

Transportation Advisory Board
of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities

ACTION TRANSMITTAL

No. 2010-49

DATE: July 14, 2010
TO: Transportation Advisory Board
FROM: Technical Advisory Committee
SUBJECT: Comments and recommendations on the draft 2030 Transportation Policy Plan update.

MOTION: That the TAB approves the attached comments on the draft 2030 Transportation Policy Plan update and forwards them to the Metropolitan Council for consideration in preparing the draft Plan for public hearing.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: The Metropolitan Council is updating the region's 2030 Transportation Policy Plan to include new policy directions generated by recent studies. The Aviation Technical Study and recently-adopted Long Term Comprehensive Plans for the region's airports will influence changes in the Aviation Chapter of the Plan. Completion of the Metropolitan Highway System Investment Study will influence the Highway and Regional Mobility chapters of the Plan. The Plan update will include other minor technical corrections as well.

The TAC Planning Committee, TAC Funding & Programming Committee and TAC Aviation Task Force all reviewed and discussed the draft 2030 TPP update chapters and appendices in June. The TAC reviewed their comments and discussed the Plan update at their meeting on July 7 and voted to forward the comments to the TAB. Although the Met Council staff is already working on addressing these comments in the draft Plan update, it is appropriate for the TAB to officially adopt these comments and perhaps continue the discussion.

ROUTING

TO	ACTION REQUESTED	DATE COMPLETED
TAC Planning Committee	Review and Comment	June 24, 2010
TAC Aviation Task Force	Review and Comment	June 18, 2010
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review and Comment	June 17, 2010
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	July 7, 2010
TAB Policy Committee	Review & Recommend	July 8, 2010
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Approve	

Transportation Advisory Committee of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities

DATE: July 14, 2010
TO: Transportation Advisory Board
FROM: TAB Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Combined Committee Comments on the Draft 2030 Transportation Policy Plan Update.

TAC FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Chapter 5: Regional Mobility/Congestion Management Process

F-1) An expanded discussion of the A- and B- minor arterial system should be added to page 4, Chapter 5. Although the freeway system is emphasized in the policy the plan, the A- and B-Minor Arterials are used as alternative routes and they are also becoming congested. Minor arterials provide important routes for bicyclists and pedestrians, particularly in environments that are not pedestrian friendly.

F-2) The project solicitation criteria may need to be re-examined to be consistent with the new direction in the TPP. A-Minor Arterial projects that involve expansion tend to score higher which is not necessarily consistent with this new approach to congestion management.

F-3) The TPP should have more explicit direction regarding access management and its connection to land use. A bullet point on access management should be added as one of the land use strategies on page 9, Chapter 5.

F-4) Access management strategies should be different for undeveloped and fully-developed areas because it is not possible to purchase access in fully-developed areas.

F-5) Bicycles and pedestrians should be accommodated on the minor arterial system with sidewalks and paths.

F-6) Although trails are often most optimal for bicycle travel, often key connections between destinations require travel along non-freeway highways. Such travel should be accommodated by using shoulders or other on-road accommodations (word choice?-facilities).

F-7) The expression “transit alternatives” implies “alternatives **to** transit”. “Transit opportunities” or “transit options” would be clearer.

F-8) Goals in this plan support giving people mobility options such as bicycling, walking, transit, priced lanes, and maximizing person-throughput. At times these goals may conflict with one another since maximizing person-throughput strategies may compromise other options. The plan does not take a position on what to do when that happens.

F-9) Figure 5-4 should state that North Star Commuter Rail is now operational.

F-10) There is a concern that we have “thrown in the towel” in the fight against congestion.

Chapter 6: Highways

F-11) Terms should be consistent throughout the chapter: The two maps on page 3 reference both the Regional Highway System and the Metro Highway System. Is there a distinction between the two?

F-12) Safety should be a top priority. All projects should be evaluated for safety first, particularly when championing design flexibility. Because there is not enough funding to build four lane divided roads throughout the region, other ways to maximize safety should be considered.

F-13) Roadway jurisdiction: MnDOT owns too many roads. If MnDOT were to turn back a third of the roads to the counties, the counties could turn a third back to the cities. With a smaller network of roads, MnDOT could focus on the most important routes. Many roads are on the turn back list but there is no mechanism to make it happen and they are not up to standard to do so.

F-14) Add historical data to VMT and trips on Table 6-18.

F-15) The future congestion map should be updated to reflect the most current TAZ forecast allocations.

