

**STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS ON THE JANUARY 2010 DRAFT  
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL PARK-AND-RIDE PLAN AND  
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL RESPONSES**



#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
1	At the beginning of the Plan, there needs to be a section linking it to the Transportation Policy Plan – what is adopted Council Policy vis a vis park-and-ride.	Chapter 1	iv	2/17/2010	Added a new section entitled "Purpose of the Park-and-Ride Plan" prior to Chapter 1. This section defines the connection between the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan and the 2030 Park-and-Ride Plan.
2	Figure 1-5 should include Columbus in the TTD map	Chapter 1	2	2/5/2010	The map reflects 2008 park-and-ride usage and TTD communities. The note beneath the map indicates that the Cities of Lakeville, Columbus, Forest Lake, and Maple Plain have since become part of the Transit Capital Levy communities.
3	Page 2 – suggestion – reorder the legend from inside to outside	Chapter 1	2	2/17/2010	Legend rearranged in the following order: (1) Inside Transit Taxing District (2) 7-County Metro Area (Outside of Transit Taxing District) (3) Outside Transit Taxing District
4	Paragraph 1.1, Table 1-7 Paragraph discusses the Park and Ride system but does not mention anything about Park and Pools, yet they are included in table 1-7. Include Park and Pools in the discussion in the paragraph.	Chapter 1	4	2/10/2010	Added the following text to page 4: <i>MnDOT and other providers offer parking lots that are not served by transit but provide for carpool parking. These park-and-pools are part of the regional system, but this plan does not forecast need or identify future locations for park-and-pool facilities. Some identified park-and-ride lots may be constructed in advance of transit service, and will provide park-and-pool opportunities prior to implementation of regular route transit service.</i>
5	Page 3 & 4 – I would recommend not using the Hiawatha hide-and-ride in the usage figures. Otherwise the %Utilized isn't accurate, because the "usage" isn't just a part of the capacity, and isn't reflecting the % of spaces being used. A footnote could be added at the end of the table to acknowledge there are additional # of hide-and-riders in the Metro Transit service area.	Chapter 1	4	2/17/2010	Figure 1-6 was revised so that Hiawatha hide-and-ride figures are not included in the reported park-and-ride system usage. The following footnote was added at the end of the table:  <i>Usage figures do not include Hiawatha hide-and-ride counts from 2005-2008. The four-year average of hide-and-ride vehicles parked at the 38th Street, 46th Street, and 50th Street LRT stations was approximately 384, which may reflect additional demand for parking spaces along the Hiawatha line.</i>

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
6	Chapter 2 Suggest changing “The process map” to something that more closely resembles the title of the figure to avoid confusion.	Chapter 2	10	2/10/2010	On page 10, replaced the first sentence of paragraph 2 with the following text: <i>The process used to forecast 2020 and 2030 demand by TAZ is illustrated in Figure 2-6, 2030 Park-and-Ride Demand Model Methodology.</i>
7	Chapter 2, page 14, second paragraph – In the paragraph it states “... unmet need for 2020 and 2030, with emphasis on 2020 needs.” Tables 2-11 and 2-14 have the P&R Investment Priority based off the Unmet Need for 2030.	Chapter 2	14	2/10/2010	On page 14, replaced the first sentence of paragraph 3 with the following text: <i>In the category marked “Corridor P&amp;R Investment Priority” these labels are based on the value of unmet need for 2020 and 2030, with emphasis on 2030 needs.</i>
8	Page 15 – row I-35W North – the 2020 unmet need should be 1,000 and 2030 should be -400.	Chapter 2	15	2/17/2010	In Table 2-11, unmet need revised for I-35W North as follows: - 2020: revised to -1,000 - 2030: revised to -400 2020 and 2030 'Unmet Need' totals also adjusted to reflect changes.
9	Page 17 – row Hwy 61 South – 2020 unmet need should be 200.	Chapter 2	17	2/17/2010	In Table 2-14, unmet need revised for Hwy 61 South as follows: - 2020: revised to 200 2020 and 2030 'Unmet Need' totals also adjusted to reflect changes.
10	Tables identical for 2 facilities- recheck/fix values	Chapter 2	21	1/20/2010	Southwest Village Park-and-Ride Usage (Table 2-17) replaced with correct values.
11	Chapter 2, page 21 - The information in Table 2-17 is the same as the information in Table 2-18, it is different in the preceding paragraphs.	Chapter 2	21	2/10/2010	Southwest Village Park-and-Ride Usage (Table 2-17) replaced with correct values.
12	Page 21 – in Table 2-17, the predicted and observed are incorrect; they are shown the same as Cottage Grove.	Chapter 2	21	2/17/2010	Southwest Village Park-and-Ride Usage (Table 2-17) replaced with correct values.

