



TAB and Partner Agency Comments and Proposed Responses to Draft 2040 Transportation Policy Plan

Transportation Committee

June 23, 2014

Comments Received

- TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning
 - Public meetings and discussion - TAC Planning June 22 and 29, TAC June 5, TAB June 18
- CTIB
- Washington County Board
- TAC Planning non-consensus comments
- MPCA, Hennepin, Ramsey and Washington counties, city of St. Paul and Minneapolis staff

Review Process Comment

- TAB, TAC-Planning request additional time for providing comments; delay release for public comment
- Concerns with:
 - Timing between Thrive MSP 2040 adoption and draft 2040 TPP
 - Length of the draft 2040 TPP and time for review
- Response: TAB review will continue at July, August, September meetings

3

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Part I Comments

- TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning, TPP Policymaker Task Force, Council members
- Highlight key messages in introduction, focus on need for funding, articulate highway vision, shorten and use plain language
- New version of Part I provided to Council members and TAB for review

4

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Nicollet Central Comment

- TAC Planning approved comment to include a reference to the Nicollet Central streetcar project and recognize Minneapolis' value capture legislation
- Paragraph added focusing on acceleration potential due to value capture funding
- Removed detailed text on streetcar policy questions and included streetcar policy study in TPP work plan chapter

5

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Transitway Map

- CTIB commented that :
 - The map lacks regional balance
 - Corridors shown do not match CTIB's map
- Response:
 - Current revenue scenario map includes projects with an LPA and viable funding
 - Increased revenue scenario map is balanced and includes all corridors being studied/considered
 - Corridors on both maps have been lengthened

6

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Transitway Prioritization

- CTIB and Washington Co. Board comments:
 - Prioritization should be driven by major funders
 - Request that prioritization of transitways be removed
 - No comparable prioritization for bus improvements
 - Prioritization implies a slate of projects, while projects advance individually
 - Use of measures across modes unclear
 - Support regional balance as a prioritization criteria

7

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Prioritization cont.

- Response:
 - Agree funding partners should drive decisions; shared funding sources requires prioritization
 - Prioritization will be transparent, involve all stakeholders
 - Implemented as a response to Legislative Auditor report and as piece of performance based planning
 - Done on a case-by-case basis, will not delay projects
 - Measures similar to FTA process; balances costs and benefits and accounts for different modes
 - Bus system investments prioritized in RSIP

8

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Gateway Corridor Comment

- Washington Co. Board requests that the Gateway corridor LPA be included to avoid a lengthy TPP amendment
- Response:
 - The Gateway corridor LPA recommendation for Council consideration is expected in October
 - Timing will not allow for public review and comment
 - Amendment process can start with TAC prior to final 2040 TPP adoption
 - TAB and Council review Dec./Jan., adoption March
 - Process will not delay Gateway project

9

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

I-94 MnPASS Corridor Comment

- Washington Co. Board requests the I-94 East corridor be removed as a Tier III MnPASS corridor
- Response:
 - Basis for MnPASS vision map is a number of studies, factors
 - Work plan calls for update of the system vision to be completed with MnDOT, public input
 - MnDOT protective of right-of-way for future MnPASS and other capacity improvements

10

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Catalytic Development

- Council members asked that the catalytic development language be strengthened and reflect community commitment to land use around transit investments
- Revisions presented at June 4 CoW
- Language will be included in draft for public comment

11

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Station Area Development Expectations

- Council member Elkins provided comments regarding identifying prohibited uses and design features near transit stations
- Revised Land Use and Local Planning text and Table 5
- Continued discussion needed regarding conformity or advisory status of these changes

12

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Additional Comments: Penn Avenue ABRT

- Minneapolis staff requested that Penn Avenue be named as the third funded ABRT
- Four ABRT are funded in draft TPP current revenue scenario by 2024; two identified
- Metro Transit Small Starts Project Office agrees Penn is next ABRT priority
- Response: List Penn Ave. as funded ABRT "C" line

13

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Additional Comments: Extended UZA Area