TAC PLANNING COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Chapter 3: Regional Transportation Finance

P-1) Last paragraph on page 5, change “newly registered vehicles” to “vehicles registered after 2010”.

P-2) A guaranteed funding picture is implied in this chapter. Explain why the increase in funding is set at one level for transit (pages 6 and 7) and another for highways.

P-3) Review the policy regarding expansion of transit versus highways (policies 2a, 2b, and 2c on page 10) and include more discussion. The details of policies 2a and 2b appear contradictory.

P-4) Page 7 (Issues and Trends): the discussion on federal funding is thin and misleading. A paragraph should be included on the coordinated efforts of EPA/DOT/HUD, and on broadening the scope of other funding sources besides ARRA, e.g. TIGER 1 and 2.

P-5) The issue of “intercity rail” should be addressed on page 7.

P-6) The uncertainty (as well as the general insolvency of the highway trust fund) should be addressed. What is the source of future federal funds?—a gas tax increase or something else?

P-7) Page 12, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: the highway user fund revenues are discussed. Of the \$1.4 billion in statewide funds, some \$835 million was transferred to the trunk highway fund: where did the rest go?

Chapter 4: Transportation and Land Use

P-8) The issue of the relationship between land use/transportation and the concerns of environmental preservation were raised. The expansion of transit corridors far beyond the developed area raises issues of environmental stewardship. Are transit and highway systems being developed in ways that address environmental issues? In light of this, pages 2 and 3 might need to be revisited.

P-9) Proper land planning is good, not only for transportation, but for the environment as well. This concept should be discussed more explicitly.

P-10) Include a reference and a policy to support joint development. The FTA has policies that support such development.

P-11) Include a discussion of “redevelopment”, since many communities are substantially developed.

P-12) On page 9, the discussion of the number of jobs is awkward and it may be more meaningful to indicate “the concentration of jobs” rather than the “number of jobs”. Additional wording could be included to address this.

P-13) On page 10: Revise the wording on how to deal with maximum versus minimum parking. More than one strategy or tool should be highlighted.

P-14) Some issues are discussed in more detail in other chapters. In an effort to direct one to those sections, it was suggested that symbols alongside the margins be included.

Chapter 5: Regional Mobility

P-15) This chapter should address the possibility of encouraging large-employers to develop TDM plans.

P-16) Page 4: under the Highway System Management discussion, it should note and emphasize that “person-throughput” is being used as a performance measure in the screening process; this is a significant change from the past.

P-17) The MHSIS is too focused on “freeways” and not enough on “other principal arterials” and minor arterials. A discussion of these “non- freeways” should be included. The “highway system” is discussed but it relates almost exclusively to “freeways”. Either the discussion of the rest of the highway system should be expanded OR simply call it freeway management.

P-18) Page 11: Clarify whether HOVs would pay a toll, as identified in the second paragraph on the MnPASS system study (page 11). HOV tolls were assumed only for the purpose of “modeling” and are NOT a policy item. This should be clarified.

Chapter 6: Highways

P-19) Define what is meant by “high, moderate, and low” shown on Table 6-ZZZ.

P-20) There is an imbalance in the “turn-back” process regarding roadways. Mn/DOT can turn back roads to the counties, but the counties cannot turn back roadways to the cities.

P-21) The names for the roadway systems shown by the maps on page 3 are confusing, given the accompanying discussions throughout the chapter that reference the systems. Add maps that illustrate the “freeway” system, the National Highway System (NHS) and the Interregional Corridors (IRC) to the two maps shown on page 3.

P-22) The Plan considers the cost effectiveness of projects and in some instances there may be no “cheaper” option available to a high cost project (as an example, TH 10 in the city of Ramsey). The low-cost solutions also relate to the Policy 11 and the evaluation of highway interchange requests. This issue should be addressed in the plan.

P-23) The ability to modify land uses that affect travel may be overstated in the section under “*A New Highway Investment Strategy*”. A question was raised as to what the implications of this strategy were regarding the minor arterial system. If it means that the minor arterials would have to play a more important role in support of the principal

arterials, then the scoring of solicitation projects, which favors preservation and not expansion and improvement, might limit the role of minor arterials in this endeavor.

P-24) The “Complete Streets” concept, which appears in Chapter 9 (*Pedestrians and Bicycles*), should ALSO be included in the Highway chapter.

P-25) Page 15: It may not always be workable or desirable from a safety standpoint to provide all or a variety of modes (bikes, pedestrian) on minor arterials. To support the principal arterial system, the ability to move vehicles on minor arterials is a higher priority. Designating bike-pedestrian facilities on other parallel facilities may be a better option.