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
13	Section 2.3 Results of 2009 Park-and-Ride Demand Model - For the park-and-ride facilities located in East Metro corridors, the Park-and-Ride Plan identifies the demand and capacity needed to both the Minneapolis and St Paul central business districts. Corridor park-and-ride investment priorities are then determined twice for each park-and-ride based on the demand to both Minneapolis and St Paul. We would recommend that the overall demand and capacity needed for each park-and-ride to both Minneapolis and St Paul should be combined when determining the investment priority. This would help to better identify the overall investment needed at each park-and-ride and to compare and prioritize corridor investments on an apples-to-apples basis.	Chapter 2	14-17	2/12/2010	The suggestion is valid and would yield comparable results for East Metro travel corridors; however, a majority of the travel corridors to Minneapolis and St. Paul do not align outside of the East Metro. For example, in the South Metro, there is only 1 travel corridor to St. Paul (I-35E South). In contrast, there are 5 travel corridors to Minneapolis (I-35W South Lower & Upper, Hwy 77 South, Hwy 52/55, and Hwy 169 South) and none of them align with the primary travel corridor to St. Paul.
14	Table 2-11 and 2-14 - Asterisks should be placed after the following corridors: I-35W North, I35E North/Hwy 36 East, Hwy 61 South, I-94 East. These corridors have been identified as transitways in the Met Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan and future transitway improvements in these corridors may increase demand.	Chapter 2	15,17	2/12/2010	Asterisks added next to the following corridors to indicate potential demand increase in conjunction with future transitway improvements: - I-35W North (Minneapolis) - I-35E North/Hwy 36 East (Minneapolis and St. Paul) - Hwy 61 South (Minneapolis and St. Paul) - I-94 East (Minneapolis and St. Paul)
15	Figure 2-15 & 2-16- final maps	Chapter 2	19- 20		Maps added to demonstrate market area analysis conducted prior to the Southwest Village and Cottage Grove Park-and-Rides opening.
16	Sections 2.2 – 2.4. Once again SWT disagrees with the Metropolitan Council’s methodology for projecting mode split and service demand. The issues are:	Chapter 2	9-21	2/15/2010	Comments addressed in a direct response to Southwest Transit.

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
17	<p><i>- By only using community TAZ data to determine the mode split, it understates SWT ridership. For example, this method works great for communities like Richfield a first ring suburb. However communities like Chaska and Chanhassen draw from the west and from south of the Minnesota River beyond their TAZ designations. Eden Prairie and Chanhassen draw from Minnetonka, Excelsior and Shakopee. The mode split numbers are understated versus what actually occurs in these examples provided. Based on SWT's 2009 customer survey, 75 percent of the customers ride five days per week to downtown Minneapolis or the University of Minnesota. There is no doubt that these are primarily work trips that go five days per week. Ridership in 2009 correlated to the down town unemployment rates. In other words, ridership declined like the loss of jobs.</i></p>	Chapter 2	9-21	2/15/2010	Comments addressed in a direct response to Southwest Transit.
18	<p><i>-The "interpolation" and "calibration" steps of the model end up skewing what behavior is actually occurring at various specific locations through out the region, especially on the growing edges of the metropolitan area. It is difficult to calibrate or interpolate data that draws riders to a "good" bus transit system that provides nice and well maintained equipment with needed frequency service. The model's data criteria for this bus variable doesn't really exist thus it can not really show the affects of something the riders, when given a choice, will choose over hard seats and a dirty bus.</i></p>	Chapter 2	9-21	2/15/2010	Comments addressed in a direct response to Southwest Transit.
19	<p><i>-The inconsistency of the data. For example on page 21 SouthWest Village park and ride has a calibrated park and ride usage of 157 per day. The actual number is approximately, per Table 3-42, 165 per day. The mode split on page 21 "represents a 36.5 percent park-and-ride mode share to Minneapolis. Finally, in another document sent to me showed a combined Chanhassen, Eden Prairie and Chaska 2008 mode split of 28 percent. SWT's actual mode split number was closer to 40 percent when an exercise was conducted as part of the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) grant request for a third level at SouthWest Village park and ride in early 2009. What percentage of all of these different percentages is correct and should be used. SWT prefers actual data to an average of an average.</i></p>	Chapter 2	9-21	2/15/2010	Comments addressed in a direct response to Southwest Transit.

