1. **Call to Order**
The meeting was called to order by Chair Freese. Since there had been changes to the committee, there was a round of introductions.

2. **Approval of December Meeting Notes**
The notes of the February 13th meeting were approved as submitted.

3. **Action Item 2014-36 - I-694 / 494 Amendment to the 2030 TPP**

   Mary Karlsson (MTS staff) distributed a one-page handout detailing the proposed improvements to these roadways and their relationship to the Policy Plan and spoke on the intent of the action requested.

   Various questions were generated during the discussion, such as the review process. Mary indicated that TAB was scheduled to recommend the amendment for public comment in June; the Metro Council adopts the TPP amendment for public comment and then forwards a public hearing notice to the State Register by the end of June. A question was raised concerning the $25 million received from ‘other districts’; this apparently came from savings on other projects. Innocent indicated that a letter of approval was given by MPCA. There was a question on how the design would be inter-phased with the intent of MnPASS; MnDOT is working with the local units of government. The issue of whether or not additional pavement would be needed was raised; the response was that north of TH55 there are two additional lanes being added.

   Kevin Roggenbuck moved, and Innocent Eyoh seconded the motion specified by the action transmittal. **Motion carried.**


   Amy Vennewitz (MTS staff) provided a handout and gave an overview of the Plan and the intent of the action being requested of the committee. She indicated that this time there is more engagement in the process, noting that the committee had been the core of the Partner Agency Work Group that had been working on the document for some time. Amy indicated that the committee’s comments were to go to the full TAC for their meeting on June 4th, to TAB on June 18th, and to the Transportation Committee for action in July. The
Council sets the start-date for public review after the State Register is out with the notice (in August).

Jack Byers commented that the City of Minneapolis has a rather short time for their staff to review and comment, given the public comment schedule and hoped that the upcoming changes would not be too extensive.

Several committee members expressed a concern that they have not been able to see that their agencies’ comments were addressed in Thrive, which helps to drive the TPP. Asked about the Thrive public comments schedule, they were told that they should be out by Friday, the 23rd. Asked whether or not the staff foresees major changes to Thrive on transportation issues, the response was ‘No’. The one change that was brought up related to maps identifying job centers. The one map has been replaced with three that identify jobs, educational institutions, and manufacturing/industrial concentrations.

The Chair led the committee through the various chapters and asked for comments.

Part 1:

- Regarding equity on page 4, this should be modified or clarified
- Lisa F commented on Part B, page 6
- The 5th bullet point on page 7 needs clarification
- Regarding pages 8 & 9, this needs a strong focal point on the vision for the highway system
- Issues were raised on Freight, page 11. There is a need to provide a good transportation network for freight and for aggregate, which is not in the core area.
- Page 16, regarding regional balance; this may not be the most strategic approach to take in promoting local transportation projects. (see last sentence in the 1st paragraph) What is meant by “The Council will strategically...........”? Amy indicated that the goal was to have regional balance to distribute funds for local projects.
- Regarding pages 16 & 18 on ‘technology’, we need to be more pro-active in this area.
- On page 18, praise was made on the added section concerning ‘driverless cars’ in that a good planning document recognized new and changing elements.
- Concerns were made on community designations (pages 21 & 23) and how these designations would be used. It was also suggested that additional elements be added to the map on page 22, e.g. the major highway system, the transit system and a legend. A question was raised as to whether this map reflects the final map in Thrive.
- Clarification was asked about the second paragraph on page 33. In response, the activities of the Policy Group Task Force were cited. There were 12 members in this group, 5 Council members, 3 from TAB, CTIB members. This was also the first time that the whole process was reviewed by the Partner Agency Work Group. Advisory groups and advocacy groups were included.
- No additional comments were made concerning sections F through J in Part 1.

Part 2:

- No comments on part A, the Existing System Descriptions.
- Part B, Transportation Policy Plan Strategies, there appears to be no paragraph on the Bike & Pedestrian Systems; there was a suggested reference on the public transit system.
- On page 31 the wording “will place a high priority” rather than “the highest priority”.
- Page 34, it was recommended that the second bullet point be deleted.
• Page 37 should reference the ‘MPO’ rather than the ‘Council’.
• On page 38, paragraph 2, some discomfort was expressed with “most highways”; perhaps it should read “on highways where it is most feasible or reasonable”.
• On C11 (page 46) this needs to be more positive regarding “when resources allow”.
• There is a need for more connection as to what is going on locally, e.g. ‘complete streets’, and acknowledgement of what is going on locally gives a more positive nod to the local constituents. Putting this in the opening text would be a good place.
• Concerning pages 47 & 48, ‘Transitway’ should be removed.
• On page 54, the last paragraph should be reviewed for correctness of the numbers. Jonathan Ehrlich pointed out that the year 2015 info was left out since the Policy Plan would not have been fully implements to have any impact.
• Item F13, page 65 was asked to be either re-worded or removed.

There was a motion to table additional comments on the plan until the members had an opportunity to review the upcoming Thrive public comments. After discussion, it was agreed that the committee would continue the review until around 4:00 PM and then meet again the following week, which would provide an opportunity to review the necessary documents that were expected to be available within days.

• In Section C, Land Use and Local Planning, the term ‘coordination’ under the chapter heading on page 68 should be clarified.
• On page 72, a question was raised about the word ‘recommended’ in the first bullet paragraph. Is this a recommendation or a requirement? Cole Hiniker responded that the Council would probably comment if this was not addressed, but it would not be a requirement.

Before beginning a discussion on Transportation Finance, the committee adjourned for the day. The discussion on the Policy Plan would continue the following Thursday, May 29th at 9:00 AM.

5. Other Business

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.