582,366 annual operations). The results of this study should be incorporated into the first subsequent LTCP update.</u> 4) <u>The MAC shall continue to work with all appropriate agencies to implement the Interstate 494/34th Avenue, Trunk Highway 5/Glumack Drive and Trunk Highway 5/Post Road interchange modifications included in the 2030 Concept Plan,</u> |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | <p><u>including preliminary environmental scoping and analysis. These highway modifications are not currently included in the region's fiscally-constrained 2030 highway plan.</u></p> <p>5) <u>The LTCP needs to acknowledge that storm water from MSP detention ponds discharges to the reaches of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers that are identified as water-quality impaired for a number of pollutants and stressors.</u></p> <p>6) <u>The LTCP should include a general discussion of financial assumptions and funding mechanisms available to implement the proposed development.</u></p> |
| 191 | 10h | Add text on surface transportation needs and multi-modal access to airports | Change recommended. Last four sentences of first paragraph on page 184 made into a new paragraph with the following revisions: " <u>Airspace is the key resource for aviation. To use global airspace, air transportation requires three basic types of infrastructure: airports, an air-traffic control system, and ground access system. Airports are locally sponsored but must meet federal development and operational certification. Air traffic control is a federally operated service provided in federally controlled airspace. Aviation user funds are used to support both functions. To connect air transportation users with the airport terminals and support facilities requires overall connectivity with the multi-modal transportation system. These connections are accomplished through shared funding efforts.</u> " |
| 113, 191 | 10i | Instances where typos, number corrections, and minor word changes or clarifications are identified. | Corrections made to: Table 10-4, Table 10-5, Figure 10-22, pg 209, Table 10-31, Table 10-47, Table 10-48, Table I-1, pg 189, Figure 10-23, App. N, pg 214, Table 10-50, pg I-3, pg I-8, pg I-6 (Fig. I-4), pg I-8 (Fig. I-8), pg M-1, pg M-2, M-6, M-7, M-10, N-6, N-8, N-9, N-10, N-11, N-12, P-3, P-4, P-5, P-7, Q-1. |
| 191 | 10j | On page 184, revise lines 5-6 to read "Maintaining air service and the airport system infrastructure will be a continuing challenge for the community communities." | Use of the word "community" means the metro-area and greater MSP airport-service area users, and is not a responsibility of a number of individual "communities." No change recommended. |
| 191 | 10k | On page 188, revise lines 6-7 to read "At MSP over eighty percent of all air service is provided by the SkyTeam alliance, with Delta Airlines. as the main U.S. partner, although MSP is currently served by all three global alliances and some non-aligned carriers." | The overall discussion under the sub-heading Open Skies Agreements is to focus on global airline alliances and relation to MSP airport service. The eighty percent by SkyTeam is accurate. No change recommended. |
| 191 | 10l | On page 191, change Policy Strategy 19d - Air Cargo Service. | Suggested text change will be added to page 215: " <u>MSP has cargo facility infrastructure available to accommodate additional cargo operations in the near term and land available for development of future cargo operations on a long-term basis.</u> " |
| 191 | 10m | On page 91, change Policy Strategy 19f - Competition and Marketing. | Suggested text will be added to page 214: " <u>The MAC is actively involved in attracting new and additional air service to MSP by both incumbent and potential new entrant airlines. The MAC maintains on file with the FAA an approved Airline Competition Plan and completed an update to the Competition Plan in 2008 in accordance with changes to the MAC's Airline Operating Agreement in 2007.</u> " |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|---|---|
| 191 | 10n | On page 192, change Policy Strategy 21b - Consider Alternatives. | Change recommended. Text revised to replace "ensure assessment" with " <u>consider impacts.</u> " |
| 191 | 10o | On page 193, change Policy Strategy 24a - Notification to FAA. | Change recommended. Strategy 24a is revised to read: " <u>The local governmental unit is required to notify the FAA prior to approving local permits for proposed tall structures.</u> " (This is consistent with page 206 notification text.) |
| 191 | 10p | On page 194, add following text to policy 25 on Airports and Land Use Compatibility: " <u>Specific mitigation plans and strategies will be included within appropriate environmental assessments or environmental impact statements. General descriptions of impacts and potential methods to address the impacts should be included in the LTCP's.</u> " | Change recommended - will be included in updated plan. |
| 191 | 10q | On page 194, Change strategy 25b and 25c text to " <u>should.</u> " | Change recommended - will be included in updated plan. |
| 191 | 10r | On page 208, revise first sentence to read that airport airspace be defined starting at 150 feet above airport ground level rather than current 200 feet above airport ground level. | No change recommended. The use of a 200-foot elevation reflects state aeronautics rules and is the height where regional airspace distinction is made concerning airport airspace and general airspace. Use of the 150-foot horizontal surface to define airport airspace seems too low an altitude below the airports local traffic pattern and may lead to unintended consequences. This comment will receive more discussion by the TAC Aviation Technical Task Force prior to next TPP update. |
| 191 | 10s | On page 209, remove reference in this section to 60% and 80% thresholds for action on airport annual service volume capacity at MSP airport. | These thresholds are still appropriate for system planning and the reliever airports and should remain until the Federal Aviation Administration advisory circular is changed. Change recommended to Appendix Q. Though Appendix Q adequately addresses capacity threshold issues at MSP, the following text is added after the second full sentence on page Q-3: " <u>The Council approval of the MSP 2030 LTCP, indicated that the MAC should initiate a capacity study in advance of the airport reaching 540,000 annual operations.</u> " |
| 191 | 10t | On page 209, 2030 Regional Development Framework delay benchmark should be re-evaluated. | Changing Council benchmarks is part of updating the Regional Development Framework, and will be considered at that time with input from the TAC Aviation Technical Task Force. No change recommended. |