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
20	The SWT concerns remain with the methodology and what the model produces. It is difficult to understand when SWT is being told that they have allegedly overbuilt the number of park and ride spaces in the 212/5 corridor but yet, the SouthWest light rail project is looking to double the size of the existing SouthWest Station park and ride facility in Eden Prairie as well as build an additional station with an additional 1,000 space structure about a half a mile to the west of SouthWest Station. How can the same regional model say there is a need to support LRT with additional park and ride locations but for express bus the corridor is over built? It sounds wrong.	Chapter 2	General	2/15/2010	Comments addressed in a direct response to Southwest Transit.
21	Table 3.2 Park-and-Ride Facilities in the Twin Cities Metro Area– The map should identify the Langdon site (southwest of W Point Douglas Road S & Islay Ave S intersection) as an alternative location for the Cottage Grove future transitway facility. The existing Cottage Grove park-and ride and the Langdon Site are being studied as potential locations for the Cottage Grove transitway facility as part of the ongoing Station Area and Site Master Planning study being conducted by the Red Rock Corridor Commission.	Chapter 3	27	2/12/2010	Revised the first sentence of paragraph 6 on page 38 (previously 39) to read as follows: <i>Additional facilities in Newport, Hastings and a relocated Cottage Grove park-and-ride may be constructed as part of the Red Rock transitway.</i>  The map in Figure 3-2 was not changed, as it shows approximate locations for proposed facilities and is flexible in that several different sites may be under consideration. Each facility, however, is only represented as one point on the map so that the plan does not appear to suggest more facilities than required to meet demand. A Cottage Grove park-and-ride is warranted and the placeholder on the map represents the general location of a future facility.
22	Chapter 3, page 27 – The page numbers in Figure 3-2 that direct readers to the different sectors is labeled incorrectly (North says pages 26-29, yet Figure 2-3 is on page 27.	Chapter 3	27	2/10/2010	Page numbers on the map revised to correct discrepancy.

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
23	The last paragraph on p. 31 states that there is relatively low demand and increased bus operating distances limit the expansion of opportunities for the northern portion of Anoka County. The demand for transit services for the corridor is high and can be seen in the Draft 2030 Anoka County Transportation Plan where it indicates that there is a definite need for expanded travel service.	Chapter 3	31	2/5/2010	Revised paragraph 6 on page 30 (previously p.31) to read as follows:  <i>The park-and-ride demand model predicts the greatest existing and future ridership will be generated between Highway 10 and County Road 14. Therefore, the primary focus of park-and-ride investment is the planned facility in Blaine. As governance and operating conditions evolve, Metro Transit will work with local partners to evaluate northerly extensions of transit service along Highway 65.</i>
24	Table 3-12 indicates the information for new riders only. Anoka Co. would like the current ridership to be taken into account as well.	Chapter 3	33	2/5/2010	Baseline usage and forecasted demand in the Plan is based on 2008 usage data for all segments of the Twin Cities Metro Area. "Current" usage figures (for 2008) are included in column 5 of Table 3-12.
25	Section 3.2 Northeast Metro I-35E North (St Paul) – The following sentence should be added to the fourth paragraph. "Other facilities may be considered based on the recommendations of the Rush Line Alternatives Analysis".	Chapter 3	34	2/12/2010	Added the following sentence at the end of paragraph 6 on page 33 (previously page 34): <i>Other facilities may be considered based on recommendations of the Rush Line Alternatives Analysis.</i>
26	Chapter 3, page 34 – The last paragraph states "The primary park-and-ride facility serving I-35E north of St. Paul is Maplewood Mall Transit Center. This facility is currently over capacity and is planned for expansion, as described below.", instead of below maybe "as follows."	Chapter 3	34	2/10/2010	Revised the last sentence of paragraph 7 on page 33 (previously p. 34) to read as follows:  This facility is currently over capacity and is planned for expansion by an additional 550 spaces.
27	Page 34 – At the end the last sentence, change "as described below" to "an additional 550 spaces".	Chapter 3	34	2/17/2010	Revised the last sentence of paragraph 7 on page 33 (previously p. 34) to read as follows:  <i>This facility is currently over capacity and is planned for expansion by an additional 550 spaces.</i>
28	Section 3.2 Hwy 36 East (Minneapolis) and Highway 36 West (St Paul) Corridors - This section should include a discussion on potential siting of new park-and-ride facilities along the Hwy 36 corridor east of 694 to help capture a share of the unmet demand for the overall corridor to both St Paul and Minneapolis.	Chapter 3	35	2/12/2010	Added the following text to paragraph 3 on page 34 (previously page 35): <i>The expanded Maplewood Mall Park-and-Ride will provide a large capacity and will support a high level of service. This will attract users from the Highway 36 corridor east of I-694. If a future river crossing is constructed and congestion increases, an additional park-and-ride farther east should be explored. The planned Maplewood expansion will satisfy current demand projections.</i>

