Connection to TAB work

- Regional solicitation
  - Functional Classification determines which roadways are eligible for federal funding
    - FHWA:
      - Urban – Minor Collector
      - Rural – Major Collector
    - Met Council:
      - Minor Arterial (A-Minor only)

- Transportation Policy Plan
  - Comprehensive Planning
    - Land use
    - Transportation
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Three broad classification categories
- Arterials
  - Principal
  - Minor
- Collectors
  - Major
  - Minor
- Local

Two area classifications
- Urban
- Rural
Functional Classification: What’s the Purpose

- **Efficiency**: Functional Class system intends to maximize efficiency of road network
  - Channelization of traffic through a hierarchical network
  - Balances mobility of users of the system with access to property

- **Standardization**: Creates one standard for all states
  - Allows coordination, comparison, knowledge transfer

- **Funding**: Allows for thresholds to be set, streamlines decision making and fosters more transparent process
Functional Classification: Local and Collectors

- **Major Collector**
  - Image of a major collector road

- **Minor Collector**
  - Image of a minor collector road

- **Local Road**
  - Image of a local road
Functional Classification: Minor Arterial

Urban Minor Arterial

Rural Minor Arterial

Suburban Minor Arterial
Functional Classification: Principal Arterial

- Interstate
- Freeway/Expressway
- Principal Arterial - Other
How is functional classification determined?

• Roadways serve two primary functions:
  • Access to property
  • Travel mobility
• All roadways perform these functions to varying degrees
• Determining a roadway’s primary purpose helps determine how to classify the roadway
• Represents the existing conditions of a roadway
Functional Classification: Why We’re Here

• 2010: Decennial Census
  • New urban area boundaries

• 2013: FHWA updated Functional Class guidelines

• 2015: MnDOT completed review and update of functional classification for Greater Minnesota. This update did not include metro.
  • Determined that systems were different enough to separate into two processes
  • Previous attempts with metro have been delayed

• FHWA has requested metro functional class be reviewed and updated to achieve consistency with Greater Minnesota and better adhere to guidelines
Statewide perspective: 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional classification</th>
<th>Urban miles</th>
<th>% urban</th>
<th>FHWA urban guideline*</th>
<th>Rural miles</th>
<th>% rural</th>
<th>FHWA rural guideline*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial-Interstate</td>
<td>325.4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1-3%</td>
<td>588.1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA- Freeway/Expressway</td>
<td>220.7</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA- Other</td>
<td>616.2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4-9%</td>
<td>3,443.1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2,550.2</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7-14%</td>
<td>6,675.3</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>2,198.2</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>3-16%</td>
<td>15,653.3</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>8-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Collector</td>
<td>789.9</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3-16%</td>
<td>12,014.3</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>15,454.5</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>67-76%</td>
<td>82,199.8</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>62-74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,155.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120,619.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FHWA Functional Classification Concepts, Criteria and Procedures, 2013

Minnesota is considered a rural state. There is guidance for rural/urban system separate from state designation.
Update on County Review Process Progress

Worked with both county and city staff
- Anoka – 3 meetings
  - 1 with county staff / 2 formal with city staff
- Carver – 2 meetings
  - 1 with county staff / 1 formal with city staff
- Scott – 2 meetings
  - 1 with county staff / 1 formal with city staff
- Ramsey – 2 planned meetings
  - St. Paul – 1 meeting held
- Hennepin – 1 meeting held, 2 planned
  - Minneapolis – 1 meeting planned
- Washington – 3 meetings planned
  - 1 with county staff / 2 formal with city staff
- Dakota – 3 meetings planned
  - 1 with county staff / 2 formal with city staff

Review process:
- MnDOT review materials sent to counties and cities
- Not all MnDOT marked routes were ultimately changed
  - If county or local had issue or more information, generally deferred unless far out of guidelines
  - Most recommended revisions have been ultimately made, no outstanding disagreements
- Some cities have offered additional roadways to classify
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Update on County Progress

• Anoka, Carver & Scott Counties
  • Technical review complete
  • Local meetings and review are substantially complete

• Ramsey County
  • Met with city staff – January 7th
  • Met with St. Paul – January 15th
  • Scheduling meeting with County staff

• Hennepin County
  • Met with County staff – December 29th
  • Working with Minneapolis staff and will meet in January 2021
  • Working on setting up city (and others) meeting(s) in January

• Dakota & Washington Counties
  • Technical review complete
    • Preliminary contact via draft County LRTP
  • Will begin review with county and city staff January/February
Key Takeaways So Far

- Metro is very low in Principal Arterial – Other mileage
  - FHWA guideline = 4%-9% of system
  - Actual = 1.72%
  - This may be influencing higher levels of Minor Arterials
- Majority of minor arterials highlighted for review/revised are B-Minor/Other subcategory
  - Overall change* = -7.5%
  - A-Minor change* = -2.6%
  - B-Minor/Other change* = -27.0%
- Lack of understanding of urban/rural & existing/planned dichotomy
- Wide variance from city to city
  - Comp planning process seemed insufficient for functional classification revision without extensive MnDOT collaboration

### Preliminary Revisions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2,433.40</td>
<td>2,251.44</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Minor</td>
<td>1,946.88</td>
<td>1,896.46</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Minor/Other</td>
<td>486.49</td>
<td>354.98</td>
<td>-27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>1,562.51</td>
<td>1,643.58</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Collector</td>
<td>820.72</td>
<td>1,246.82</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>11,558.22</td>
<td>11,229.25</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preliminary data is subject to change per local reviews
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Next Steps in Process

• Finish local partner review

• Tentative February 2021 final Steering Committee meeting
  • Aiming to have any/all outstanding disagreements ready for Committee final decision

• Submission of updated system to FHWA – March/April 2021

• Met Council update on process and formal review/approval
  • Will be coming back to TAB for review of final system revisions and to move recommendation of approval to MnDOT Commissioner
  • Met Council will follow up this study in late 2021 to implement findings
Thank you!

Joe Widing
joseph.widing@state.mn.us