- Show Wright CSAH 22 Interchange with I-94 (approved by FHWA in 2010) as a future Access Improvement Response: this can be added
- Desire 6 lanes on I-94 from TH 241 to CSAH 19, to be funded in future so plan will not need to be modified Response: plan must be modified when funding is received
- Strengthen importance of strategic capacity improvements needed for freight bottlenecks Response: will review language

14

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Other Changes

- Other TAB consensus and agency staff comments; many addressed as shown on comment document
- Adjustments to highway and transit revenue and spending figures
- Plain language edits by communications staff

15

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

Public Comment Schedule

- May 22 and 29 – TAC-Planning recommend draft with comments
- June 4 – TAC recommend draft with comments
- June 18 – TAB recommend draft with comments
- **June 23 – Transportation Committee review TAB/TAC comments recommend response**
- July 14 – Transportation Committee recommend draft for public comment
- July 23 – Council release draft for public comment
- August 4 – Public notice; review and comment period begins
- September 8 – Public Hearing
- September 18 – Public comment ends
- November 19 – TAB recommendation for approval
- November 24 – Transportation Committee recommendation for approval
- December 10 – Council approval

16

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

The "Thrive MSP 2040" logo, which includes a stylized city skyline and the year "2040" above the text "Thrive MSP".

TRANSPORTATION
POLICY PLAN

Questions?

ID#	Comment	Commenting Entity or where discussion took place	Recommended Response
	<p>TAB Issues and Concerns Raised with Consensus</p> <p>1 Part I of the plan is generally too long and does not provide a good summary of the key content at the opening. (Council staff agreed, confirmed the Policymaker Task Force gave the same direction, indicated that Part I is being refined, and reported that staff hope to be able to provide revised text to the full TAB prior to its review.)</p>	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	Part I has been revised to incorporate a summary with the introduction to the plan and also to shorten and edit the full Part I. The Tables summarizing the highway and transit investment factors and also indicating the relationship to the Thrive outcomes have been eliminated. The length has been reduced by approximately 10 pages.
	2 In Part I, the vision for the regional highway system needs to be more clearly articulated.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	Text has been added in the introduction to Part I to more clearly articulate the components of the highway Increased Revenue scenario, including a focus on mobility projects such as MnPASS and other strategic capacity projects.
	3 Part I should provide a more prominent message on the need for increased transportation funding.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	A clear statement has been added to Part I as follows: "The bottom line: the region will not realize the transportation vision identified in Thrive MSP 2040 within currently identified resources."
	4 In Part I, B Transportation Challenges and Opportunities, the committee appreciated the discussion on the potential effects of technology but thought it needed a more positive and proactive tone better conveying the potential benefits of technology.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	The "Disruptive Effects of Technology" issue has been eliminated and text added to the TBI discussion in Part I to discuss how new technologies such as vehicles with driver assistance technology, mobile applications, and social networking can have significant impacts on how and where people travel.
	5 Part II, B Transportation Policy Plan Strategies should acknowledge the various positive actions that local partners are already taking, such as local work on 'complete streets'. These could be included in 'call out' boxes in the final document (not the public comment version.)	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	The introduction to the Strategies chapter discusses how many local entities are already actively and positively implementing the identified strategies. During production of the TPP staff will seek to use side-bars or call out boxes within the strategies chapter to emphasize work of local governments, including specific examples.
	6 Part II, B Transportation Policy Plan Strategy, Section E -- The MPCA provided detailed written comments regarding air quality and consistency with state requirements and these technical comments should be addressed in the revised document.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	Specific responses to the MPCA comments have been included in the strategies section. See TAC-Planning additional comments responses for specific changes.