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
29	Page 35 – in paragraph three, “there are four facilities planned for expansion or construction”. Only three expansions are described. Is the Rosedale Mall park-and-ride going to be expanded?	Chapter 3	35	2/17/2010	<p>The following sentence was added to paragraph 3 on page 35 (previously p. 34):</p> <p><i>The four facilities include: I-35E &amp; Co Road 14, I-35E &amp; Co Rd E or CSAH 96, Maplewood Mall Transit Center, and Hwy 36 &amp; Rice Street.</i></p>
30	Regarding the potential market demand for St. Paul, the Plan may want to reference the Robert Street Corridor Transitway feasibility study as a starting point for addressing p-n-r issues in the corridor and that future project development activities will provide greater definition of the transit facility needs in the corridor.	Chapter 3	39	2/15/2010	<p>This section of the Plan was not revised to mention the Robert Street Corridor Transitway feasibility study as the Plan does not mention the variety of studies conducted in other corridors. Metro Transit will reference the study in the future planning efforts as necessary.</p>



#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
31	<p>(1) Table 3.24 Southeast Metro Park-and-Ride Figures – The planned Hastings park-and-ride should be included in the Highway 61 South Corridor not the 52/55 corridor.</p> <p>(2) The planned expansion and estimated 2030 capacity should be increased from 200 to 250 to comply with the Commuter Bus Feasibility Study completed by the Red Rock Corridor Commission in 2009</p>	Chapter 3	41	2/12/2010	<p>(1) The following footnote was added to Tables 2-11, 2-14, 3-3, 3-4, and 3-24 to reflect that a portion of demand for Hastings P&amp;R facility may be associated with the Hwy 61 South corridor rather than the Hwy 52/55 corridor:</p> <p><i>New facilities listed as part of the Hwy 52/55 corridor have potential to increase park-and-ride demand in the Hwy 61 South corridor; therefore, park-and-ride demand and capacity in the Hwy 61 South corridor could be greater than suggested in this table. Park-and-Ride priority of the Hwy 61 South corridor will be re-evaluated on the basis of observed usage patterns as necessary.</i></p> <p>(2) Metro Transit’s demand model estimated a capacity of 200 spaces for the Hastings Park-and-Ride in 2030. This estimated will be retained to be consistent with methodology used in the remainder of the plan. However, to communicate the higher demand estimate that resulted from the Red Rock Corridor Commuter Bus Feasibility Study, the following footnote was added to Table 3-24:</p> <p><i>The Red Rock Corridor Commission completed a Commuter Bus Feasibility Study in 2009, which suggested 2030 should be 250 spaces. Specific market area analyses, as described in Chapter 5 of this plan, will inform the actual capacity.</i></p>
32	Page 43 – At the middle of the second paragraph, the left margin changes	Chapter 3	43	2/17/2010	Margin fixed in second paragraph of Page 42 (previously page 43).
33	Chapter 3, page 44 – Figure 3-31 shows Highway 212 labeled as 312, the road labeled as 212 is Flying Cloud Dr.	Chapter 3	44	2/10/2010	<p>Map in Figure 3-31 revised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hwy 212 road label removed from Flying Cloud Drive</li> <li>- Hwy 312 road label replace with Hwy 212 label</li> </ul>