P-26) Table 6-TTT should be clarified; the question was raised as to what steps are being taken to obtain local support for these projects. Specifically, regarding the river crossings identified between Dayton and Ramsey and TH41 over the Minnesota River, local communities have been kept very much in the loop. These two facilities are expected to be addressed in the post-2030 time frame.

Chapter 7: Transit

P-27) On page 12, the first sentence under *Alternatives to Congestion* should clarify that this is an “AM peak hour” situation.

P-28) On page 14 under “*Demand for Service*”, include a figure showing ridership growth.

P-29) Pages 61 and 62: Clarify the inconsistency between transit and highways relative to the funding picture. Assumptions are included in the Plan that funding has declined but the state is expected to “backfill” funds with a doubling in the forecast of transit passengers. This is different from the assumptions being made regarding highway funding. Pages 3 and 15 of the finance chapter (Chapter 3) may clarify these funding assumptions for highways and transit.

P-30) Page 18, Policy 14, clarify the assumption regard expansion of the transit system and the downward trend in MVST.

P-31) Page 19: Include a “disclaimer” that would indicate, “Except where prohibited by legislation”. (This addresses the Dan Patch issue.)

P-32) Page 19, Strategy 15a: the list of modes excludes “streetcars”. This mode is identified on page 55. If the Plan excludes streetcars, then it is inconsistent with state regulations (174.93, section 8). Some of these new modes that address livability could be added to the “Issues and Trends” section (beginning on page 14).

P-32) Include Midtown Corridor under Recommendations

P-33) Chapter 7 seems to have a repetition of items/concepts which are "described" differently, which is difficult to follow.

TAC AVIATION TASK FORCE COMMENTS:

A-1) Concern that airport classification text remained in the document. It was clarified that discussion of airport classification is a basic element of system planning and would always be in the system plan document. Although the System Technical Study had substantial discussion concerning reclassification of the Minor airports, no references to Minor 1 and Minor 2 airport reclassification analysis were included in the text of the TPP Update.

A-2) There was discussion that the MSP LTCP update did not address development alternatives, only facility options. This issue is addressed in new Appendix X of this plan. An airfield capacity study and noise analysis will be performed prior to aircraft operations at MSP reaching certain operational levels. If these studies indicate a need for additional capacity development, various alternatives, including multi-modal options, will be examined.

TAB POLICY COMMITTEE COMMENTS:


TP-1) Land use influences transportation investments, but the opposite is also true; TPP should elaborate on how transportation investments influence land use and development.

TP-2) Acknowledge that some PAs serve a secondary local access function in addition to providing mobility for longer trips; improving traffic flow on PAs can conflict with safety needs of bikes/peds crossing the arterial.

TP-3) Replace the term "bicycle accommodations" with "necessary bicycle infrastructure."

TP-4) Trans. Secretary LaHood encourages MPOs to set targets for increasing biking/walking mode share similar to goals for transit mode share; TPP should acknowledge this.

Transportation Advisory Board
of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities

TO: Transportation Advisory Board 
FROM: Kevin Roggenbuck, Transportation Coordinator
DATE: July 14, 2010
RE: Draft 2030 Transportation Policy Plan update.

The TAB Policy Committee met on Thursday, July 8 to discuss the draft 2030 Transportation Policy Plan update and the comment/recommendations provided by the TAC Planning Committee, TAC Funding & Programming Committee and the TAC Aviation Task Force. The TAB Policy Committee endorsed the technical committee's comments and added four additional comments. Metropolitan Council staff is working to address these comments and recommendations in the draft Plan update before it is sent to the Met Council Transportation Committee and adopted by the full Council for public comment.

The draft Plan update and comments from the technical committees were sent to you in the July 8 Policy Committee mailing – please bring this information to the full TAB meeting on July 21 if you would like to continue discussion of the Plan update.

Attached with this memo is a matrix of TAC and TAB comments on the Plan update and the action or response from the Council staff. All the TAC comments in the memo sent to you in the TAB Policy Committee mailing are included in this matrix, plus it includes the four comments made by the TAB Policy Committee last week.

