

# Functional Classification Study — TAC Planning



# Study Update

## Today's Agenda

- Update on Overall Study
- Task 5 Revised – Minor Arterial Routes
- Next Steps
- Additional discussion/questions



# Overall Study Update and Work since April



# Overall Study Update

## Tasks Completed

- Task 2 – Peer Region Review and A Minor Arterial Effectiveness
- Task 4 – Functional Classification Change Process
- Task 6 – Future PA Functional Classification Map



# Overall Study Update (continued)



## Remaining Work

- Task 1 – Project Management
  - TAC Planning meeting
  - TAC meeting
- Task 3 – Appendix D
  - Revised Appendix D text/table (Draft October / Final November)
- Task 5 – Minor Arterial Sub-Designations (October)
- Task 7 – Summary Presentation and Memo (November)

# Recap of Work Since April

## Work Activities

- Task 3 – Appendix D
  - Draft revised Appendix D to project team
- Task 5
  - Meetings with all counties
  - Meetings with the one township
  - Meetings with most cities – two meetings left – Bloomington and Stillwater
  - Meeting with MnDOT
  - Revised maps and spreadsheet based on feedback
- Task 7
  - Outlined final presentation and memo



# Minor Arterial Routes — Sub-designation



# Effectiveness of “A” Minor Arterial System (continued)

## Findings and Recommendations

- Finding #2: The A-Minor Arterial Designation is inconsistent with federal functional classification guidance, is inconsistent with peer region practices, is confusing for local and state stakeholders, and is not regularly reviewed nor maintained by road authorities. Over time, this two-tiered system (A-Minor Arterials and B-/Other Minor Arterials) has become unbalanced and lost some of its usefulness with 84 percent of the total Minor Arterials being classified as A-Minors and only 16 percent being classified as Other Arterials.
  - Recommendation #1: As an interim step, with only 16 percent of the Minor Arterials classified as Other Arterials, the region should dissolve the distinction between the A-Minor Arterials and Other Arterials but retain the sub-classifications/designations. As part of this step, the remaining Other Arterials would need to have sub-classification/designations assigned – Augmentor, Connector, Expander, or Reliever. Then, as part of a future study effort, the region should work together to identify and evaluate options for updating sub-classifications/designations (if they are to remain) so they:
    - Are regularly reviewed by road authorities
    - Are regularly updated in routine state, regional, and local transportation planning activities, and
    - More transparently consider and prioritize the corridor’s support for multimodal travel in the region – including movement of freight and support for existing and planned land use



# Minor Arterial Sub-Designation Process



## General Process

- Review all routes currently classified as “Other” minor arterials and apply a sub-designation
  - WSB conducted initial review
  - Isthmus reviewed sub-designations
  - Team conducted meetings to discuss potential modifications
- Review all currently classified “A” minor arterials and check the existing sub-designation
  - WSB conducted initial review
  - Isthmus reviewed sub-designations
  - Team conducted meetings to discuss potential modifications
- Provide maps and spreadsheet of sub-designations to project team
  - Reviewed suburban counties with project team – June meeting
  - Did not review urban counties due to date conflicts in - July

# Minor Arterial Sub-Designation Process

## General Process (continued)

- Met with owners of minor arterial routes
  - Scheduled half hour to hour-long meetings with agencies that own minor arterial routes
  - Provided maps and spreadsheet of routes to agencies in advance of the meeting
  - Provided an overview of why the Met Council was making changes to the minor arterial routes and indicated interest in collecting feedback on sub-designation assignments and/or modifications (if an existing “A” minor arterial)
  - Documented meetings with agencies and revised maps/spreadsheets based upon discussion
  - Discussed routes with multiple agency interest (TH routes and county routes)
- Meeting with project team
  - Provide revised maps and spreadsheet
  - Provide overall comments, identify some additional considerations/issues that will be addressed outside of the study
  - Request comments on revised maps and spreadsheet
- Finalize spreadsheet and prepare GIS maps
- Present information to TAC planning for consent/approval



# Meetings with Agencies

## General Feedback and Comments

- Agencies welcomed combining “A” and “Other” minor arterials into a single category.
- Agencies were supportive of all minor arterial routes being eligible for regional solicitation funding in the future – understood it would not apply to this year’s solicitation
- Agencies appreciated that they would not have to take the map through the change process
- Most recommendations developed by the project team were supported/agreed to by the agencies



# Meetings with Agencies (continued)

## General Feedback and Comments (continued)

- Most comments for potential change were made to the reliever and connector sub-designations
  - Some connector recommendations were changed to expander due to growth that has been occurring in the area and is expected to continue to develop in the near-term
  - Some reliever recommendations were changed to expander based upon discussion of how the route is used through their communities



# Meetings with Agencies (continued)

## General Feedback and Comments (continued)

- Conversations spurred interest in potential changes – ones that will need to be explored by the various agencies
  - Change in major collector routes and/or local routes to a different designation
  - Agencies need a better understanding of growth areas and potential system modifications
- One agency indicated that there were higher priority items on their list in terms of infrastructure and were fine with routes being included in a single minor arterial category



# Issues for Future Consideration



## Additional Items

- Agency route-specific changes to the minor arterial network. Agencies with potential changes
  - Scott County
  - Coon Rapids
  - St. Louis Park
  - Cottage Grove
- Augmentor and Expander definition/areas
  - Some locations outside the I-494/694 beltway are experiencing development/redevelopment are more intense levels than previously done in the region – especially locations with more transit services
- Principal arterial routes
  - Can we include some administrative/corrective changes in urban core?

# Recommended Revisions



## Maps and Spreadsheets

- Maps provided by county
  - Highlighted changes provided – identified by segment to corresponding spreadsheet
- Spreadsheet by county
  - Identify route, segment, and proposed recommended change
- Final round of review underway
- Materials will be revised based on comments and will be transferred into GIS

# Recommended Revisions



## Overview

- Ramsey County – Overview
  - Ramsey had several “other” arterials – probably the largest group
  - Most were identified as Augmentor routes, as the county is primarily located within the I-494/694 beltway
  - Some Expander routes in northern portion of the county
  - A limited number of Reliever routes within the county
- Hennepin County – Overview
  - Hennepin had several “other” arterials
  - Mix of Augmentor, Expander, and Reliever changes
  - County covers a wide variety of land use densities
- Scott, Carver, Washington, Dakota and Anoka Counties – Overview
  - Fewer “other” arterials
  - Additional discussion on current “A” routes



# Recommended Revisions



## Overview

- Cities – Overview
  - Most of the city routes were “other” arterials, as cities do not generally own “A” minor arterials
  - Most city/county discussions were in alignment with one another. There were a few exceptions and the team went with the owner of the roadway
  - Two cities have yet to participate – but we have one meeting scheduled and one more to do
- Township – Overview
  - Current township roadway in Washington County. County and township are in discussions to make it a county route. Both agencies agree on a connector sub-designation

# Maps

# Next Steps



# Next Steps



## Key Tasks and Work

- Finalize sub-designations based on comments
- Appendix D
  - Reformatting of comparison table and potential Appendix D changes - finalize
- Summary memo and presentation for the study
- Presentation to TAC

# Questions / Additional Discussion