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
34	Chapter 3, page 46 – Third paragraph refers to “hide and ride”, the term should be explained/defined.	Chapter 3	46	2/10/2010	Added the following footnote text to page 45 (previously page 46):  <i>“Hide and ride” is a term used to describe vehicle parking in non-park-and-ride areas along a transit line for the purpose of boarding transit.</i>
35	Chapter 3, page 46 – Fourth paragraph at the end of the first sentence it states “The Highway 52/55 corridor facilities in the Central Metro sector include those located in the city of Eagan.” From Table 3-37, The Highway 52/55 corridor facilities are not in Eagan, they are in Fort Snelling.	Chapter 3	46	2/10/2010	Revised the first sentence of the fourth paragraph on Page 45 (previously p. 46) to read as follows:  <i>The Highway 52/55 corridor facilities in the Central Metro sector include those located in the city of Fort Snelling.</i>
36	Chapter 3, page 50 – The third paragraph talks about Chanhassen Station will complete with the Southwest Village Park-and –Ride. Looking at Table 3-42 there is no Chanhassen Station listed.	Chapter 3	50	2/10/2010	Table 3-42 revised to include the name "Chanhassen Transit Station" as an alternative to Market Blvd & Pauley Rd.
37	Chapter 3, page 52 – Figure 3-41 shows Highway 212 labeled as 312, the road labeled as 212 is Flying Cloud Dr.	Chapter 3	52	2/10/2010	Map in Figure 3-41 revised as follows: - Hwy 212 road label removed from Flying Cloud Drive - Hwy 312 road label replace with Hwy 212 label
38	With the potential for Ham Lake, East Bethel, and the entire Metro to be included in the Transit Taxing District there will be potential for improved bus service in the area. Also, demand is high for this corridor and not low like it is stated in the document. The Draft 2030 Anoka County Transportation Plan indicates that there are 40,000 trips at CSAH 14 and TH 65 and the projected model shows 50,000 trips. This alone shows a service need. In addition to the Draft 2030 Anoka County Transportation Plan,our 2008 Transit System Plan for Anoka County indicates a need. Please see the 2000 traffic model in the Draft 2030 Anoka County Transportation Plan as a reference.	Chapter 3	30-33	2/5/2010	Revised paragraph 6 on page 30 (previously p.31) to read as follows:  <i>The park-and-ride demand model predicts the greatest existing and future ridership will be generated between Highway 10 and County Road 14. Therefore, the primary focus of park-and-ride investment is the planned facility in Blaine. As governance and operating conditions evolve, Metro Transit will work with local partners to evaluate northerly extensions of transit service along Highway 65.</i>

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
39	Pages 28 and 29 have the same errors as pages 15 and 17. In addition, the totals at the end of the tables are different.	Chapter 3	28-29	2/17/2010	<p>In Table 3-3, unmet need revised for I-35W North as follows:  - 2020: revised to -1,000  - 2030: revised to -400  2020 and 2030 Minneapolis 'Unmet Need' totals were adjusted to reflect changes.</p> <p>In Table 3-4, unmet need revised for Hwy 61 South as follows:  - 2020: revised to 200  2020 and 2030 St. Paul 'Unmet Need' totals were adjusted to reflect changes.</p> <p>Unmet need in Central Cities park-and-rides was removed from Minneapolis and St. Paul totals to correspond with values shown in Tables 2-11 and 2-14.</p>
40	Anoka Co. would also like the plan to mention that there are improvements planned on TH 65 such as interconnected signals, bus shoulders and the awarded CMAQ dollars for use on the corridor. Service is now viable and Anoka County has been awarded \$8,482,235 of CMAQ money through the 2009 Regional Solicitation (2013-2014).	Chapter 3	30-33	2/5/2010	<p>Revised paragraph 3, sentence 3 on page 30 (previously p. 31) to read as follows:  <i>Bus-only shoulders and other features will be added by 2013, allowing competitive transit service to enter the already strong market.</i></p> <p>Note: Information about CMAQ funding a park-and-ride along the TH 65 corridor was not incorporated into the plan, as the remainder of the plan does not include information about granted and/or allocated funding sources for planned park-and-ride facilities.</p>
41	First sentence under the "Highway 212/5 Corridor" section, SouthWest Transit's (SWT) name does not include "Metro." If there are other pages, please delete the word Metro in the SouthWest Transit name.	Chapter 3	50- Check all Pages	2/15/2010	<p>Revised the first sentence of the second paragraph on Page 49 (previously p. 50) to "SouthWest Transit".  Checked the remainder of the document to ensure the error did not appear on other pages of the document.</p>

