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Existing Plan and Study Review

Priorities & Goals Review

- Identified similarities and differences in relevant plan goals and objectives:
  - Federal
  - State
  - County
  - Metropolitan Council
  - City/Township

Synthesis of Peer Region Themes

- Overview of how similar regions are approaching goals and objectives
  - Denver DRCOG
  - Philadelphia DRVPC
  - Chicago CMAP
  - Kansas City MARC
  - Austin CAMPO
A High-Level Review

Twin Cities Federal, State, Regional, and Local Plan Review

Shared Themes

- First level of analysis
- Examined relevant plans, studies, and guidance from each type of organization
- **Three topic areas prioritized by almost all agency/organization types:**
  - Safety
  - Multimodal/Mode Shift
  - Economic Impact
Safety Example

KEY SAFETY SIMILARITIES

- Improve safety for people (users of all modes, ages, and abilities) and goods
- Reduce serious and fatal crashes
- Safety and comfort are linked
- Use proven methods and data to increase safety

Differences

The definition of safety and its impact differs based on what agency we reviewed. The higher-level agencies, such as Federal and State, included safety goals with broader implications – such as defining the culture of safety. As we worked down to smaller-scale agencies, such as counties and cities, safety goals became more focused.

KEY SAFETY DIFFERENCES

- How is safety defined? Does it include only traffic safety, or also include workers, community, and resiliency?
- Who is impacted? Are areas of poor safety impacting specific groups?
- How do we improve safety? Is safety prioritized above speed and efficiency? Do we facilitate a culture of safety through intentional design?

Twin Cities Federal, State, Regional, and Local Plan Review
Mobility Example

**KEY MOBILITY SIMILARITIES**

- Improve reliable mobility for both people and goods
- Utilize mobility to connect assets (such as people, natural resources, and business)
- Mobility provides economic and quality of life improvements

**Differences**

Many of the differences relating to mobility are around how improvements are planned. Federal, State, and Council documents identify the importance of improving mobility for underserved populations, while county and city documents focus on how improvements are chosen and designed.

**KEY MOBILITY DIFFERENCES**

- Who is impacted? Are areas of poor mobility impacting specific groups? Do communities experience undue burden from mobility improvements?
- Should mobility improvements be prioritized for certain modes (such as non-single-occupant vehicle or low emission)?
- How effective are mobility improvements? Should proactive planning be used to implement the most effective solutions? Or the solutions that maximize social, economic, and environmental benefits?
- Where do we improve mobility? Within the city, county, or region?
- How should land use planning consider mobility? Do current methods ensure land use decisions improve or consider mobility?
Climate Change, Environment, and Sustainability Example

KEY CLIMATE CHANGE, ENVIRONMENT, AND SUSTAINABILITY SIMILARITIES

- Transportation system projects should limit impacts on the environment
- The transportation system can positively impact climate change and sustainability
- Impacts on the environment need to be considered when planning, prioritizing, and implementing projects

Differences

Although all plans want to reduce impacts on the environment, how they strive to accomplish this presents key differences. Higher level plans like Federal, State, and Council plans identify overarching vision statements related to sustainability such as reducing vehicle miles travelled or supporting electric vehicles. At smaller scales, plans can identify specific outcomes and processes that will be used to accomplish environmental goals.

KEY CLIMATE CHANGE, ENVIRONMENT, AND SUSTAINABILITY DIFFERENCES

- Do we have defined data-driven goals related to climate change and sustainability?
- What weight is sustainability given in project prioritization?
- Can we limit system expansion to improve sustainability?
Prominent Differences

- **Measuring the Impact:** This relates to many themes, as plans differ in the approach to measuring impact and using it to guide decisions. Some plans specifically identify examining in detail what community groups are being disproportionately impacted, and others note it will be included as a metric to make transportation-related decisions.

- **Scale of Impact:** When prioritizing different methods or identifying performance measures, plans vary in their desired scale of impact. In city plans, for example, scale is often limited to the city boundaries without focused attention on the regional connections.

- **Defining Safety:** Some plans include transportation users only, while others include transportation workers, the community, and safety against natural or human-made incidents.