ID#	Comment	Commenting Entity or where discussion took place	Recommended Response
7	Part II, C Land Use and Local Planning, the committee asked whether the forecasts identified in Thrive MSP 2040 would happen on their own or if they have been shaped by the investment of public dollars (highway, transit, sewers, parks) that encourages development. Some language should be included concerning this interaction. (Page 68)	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	Added references on how transportation influenced the forecasts, how the forecasts will be updated to reflect changes in trends or investment patterns, and reference to Thrive MSP 2040 for more detail.
8	It was suggested that a statement be added on how communities and counties might need help in reaching the density targets recommended for station area planning in Table 4 of the Land Use chapter.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	Added reference to Council TOD programs in introduction to Table 4. Added many references to partnerships between local governments and the Council in implementing the combined vision of transit and land use.
9	Part II, D Transportation Finance (page 93), it should be corrected that non-freeway principal arterials continue to be eligible for funding through the Regional Solicitation.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	Agree, this language will be removed.
10	Part II, D Transportation Finance needs to recognize the significant funding needs of the Local Transportation System. A specific number does not need to be included in the Increased Revenue scenario.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	A new paragraph has been added to the Finance chapter recognizing that the local transportation system has significant funding needs for the local road and bicycle transportation systems and an increased funding package should also consider and fund the local transportation system needs.
11	Part II, D Transportation Finance should recognize that when development occurs, the developers often contribute revenues to the improvement of the local transportation system.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	A reference to contributions from developers has been added and included in the Finance chapter under the local property tax and other local assessments revenues description.
12	Part II, E Highway Investment Direction and Plan, Table 14, Regional Mobility Investments (Investment categories 6 through 10) potential funding should be reported using ranges rather than specific numbers to manage expectations and clearly demonstrate the uncertainty of the funding levels.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	Comment acknowledged. Change will be made to 2040 TPP after project lists and estimates are finalized following public review and comment.

ID#	Comment	Commenting Entity or where discussion took place	Recommended Response
13	<p>Part II, E Highway Investment Direction and Plan needs to more clearly articulate that safety and security will be part of every highway investment.</p>	<p>TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. The title for highway investments was revised to read, "Specific Highway Safety Investments" throughout the document and the text for the investment category description was modified to read, "Highway safety is a priority for the region and is being pursued through all types of <u>highway investments</u>." This supplements Highway Investment Direction & Plan Table 9 with identifies Safety and Security and Preservation and Maintenance investments as, "These investments are requirements, not prioritization factors, for all regional highway investments. These types of investments advance all goals and objectives in the Transportation Policy Plan."</p>
14	<p>Part II, E Highway Investment Direction and Plan discusses expressway corridors studies underway. Better linkage/reference to the TPP work program "expressway to freeway study" that will prioritize the intersection conversion needs determined for these and other expressway corridors metro wide.</p>	<p>TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning</p>	<p>No change recommended. Part II - Highway Investment Direction & Plan "Strategic Capacity Investments" and "Regional Highway Access Investments" currently reads: "As a work program item for the future update of the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, the Metropolitan Council and MnDOT will work with regional highway partners to analyze all intersections on the non-freeway principal arterial system within the urban service area to identify and prioritize specific intersection conversion projects [LINK to Work Program]."</p>
15	<p>Part II, E Highway Investment Direction and Plan – provide clear cross references between the investment plans and performance outcomes in Part III.</p>	<p>TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning</p>	<p>The "Highway Investment Summary" section was revised to state, "Performance outcomes based on these investments are summarized in Part III – System Performance Measurement and Monitoring [LINK to section III-A]."</p>
16	<p>Part II, F Transit Investment Direction, the committee made and unanimously approved a motion to include a reference to the proposed Nicollet-Central Line as part of the current revenue scenario to recognize the value capture authority received by the city of Minneapolis and its potential to provide a source of funding to accelerate the project if additional competitive funding is received.</p>	<p>TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning</p>	<p>A paragraph on modern streetcar acceleration will be added to recognize the opportunities that exist, including value capture for Nicollet-Central. Additional edits to modern streetcar will be made to reference the work program item on Streetcar Policy and remove detailed text on the policy questions that will be covered by the study.</p>