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
42	Section 3.6. There is a difference between modeling a corridor like 212/5 and the roadways commuters take and the origin areas that they are drawn from. For example, highway 212 is one vein drawing from a different geographical area including the south, southwest and west. Highway 5 is another vein drawing from another geographical area that includes the north, northwest and west. In other words, the two are split and are basically stand alone based on the highways they serve and the commuters that drive them.	Chapter 3	50-51	2/15/2010	Comments addressed in a direct response to Southwest Transit.
43	Should the Hastings information be included as part of the Hwy 61 South Corridor and not with the Hwy 55/52 Corridor? This would be more consistent with the Red Rock Corridor's park and ride needs.	Chapter 3	41	2/15/2010	The Hastings park-and-ride was included in the Hwy 52/55 corridor rather than the Hwy 61 South corridor because Hwy 52/55 aligns most closely with typical travel behavior patterns.
44	(1) Table 4-17: Should include info about the new facility and it's utilization and that the previous location will be redeveloped (not sure if these spaces were included in the 1,238 total), capacity should be capped at 950 spaces. (2) Should also reference the Cedar Avenue Implementation Plan Update is investigating the additional park and ride needs as part of the Cedar Avenue Bus Rapid Transitway. (3)Cedar Grove should be 125 spaces and not 160.	Chapter 3 Chapter 4	42 & 73	2/15/2010	(1) Table 3-32 - changed Apple Valley Transit Station information as follows: - Expansion: 182 spaces - Estimated 2030 Capacity: 950 spaces  (2) Added the following sentence at the end of Section 4.5: <i>The ongoing Cedar Avenue Implementation Plan Update will further inform park-and-ride development in this TH77 corridor.</i>  (3) Table 4-17 revised as follows: -Cedar Grove: Capacity and New Spaces = 125 - Apple Valley Transit Station: - Capacity: 950 spaces - Expansion: 182 spaces
45	The Park-and-Ride plan should mention that there are plans to extend service to St. Cloud, which will affect all modes of transit service in the TH 65 corridor.	Chapter 4	69	2/5/2010	Added the following text in paragraph 3 on page 68 (previously p. 69):  <i>An additional park-and-ride is located in St. Cloud, and served by Northstar Link service, connecting St. Cloud with Big Lake Station.</i>

#	Comment/Question Received from Stakeholder	Plan Chapter	Page #	Date Received	Plan Revision/Metropolitan Council Response
46	<p>(1) Section 4.3 Red Rock Corridor– Delete the word possibly from the first sentence. The Red Rock Corridor is defined as service to St Paul and Minneapolis.</p> <p>(2) A sentence should also be added stating that the Hastings park-and-ride facility could be constructed in advance of rail implementation to support an extension of bus service on route 361 to St Paul and 365 to St Paul or as a stand-alone express bus service.</p>	Chapter 4	69	2/12/2010	<p>(1) Word "possibly" was deleted from the first sentence of paragraph 1 on page 70 (previously 71).</p> <p>(2) Revised paragraph 3 on page 70 (previously 71) to read as follows:</p> <p><i>The Newport facility could be constructed in advance of rail implementation to support existing and future bus service changes to Downtown St. Paul on Route 364. In addition, the Hastings park-and-ride facility could be constructed in advance of rail implementation as an extension of bus service on route 361 and route 365 to St. Paul.</i></p>
47	P&R Capacity is incorrect in Table 4-8 (SW Transitway)	Chapters 3-4	70	1/29/2010	Table 4-8 was revised with updated capacities from Hennepin County. Table 3-37, 3-42, and 3-45 also were revised to correspond with updated Southwest Transitway estimated park-and-ride capacities.
48	As this study deals with regional facilities, there should be a regional review of the study. Whether or not there is public comment period per TPP adoption, this study would benefit from a larger perspective from other public stakeholders, cities in particular as many cities have recently developed transit plans for their communities.	General	General	2/15/2010	Park-and-Ride locations were developed with city and county input, working directly with transit providers and city staff. As projects develop and issues are identified, the <i>2030 Park-and-Ride Plan</i> may be amended as necessary. New park-and-ride locations identified in the Plan resulted from the participation of city stakeholders and transit providers. In addition, Council staff reviewed newly completed local comprehensive planning documents.
49	The Met Council needs to identify other facility needs for regional purposes, such as the Mall of America Transit Station. As future development occurs as well as the introduction of other transitway corridors, the MOA location may no longer serve regional needs. County staff suggests that the Met Council, transit providers and the City of Bloomington begin to address these issues to ensure that every opportunity is seized for transit before further development occurs in the area.	General	General	2/15/2010	This plan focuses solely on park-and-ride facilities. Other facility needs, such as the Mall of America Transit Station, will be considered through other facilities planning processes.
50	Various other minor grammatical and typographical errors	Various	Various	Various	Minor grammatical and typographical errors were corrected in various sections of the final draft of the <i>Plan</i> .