- **The Role of Land Use in Transportation Planning:** Do transportation planning decisions consider or consult land use planning – or vice versa? Agencies and organizations vary in their approach, with some deliberately stating the importance of collaboration, the specific metrics to assess collaboration, and the techniques that will be used to connect land use and transportation planning.

- **Defining Stakeholders:** Higher-level plans (such as state or regional) typically include more types of stakeholders. Examples include the private sector, regional job centers, potential employees.

- **Utilizing Data:** Plans, no matter their organization, utilize different approaches to data and the role of data in guiding processes, decisions, and outcomes.
Early Themes from Listening Sessions*

11 Listening Sessions Complete, 7 Remaining

Consistently mentioned as high priority goals
- Safety – Both traffic safety and personal security
- Preservation – Need to maintain what we have first

Other common themes
- Transportation Policy Plan needs more clear priorities
- Multimodal investments are important, but context matters
- When tying funding to goals, need to ensure that every part of the region has opportunities for receiving funding
- Equity and inclusion should be relevant to the geographic context in the region and consider how best to address it within each area and the specific populations that reside there

*Does not reflect feedback from Equity Engagement consultant work
Synthesis of Peer Region Plan Themes

- Reviewed the plans of five peer regions
- Identified their approach to important, recurring, missing, or under-investigated outcomes
- Provides a variety of approaches to goals and objectives that will inform an assessment of strengths and weaknesses of current strategic planning framework
Shared Themes

The peer regions and plans within the council boundaries identify similar **opportunities and threats** in transportation planning.

**Shared Themes**

- Safety
- Sustainability
- Multimodal
- Quality of Life
- Resilience
- Economic Impact
- Collaboration
Objectives & Tools (Safety & Multimodal)

Safety
• Safe to breathe the air
• Support local governments in reaching safety goals

Multimodal
• Provide time-competitive multimodal options that recognize the value of time
Objectives & Tools (Quality of Life & Resilience)

Quality of Life
- Provide a system that gives everyone access to opportunity
- Develop a system that respects communities and their current and future populations

Resilience
- Ensure our system can thrive under uncertainty
- Approach resilience with a variety of lenses: environmental, infrastructure life cycles, future technologies
Objectives & Tools (Economic Impact & Collaboration)

Economic Impact

- Provide a system that grows an innovative economy with broad prosperity
- Facilitate inclusive growth for all

Collaboration

- Collaborate with other transportation planning, implementation, and development entities
Metrics Dashboard

- The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (Philadelphia) created a dashboard to track the progress of their long-range plan goals.

- The dashboard utilizes regional indicators to understand where the region is at a given time period, identify successful programs, align planning and implementation activities, and inform regional strategies.
Implementation Toolbox

- The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (Philadelphia) also incorporated a municipal implementation toolbox, an information hub to support municipalities in accomplishing regional goals.

- The 75 tools are categorized into focus areas and principles. Focus Areas include Communities, Transportation, Economy, Environment, and Regional Planning. Principles include Equity, Sustainability, and Resiliency.

Peer Region Plan Review
Project List

- Kansas City included a separate "Projects" page on their interactive plan website. This page explains how projects were selected, including their methodology and prioritization process.

- The selected projects are available in list and interactive maps to learn more.
Goals, Policies, and Studies Alignment Table

- The Austin plan highlights the connection between their goals, policies, and studies in a simple table.
- This straightforward layout allows readers to identify which policies are related, how they relate to specific studies, and how they are furthering the high-level goals of the plan.

| 2045 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN GOALS, POLICIES, AND STUDIES ALIGNMENT |
|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| POLICY                       | RATP   | RIMS   | TDM    | CMP    |
| Encourage implementation of pedestrian facilities with resurfacing, new construction, major rehabilitation, and other maintenance projects of regionally significant roadways at the major arterial functional classification or higher. | X      |        |        |        |
| Encourage implementation of bicycle facilities with resurfacing, new construction, major rehabilitation, and other maintenance projects of regionally significant roadways at the major arterial functional classification or higher. |        | X      |        |        |
| Consider transportation improvements that increase person-carrying capacity, rather than vehicle-carrying capacity of the regional transportation system. |        |        | X      | X      |