

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD  
Metropolitan Council  
390 N. Robert St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1805

Notes of a Meeting of the  
**TAC-PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
May 29, 2014

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lisa Freese, Holly Anderson, Michelle Beaulieu, Patrick Boylan, Bob Byers, Jack Byers, Paul Czech, Elaine Koutsoukos, Steve Mahowald, Kevin Roggenbuck, Amanda Smith, Ann Pung-Terwedo, David Vessel

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mary Karlsson, Connie Kozlak, Katie White, Amy Vennewitz, Cole Hiniker, Russ Owen, Mark Filipi, Jonathan Ehrlich, Michelle Fure, Steve Elmer, Chris Gabriel, Jake Rueter, Joe Barbeau

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Freese.

**2. Changes to Thrive**

Libby Starling gave an overview of the public comment summaries received for Thrive MSP2040 during the period February 26 to April 28, 2014. She distributed a handout that summarized the major changes made from those comments. Libby indicated she saw no additional need for expansion, given the anticipated demographic forecasts for the region.

There were changes made in the language regarding economic competitiveness as well as the map showing employment. The map now shows job centers and concentrations.

A comment was made concerning community designations in that they seemed like investment priority categorizations.

**3. Continued Review of the Draft 2040 TPP**

The Chair reviewed earlier comments on the TPP. The introductory chapter is too long and encouraged that it be shortened and more focused, eliminating things that are yet to be vetted. Staff indicated that this was being worked on; the introductory chapter would include an executive summary. A comment was also made that, this being a policy document, that a number of things would be better placed in the appendices. Staff asked that committee members send comments directly to staff so that they would have more time to review them during the overall process. The Chair distributed a handout containing her thoughts on the process itself. During the discussion, it was felt that the tone of the comments out to be softened.

Finance Chapter:

It was asked that the second paragraph on page 93 be modified to make it clear as to what exactly is eligible for funding.

Staff indicated that a number of changes are being made, including a paragraph on the differences between road and transit operations and an increased revenue scenario. Wording was being added to include discussion on local roadways. Comment was made that when development occurs, often the developer contributes to the improvements to the nearby system, and that this should be acknowledged.

A question was raised as to what the \$100 million (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, page 95) is based on. It was felt that this should be described somewhere as background information.

#### Land Use & Local Planning Chapter:

Regarding page 68, a question was raised as to whether the forecasts in Thrive will happen on its own or is it shaped by certain policies. Language should be incorporated to address this.

Concerning the table on page 78, there was some uncertainty as to the proper placement of arterial BRT elements. There was disagreement as to whether it should be in the transitway category or not. The issue was the definition of 'Arterial BRT'. A question was raised as to whether communities will have these standards in their Comprehensive Plan implementation? It was noted that there is an attempt to describe this in Table 5 on page 80.

Under the heading of '*Potential Constraints to Transit-Supportive Land Use*' on page 79, it was suggested that a statement should be included on how communities and counties might require help before some of these things could be done, for it entails more than simply changing the land use map.

#### Bicycle & Pedestrian Investment Chapter:

It was asked that ***Browns' Creek Trail*** be added to the map. It was noted that the TPP is transportation focused, but the counties typically look at this as a recreational item and asked that some acknowledgement be included that adds linkages to the recreational and regional trails plans.

Comment was made that the costs of bicycle/pedestrian elements are the burden of the local governments; the TPP should not appear to reinforce this circumstance.

#### Highway Investment Chapter:

Discussion took place concerning Table 14 on page 138. In place of specific dollars, it was suggested that a range of dollars be used. A suggestion was made that specific dollars not be included in the table, rather it be incorporated into the text.

It was noted that the costs of highway safety improvements and that of bicycle and accessible pedestrian improvements are basically the same. This might be an issue for some people. It was suggested that work was needed to improve the message of Table 14.

A question was raised as to the source of Figure 15. The response was MnDOT. A comment was made concerning the 'opportunity nodes' on the illustration that it was important to understand what was being moved through these nodes; some of them are heavy freight areas.

#### Transit Investment Chapter:

Kevin distributed a handout of comments from CTIB. It was noted that a date should be added to the Nicollet-Central corridor on Page 181 so that it is not perceived as open-ended. A comment was also made that there should be some recognition that the development of a transitway is necessary to support the city center. Discussion followed on the actions of the

City of Minneapolis to date to support this line in the city's plans and as part of an increased revenue scenario. It was **moved** that *the Nicollet-Central Line be carried from the existing TPP into the 2040 TPP and that it is part of the current revenue scenario, recognizing that it does not have priority of funding.* **Motion carried.**

Aviation Plan & Investments Chapter:

No additional comments were made on this chapter.

Freight Investment Chapter:

No additional comments were made on this chapter.

Part Three: Federal Requirements & Work Program

The comments made to this chapter include a clarification as to what elements are specific to Federal policies and that there is a need for an introductory paragraph.

It was suggested that the Work Program be moved from Part III and, perhaps, be shown as the last elements of Part II, element J.

Concerning the Work Program, the issue of the MnPASS Study was raised; this should be reflected in the work program and local governments should be involved for input. The committee was directed to Page 71.

On the issue of the 'streetcar' plan, a question was raised as to whether it should be incorporated into the plan. It was thought that it could be added to page 73 with a paragraph describing it.

It was suggested that wording be added to the introductory text on the financing of all of this and that it depends upon available funding sources.

It was suggested that the Minnesota River system be added to the paragraph at the bottom of Page 74.

Appendices:

Staff noted that Appendix C is being assembled.

Having completed its discussion of the TPP, **the committee moved approval of Action Transmittal 2014-37.** **Motion carried.**

**4. Other Business**

The secretary noted that there were several roadway functional classification changes to come before the committee at its next meeting. Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 PM.

Bob Paddock, Secretary