ID#	Comment	Commenting Entity or where discussion took place	Recommended Response
17	Part II, G Bicycle and Pedestrian Investment Direction needs to recognize that bicycle transportation facilities and bicycle recreational facilities are overlapping and not mutually exclusive.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	Added wording to acknowledge the overlap of regional bicycle recreation and bicycle transportation networks.
18	Part II, G Bicycle and Pedestrian Investment Direction should recognize that there is a need for increased regional and MnDOT funding, and cost participation support, beyond the local funding contribution.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	The plan acknowledges that additional resources are needed to implement the regional bicycle network. The following sentence will be added to emphasize that this funding should come from all levels: "There is an existing and growing need for increased funding at the federal, state, and regional levels to offset the increasing demand on local funding sources for maintaining and expanding the regional bicycle system."
19	Part III the Federal Requirements section should include an introductory section explaining the purpose of the various elements included in this section.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	This has been added and will be reflected in the public comment draft of the document.
20	It was recommended the Work Program be moved out of Part III into the end of Part II following the investment chapters.	TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning	This has been added and will be reflected in the public comment draft of the document.

TAB/TAC Process Comment

21 TAB discussed the process undertaken to review the Draft 2040 TPP and requested that the Council delay the release of the document for public review and comment to allow for additional review by TAB and TAC. In addition the TAC Planning comments included similar comments indicating a discomfort with the closeness of the TPP comment recommendation with the Thrive adoption and also the difficulty in reviewing a document with such lengthy content. However, TAC Planning also recognized that their members have been participating in the PAWG throughout the past year and that the membership of the PAWG expanded the representation for the process.

TAB/TAC/TAC-Planning and
Washington Co. Board

Council staff acknowledges the time period between adoption of Thrive and the TAC Planning recommendation on the draft 2040 TPP was very tight. However, all of the TAC Planning members participated in the PAWG which has been meeting for over one year and all sections of the draft TPP were brought before the PAWG for their review. The Thrive staff also presented on the content and direction of Thrive on a number of occasions. Monthly presentations on the TPP document were brought before TAB since January. The full document was released to the TAB on May 9th allowing for over 5 weeks of review by TAB. Given the time needed for a thorough public review and comment period this August-September, subsequent document revision in response to the public comment and final adoption by the end of the year, any delay in TAB's review would result in the document not meeting the end of the year adoption by the full Council. Council staff indicated that historically TAB has continued to review the document during the public comment period with the option of submitting additional consensus comments from TAB. Staff will provide a response to the TAB consensus comments at the July meeting and will continue to be available for additional presentations on the draft for public review.

CTIB Comments

<p>22 The transitway expansion maps in Figure 25 and 26 state they include potential CTIB transitways. However, the Council changed the CTIB map for the purposes of the TPP. The Anoka County North Central Transitway was removed and the Rush Line, Highway 36, and Robert Street Transitways were cut short. The full CTIB map should be included.</p>	<p>CTIB and Washington Co. Board</p>	<p>Counties Transit Improvement Board corridors will be lengthened to reflect the CTIB corridor lengths.</p>
<p>23 Expansion transitways under the current revenue scenario is limited to corridors with a local preferred alternative, but also includes ABRT corridors, applying a different standard. There are not operating funds identified for ABRT, again, applying a different standard than that applied to transitway expansion.</p>	<p>CTIB</p>	<p>Arterial BRT projects are considered to have a locally preferred alternative with mode and alignment defined. Capital investments will create operating efficiencies that allow for different service plan but modest additional revenues may be needed, depending on the corridor. Operating funds will be identified during project development.</p>
<p>24 Transitway expansion maps lack regional balance. Plan indicates there will not be available funding for corridors outside of Hennepin County until 2025. This will have a chilling effect on transitway development.</p>	<p>CTIB and Washington Co. Board</p>	<p>The Transit Investment Plan includes a vision for expansion in the Increased Revenue Scenario and discussion about interim solutions for acceleration. The Current Revenue Scenario only reflects defined corridors for transitways and will be amended as LPA recommendations come forward. The increased Revenue Scenario is regionally balanced.</p>
<p>25 The ultimate determination of whether projects advance to funding should rely on local project prioritization that is driven by the priorities of the funding partners. The counties, CTIB and the FTA are the major investors in these projects.</p>	<p>CTIB</p>	<p>Agreed that prioritization should be driven by funding partners. The Council is a funding partner through state and federal sources and the FTA looks to MPOs to coordinate regional priorities for federal funding and coordinate public input on these priorities. Priority setting may be less applicable to projects that are primarily locally funded.</p>