| 191 | 10u | On page 210, revise second sentence of second paragraph to read "The airport sponsors may use corrective land use measures to help mitigate noise in areas with existing development that is incompatible with designated noise levels." | Change recommended. The context of the paragraph focuses on the distinctions of preventive and corrective programs and implementation responsibility in general, not to identify acceptability or eligibility of specific measures. The terms "preventive" and "corrective" will be italicized to highlight the distinction. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|--|----------|--|---|
| Chapter 11 - Federal Requirements | | | |
| 220 | 11a | Plan's environmental justice section does not emphasize people with disabilities. | Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice) addresses minority and low income populations, though is not specific to people with disabilities. A new section on ADA will be added to Chapter 12 to address this issue. See response to comment 12b. |
| Chapter 12 - Work Plan | | | |
| 220 | 12a | Work plan should require all documents of the Council to be made available by accessible screen reader software. | This comment will be forwarded to the work unit within the Council that maintains the Council's website and addresses accessibility issues. Specific operational issues such as this are not contained in the long-range transportation plan. No change recommended. |
| 220 | 12b | The work plan should include an item to improve accessibility in the metro area. | In Chapter 12 , the Federal Requirements Chapter will include a paragraph on the role of the Metropolitan Council in fulfilling the requirements of the Americans With Disabilities Act, as follows: <u>"ADA: The Americans With Disabilities Act requires that all pedestrian facilities and transit facilities that are constructed be accessible to users with all levels of functional ability. Policy 16 of the Transportation Policy Plan assures that this goal is pursued for the entire transit system including pedestrian access to that system. Chapter 9 also includes a discussion of the requirement that all owners of pedestrian facilities should strive to make them accessible and that all public entities with 50 or more employees are required by law to develop an ADA Transition Plan that will detail steps to make their public rights of way accessible."</u> |
| Appendices | | | |
| 88 | A-1 | Appendix F appears to evaluate air quality at speeds higher than possible in the highway system. | The speeds included in the air quality analysis are for free-flow traffic conditions. The Council model follows accepted federal rules and guidelines and has been approved upon federal review. No change recommended. |
| 160 | A-2 | Appendix E 2-mile spacing requirement for interchanges contradicts ongoing work. | See response and text change under Comment 6d. |
| 141 | A-3 | Appendix I should address compatibility issues and reference Appendix M. | Noise issues are specifically addressed under sub-heading Airport and Aircraft Environmental Capability. Following text is added under the sub-heading: <u>"Objective: To define aviation impacts and measures needed to meet both social and natural environmental needs of the region."</u> The plan should include: A third bullet under this sub-heading to reference Appendix M. |

2030 Draft Transportation Policy Plan - Public Comment Report

| Comment ID | Issue ID | Comment | Staff Response |
|------------|----------|--|--|
| 141 | A-4 | Appendix M, No fair property disclosure, nor dedication of aviation easements, have not been approved, entertained, promoted by the city. | Table M-2 includes this item primarily as a preventive measure and it is applied in communities that are not fully developed. For fully developed communities this measure would be applied primarily for major redevelopment areas. Overall review of Appendix M should be considered by the TAC Aviation Technical Task Force prior to the next update of the TPP (see also response A-6). No change recommended. |
| 141 | A-5 | Appendix M, No approved 2007 Part 150 noise compatibility program; sound insulation program now underway to 2014 is in accord with 2008 Consent Decree. | Text on page M-2 revised to read: " <u>Table M-2 depicts the current land use measures adopted as part of in conjunction with development of the approved MSP Part 150 noise compatibility program.</u> " |
| 141 | A-6 | Appendix M, Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Aircraft noise and Structure Performance Standards are inconsistent, virtually all homes meet 45dba interior noise level. | There is no inconsistency. It is fortunate if existing residential structures already provide up to 29 dba attenuation of the 45dba interior level desired. Use of low cost best-practices (e.g. storm door, solid entrance door, chimney cap, bathroom/kitchen vent modifications and weather stripping) also provide additional noise attenuation to existing structures. It is acknowledged that the 45dba level is not an ideal environment; however it is an acceptable overall trade-off environment between the system and community needs. The 45dba interior level application applies to both preventive and corrective measures. At MSP the Part 150 noise program and MAC/Community Consent Decree provide a spectrum of funding for current corrective noise mitigation efforts that are expected to be completed in 2014. No change recommended. |
| 191 | A-7 | Table M-3 should be revised to reflect World Health Organization standard of 35/30 in bedrooms. | No change recommended at this time. After completion of the current noise mitigation program, and acknowledging that advances in noise definition, measurement, and source reductions have occurred, the Council should conduct a cooperative, comprehensive assessment of next steps in regional noise policy direction and land use compatibility, including evaluation of other potential noise standards, in anticipation of a TPP system plan update. |
| 191 | A-8 | Appendix M, MAC agrees with the longstanding federal and local goal of a 45 db interior day-night average sound level (DNL). The Council's land use compatibility guidelines including Table M-3, should remain unchanged in the TPP update. | Comment acknowledged. No change required. |
| 191 | A-9 | Appendix I, page 2, MAC recommends that this section be revised to reflect general guidance and to remove detailed requirements for the long-term comprehensive plan. | Recommend changing the bullet on drainage system to acknowledge the last two sentences that refer to activities that occur during the environmental review phase, not the long-term comprehensive planning process. |
| 191 | A-10 | Appendix N, MAC requests that the Council review the Appendix N report cards for accuracy when compared to recently adopted long-term comprehensive plans for MAC airports | This issue will be referenced in the TAC Aviation Technical Task Force for its review in 2011. No change recommended at this time. |