TAC/TAB Committee Comments and Response Summary			7/9/2010
Comment Number	Comment	Action/Response	Location in TPP
TAC Funding and Programming Committee Comments			
F-1	Expand discussion of A- & B-minor arterial system.	Will address w/added text.	Chapter 6
F-2	Re-examine project solicitation criteria for consistency w/new direction.	Item to be added to Work Program to address TAC/TAB solicitation criteria for expansion vs. preservation.	No plan change required.
F-3	Be more explicit in access management direction relative to land use strategies.	To be addressed in access management policy and Highway Interchange Request Eval. Criteria.	Chapter 6 and Appendix E
F-4	Identify different access management strategies for undeveloped vs. developed areas.	To be addressed in access management policy and Highway Interchange Request Eval. Criteria.	Chapter 6 and Appendix E
F-5	Stress importance of minor arterials to bike/ped modes.	Will add text re complete streets policy.	Chapter 9
F-6	Accommodate key bike connections on non-freeway arterials.	Will add text in discussion of complete streets policy; new MnDOT Complete Streets policy will address for TH system.	Chapter 9
F-7	Heading "Transit Alternatives" implies "alts to transit." Use "opportunities" or "options" instead.	Text to be revised.	Chapter 5
F-8	Plan goals supporting mobility options that maximize people throughput, may be in conflict.	Comment acknowledged. Text to be reviewed.	Various chapters
F-9	Fig. 5-4 should state that rail is now in operation.	Text to be revised.	Chapter 5
F-10	We've "thrown in the towel" in fighting congestion.	New language establishes strategies to manage congestion.	Chapters 5 & 6
F-11	Regional Highway System and Metro Highway System are conflicting terms.	Will modify text to address.	Introduction
F-12	Safety should be top priority; potential projects should be evaluated for safety first.	Addressed in Strategy 10-c.	Chapter 6
F-13	MnDOT should turn back more roads to counties & focus on most important routes.	Jurisdictional parameters recognized in Policy 9f.	Chapter 6
F-14	Add historic VMT & trip data to Table 6-18.	Table uses modeled data, not actual data.	No plan change required.
F-15	Update future congestion map to reflect most current TAZ forecasts.	Will update map with future regional model runs.	No plan change required.

TAC/TAB Committee Comments and Response Summary			7/9/2010
Comment Number	Comment	Action/Response	Location in TPP
TAC Planning Committee Comments			
P-1	Change "newly registered vehicles" to "vehicles registered after 2010" in Regional Trans. Finance chapter, p. 5.	Text to be revised.	Chapter 3
P-2	Explain differences in transit & highway forecast assumptions.	Will address with added text.	Chapter 3
P-3	Review policy re transit vs. highway expansion for possible conflicts (2a - 2c, p. 10 of Ch. 3).	Policy language will be reviewed.	Chapter 3
P-4	Discussion of federal funding is thin and misleading (Ch. 3, p. 7).	Will add text to recognize change in federal funding philosophy.	Chapter 3
P-5	Funding for intercity rail s/be addressed.	Funding for Intercity Rail not part of 2008 law; no action required.	No plan change required.
P-6	Need to address uncertainty/general insolvency of highway trust fund.	Plan addresses under "Uncertain Future of Fed. Revenues" (Ch. 3, p.9)	No plan change required.
P-7	Where did remainder of \$1.4 B state funds go after \$835 M transfer to trunk hwy fund? (Ch. 3, p. 12, 2nd para.)	Text to be revised.	Chapter 3
P-8	Revisit language re land use/transportation relative to environmental preservation.	Relevant section text will be reviewed.	Chapter 4
P-9	Environmental benefits of good land use planning should be discussed more explicitly.	Will address with new text to introduction of land use chapter.	Chapter 4
P-10	Include reference & policy supporting joint development.	TPP encourages development in transit corridors (Policy 4).	Chapter 4
P-11	Include discussion of redevelopment in "developed" communities.	Will address with added text.	Chapter 4, p. 2
P-12	Discussion of "number of jobs" is awkward; "concentration of jobs" would be better.	Text to be revised.	Chapter 4, p. 9
P-13	Text dealing with minimum/maximum parking standards needs re-wording.	Section will be reviewed and revised.	Chapter 4, p. 10
P-14	Symbols in the margins s/be applied to cross-reference related sections.	Some symbols in plan already do this; more detailed approach not needed and outside of time constraints.	No plan change required.
P-15	Should address possibility of encouraging large employers to develop TDM plans.	Plan addresses via discussion of TDM initiatives (Ch. 5).	No plan change required.
P-16	Plan should emphasize that person-throughput will be used as a performance measure in the project screening process.	Will address with added text.	Chapter 5
P-17	Plan needs more discussion re non-freeway PAs and minor arterials.	Will address with added text.	Chapter 6