ID#	Comment	Commenting Entity or where discussion took place	Recommended Response
26	<p>There is no comparable level of suggested prioritization criteria for bus and support system efforts, creating disparity in the treatment of transitways vs. the bus system in the TPP.</p>	<p>CTIB and Washington Co. Board</p>	<p>The Bus and Support System includes a table for prioritizing service improvements through the Regional Service Improvement Plan (table 16). The bus system is also guided by the Transit Market Areas and the extensive Design and Performance Standards described in Appendix G. The Park-and-Ride Plan includes additional criteria documented separately and the work program includes an item to better document investment priorities in bus stop amenities.</p>
27	<p>The council's proposed approach to prioritizing transitways implies that a slate of projects will be presented to Council at a single moment for comparison and prioritization when in reality projects advance singularly and independently after crossing rigorous federally prescribed milestones. This makes a complete prioritization of projects at any given time with the purpose of eliminating projects for further advancement not practical nor technically feasible.</p>	<p>CTIB</p>	<p>Setting priorities provides a framework for determining the status, potential funding sources, and timing of projects in the plan. A case-by-case approach is described after table 19 of the Transit Investment Plan.</p>
28	<p>It is unclear how a single set of measures could be used to evaluate transitways across modes as each mode has unique factors that emphasize certain measures over others based on local need and context sensitive design.</p>	<p>CTIB</p>	<p>The approach in the TPP is similar to the FTA approach to evaluating projects and will balance costs and benefits. The measures provide context for regionally significant projects that are guided by the performance-based approach to planning, a new emphasis of the federal DOT. Local context will still be emphasized but balanced with regional considerations.</p>

ID#	Comment	Commenting Entity or where discussion took place	Recommended Response
29	<p>The council should remove the transitway prioritization measures from the draft TPP and continue to work collaboratively through existing local, regional and federal processes that have effectively prioritize transitway projects for project development for the last several years. Adding another layer of prioritization beyond local, CTIB, and Federal processes is duplicative and confusing to agencies, businesses, and residents and wastes time and resources. Proposed transitway prioritization measures are not transparent. There are 19 primary measures and 9 secondary measures, which are not weighted or ranked in the draft. It is premature to include these measures in the TPP.</p>	<p>CTIB and Washington Co. Board</p>	<p>The Council is committed to providing a more transparent process for regional decision-making around projects that represent a major investment in the region transit system. The Council is also responding to a request by the State Legislative Auditor that the Council "should coordinate with stakeholders to establish regional transit priorities and prioritize potential transitways for future development based on data and the needs of the region." The Council is committed to involving partners from all levels of stakeholders in the work program to better define priorities. The framework being established in the 2040 TPP is a valuable step in moving this process forward and implementing the TPP's performance-based planning principles.</p>
30	<p>Strongly support the inclusion of regional balance as a highway investment prioritization criteria.</p>	<p>Washington Co. Board</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
31	<p>Modify Appendix E to allow for signalized interchange spacing that is at less than one-mile without seeking an exemption.</p>	<p>Washington Co. Board</p>	<p>No change recommended. These are long-standing and accepted guidelines and they are not applied as "hard and fast" engineering standards; they are planning-level criteria to be used to identify proposals that require additional conversation with the proposing agency.</p>
32	<p>Identify the Hadley Ave. and Highway 36 as a spot mobility improvement investment.</p>	<p>Washington Co. Board</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. No change. Part II- Highway Investment Direction & Plan, "Non-Freeway Conversion Status Updates" identifies TH 36 as a potential future freeway and states, "Ramsey and Washington counties are working with MnDOT and Metropolitan Council to develop interchange designs that convert TH 36 to a freeway. The improvements being identified through these efforts are not included in the current or increased revenue scenarios and should be prioritized for funding through the Metropolitan Council Intersection Conversion Study."</p>

ID#	Comment	Commenting Entity or where discussion took place	Recommended Response
33	Continue to allow all principal arterial to remain eligible for federal funding through the regional solicitation.	Washington Co. Board	Under the proposed regional solicitation revision, freeway principal arterials remain ineligible to apply for regional solicitation funding. Non-freeway PAs are eligible and the incorrect statement in the Finance chapter has been removed.
34	Remove the I-94 corridor as a Tier III MinPASS corridor due to the results of past studies and analysis.	Washington Co. Board	No change recommended. MnDOT's MinPASS 2 and Metropolitan Council's Metropolitan Highway System Investment Study (MHSIS), both completed in 2010, were the initial basis for the TPP MinPASS System vision. This information was supplemented by other factors and information in the final identification of the MinPASS system vision in the 2030 TPP (adopted November 2010). The map in the TPP is the MinPASS system vision. Not showing Tier 2 and 3 corridors dramatically reduces the MinPASS system vision and introduces risk that funding and highway right-of-way needs will be overlooked in these corridors, compromising MnDOT's ability to compete for and build highway capacity improvements in the corridors.
35	The Gateway corridor LPA designation should be included in the final draft of the TPP approved by the Council to avoid the need to go through a lengthy TPP amendment process.	Washington Co. Board	The Gateway corridor has not yet moved an LPA recommendation through an approval process at the county and local level. The Council will consider the Gateway LPA recommendation when it is brought forward. Under the project's current schedule it is anticipated that the amendment to the draft 2040 TPP can begin after the public comment review and revisions have been completed in fall 2014, with the proposed amendment released by the Council soon after final adoption of the 2040 TPP in late 2014/early 2015.
36	The Draft TPP should be revised to make a distinction between Small Starts type BRT projects and New Starts BRT projects.	Washington Co. Board	A clarification will be added to state that Highway and Arterial BRT projects can be built in phases and shorter sections may qualify for Small Starts funding.

ID#	Comment	Commenting Entity or where discussion took place	Recommended Response
37	Revise the plan to focus beyond bicycle commuting trips to trips including recreation.	Washington Co. Board	Comment acknowledged. Added wording to acknowledge that recreational bicycling provides local economic benefits around the metro, especially in suburban and rural areas. Also noted that recreational cycling by young families is growing with a corresponding need for protected or off-road facilities.
38	Revise the RTBN to add Brown's Creek State Trail and Central Greenway Regional Trail and elevate the rail corridor from St. Paul to North Branch as a Tier I alignment.	Washington Co. Board	Added Brown's Creek State Trail in Washington County to Figures 26 & 27.
39	Remove the entire list of bicycle facility types especially recommendations for specific engineering and signing treatments.	Washington Co. Board	There are no design standards described anywhere in the draft Plan. A range of bicycle facility treatment types is described in the bicycle investment direction section as suggested treatments for the proposed Reg Bicycle Trans Network. Changed "acceptable" to "suggested" treatments to clarify the intent.
Select Metropolitan Council Member Feedback			
40	Substantive comments on Part I of the plan and the need to provide a summary of the key messages and investments at the opening of Part I, use plain language and shorten Part I.	Met Council members	Part I has been shortened and revised and the opening pages significantly rewritten to highlight the key messages and vision of the plan. The revised version was provided at the Council's committee of the whole meeting on June 4th and also released to the TAB for its review.
41	Better reflect catalyze development language and strengthen language relating to land use expectations around transit investments	Met Council members	Various edits were made to Land Use and Local Planning and Transit Investment Plan to better reflect Council members concerns. The proposed edits were provided at the CoW on June 4th.
42	The plan needs to better reflect mixed use development expectations around transitway stations and specifically identify uses and design features that should be prohibited.	Council member Elkins	Staff has developed draft language for review by Council members. Staff is continuing to seek Council member feedback and guidance on the proposed language.