TAC/TAB Committee Comments and Response Summary			7/9/2010
Comment Number	Comment	Action/Response	Location in TPP
P-18	Clarify whether or not HOVs would be tolled to use MnPass lanes.	Text w/be added to clarify that HOV tolls were assumed for modeling purposes only.	Chapter 5
P-19	Define "high, moderate, & low" in Table 6-ZZZ.	Table will be removed.	Chapter 6
P-20	There is imbalance in highway turn back process (i.e., counties cannot turn back roads to cities).	Plan addresses via Strategy 9g re roadway jurisdiction.	Chapter 6
P-21	Roadway systems names on maps (Ch. 6, p. 3) are confusing; add maps to illustrate "freeway system", NHS, & IRCs.	Will address with added text.	Chapter 6
P-22	Some cases may call for high-cost projects where cheaper options not available.	TPP emphasizes the need to find lower cost solutions to mobility/safety needs; no action required.	Chapter 6
P-23	What are the impacts of TPP on minor arterial system?	Will address with added text and study in Work Program.	Chapter 6
P-24	Complete Streets concept in Peds/Bicycles chapter (Ch. 9) should be included in Highways chapter.	Will add text in Highways chapter referencing Complete Streets concept from Ch. 9.	Chapter 6
P-25	Issue raised re suitability of minor arterial system to support bikes/peds in addition to supporting traffic overflow from PAs.	Will add text in discussion of complete streets policy; new MnDOT Complete Streets policy will address for TH system.	Chapter 6
P-26	Clarify Table 6-TTT re obtaining local support for projects; major river crossings (i.e., TH 41 & Dayton-Ramsey) are expected in post-2030 timeframe.	Lower-cost solutions are proposed consistent with overall philosophy of this TPP hwy chapter update.	No plan change required.
P-27	Clarify this is an "AM peak hour situation" in 1st sentence under "Alts to Congestion" (Ch. 7, p. 12).	Will revise text.	Chapter 7
P-28	Insert new figure re ridership growth under "Demand for Service" (Ch. 7, p. 14)	Will review and revise figure as appropriate.	Chapter 7
P-29	Clarify apparent inconsistency between transit & highway funding (Ch. 7, pp. 61-62)	Will review and revise text as appropriate.	Chapter 3
P-30	Clarify assumption re transit expansion & downward trend in MVST (Ch. 7, p. 18, poi. 14)	Will revise text to clarify MVST forecast trends.	Chapter 7
P-31	Add disclaimer to indicate "except where prohibited by legislation" (Ch. 7, p. 19)	Will add text referencing Dan Patch Corridor exception.	Chapter 7
P-32	List of modes (Ch. 7, p. 19, strat. 15a) excludes streetcars; add new mode to "Issues & Trends" section (p. 14).	Will add text re streetcars and local interest.	Chapter 7
P-33	Chapter 7 repeats items and concepts that are described differently; difficult to follow.	Will review text and revise as appropriate.	Chapter 7

TAC/TAB Committee Comments and Response Summary			7/9/2010
Comment Number	Comment	Action/Response	Location in TPP
TAC Aviation Task Force Comments			
A-1	Concern expressed that airport classification text remained in the plan.	This is a basic element of the plan and will continue to be an element of the plan.	No plan change required.
A-2	Discussion re MSP LTCP update did not address development alternatives, only facility options.	Addressed in Appendix X	No plan change required.
TAB Policy Committee Comments			
TP-1	Land use influences transportation investments, but the opposite is also true; TPP should elaborate on how transportation investments influence land use and development.	Will add text to acknowledge transportation's role in affecting land use and development.	Chapter 4
TP-2	Acknowledge that some PAs serve a secondary local access function in addition to providing mobility for longer trips; improving traffic flow on PAs can conflict with safety needs of bikes/peds crossing the arterial.	Will add text that acknowledges the secondary local access function and potential safety conflicts between mobility goals of PAs and use by bikes/peds.	Chapter 6
TP-3	Replace the term "bicycle accommodations" with "necessary bicycle infrastructure."	Will revise text to express need to facilitate bike travel within travel corridors.	Chapter 9
TP-4	Trans. Secretary LaHood encourages MPOs to set targets for increasing biking/walking mode share similar to goals for transit mode share; TPP should acknowledge this.	Will add language in "Issues and Trends" section of TPP to reflect federal direction to encourage more biking/walking.	Chapter 9